

By Mr. BROCK:
H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUTTON:
H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:
H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT:
H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution proposing a multilateral treaty to bar all military installations from the seabed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:
H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:
H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN:
H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:
H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIERNAN:
H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAMPLER:
H. Con. Res. 227. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZWACH:
H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:
H. Res. 375. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:
H. Res. 376. Resolution creating a select

committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. QUIE, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H. Res. 377. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of programs for support of education by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. NIX, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Res. 378. Resolution establishing a Select Committee on Congressional Mailing Standards; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

138. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the first session of the 32d Oklahoma Legislature, memorializing Congress to establish November 11 as Veterans Day and May 30 as Memorial Day in each year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

139. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal assistance to storm- and flood-damaged businesses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

140. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to offshore oil and gas operations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

141. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to designating the week of August 1 through August 7, 1969, as "National Clown Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CORMAN:
H.R. 10655. A bill for the relief of Marina Hernandez Portillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:
H.R. 10656. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Calamba Sy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:
H.R. 10657. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a conveyance of certain real property in the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACOBS:
H.R. 10658. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Philip J. Fichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:
H.R. 10659. A bill authorizing the payment of retired pay to Lawrence E. Ellis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN:
H.R. 10660. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:
H.R. 10661. A bill for the relief of Mario Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H.R. 10662. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:
H.R. 10663. A bill to provide private relief for certain members of the U.S. Navy recalled to active duty from the Fleet Reserve after September 27, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:
H.R. 10664. A bill for the relief of Hoo Sun Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

97. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Madison, Wis., relative to honoring deceased Congressmen; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS EXPANDS AIR TIES WITH LATIN AMERICA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the well-being of the Americas is a profound concern of mine. Ever since the charter of Punta del Este establishing the Alliance for Progress within the framework of Operation Pan American we have been struggling with the problem of bringing the people of the Americas accelerated economic progress.

Much progress can be recorded since August 5, 1961. Much more needs to be done. In all our conversations we have constantly stressed how we, the United States and our Latin American neighbors, could build together—how we could help each other—and how we could bring about closer ties with our Latin American brothers.

Not all of this effort need be borne by

the American taxpayer. If we are to be really successful we need the total commitment of the business community as Government's partner in the task of building a sounder economy in Latin America.

American business has done much over the years in opening up new business opportunities and new economic horizons. One such company that has consistently been involved in the growth of South America has grown to the point where it is today the world's most experienced airline—Pan American World Airways. This American corporation has been so closely wedded to the ever-increasing development and growth of the South American people that its very name directs your thoughts to Latin America.

On October 28, 1927, a Pan Am Fokker F-7 appropriately listed as Pan Am Flight No. 1 taxied down a Key West, Fla., runway and flew to the Caribbean. This was the first U.S. International Air Service in scheduled operation. By 1928, Pan American had blazed a trail to the cities of the South American continent.

On April 27 this year Pan American

demonstrated that it is still blazing the Latin American trail when it inaugurated service between New York, Washington, and Guatemala City. These flights are significant since they not only will establish a very vital link with Central America but also because they will establish a connecting network of transportation to such other places as San Salvador, Managua, San Jose, Panama City, Caracas, Sao Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Brasilia.

I am certain the House recognizes the significance of this new service and the tremendous potential for further exchange of thought, people, and economic progress. I am also confident that the establishment of this vital route to Central America will bring a new dimension of friendship with the people of Guatemala and serve as a bridge of our common hope for our people and our common futures.

This new Central American service to Guatemala will increase opportunities for exporters of the Americas to ship by air freight and therefore bring their needed markets much closer to the products

since each of these flights will offer approximately 17,000 pounds of cargo capacity.

I believe this latter fact strengthens our trade ties and serves as another step in strengthening the economy of all countries involved.

PAUL CLAIBORNE, FOUNDER OF INTERNATIONAL 20-30 CLUB, GREW UP WITH HISTORY IN THE MOTHER LODGE

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, funeral services for Paul Claiborne, a poor boy who made good but never lost touch with reality and civic duty, were conducted last week in Auburn, in the heart of California's Mother Lode country.

Paul Claiborne and his family moved to Roseville in 1910, my family arrived in 1907, and all of my life, Paul has been my great and good friend. He has made a contribution to all those lives which have touched his, and the entire community will miss his guidance and good will.

The man, who as a young 20-year-old businessman founded the International 20-30 Club, was a living example of the opportunities which are available to all in this wondrous land.

Paul Claiborne had a strong sense of heritage, which is appropriate for a man whose family has been a factor in American history since 1631 when William Claiborne served as secretary to the colony of Virginia. The Claiborne family moved West with the pioneers, first to Tennessee and then more than a century ago, on to California where the Claibornes settled in Grizzly Flat, a small El Dorado County community. Paul's father moved from the hills to my hometown of Roseville in 1910, where he lived until retirement after 25 years as a railroad worker.

In the words of W. K. Bixler's book entitled "A Dozen Sierra Success Stories":

That was the humble, honorable heritage young Paul Claiborne looked back on as a small lad. It was at that early age when his sense of enterprise began to take shape. Being the oldest child of "quite a large brood," he always seemed to have odd-jobs. In those days, his father's wage for a nine-hour day would be \$2.70. And therefore, everything the boys brought in was welcomed.

In his younger years Paul and his younger brother, Silas, proved their enterprise in many ways: selling fruit to travelers at the railroad depot, selling vegetables, fruit and milk from the family's home garden plot, delivering all the newspapers read in the city of Roseville, and still finding time to go to school.

Prevented from completing high school because of family financial difficulties, Paul followed his father's footsteps to the railroad, working first as a car cleaner,

later as a "wiper" and during World War I as an engine crew dispatcher.

Still in his teens, Paul Claiborne returned to business college in Sacramento. Upon graduation, he became a reporter for the mercantile firm that later became known as Dun & Bradstreet. Subsequently he joined the Retailers Credit Association in Sacramento, an association with which he stayed, except for brief excursions into the advertising business, selling life insurance and operating a Star automobile agency, until 1946 when he organized and became first president of the Placer Savings & Loan Association.

It was during his early days with Retailers Credit that Paul—still not old enough to vote, gave birth to the International 20-30 Club, which today has some 4,500 members belonging to 233 chapters. Even at the age of 20, Paul expressed a great dedication to community service.

This is reflected in the goals set forth by Paul Claiborne and his fellow 20-30 Club organizers—Charles McBride, M. A. "Mike" Page, Earl Casey, and Al Franke:

To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship; to provide a practical means of forming enduring friendships, of rendering altruistic service, and of building better communities.

At an early 20-30 Club organizational meeting, Paul explained it this way:

Our aim is to make the young businessman feel his responsibility to his city while he is making his way, and not wait until he has made his money in the town before he realizes his civic and social obligation to it.

Paul Claiborne lived his lifetime by these words. Few civic projects have been carried out in Auburn and the surrounding area without his guidance and leadership.

His contributions were many, but his most proudest work was through the Savings and Loan Association which he founded. Bixler, in his book on the leaders of the Mother Lode, quotes Paul Claiborne as saying:

In a very real sense, we (the Savings and Loan Association) help people in two ways. We encourage thrift and we help them obtain a home of their own. I've had people thank me with grateful tears in their eyes, which proves to me the importance of a home as a basis for our way of life.

This was a man who believed in the blessings of this land of ours. This was a man who was convinced that the citizen had to work and contribute to the Nation in order to earn these blessings, and no one worked harder or contributed more than Paul Claiborne. Along with his great dedication to this Nation, Paul Claiborne held a great love for his fellow man. He cared about people. He spent a lifetime doing things for them. We will miss Paul Claiborne. He was one of God's greatest people, but this world is a better place for his having lived here.

Our love and our prayers are with his wonderful wife, Mary, and all the family of Paul Claiborne, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, on April 17, the Auburn Journal carried an excellent account of the life of Paul Claiborne. I ask unani-

mous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

PAUL CLAIBORNE DIES SUDDENLY OF HEART ATTACK

(By Joe Carroll)

Funeral services for Paul Claiborne, a poor boy who made good but never lost touch with reality and civic duty, were conducted yesterday at the Chapel of the Hills.

Mr. Claiborne, president and manager of Placer Savings and Loan Association and the founder of the International 20-30 Club, died Sunday evening at a local hospital after suffering an apparent heart attack at his home, 174 College Way. He was 67.

Members of Eureka Lodge No. 16, F. & A.M., officiated at the rites which were followed by burial in the New Auburn District Cemetery.

A native of Indiana, Mr. Claiborne was two years old when his parents moved to California, settling first in Sacramento, then El Dorado County and finally, in 1910, in Roseville.

His Horatio Alger-like career took shape in Roseville where as a youth he helped support his parents by holding dozens of odd jobs, hustling fruit to travelers at the railroad depot and delivering newspapers. Conditions were such that he had to quit high school and concentrate on earning a living, although he later managed to attend Heald's Business College.

In 1922, when he was 20 and working in a Sacramento business house, he saw the need for young persons in community service. In later years he explained the club's purpose:

"Our aim is to make the young businessman feel his responsibility to his community while he is making his way and not wait until he has made his money in the town before he realizes his civic and social obligation to it."

In 1926 Mr. Claiborne settled in Auburn—"the friendliest place in the world," he reflected to friends only the other day—and started the retailer's credit association here. He later operated the Placer Land Company and in 1946 organized Placer Savings and Loan Association, an immensely successful venture.

But despite his rise in the business world, Mr. Claiborne never lost sight of his civic responsibilities. He was a "doer" and not merely a "talker."

The suddenness of his death shocked hundreds of persons here and across the nation. Among the first to wire condolences to his family were President and Mrs. Richard M. Nixon, who said in part: "We have lost a dear and old friend, and no words can convey how deeply he will be missed."

Resolutions honoring him were approved by the Legislature on motions by Assemblyman Eugene Chapple and Senator Stephen P. Teale. The Placer County Board of Supervisors adjourned in his memory this week as did the Auburn City Council, which he served for many years as a planning commissioner.

Mr. Claiborne's interests and affiliations were legion. He was a charter member of the Auburn Dam Committee, a member and past president of the Mother Lode Golden Chain Council, a past president of the Tahoe Council of the Boy Scouts, a past secretary of the Auburn Area Chamber of Commerce, a charter member and past president of the Sierra View Country Club, a past president of the Auburn Rotary Club and a past district governor of Rotary International.

A former member of the board of trustees of the Auburn Elementary School District, he was a longtime member and past chairman of the Placer County Republican Central Committee, a member of the Placer County Board of Realtors and a member of the Tahoe Club.

In addition to Eureka Lodge No. 16, his Masonic affiliations included membership in the Placer Shrine Club, Ben All Temple of the Shrine, the Royal Order of Jesters, the Knights Templar and the Royal Arch Masons. Fraternally, he belonged to the Elks and the Eagles.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: COOL, IMPRESSIVE, AND SELF-ASSURED

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the April 18, 1969, edition of the Charlotte Observer which is highly complimentary of the Vice President.

Following is the complete editorial:

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW: COOL, IMPRESSIVE, AND SELF-ASSURED

(By David E. Gillespie)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President Spiro T. Agnew in person is cool, poised, relaxed and impressive in speech and looks. He is taller and more slender than he looks on television or in newspaper photographs. He is an immaculate dresser, highly masculine and has a ready smile that crinkles and brightens his face.

The Vice President exuded confidence Thursday morning as he sat in his Executive Office Building quarters and talked informally for half an hour with news and editorial executives of Knight Newspapers. His answers to questions came with calm self-assurance and an attractive sense of humor.

Press secretary Herb Thompson (a native of Chadbourne, N.C., who was educated at Wake Forest) met the Vice President's visitors and ushered them into Mr. Agnew's office. The decor is off-white and * * * by a low coffee table at one end of the office.

NO GOLF, JUST TENNIS

Chairs were arranged in a circle around the table. The Vice President seated himself in one and the others were occupied by John S. Knight, editorial director of Knight Newspapers; Lee Hills, publisher of The Detroit Free Press; Mark Ethridge Jr., editor of The Free Press; Ben Maldenburgh, publisher of The Akron Beacon Journal; Don Shoemaker, editor of The Miami Herald; Robert Boyd, chief of the Knight Newspapers Washington Bureau; and The Charlotte Observer's representative.

A white-jacketed steward served coffee as the conference got under way. Mr. Knight remarks that the Vice President appeared to have lost weight and asked him about his golf game.

The Vice President laughed. "I've given up golf," he said. "I got so disgusted with my score. I'm playing some tennis."

Mr. Agnew wore a smartly fitted dark suit with cuffless pants. His shirt was light blue with a silk handkerchief to match in his breast pocket. His diagonally striped tie in two shades of blue was subdued. His shoes were buffed to a high gloss. In conversation he uses his hands expressively. The ring finger of his left hand held an unusually wide wedding band.

Mr. Knight began the questioning by asking him about his reaction to critical news stories and editorials in the presidential campaign. How had abrasive comments affected him personally?

HARD TO TAKE

The Vice President answered quickly. It was "hard to take" he said because he had always enjoyed a good press and a good rela-

tionship with members of the press as governor of Maryland.

"I began to feel," he said, "that there was an inordinate amount of interest in the 'fluff' and not enough on the issues of the day."

He added that he did not feel that certain reporters were out to get him in the campaign. "It was not that simple," he said. He did get the impression that some reporters had made up their minds about the election and were not averse to showing him in a bad light when they got a chance to do so.

Mr. Agnew said that while he may have been harmed somewhat by the press, the impression that he was being picked on could have crystallized some support for him that "might have gone in another direction."

"Personally," he said about the criticism, "I didn't like it. My family held up very well under it. Even among the children there was never any real problem."

REWARDS GREATER THAN EXPECTED

How does he feel personally about the job after three months?

Mr. Agnew said it is "more rewarding than I ever envisaged . . . mainly because the President, having been through the job and knowing the weaknesses and strengths, saw fit to reinforce the positive side."

Smiling, he added, "The Vice President can be a forgotten man, you know. I don't feel that way at all. I am a member of every important Cabinet committee—vice chairman, in fact, of those committees."

He cited his duties in the areas of inter-governmental cooperation, the Space Council and the Marine Sciences Council as being of special interest. "My only impediment," he said, "is time, and if it were true that this job is unimportant, I wouldn't be able to joke about it." He estimated that he puts in a work day of 12 to 14 hours.

"The 'on-the-job' training is constant. There are frequent meetings at the Cabinet level. I would estimate that in the first three months there have been well over 70 of these lasting from an hour to two and a half hours each. In addition to my own staff, I have access to the President's staff in getting prepared for my duties."

"There is no danger," the Vice President said, that he would ever be in the unformed position of President Harry Truman at the time of the death of President Roosevelt.

"Truman began the new attitude toward the vice presidency," he said. "The staff prepares vital information for me which I read every morning, including the classified information essential for the meetings I attend."

URBAN PROBLEMS PRESSING

Mr. Agnew spoke feelingly of his work with the Urban Affairs Council. He parried any hint of disagreement within the administration on either urban affairs or defense matters. "At this point," he said, "I know of no friction in this administration. I suppose there will be, but not now."

Explaining his views on the problems of the cities, Mr. Agnew said, "The most frustrating thing is getting a handle on these problems." He is inclined to feel that the nation has gotten off the track in placing so much emphasis on the socioeconomic aspects of urban problems when the basic problem is "environment."

"The environment (ghettos, poverty, ugliness, etc.) is not conducive to yielding the kind of results from the seed money put into it," he said. He cited the great personal distractions of adults and children under slum and poverty conditions where population density is high.

"These people need a place to live that is pleasant," he said. "We can't talk about curing the problems by talking only about the physical boundaries of the city. We need total environmental planning. The Model Cities program needs to focus more on the

entire metropolitan area—not just the city. We need more planned industrial-residential 'new towns' with low, medium and high cost dwellings. It seems to me we must attack the problem of density . . . You can't expect a man, regardless of job training, to go home and sleep in a cold room with rats, flashing neon signs, 20 or 30 distractions, and do anything. It's the same with a child, regardless of Head Start, nutrition or hot breakfast, if he doesn't have a place to live where he can learn or study."

ABM—"ONLY PROTOTYPE"

Mr. Agnew offered a calm defense of President Nixon's decision on the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System, describing it as "only an R&D (research and development) prototype."

"I was unalterably opposed to a thick (ABM) system," he said, "and even to a thin system that would grow into a thick system. But there is nothing about the nature or cost of the President's program that is irreversible if the facts change. I don't see any real resemblance between the Safeguard system and the Sentinel system (of the Johnson administration)."

"All the President has said is, 'Don't tie my hands at this point.'"

"If at the end of a year or so considerable progress has been made on détente (with the Soviet Union) we can take a new look."

The Vice President said he shared some of his associates' concern about the Soviet Union's missile intentions. He said the Russians have closed the gap until there is near parity in intercontinental ballistic missiles and that Russian development of the SS-9 missiles with 25-megaton warheads does not represent a defensive effort.

He said he was concerned with two things about the Russians—their invasion of Czechoslovakia and their speed in building offensive missiles.

Mr. Knight wanted to know about the replacement of Republican Party Chairman Ray Bliss with Representative Rogers Morton of Maryland. In view of Bliss' pragmatic, unifying approach to the job, he asked couldn't Morton's more vocal position on issues lead to division within the party?

"Yes," said Mr. Agnew. "There could be splits, but these were probably inevitable whether Bliss stayed or not." He said he has great admiration for Morton, to whom he gave credit for first urging him to run for the governorship in Maryland. He said Morton would make a good party chairman.

GOP IN SOUTH

As for the Republican Party in the South, the Vice President said he did not want the party to be viewed only "as a refuge for every alienated Democrat" but as a party that could effectively represent the American people and solve the nation's problems.

He implied that he does not feel the party would be built soundly in the South on racial or radical-right grounds, although, "I guess the first instinct of a person alienated from his own party . . . is immediately attracted to the other party, whether the other party seeks him or not."

The Vice President paused at one point in his remarks to explain noisy pounding going on outside his office. "I sent a secretary out to see what the noise was," he said, "for it was hard to work in here. She said a small office was being added for the President's convenience. I now find that sound very compatible."

In exactly a half hour after we entered, the interview was over. Vice President Agnew shook hands all around and bid us goodbye near a painting of Andrew Jackson.

For all the lampooning he has gotten, Mr. Agnew comes off as a man who has risen to the demands of the job so far. And in his calm, reasoned demeanor and firm handshake there is evidence of a bit of "Old Hickory" in his own makeup.

CALL TO ACTION

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1969, some 97 Iowa Farm Bureau women came to Washington by charter plane and during the course of their stay in the Nation's Capital they gave a dinner honoring the members of the Iowa congressional delegation and their wives.

Following the dinner, one of the principal addresses of the evening was given by Mrs. Herbert Johnson, State chairman of the Iowa Farm Bureau Women, and herself the wife of a farmer living near Charles City, Iowa.

While I differ with the Farm Bureau policy of international free trade, I wholeheartedly support Mrs. Johnson and her organization in support of constitutional government and the private enterprise system. As Mrs. Johnson so well points out:

The amazing productivity of American agriculture hinges on this system.

To the end that others may have the opportunity to read Mrs. Johnson's excellent remarks on this occasion, I hereby submit them for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Distinguished Guests and Farm Bureau Friends: We appreciate the presence of our esteemed Congressmen and their wives here this evening. We are grateful for the high calibre of our representatives in our Nation's Capitol. We wholeheartedly support your efforts to further the interests of Iowa Citizens, for the country as a whole, and the world.

Why did this group of Iowa women leave their homes and families to make the trip to see the federal government in action, guiding the affairs of our great and beloved country? We are homemakers and mothers. As such, we are women concerned about the future of our country and children. Years ago the law making role of a woman was limited to laying down a few rules in her home. Now more and more women are interested in working for good government, willing to take time for discussion, study, and solid thinking. The stakes are worth it! In addition to our role as homemaker and mother, we are wives of farmers. Farmers and business people engaged in the biggest business in the world, agriculture. As their wives, we find ourselves in the role of business partner and financial adviser. We are deeply concerned over the part the federal government plays in the conduct of this immense business enterprise. I am convinced that deliberate misconceptions spread about the importance of the part federal farm policies play, and can reasonably be expected to play, in making or breaking us as farmers, have caused much of the wheel-spinning in agriculture. We in our organization believe in supply management by farmers. Time has proven to us that the answers to most of our farm problems are at our doorstep, if we but look for them. Farm Bureau members have long been on record as determined to control the supplies of food and fibre they produce, rather than handing over this responsibility to government, or to labor, or to anyone else outside of agriculture. We do realize the need for government help in expanding markets, one of the most important functions, to promote economic cooperation through trade and the free flow of capital. This is a must if agriculture is to avoid very

serious trouble. A healthy and expanding world trade will aid the developing nations to increase their strength, as well as keeping our own economy healthy. We in Farm Bureau feel that international trade should be as free as is practicable. We should do everything we can to reduce tariff barriers, quantitative restrictions, and other interventionist devices. International commodity agreements should be vigorously opposed. The critical needs of the less developed countries are greater capital investment and improved know-how. We Farm Bureau members feel that the private enterprise system, self-reliance, and freedom of farm people to make their own decisions are the ingredients of our nation's continued abundance of food. They are the ingredients of a healthy national economy. Agriculture has outdone all other industries in Iowa, indeed in the nation, in terms of production, with much of the nation's economic growth made possible because of an efficient agriculture. Our agricultural production is the envy of most of the world. Food is high priority as a human need!

You will note that I have been referring to *members* of Farm Bureau, rather than *leaders* of Farm Bureau. Why do I use that term? For two reasons, (1) because of the procedure our organization uses to develop its policy, (2) because of the integrity of Farm Bureau leaders and staff in abiding by, and doing their best to carry out the policies which stem from the men on the land. I have participated in every step of our policymaking so think I can tell it like it is.

Farm families discuss issues. They talk problems over in the community and make recommendations. County resolutions are adopted and recommendations made to the State Farm Bureau. Adopted state resolutions become policies for dealing with state problems and recommendations to the American Farm Bureau Federation for dealing with national and international issues. It is "farmers speaking for farmers". Information is vital to analysis and discussion. A large part of Farm Bureau's activities consists of informing members by way of voluntary leaders, county and state bulletins and publications, national publications, and, in Iowa, our own Farm Bureau Spokesman, distributed weekly to all members. Many booklets, leaflets and special studies are used as discussion materials in neighborhood, community, and county meetings which are held to develop understanding and arrive at solutions to problems. Usage of the media of radio and TV is being stepped-up. We have found that once volunteer citizens have the facts they operate with effective strength. More than 40,000 persons annually participate in developing the policy of the Iowa Farm Bureau. Much effort is directed toward increasing this participation. We know of no other organization that tries this hard to represent the viewpoint of a majority of its members.

I indicated earlier that Iowa Farm Bureau women are vitally concerned for the future of our nation. We are well aware that each generation has to work to keep the Republic established by our forefathers. Our importance as individuals can be best measured by our willingness to participate actively in the effort to preserve freedoms. The theme of the American Farm Bureau women for 1969 is Progress Through Participation. Being concerned simply isn't enough. We feel we must be involved if we are to make progress.

There are few areas in which women can and will do so much work, and work so effectively, as in the area of Political Education. It is activity women like to do, and they do it well.

They make supreme efforts to be informed on issues, and to help others inform themselves. I guess you could say that our members are "issue oriented." We feel that it is essential to avoid "tunnel vision" as we seek to deal with various public policy issues. By

"tunnel vision" I refer to the human tendency to become preoccupied with only that part of the issue that hits us directly. We in Farm Bureau try hard to employ the wide angle vision a basketball player demonstrates when he watches every member on both teams as he serves the basketball down the court. We want to know that our actions will not adversely affect our whole economy.

Our most desperate concern is to prevent further erosion of the private Enterprise system. The amazing productivity of American agriculture hinges on this system. We farm people operate on so-called "Venture capital," which we might consider the very life-blood of the Free Enterprise System. We live with the fact that with such investment of capital into the land or equipment required to operate our enterprise we take a very real risk of losing all or part of our money. In return, however, there is also a chance for maximum gain or profit as our investment. The most productive farming requires people who save money from their earnings, often by frugal living, and are willing to risk it on expansion or new ventures. This is freedom of enterprise. Obviously, one motive is the possibility of realizing a significant profit. There are some people who would have you believe that profit in and of itself, objectionable, and that the individual or business enterprise which earns a profit has done so at the cost of sweat and blood and tears of other human beings. Actually, without profits, there will be no Free Enterprise system, which has given Americans the highest standard of living the world has ever known, even for these people at the so-called "poverty level." Most of them have a TV, a radio, the opportunity to avail themselves of our tax-supported public education system, and many other benefits.

Incidentally, I want to remind us that profits are the life-blood of any system of government based on taxation. We hear much about excessive profits, but is there any such thing? When the Free Enterprise System is permitted to perform its legitimate function, any excess profit is automatically self-correcting. Any enterprise realizing an unusually high profit attracts other capital to the same field, the same activity, to the same market, until such profit, through the force of competition, drops to the level that capital is earning generally. For example: The manufacture of nitrogen fertilizer has been extremely profitable for many years. Production has now increased and bargain prices prevail. In other words, this so-called excessive profit directs the flow of capital into these areas where there is an obvious need, and, conversely, when the profit factor becomes ordinary, the flow of capital will be directed to other areas and activities. The level of profit, however, is merely the signal. The consumer, is what is collectively known as the market place, actually determines the price and consequently level of profit.

We would take the Ford Motor Company as a specific illustration. When, in the early part of this century, Ford came out with a standardized product, a high volume, at a price within reach of many consumers, they unearthed a huge demand for automobiles. They began to realize unusually high profits, based on volume. As a result, a tremendous amount of capital flowed into the automotive industry, hundreds of corporations were established, and competition for Ford sprang up everywhere. Eventually, when the need was supplied, the profit rate in the automotive industry sank back to normal levels. During this time 100's of different automobiles were marketed, of which 90% failed and disappeared from the market. When competitors flock in this way to supply the same need, they are forced to refine the product, improve the service, and better satisfy the consumer's need. In my mind, this is the basic reason we have in the U.S. the biggest

supply of the best food at the lowest percentage of the consumer's income of any country in the world. AFBF President Shuman has said that if we believe in progress we must accept competition. Protection by government for these in competition will soon destroy competition, and then progress and prices.

We fear the loss of this system which has worked so well for us for so many years. We may lose it because we fail to realize that we cannot have the superficial attractive benefits of a Welfare State, and at the same time, maintain and expand our economy in a sound manner. Even worse we must recognize that if we destroy our Free Enterprise System, we destroy our democratic system of government. One cannot exist without the other. We expect you to approach the problems facing us as citizens in a statesmanlike way. We assume and ask you to help our Free Enterprise System and our Democratic Form of Government.

BERKELEY OPPOSES ABM

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether the United States should construct an antiballistic missile is one of increasing national concern.

Not only are we in Washington aware of the enormous costs, the risks of escalation in the arms race, and the questionable efficiency of the ABM system, but, in my hometown of Berkeley, Calif., the city council has, by resolution, stated its strong opposition to the construction of an anti-ballistic-missile system.

I heartily concur in this opposition, and I ask unanimous consent to include the text of this resolution in the RECORD at this point.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING DEVELOPMENT AND INSTALLATION OF PROPOSED ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM BY THE U. S. GOVERNMENT

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows:

Whereas, the Berkeley City Council adopted a resolution in August, 1967, stating that "it is the belief of this Council that the greatest task of the City and of our nation is to correct the ills of our society: unemployment, underemployment, poverty, under-education and discrimination"; and

Whereas, the construction of the proposed anti-ballistic missile system with its estimated cost of ten (10) to one hundred (100) billion dollars would seriously hinder the pursuance of that task; and

Whereas, an installation such as that planned for the San Francisco Bay Area would place its neighboring communities in jeopardy of accidental nuclear explosions as well as make them a prime target in a nuclear attack; and

Whereas, there is great doubt among experts as to the effectiveness of such an anti-ballistic missile system in protecting our nation.

Now, therefore, Be it Resolved that the Berkeley City Council opposes the development and installation of the proposed anti-ballistic missile system by the United States Government.

Approved as to form:

ROBERT ANDERSON,
City Attorney.

YALE'S POSITION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, in light of the current events taking place on campuses across this country, I believe that Members will be interested in a reasoned exchange of letters between John Perry Miller, dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Yale University, and Kingman Brewster, Jr., the president of Yale.

This correspondence reflects, in my judgment, Yale's concern for close communication between faculty, students, and administration and is a timely statement of a forthright university position.

Under unanimous consent, I include President Brewster's and Dean Miller's letters in the RECORD at this point.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES,
April 2, 1969.

KINGMAN BREWSTER, Jr.,
President, Yale University.

DEAR KINGMAN: While you were away Secretary Finch reminded all colleges and universities about the legislation which withdraws federal aid from students found to have violated criminal laws during student disruptions. He also asked for further discussion on all campuses about both the protection of dissent and the prevention of disruption.

The Corporation made it clear last fall that it did not intend to treat students on federal funds any differently from those on other funds or on their own. Also, you have made it clear that Yale intends to continue the protection of dissent, no matter how radical. Finally, your recent Annual Report and other public statements have made it clear that disruption at Yale should expect to be met by suspension or dismissal.

In view of Secretary Finch's letter, do you plan to make any further formal statements?

Sincerely,

JOHN PERRY MILLER,
Dean.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
April 6, 1969.

JOHN PERRY MILLER,
Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

DEAR JOHN: Thanks for your note about Secretary Finch's letter concerning the withdrawal of federal aid from disruptive students.

I had not planned to add to the statements I have already made; but your letter prompts me to give you my own current thinking.

First of all, I am sure we were right to respond to the legislation which seeks to discipline disrupters by withdrawing their federal loans and grants by saying that Yale students would be disciplined by Yale standards wherever their financial support came from. In all likelihood we would have suspended or dismissed any student whose action involved criminal liability for campus violence or disruption anyway, but the fact he was on federal funds shouldn't affect either his rights or our decision. Also I have stated on several public occasions that the effort to use loans and scholarships to regulate local conduct seems to me repugnant to the spirit of the United States Constitution. I don't think that the spending power should be used as a subterfuge for extending the federal police power. In the particular case of educational institutions there is the special concern about academic freedom

and institutional autonomy. While I wish President Nixon had opposed this kind of legislation, I was glad to see that his recent statement put the responsibility for campus government on the institution not in Washington.

So, if it is up to us, what are we going to do about it? We have thus far followed two lines, and I think we shall continue to do so.

First, we have not only protected but we have encouraged controversy and have indulged dissent no matter how extreme, whether by students, faculty, or visitors. This has applied to all forms of verbal demonstration, protest, and criticism, whether directed at national or local policy or at Yale. When Yale policy has been at issue we have done our best to make it possible for the message to get through to and be responded to by the person whose ideas or actions were in question. Often the criticism or suggestion has found resilient response, especially in the case of curricular flexibility, course load, grading system, and the development of experimental programs such as African-American Studies. While I think the faculty has to have the right to meet alone on academic and appointments matters if they are to be uninhibited in their job of setting and maintaining standards for degrees and for their own ranks, I think that we do have to continue to experiment with ways in which the great variety of student views can be taken into account, even on such matters. Also I am increasingly aware that there has to be some protection of professional legal, financial, and architectural advisors against being second-guessed by amateurs or neophyte professionals if the University is to get on with its administrative decisions competently. Nevertheless, those most directly affected by an action based on professional advice should have a chance to make their views and interests known, not as professional advisors but as parties directly affected.

Finally, the more opportunity for basic reappraisal of the ends and means of a University, the better it will be, both for the education of our students and for the quality of Yale.

So, proposition one is the encouragement of controversy, no matter how fundamental; and the protection of dissent, no matter how extreme. This is not just to permit the "letting off of steam" but because it will improve Yale as a place in which to be educated.

Proposition number two is a convincing intention to deal speedily and firmly with any forcible interference with student and faculty activities or the normal use of any Yale facilities. Lest anyone should be surprised at this "hard line" approach to disruption, I affirmed it explicitly in my Annual Report. More important, I have encouraged Deans to call this policy to the attention of any individual students or groups who seemed disposed to risk possible resort to disruption.

I see no basis for compromise on the basic proposition that forcible coercion and violent intimidation are unacceptable means of persuasion and unacceptable techniques of change in a university community, as long as channels of communication and the chance for reasoned argument are available. The principle involved is so basic that I could not imagine trying to discharge my responsibility as presiding trustee and chief executive officer if I were required to stand aside while any of Yale's activities or facilities were forcibly interfered with, even if the rest of the University might, as a practical matter, continue to operate.

At the same time I am quite aware that the faculties have a special responsibility to be sure that students are not disciplined unfairly as a result of administrative pique or under political or alumni pressure. Even though only the trustees can, legally, confer a degree of the University and invite a stu-

dent or faculty or staff member to use its funds and facilities, no ultimate disciplinary action should ever be taken without giving presumptive weight to the recommendation of the faculty involved.

So, the dilemma is how to act speedily and firmly; hopefully to prevent, at worst to bring to a stop, any forcible disruptive interference with Yale activities or facilities, and at the same time honor the faculty's crucial role in any final disposition of sanctions against a student or faculty member.

I have been reluctant to spell out any "scenario." First, Yale's almost unique good fortune in the avoidance of any resort to violence or disruption makes me reluctant to stir up the atmosphere. Almost anything I might say would to someone seem either provocative, defensive, or smug. Also, I am quite aware that no amount of forethought will ever anticipate the event, and intuitive reaction is part of the risk of responsibility. Also, we learn by our own experience and thought as well as by the experience of others.

Subject to these caveats, however, my present instinct would be to react as follows in the event of a forcible interference with Yale activities or facilities.

First, I would make a clear and precise invitation to meet with the disrupters at some stated place and some stated time in the immediate future where discussion could be held without limit of time and without interfering with the conduct of any University activity or access to any useful facility.

Second, assuming this invitation is spurned, I would inform the disrupters that if they did not desist within a stated short period of time they would be subject to immediate suspension. This suspension would remain in effect until terminated, modified, or extended; or superseded by dismissal on recommendation of the appropriate faculty. If I had a definite view about the appropriateness of suspension or dismissal as the ultimate disposition, I should in fairness try to inform the disrupters of what I proposed to recommend to the appropriate faculty.

I would hope that a brief time to ponder this prospect would persuade those involved to abandon their wilful persistence in disruption.

Third, if the wilful and forcible interference persisted after such warning, I would declare the suspension of those involved and feel under an obligation to use whatever University or public legal resources seemed necessary to enable the activities and facilities of the University to be restored to their normal course and use. If legal authority were to be invoked, a court order might be obtained first. The resources of the campus police would be exhausted before considering, as a last resort, any request for assistance from authorities outside the University.

Fourth, each faculty whose students or colleagues were involved would be asked immediately to proceed to make their own recommendation about how the interim suspension should be disposed of. Obviously this would involve a review of the appropriateness of the interim suspension and a consideration of the administrative recommendation for ultimate disciplinary action. Whatever the procedure traditionally resorted to by the particular faculty it would obviously be necessary to assure those whose cases were under review full opportunity for a fair hearing.

I am not unaware of the risks of this way of proceeding. It focuses the burden on me for swift and decisive response, subject to the second guessing of a more calm and deliberative process later on. It is even possible that a faculty reversal of a President's judgment would seriously impair the President's usefulness and fitness to continue. I personally find that risk much more acceptable than the risk of being unable to take speedy and unambiguous interim action against anyone who would wilfully persist in trying to intimidate Yale into following his will by seeking to disrupt its normal activities.

Also, of course, to the extent it seemed appropriate I might delegate any of the powers involved in any stage of these proceedings to a fellow officer or dean; except that resort to public legal authority, I think, should be reserved to the officers of the University in order to be sure that such unwelcome resort is clearly a last resort.

Throughout this letter I have talked about what I would do. Obviously this is no one man band. Most important, the Yale Provost is a Deputy President in the full sense. Charlie and I have talked about this a lot. Any powers I can exercise, he can too. I know he would take exactly the same position, not only in principle, but in detail. (Although being an English Professor he might state it with more felicity than can be expected of a Law Professor.)

Sincerely,

KINGMAN BREWSTER, Jr.,
President.

MUCH AT STAKE IN TOBACCO BATTLE

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, in our second congressional district, Mr. L. L. Valentine is the president and general manager of the Franklin Favorite in Franklin, Ky., and I consider it a privilege to call your attention to the editorial which appeared in the April 24 edition of that newspaper:

CUTTING THROAT TO CLIP WART OFF OF NOSE

Nobody yet, has contended that by smoking, in any degree, the smoker has found that universally sought but ever elusive fountain of everlasting youth.

Neither has anybody nailed down positive proof that smoking cigarettes causes lung cancer or any other disease. Statistical, or purely circumstantial evidence, points an accusing finger at smoking. But when did we begin executing suspects without proof of guilt?

When cornered and pinned down to facts, even the crusaders against tobacco admit they have found no direct causative link. The purely circumstantial evidence they have points not to smoking—but to excessive smoking.

Of the millions who smoke, comparatively few smoke excessively. And it's to the heavy smokers that the health crusaders essentially direct their warnings. Heavy smokers need and should heed the warnings. So should people who haven't formed the habit.

But now the health crusaders have recruited, or joined, a new ally, the opponents of price supports. Both camps know, of course, that without price supports and crop controls tobacco growers will stifle themselves with over production. And the battle against smoking has changed to a war on the crop.

On purely circumstantial evidence, the opponents of smoking, whatever their cause may be, would rob the nation of a \$10 billion industry and rob millions of their jobs and income because a relatively few people smoke excessively.

Who but taxpayers will cough up the \$3½ billion which the federal government collects annually from tobacco taxes?

In Kentucky, the state derives \$7 million annually from taxes on tobacco. Who but the taxpayers—in the form of other taxes—will make up the loss?

In Kentucky, 450,000 people work in tobacco, producing the crop, marketing it and processing it. Where will these workers find jobs to replace the ones they will lose?

How will Kentucky farmers replace the 77

per cent of their income which they will lose if the crop is lost?

Getting down to the nitty-gritty of the question, to protect the few who smoke heavily, the antitobaccoists would penalize the many, with heavier taxes, loss of jobs by millions, and rob them of income it takes to pay grocery bills.

More people than tobacco growers have a stake in this battle.

TO FIGHT PORNOGRAPHY

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, today I am introducing a bill which I believe will be effective in keeping pornographic material out of the hands of minors and in keeping minors away from obscene movies.

The U.S. Post Office Department estimates that more than \$500 million worth of obscene material is sold to young people through the mail each year. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warned more than a year ago:

The publication and sale of obscene material is big business in America today . . . It is impossible to estimate the amount of harm to impressionable teenagers and to assess the volume of sex crimes attributable to pornography, but its influence is extensive.

FBI statistics show that sexual violence is increasing at an alarming pace, and Mr. Hoover states that pornography in all its forms is a major cause of sex crimes, aberrations, and perversions.

A factor complicating the legislative attempts to deal with the increasing flow of pornography has been the uncertainty in the law caused by the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the area of antiobscenity legislation. State legislatures do not know, and the U.S. Supreme Court has not stated with certainty what statutory regulations will be upheld.

Since obscenity is not protected by the first amendment of the Constitution, and since Congress has a responsibility to protect the public interest, I believe there are compelling reasons for Congress to take the initiative and deal with the problem. It is for these reasons that I am introducing legislation today to suppress traffic in obscenity, particularly pornographic material that is sent to young people through the mail.

My bill makes it a Federal crime to disseminate through interstate commerce or the mails obscene matter to minors under the age of 18. Moreover, to protect families, my bill prohibits the unsolicited mailing of obscene material to people with minor children living with them. To enforce its provisions, the bill provides a penalty which is higher than in similar bills introduced by many of my colleagues. A penalty of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000 and imprisonment for not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years is provided for the first offense. For each additional offense, the penalty is not less than \$3,000 nor

more than \$20,000 and imprisonment for not less than 3 years nor more than 10 years.

My bill would further bar Federal courts from hearing appeals of local jury finding of fact in obscenity cases. Thus, under this provision, if a movie, theatrical production, or publication were found obscene by a jury under local law, no appeal could be taken to the Federal courts. This provision still retains the right of appeal on questions of law to protect "due process." Moreover, the Congress is clearly within its constitutional powers in so limiting the appellate jurisdiction.

I am hopeful that committee action can soon be taken on this proposal so that the youth can be protected from the ever-increasing traffic in obscene materials in this country.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Muscatine Journal featured an editorial earlier this year endorsing the concept of revenue sharing; and in particular, my bill H.R. 663. The earlier editorial appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 28, 1969, at page 2049. Last week the Journal featured another editorial on this subject, indicating the growing support for this proposition throughout the country. Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

REVENUE SHARING

It appears that more and more hard-pressed governors and mayors are lining up behind proposals for revenue sharing as a means of fiscal salvation for the nation's cities and states.

They are arguing that revenue sharing might help replace a federal grant system of unbelievable complexity.

At last count 21 federal agencies with some 400 regional and field offices were administering at least 160 major programs based on more than 400 congressional authorizations. And the aid they dispense has grown from \$5-billion in fiscal 1958 to an estimated \$25-billion for fiscal 1970.

On the receiving end, are more than 80,000 state and local government jurisdictions, including 3,049 counties, over 35,000 municipalities, towns and townships, some 20,000 independent school districts, and as many special districts for water supply, sewerage, road building and other functions.

Revenue sharing is the process by which the federal government—which receives two-thirds of all taxes collected—automatically would turn over to the states and localities a portion of its yearly revenues. Revenue sharing, say its advocates, fosters the kind of decentralized decision-making that would reinvigorate the local governments. Grants, by contrast, are rarely discretionary.

More than ninety bills having to do with one form of revenue sharing or another were introduced during the 1967 session of Congress. President Nixon endorsed revenue during his campaign and recently Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York proposed that the federal surtax be retained and its revenues given to the states.

While revenue sharing admittedly has some flaws, it certainly has more merit than any of the other proposals presented to date for the solution of urban crises.

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME A CONSERVATION SHOWCASE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting attractions in the entire Nation is the Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center located in my district at Bonner Springs, Kans.

The Agricultural Hall of Fame is a nonprofit, independently supported center administered by a board of directors and managed by Mr. Del Hininger. For over 200,000 visitors each year, it is an opportunity to witness the progress in American agriculture from the very beginnings of the Republic. For the entire Nation, it is a testament to the inventiveness and commitment to excellence of farming in America.

But the National Center is more than a museum displaying the tools and methods of the past. It is also a living, working exhibition of the most modern and forward-looking concepts of soil and water conservation. The Center provides a demonstration to each visitor of what must be accomplished across the Nation if we are to preserve the priceless heritage that is our land and water.

In order to fully inform each Member of the work in conservation being undertaken at the Agricultural Hall of Fame, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the April 1969 issue of Soil Conservation, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The article by Mr. F. DeWitt Abbott, the Kansas State Resource Conservationist, follows:

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME A CONSERVATION SHOWCASE

(By F. DeWitt Abbott, State resource conservationist, SCS, Salina, Kans.)

The Agricultural Hall of Fame and National Center, Bonner Springs, Kans., with its 275 acres under conservation land use and treatment, will provide visitors with an opportunity to view firsthand and at close range conservation practices on the land.

It is not unusual for more than 1,500 people to visit the center on summer weekends. Many of these people are from nearby cities, and many are from all over the United States.

Conservation is being featured on the land for several reasons: The land needs conservation treatment. Conservation fits in with the nonprofit Agriculture Center's aim to exhibit the past, present, and future of agriculture and agribusiness, as provided in its Congressional charter, and it will give thousands of people a chance to observe conservation work.

With technical help from the Soil Conservation Service through the Wyandotte Soil Conservation District, the board of directors of the center has developed a conservation plan for the acreage involving a wide variety of conservation practices and treatments.

Some of the conservation work includes healing gullies with grassed waterways; building a multipurpose dam near the main exhibit hall to function as a small flood-detention and grade-stabilizing structure, a 2-acre pond for providing stockwater, a diversion channel to bring storm runoff into the pond, and an access highway; and reserving a 114-acre smooth brome meadow for planned exhibit buildings.

Forty-five acres of cropland with waterways and graded parallel terraces will be used to grow adapted crops, such as corn,

sorghum, soybeans, wheat, and alfalfa-grass in rotation and on the contour.

A few head of domestic livestock will be kept on 24 acres of brome pasture where gullies will be smoothed and seeded, grazing regulated, land fertilized, and a field border of multiflora rose planted.

Other plans call for 12 acres of rangeland to have brush control, range seeding, and a grade-stabilizing structure; 27 acres to be in smooth brome for hay; a wooded area of 28 acres to have hiking trails, woodland management, and evergreens; trees and shrubs along the trails labeled; and a pond in a 22-acre wildlife area rebuilt by deepening and reshaping the edges. It and the multipurpose pond will add to the scenic beauty of the Agriculture Center's grounds.

Also an acre below the wildlife dam will be planted to trees and shrubs for wildlife habitat; 2 to 5 acres will be kept in grass for nesting cover; a three-row windbreak will be planted near residential buildings; and several other measures applied for the encouragement of wildlife throughout the property.

The Agriculture Center directors are determined to set up an outstanding demonstration of conservation of soil and water. They realize how important it is to remind all who come that way of the need for land protection and wise use for a permanent and productive agriculture and national economy.

LET THE WORLD KNOW

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following poem written at the time of the tragic assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy by Mr. Leo Lipp, author and poet of Seattle, Wash.

LET THE WORLD KNOW

(By Leo Lipp)

A dark cloud spread its wings over the nation,
The cloak of death enwrapped one more toll.

His life was robbed by an assassin;
Was this the last of the assassin's goal?

Or will there be more who will fall victims
To the assassin's bullet for the ideas they unshakably believe?

Must human blood be the price for progress
Before mankind can freedom and equality achieve?

Are darker days forging ahead now?
Mankind, prepare to meet them when they come.

Don't extinguish the torch which lights the way
To freedom; the road is long and may be tiresome.

Freedom from oppression should be priceless to all,
Though it become costly to mankind day by day.

Life will be given, and some will be taken,
But this darkness must vanish; it cannot stay.

Yet, who can tell what fate holds now
For each and every one in store,
When a smiling face and sparkling eyes
Succumb to an assassin's bullet on a kitchen floor?

Robert Kennedy fell martyr. Why? Was it for his idea,
"Love for mankind," which he believed was right?

To bring peace and freedom to a world of turmoil,

This was his aim—it shone with the brightness of light.

He spoke freely of his ideas to friend and foe alike.

Kindness and compassion he had for everyone in life.

His ambition and desire was to lighten man's burden.

This would wither away hatred and strife.

But his life was extinguished like the flame of a candle,

The work left unfinished he eagerly wanted to pursue,

Bringing equality and justice to mankind in this world,

Was this a reason for an assassin? Man of conscience, I am asking you!

DR. DAVID M. BROTMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. David M. Brotman of Beverly Hills for his outstanding achievements in the field of medicine, hospital planning and hospital construction in southern California.

The 20th century has brought extraordinary advances in science. Today we are preparing to put men on the moon. Today, with miracle drugs, we can cure illnesses that not too long ago were often fatal. With our ever-increasing knowledge of the human body and the diseases that strike it, we are able to provide healthier, more productive lives for millions of Americans. Yet all the advances in medicines, treatment techniques and diagnostic procedures would be worthless if modern hospitals and skillfully trained physicians were not available. Dr. Brotman has done much to assure that both of these are available to the people of southern California.

In 1959, Dr. Brotman created the Brotman Foundation, a nonprofit organization devoted to assisting physicians doing research and study in their medical fields. One of the major programs of the foundation is the scientific seminar, conducted annually at the Memorial Hospital of Southern California in Culver City and the New Memorial Hospital in Gardena. These seminars draw outstanding medical specialists from all over the country for a week-long series of lectures, held in the two ultramodern hospitals, both planned and built by Dr. Brotman's foundation.

The Brotman Foundation has also been instrumental in financing research grants for physicians for research projects in their specific fields, and has donated equipment to hospitals in southern California for use in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer and heart diseases.

In addition to these projects, the foundation conducts a continuous schedule of education programs in cooperation with governmental and educational institutions. These programs offer student training for various professions such as nurses aides, licensed vocational nurses and surgical technicians.

Still another contribution of the foundation is the development of volunteer

programs in the area hospitals. Several hundred adults and teenagers in the community now take part in this program and work on a volunteer basis in nearby hospitals.

In undertaking all these projects, including the construction of the two hospitals in Culver City and Gardena, Dr. Brotman has at no time asked for any government funds—Federal, State, county, or local. Such an outstanding record, achieved without outside help, should be an inspiration and source of pride to us all.

Dr. Brotman is truly a man of vision who has served his community and our district unselfishly and well. It is a privilege for me to salute this man and his notable achievements.

THE NEED FOR TAX REFORM

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, April 15 is still a keenly painful memory for most Americans. Taxes—Federal, State, local—are moving upward at a dizzying pace. Caught between governments' demands for revenue and the economy's restless inflationary trends, the average American is witnessing the slow but steady eroding of his paycheck's buying power. Taxpayers are fed up—and justifiably so. They are all too acutely aware of the Federal income tax system's tyranny: The poor are overtaxed; the rich are undertaxed; the average citizen is yoked to a tax percentage schedule that makes him carry far more than his just share of the burden.

The fundamental principle underlying our income tax system is—putatively, at least—"the ability to pay." Yet we are witnessing alarming violations of this principle at both ends of the income scale. At the lower end of the scale there are 2.2 million families with incomes below the poverty level who are required to pay Federal income taxes. The recent Treasury Department tax proposals define poverty income levels for 1969 as ranging from \$1,735 for a single person to \$5,755 for a family of seven or more. In addition to the Federal taxes many of the poverty stricken must pay, they are also hard hit by the taxes imposed at State and local levels. Sales taxes or necessities and property taxes incorporated into rent charges are regressive, placing the heaviest burden on those least able to pay.

At the upper end of the scale we have the recent astonishing revelation that there were 155 individuals with incomes in excess of \$200,000 who paid no Federal income tax at all in 1967. Legal avoidance by wealthy taxpayers has been going on for some time, but public awareness has been accelerated by the upward movement of taxes at all levels of government—particularly State and local. These increases in taxes plus the implacable rise in the cost of living have made it difficult for the low- to middle-income taxpayer to make ends meet.

Naturally, when he learns of these flagrantly unfair examples, he becomes angry, and so do I.

Equity in the tax structure calls for similar effective tax rates for those of similar incomes and unequal tax rates for those of dissimilar incomes. Instead, we find that people with almost identical levels of income pay taxes in widely varying amounts, and people of vastly different incomes are paying at comparable rates.

For taxpayers above the poverty levels up to the middle-high brackets, there is a considerable range of effective tax rates—taxes actually paid as percent of income—because of variations in their itemized deductions and marital status. Sixty-eight percent of the taxpayers at an income level of \$3,000 and below pay from zero to 5 percent of their income in taxes. From an income level of about \$3,000 up to \$20,000 most taxpayers pay from 15 to 20 percent of their income in taxes.

Similar effective tax rates for those of similar incomes begin to erode at an adjusted gross income level of \$20,000 and worsen until we reach the extreme cases of the 21 millionaires who paid no tax at all. Approximately half of all taxpayers reporting adjusted gross incomes of \$100,000 and over pay an effective tax rate of 30 percent and under. And the percentage paying a higher rate declines as incomes rise above \$100,000.

These figures demonstrate that the progressive nature of the income tax structure is becoming badly distorted. The more wealthy the taxpayer, the more opportunities there are to take advantage of special tax treatment. The amount of income open to this special treatment goes up in about direct proportion to a taxpayer's increase in income. It is the 35 million taxpayers in the \$7,000 to \$20,000 adjusted gross income level who pay more than half of all the individual income taxes the Treasury receives—and who are paying taxes at the "full ordinary rates" called for in the rate schedule. There are very few areas of special tax treatment for these individuals, whose incomes are mostly derived from wages and salaries. Theoretically, they are only required to pay their fair share. But because others with more income often pay far less than their fair share, they must bear an inequitably heavy burden.

Many of these special tax provisions through which the wealthy either avoid taxation altogether or pay at a lower rate than their income would indicate were originally justified as necessary or desirable to achieve some specific economic or social objective. But unintended benefits or "loopholes" have developed over the years. It has been 15 years since the Internal Revenue Code has been overhauled, and it has been 10 years since a major study of the tax structure has been undertaken.

It is absolutely imperative that we close loopholes through which the wealthy taxpayer escapes his fair share of taxes and through which badly needed revenue is lost to the Federal Government. But real tax reform must also assure that the tax load be eased for those who have for too long borne the brunt of the inequities of the tax structure.

Revenue gains and losses cannot be the only criteria.

In this connection I have introduced legislation to increase the personal exemption from \$600 to \$1,200. The cost of living has increased almost 50 percent since the \$600 personal exemption was adopted in 1948. There appears to be no end in sight. In March 1959, we experienced the steepest monthly rise in the cost of living in 18 years. A \$1,200 personal exemption will eliminate Federal taxation altogether for most of those living in poverty and will also reduce the taxable income of those low- to middle-income taxpayers who presently bear a disproportionately high share of the tax burden.

I have also introduced two bills to provide relief for the expenses of higher education. One bill, H.R. 994, provides a tax credit based on the first \$1,500 paid for tuition, fees, books, and supplies for any student at an institution of higher education.

The second bill, H.R. 9005, provides a Federal income tax deduction up to \$1,200 annually for the cost of higher education. It allows a deduction for certain costs of tuition and fees for the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents.

No one today can realistically consider a college education a luxury and yet costs for a low- to middle-income family are prohibitively high. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that the average charges for tuition, fees, and room and board for a full-time resident, undergraduate student in a public 4-year institution for the 1968-69 school year will total \$1,114. In a private 4-year institution the cost for the year is estimated to be \$2,297.

Investment in education is the best investment this country can make. The Government will be more than compensated in the long run by revenue from the additional taxes generated by the increased earning power of these individuals resulting from a college education. It is estimated that on the average an individual with a college education earns some \$200,000 more in a lifetime than a high school graduate. The gains to the individual himself and to society as a whole cannot be measured solely in monetary terms.

In my opinion, meaningful tax reform cannot be accomplished without revising the present tax treatment of the oil and gas industry—especially the percentage depletion allowance. I have introduced two bills which will take a major step toward closing this most notorious of all loopholes through which many wealthy individuals and corporations escape their fair share of taxes.

In principle, the deduction for depletion of natural resources for the extractive industries is comparable to the depreciation deduction taken by other industries which permits the gradual writeoff of capital costs over the life of the investment. However, by using the 27.5 percent depletion allowance—the largest percentage for any natural resource—oil and gas producers are permitted to make annual deductions as long as the property produces; these deductions usually exceed their original investment many times over. The Treas-

ury Department estimates that the annual revenue loss due to the excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion for all industries is \$1.3 billion. My bill, H.R. 998, would reduce the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas to 15 percent.

The second bill, H.R. 9896, would eliminate the percentage depletion allowance on oil produced outside the United States. Many U.S. companies operating abroad pay little or no Federal tax on their foreign operations even though their incomes exceed hundreds of millions of dollars, partially because of foreign taxes and royalty payments, but primarily because of the percentage depletion allowance.

It does not benefit the consumer by enabling him to buy the foreign product at a lower price—oil import quotas have seen to that. The primary beneficiary is the oil industry. When the 23 largest oil companies pay an average Federal income tax of less than 10 percent, these special tax privileges border on the outrageous.

I find it particularly regrettable that the tax reform proposals just submitted by the present administration do not directly attack these provisions. I am also sorry that the administration's tax reform package is considered to be "interim," with comprehensive proposals for revision of the tax structure scheduled for submission by November 30, 1969. We have four volumes of just-published tax reform studies and proposals prepared by the Treasury Department under the previous administration available now. Surely, they are sufficient. The momentum for tax reform is at its peak. The time for study is over. Relief is urgently needed today. The time for action is now.

The Springfield, Mass., Daily News has published an editorial pointing out that the administration's tax reform proposals constitute only a modest first step toward the kind of comprehensive reform we need. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

TAX REFORM LONG OVERDUE

Most Americans will agree with President Nixon that taxes cannot be made popular, but they will rejoice a bit that he is initiating efforts to make them fairer.

After getting through with the annual squaring of accounts with the Internal Revenue Service, the average taxpayer cannot be blamed for feeling that the system is designed to get the most out of him and the least out of those who can best afford to pay. Those 155 persons who earned \$200,000 or more in 1967 and paid no taxes emphasize the point.

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is a maze of special exemptions and allowances that works to the advantage of the wealthy. Back at the office and the factory, the average taxpayer never sees his tax money. Withholding is supposedly painless.

The President's proposal to limit to 50 percent the amount of personal income that may be exempted from taxation is particularly commendable. The general taxpayer would get some relief in the proposed reduction of the surtax from the present 10 percent to 5 percent on Jan. 1.

Much of tax income lost through the latter would be regained by immediate repeal of the 7 per cent tax credit. This provision is regarded as the most controversial of Nixon's proposals. Spokesmen for business and industry claim it is necessary to encourage

plant modernization. Others assert the tax credit fuels inflation.

The plan to remove some 2.2 million persons below or near the poverty level from the tax rolls is both wise and humane. It makes no sense to tax these people on the one hand and give them public assistance on the other.

While talking tax reform has become something of a national pastime, acting on tax reform is something else. Former Sen. Paul H. Douglas, recalling 18 frustrating years as one of the Senate's leading tax reformers, observed that, despite some changes, "the big loopholes and truckholes remained." Observers agree with Douglas that not more than one out of a hundred citizens working on proposed tax legislation represents the general public.

In the past, politicians have shown little inclination to deny special interests their tax havens. The oil depletion allowance is an example.

The President's tax reform proposals are just a beginning. More needs to be accomplished in matters such as oil depletion allowances, capital gains, tax-exempt foundations, estate and gift taxes, bonds, personal deductions and hobby farming for tax "loss" purposes.

The public is demanding reforms. They are long overdue.

THE OIL TANKER: BEACH POLLUTER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the Los Angeles Times had an excellent editorial entitled "The Oil Tanker: Beach Polluter." The editorial points out that part of the problem of oil coming ashore onto the beaches of southern California lies with a hitherto unknown and elusive culprit, the commercial oil tanker.

This is a problem that we believe will be taken care of through the passage of H.R. 4148, the Comprehensive Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, which would impose stiff penalties on owners or operators of vessels who willfully or negligently discharge oil into the water. The House passed this bill on April 16, 1969, after being favorably reported out of the House Public Works Committee. I am very hopeful now that the Senate will also see fit to pass this important measure.

This editorial gives added impetus to the urgency of enacting the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 as soon as possible.

The editorial follows:

THE OIL TANKER: BEACH POLLUTER

(ISSUE.—Oil tankers continue to pollute local beaches by dumping oil at sea. How can this illegal practice be halted?)

Swimmers and sun bathers along Southland beaches are on special alert these days for any signs of oil or tar.

With the recent Santa Barbara Channel oil platform rupture fresh in mind, the immediate tendency is to blame visible pollution on such drilling leaks.

But the State Department of Fish and Game, the area's most effective enforcement agency, links most of the current and past beach oil to a more elusive source—the oil tanker.

Although some Santa Barbara crude undoubtedly has drifted south, investigators

contend recent damage was caused by illegal discharge of bunker and bilge oil in off-shore waters. Natural seepage from submarine fields and leaks and spills from oil drilling platforms are other contributors.

But the principal local offender, investigators insist, is the commercial oil tanker. They feel this unnecessary polluter can be curbed with the help of the public, the federal government and some self-policing on the part of the oil transport industry.

Under an international agreement signed by 48 nations in 1961, oil dumping is prohibited within 50 miles of the California coast. But enforcement remains practically impossible.

Under pressure to operate cheaply, tankers continue to flush residue oil at sea instead of going through a costly and time-consuming process of utilizing dockside disposal facilities.

The Coast Guard, on the rare occasion it spots an offending vessel in the act, can crack down on American Flag tankers. Foreign flag offenders present a more difficult problem. The only resort is a usually fruitless State Department protest to their governments.

Also hampering local enforcement is lack of a government lab to "fingerprint" the oil source, a necessity if the fast-moving offender is to be traced. Currently, this service is provided free by major oil firms. Enforcement agencies, understandably, would prefer their own facility.

Despite obvious handicaps, fish and game officials believe tanker dumping must be curbed. The department asks:

Reports from the public of slicks or heavy beach oil.

Expansion and enforcement of the international pact.

Federal funds for a local marine laboratory.

Certainly, it is not asking too much of the public and the federal government for this minimum cooperation. The price is small; our beaches are priceless.

SALUTE TO OUTSTANDING MARENGO CITIZENS

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, the Marengo Pioneer-Republican recently carried an editorial saluting Mr. and Mrs. R. R. Schroeder for their many civic contributions. The tribute is well deserved, for these folks are indeed outstanding, public-spirited citizens, to say nothing of the fact they they are very dear friends of mine. I insert in the RECORD the editorial detailing the many contributions of the Schroeders:

COMMUNITY SPIRIT SHOWS IN ACTIVITIES

While R. R. Schroeder will continue on a limited basis with the Iowa County Savings Bank, he has turned over the presidency to Kenneth Crow. Schroeder, who has been in the banking business 40 years and was instrumental in the start of this bank, will continue with the bank, visiting customers, particularly farm ones.

Marengo has an Interstate 80 interchange thanks to Rudy Schroeder's persistence. When I-80 plans showed none at this location though it had been planned earlier, he went to Washington to intercede on this city's behalf. So it is that Marengo, as well as those due north as well as south, has a direct route to I-80. Certainly it has much to do with attraction for business as well as local convenience and is a necessity if future industry should settle here.

Schroeder has long taken an active interest

in this community. A member of the Iowa County Historical Society, he was instrumental in having the log cabin moved from Iowa township to its place one block north of the city square. It's a part of local history where children may learn, and it attracts numerous visitors, which we point out is not only good for history, but also for local merchants.

He has provided for the bachelor's cabin next to the main cabin, also located originally in Iowa township, the simulated old open well on the grounds, as well as for the picket fence, picked particularly for its authenticity. One of his projects this spring may be to paint the fence.

Driving by St. John's Lutheran church during good weather, one may often see Schroeder trimming or caring for shrubbery on the church grounds. At Christmas time he sets up the nativity scene which is arranged on the church site. He also serves on the church board.

A past president of the Iowa Bankers Association, Schroeder has long been active in that organization. Locally as a Rotarian he has had his hand in on numerous projects too. He has served on several school advisory councils also. Chamber of Commerce and its activities has also been benefited by his membership and interest.

Schroeder and the bank have sponsored the annual 4-H breakfast, and he is usually on hand for it.

Mrs. Schroeder, who is president of the Marengo Library board, has been instrumental in guiding the remodeling and re-decorating of that public facility. She has spent many hours on the project, coordinating efforts as well as doing a considerable amount of the work itself, as, for example, the refinishing of book shelves. She has had a long range plan which has up-graded the library in service and appearance.

A gardener whose home reflects her touch, she has served as president of the Cedar Rapids garden club. That group has been consulted on landscaping plans for the Herbert Hoover park, West Branch.

She too is active in several other organizations though probably the library and garden ones take precedence.

We salute the Schroeders many efforts to improve the city of Marengo. We hope they will certainly enjoy the rewards of fewer pressures and demands on everyday life. While Rudy has stepped down from many of the business demands, we trust his many civic interests will continue.

We welcome Ken Crow and Elgin Morris, the new bankers to Marengo. They will find many places for business and civic interests. Their response may well direct the future of our city!

IMPROVEMENT IN THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN URBAN POVERTY NEIGHBORHOODS

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a significant decline in unemployment in the poverty neighborhoods of the Nation's 100 largest cities has been reported by the Labor Department.

During the first quarter of 1969 the unemployment rate in these neighborhoods was 5.6 percent. This is a distinct improvement over the 7 percent rate reported in the first quarter of 1968 and represents a decline of 100,000 in the number of unemployed in urban poverty neighborhoods.

For Negroes the rate dropped from 8.7

to 7 percent, while the white rate declined from 5.7 to 4.6 percent.

Labor Department officials pointed out that Government and private efforts to train and place unemployed workers have been increasingly focused in residents of urban poverty neighborhoods. I am pleased to observe that these efforts are showing positive results.

The details of the improved employment rate in our urban poverty neighborhoods are as follows:

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN URBAN POVERTY NEIGHBORHOODS: FIRST QUARTER 1969

The unemployment rate in the poverty neighborhoods of the Nation's 100 largest cities was 5.6 percent in the first quarter of 1969, the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported today. That was an improvement over the 7.0 percent rate reported for the first quarter of 1968.

Over-the-year drops in the urban poverty neighborhood unemployment rate have exceeded over-the-year declines in the national unemployment rate over the past four quarters.

The number of unemployed workers in urban poverty neighborhoods declined by 100,000 from the first quarter 1968 to the first quarter of 1969. This accounted for about two-fifths of the 250,000 decline in total unemployment in the Nation during the period.

WHITES AND NEGROES

Both whites and Negroes shared about equally in the unemployment decline between the first quarters of 1968 and 1969. For whites, the jobless rate fell from 5.7 to 4.6 percent, while the Negro rate dropped from 8.7 to 7.0 percent. Despite the decline, the Negro jobless rate remained half again as great as that for white urban poverty neighborhood residents.

In the other urban neighborhoods of the 100 largest cities, the Negro jobless rate also declined over the year, from 6.5 to 5.2 percent. The unemployment rate for these workers, however, continued to be higher than that of white workers living in poverty neighborhoods.

In the first quarter of 1969, there was an average of 170,000 white workers and 190,000 Negro workers who were unemployed and living in urban poverty neighborhoods. Slightly more than half of all unemployed Negro workers living in these metropolitan areas resided in poverty neighborhoods, compared to only about 14 percent of all white unemployed workers.

UNEMPLOYMENT BY AGE AND SEX

Of the 360,000 unemployed workers living in poverty neighborhoods during the first quarter of 1969, approximately 45 percent were men, 31 percent women, and 24 percent teenagers. This contrasts with other urban neighborhoods where a smaller proportion of the unemployed were men (36 percent) and larger proportions were women (37 percent) and teenagers (27 percent).

Adults accounted for three-fourths of the 100,000 drop in unemployment in poverty neighborhoods between the first quarters of 1968 and 1969. The jobless rate for women fell from 6.2 to 4.8 percent over the year, a greater decline than for women in other neighborhoods.

The unemployment rate for men in poverty neighborhoods dropped from 5.5 to 4.4 percent. The jobless rate for men from poverty neighborhoods continued at 2.4 times the rate for men in other parts of these cities.

Jobless rates for both Negro and white adults from poverty neighborhoods were significantly lower than a year ago.

The unemployment rate for teenagers in poverty neighborhoods averaged 16.7 percent, more than 3.0 percentage points lower than in the first quarter of 1968. The rate for teenagers in other neighborhoods was unchanged at 11.4 percent. Negro teenagers accounted

for most of the over-the-year decline in teenage unemployment in poverty neighborhoods, and their rate of unemployment declined sharply from 27.3 to 20.9 percent.

NOTE.—The poverty neighborhood classification used in this report was developed by the Bureau of the Census and is based on a ranking of census tracts according to 1960 data on income, education, skills, housing, and proportion of broken families. The poorest one-fifth of these tracts in the Nation's 100 largest metropolitan areas are considered poverty neighborhoods. The poverty

neighborhood statistics probably include some middle- and upper-income families and also exclude some poor families who live in other urban neighborhoods. In 1967, for example, only about one-third of the nonwhite families living in poverty neighborhoods had incomes below the poverty level as defined by the Social Security Administration. These data, therefore, do not represent the exact dimensions of the employment problems of all poor people but are instead minimal estimates of the adverse conditions of residents in these specific poverty neighborhoods.

ANOTHER ACT OF BARBARISM—
ANOTHER INSULT UNANSWERED?

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, former California Senator Bill Knowland, in an editorial in his Oakland Tribune, clearly delineates the responsibility for the recent and tragic loss of our reconnaissance plane and its crew. Realizing that one one has the full scope of information available to the President, he makes no specific suggestions for action at this time, but does most effectively detail what we should not do. Mr. Speaker, I place the editorial in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD:

ANOTHER ACT OF BARBARISM—ANOTHER
INSULT UNANSWERED?

Our nation today is once again gripped in the agonizing dilemma of how a respond to a murderous and barbarous act by the belligerent Communist regime in North Korea.

North Korea is scornfully boasting to the world that on Tuesday it downed "with one stroke" a United States Navy reconnaissance plane with a crew of 31 men aboard.

The Pentagon says two bodies, but no survivors, have been found.

Our plane, a lumbering, 300-m.p.h. propeller-driven surveillance aircraft laden with six tons of electronic equipment, was clearly defenseless—in fact, shockingly defenseless under the circumstances.

The kill—apparently by two sophisticated Communist MIG jets—was as simple to achieve as it was cowardly.

Ours was a routine reconnaissance flight—the sort of flight which has been common over the Sea of Japan for 20 years, the sort of reconnaissance activity, in fact, carried on today by every world power.

The North Koreans contend the U.S. plane violated their air space—as if, even if it were true, this fact alone could somehow make right a homicidal skeet shoot in the sky with 31 defenseless American airmen as the target.

Our government flatly denies any such air space violation. The Pentagon insists the plane was lawfully traveling only in international corridors. The recovery by rescue ships of the bodies and portions of the plane's wreckage 120 miles off the North Korean coast points ominously to a blatant North Korean lie.

Our nation, of course, has been here before—just 15 months ago when the USS Pueblo was seized by North Korea, with one of its crewmen killed and the remainder ignominiously imprisoned, tortured and subjected to extracted "confessions."

We responded then with a weakness unbefitting our role as the leading defender of freedom and democracy against the dictators and tyrants of not only the Far East but of the entire planet.

When the Pueblo was seized we should have immediately proceeded to blockade Wonsan and other North Korean ports. No vessels should have been allowed to leave or enter until the Pueblo and its crew were back under United States jurisdiction.

But we didn't. Perhaps the argument could have been made then that to do so would have jeopardized the lives of the Pueblo crewmen. No such claim can now be made.

The words and warning of Thomas Jefferson at an earlier date in our history haunt us today.

In a letter to John Jay, Jefferson urged not only the establishment of a strong U.S. naval force but also prompt retaliation against any

TABLE 1.—EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER, IN URBAN POVERTY AND OTHER URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS¹ BY COLOR

Employment status	[In thousands]					
	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968
Total United States:						
Civilian labor force.....	78,868	77,065	70,218	68,556	8,650	8,509
Unemployment.....	2,848	3,097	2,297	2,463	551	634
Unemployment rate.....	3.6	4.0	3.3	3.6	6.4	7.5
Urban poverty neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	6,417	6,575	3,734	3,853	2,683	2,722
Unemployment.....	361	457	127	220	189	237
Unemployment rate.....	5.6	7.0	4.6	5.7	7.0	8.7
Other urban neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	38,210	36,877	35,089	33,991	3,122	2,886
Unemployment.....	1,188	1,253	1,024	1,064	164	189
Unemployment rate.....	3.1	3.4	2.9	3.1	5.2	6.5

¹ Pertains only to standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) with populations of 250,000 or more.

TABLE 2.—EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OVER, IN URBAN POVERTY AND OTHER URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS¹ BY COLOR, SEX, AND AGE

Employment status, sex, and age	[In thousands]					
	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968	1st quarter, 1969	1st quarter, 1968
Males 20 years and over:						
Urban poverty neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	3,589	3,668	2,185	2,271	1,404	1,396
Unemployment.....	163	201	86	114	78	88
Unemployment rate.....	4.5	5.5	3.9	5.0	5.6	6.3
Other urban neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	22,432	22,063	20,788	20,481	1,643	1,555
Unemployment.....	435	511	384	445	51	66
Unemployment rate.....	1.9	2.3	1.8	2.2	3.1	4.2
Females, 20 years and over:						
Urban poverty neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	2,321	2,366	1,265	1,270	1,056	1,096
Unemployment.....	112	148	48	61	64	87
Unemployment rate.....	4.8	6.2	3.8	4.8	6.1	7.9
Other urban neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	13,009	12,272	11,732	11,122	1,279	1,150
Unemployment.....	436	448	372	373	64	75
Unemployment rate.....	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.4	5.0	6.5
Teenagers 16 to 19 years:						
Urban poverty neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	507	542	285	312	222	230
Unemployment.....	85	108	38	45	46	63
Unemployment rate.....	16.7	19.9	13.5	14.4	20.9	27.3
Other urban neighborhoods:						
Civilian labor force.....	2,769	2,569	2,568	2,389	201	180
Unemployment.....	317	294	268	247	48	47
Unemployment rate.....	11.4	11.4	10.5	10.3	23.9	26.1

¹ Pertains only to SMSA's with populations of 250,000 or more.

TOGO

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to extend my personal congratulations and those of this assembly to the African state of Togo, which on April 27 will celebrate the ninth anniversary of its independence. During the postindependence period, the Republic

of Togo has made great strides toward economic progress. Under its energetic President, Gen. Etienne Eyadema, Togo has remained a peaceful country, maintaining a forward-looking and reasoned posture in foreign affairs.

Relations between the United States and Togo are warm and friendly, thanks in good part to the skillful hands of Dr. Alexandre Ohin, Ambassador of Togo to the United States. It is through such collaboration that ties between the United States and Africa draw closer, in a spirit of self-respect and constructiveness.

aggressor seizing or harassing U.S. ships on the high seas.

Speedy retaliation, Jefferson declared, was necessary because—as he put it—"An insult unanswered is the parent of many others."

We shall not be so presumptuous as to suggest what specific course of action our President should now take. No citizen does or can have the information available to a President. None of us can know all the implications of this latest, and obviously deliberate, Communist diversionary tactic.

But we can suggest what ought not be the limit of our response. We ought not merely express our outrage. We ought not be satisfied with merely a "strong diplomatic protest." We ought not let the matter repose in a new round of "negotiations" with sullen and smug tin-horn tyrants. We ought not settle for only the ultimate issuance of some debasing and self-degrading mutual "statement"—as we did in the Pueblo incident.

For, as surely as the unanswered insult of the Pueblo's seizure was the parent of Tuesday's bloodthirsty attack on our unarmed reconnaissance plane, just as surely will this latest insult—if unanswered—be the parent of yet further insult and tragedy to our nation.

COLLEGES AND ROTC

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as an ROTC commissioned officer who served in World War II, it grieves me deeply to see the controversy which is presently going on in our country today over this program. While the student opposition to the program is bad enough, I am also disturbed at the lack of support ROTC is getting from other sources.

I was pleased, however, to see the following editorial in the Birmingham Post-Herald which expresses some of my own thoughts on this very important matter:

COLLEGES AND ROTC

It is singular, at least, that 29 independent college newspapers all would publish an identical editorial, simultaneously, demanding that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps be abolished from all campuses.

Most editors, perhaps college editors in particular, would prefer to write their own opinion, even if they agreed with the others.

If nothing more, this sudden unanimity arouses some wonder about the organizing effort that went into this "spontaneous" outburst—especially, since eliminating ROTC is a major aim of the riot-making, destructive outfit calling itself Students for a Democratic Society.

On the other hand, if it can be presumed that the organizers of the all-of-one-mind collegiate opinion offered the same canned editorial to all schools giving ROTC training their batting average was pretty low. At last count, 353 colleges had ROTC units—and 335 more have applied to the Defense Department for units.

This year the military services expect to get some 25,000 officers from college ROTC advanced courses—all of which are optional with the students. This suggests that, despite the college paper editorial and the SDS, there still are a substantial number of students interested in this type of training.

The campaign against ROTC is intemperate and inconsistent. It is not, or shouldn't be, up to one group of students to decide what courses other students should take. It

is no more "democratic" to demand that ROTC be eliminated than to demand that courses in psychology or history should be abolished.

ROTC is compulsory for the first two years on some campuses, but not at many others, such as Harvard where recent disturbances have focused on this issue. Those students who don't want it don't have to attend a college which requires the basic training or take the training at schools where it is optional.

The 29 college editors have made themselves patsies for a maneuver which misses the whole point of democratic processes—and they have tainted their independence as well. In maturity, they may think better of their subservience.

PRESIDENT NIXON TAKES COURAGEOUS STEPS TOWARD FISCAL SANITY

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday marked the third month that President Richard Nixon has been in office as 37th President of the United States. In these days and weeks, the President has taken courageous and noteworthy steps to insure the economic strength of our Nation.

In part, I speak of the recent moves by Mr. Nixon charting a path out of the fiscal morass in which the previous administration left this country. Last week, a series of budget amendments began coming to the Congress from downtown. The message is bleak. Without substantial reductions in Federal expenditures in nearly every area, the cruel inflationary trend will continue.

I join with many of my colleagues in the Congress in wishing that these reductions need not be so stringent in some areas. But wishing will not solve the problem of inflation. And that is why I hope that there is a community of opinion in this House and in the other body favoring in large measure what the President has requested. For the economic health of the Nation, we can do no less.

Monday, President Nixon sent another message to the Congress, this one further outlining his approach to regaining fiscal sanity and integrity on our home front. Extension of the surtax with reduction to 5 percent in January of 1970, a restructuring of the tax system to lighten the burden of the overtaxed and increase the taxes of those undertaxed, and repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit are proposals that deserve and will receive laborious attention.

The priorities that President Nixon has set for the future are seen in the figures of the budget amendments, evident from his messages such as today's, and felt from the calm and confident approach he has undertaken to our many problems. As President Nixon moves into the second quarter of his first year in office, I speak on behalf of the Chief Executive, a man that deserves singular commendation for his contribution to our economic well-being.

NEEDED: A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are historians who believe that the 20th century will be recalled primarily as the dawn of the nuclear age. Others believe it will be noteworthy as that point in time when man was first able to break the fetters of gravity and travel to the stars. Still others are of the opinion that future generations will regard genetic and medical discoveries as the greatest contribution of our generation to the mainstream of civilization.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have the opportunity to achieve, in our time, a distinction which would be more important to the future of mankind than any of these.

We can become that generation in which men, for the first time, are wise enough to leave the earth, its waters, and its atmosphere in better condition than we found it.

Perhaps "opportunity" is misstating the challenge. More accurately, it is mandatory that we gain a positive and perpetual control over those byproducts of civilization which are destroying our physical environment.

Since the dawn of history man has regarded the natural environment as a great bank from which to draw for his physical needs. He has also used it as a repository for his waste products.

Until relatively recent times man tended to regard the ability of the environment to sustain these functions as infinite.

Today we know that every component in what we collectively term "the environment" is not only finite—in some cases we are tragically near depletion or, as the case may be, irreversible despoilment.

I do not think it is necessary to document here the diverse catastrophes which has occurred and are occurring on the land, in the waters, and in the atmosphere of our planet. I think all of us would agree in principle with the proposition that we have fouled our own nest.

Insofar as the magnitude of the threat to future generations is concerned, I cite the following stark word picture, set forth by Dr. David M. Gates, director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, as part of a congressional colloquium last summer:

A future earth populated by half-starved, depressed billions gasping for air, depleted of oxygen and laden with pollutants, thirsting for thickened eutrophic water, struggling to avoid the constant presence of one another, and in essence continuing life at a degraded subsistence level.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to attack the factors which are degrading our environment, systematically and as a matter of the highest national priority.

I do not imply that either the executive branch or the Congress have been blind to the threats or negligent in step-

ping out to meet them. The aforementioned colloquium—which was sponsored by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—was held to discuss establishment of a national policy for the environment. It graphically demonstrated a high level of awareness in the Federal Government of the magnitude of the problems.

But I do believe that insufficient human and material resources have been brought to bear. Furthermore, I think that the problems are so interrelated and complex that it is going to require a "systems management" approach, such as we employ in our most sophisticated space-age industries, to be equal to the challenge.

It is incumbent upon Congress, in my view, to take a single-minded approach in providing the enabling legislation, the funding and—perhaps most important of all—eternal oversight as the environmental salvage efforts proceed.

We are not talking in terms of a few years or even a decade of environmental therapy, Mr. Speaker. It may well take 100 years or more of research and applied science to restore clean air, with a proper balance of carbon dioxide and oxygen. Or to rescue bodies of water such as Lake Erie, San Francisco Bay, and the Potomac River from their current status as open sewers. Or to learn how to dispose of our solid wastes and our chemical and radiological poisons without having them turn up to bedevil our children and grandchildren like Biblical plagues. Or to learn how to control insect and plant pests without killing our wildlife and upsetting our ecological balances.

Today, I am introducing a resolution which would establish a Standing Committee on the Environment.

This committee would have jurisdiction over many—although not all—of the environmental problems which today beset us.

Initially, I would recommend that the Committee on the Environment be vested with such areas of concern as water quality, air quality, weather modification, waste disposal of all kinds, pesticides and herbicides, and acoustic problems.

In introducing this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I want to state very clearly that I do not minimize the excellent work which has been done by a number of our present committees in these very areas.

But I do claim that some of these problems currently are under the scrutiny, irregularly, of two, three, and even four different committees, a situation which is neither efficient nor conducive to the coordinated leadership which the Nation and the world so desperately need for the environmental quality crusade.

Nor am I the first Member to propose special emphasis by Congress on the problems of the environment.

During the 90th Congress a Senate Select Committee on Technology and Human Environment was proposed.

A Joint Committee of Congress for Marine and Atmospheric Affairs was suggested.

Also, an unofficial Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment was formed, with 87 Senators and Representatives as signatories.

All of these efforts are praiseworthy. However, it is my opinion that they simply do not go far enough, considering the magnitude and the insidiousness of the problem. Neither a select committee, a joint committee limited to the seas and the atmosphere, nor an ad hoc committee would provide—in my opinion—enough "horsepower" for the job at hand.

I firmly believe that a standing committee of the House—matched, I would hope, by an equivalent standing committee in the other body of Congress—is sorely needed to forge some of the landmark legislation which will be needed in the decades ahead.

Such a committee would enable Members to apply themselves squarely to environmental problems—with the assistance of a professional staff which could include ecologists, physiologists, biologists, agronomists, meteorologists, and other environmental specialists.

I envisage the Committee on the Environment as potentially one of the most prestigious assignments in the Congress. Certainly I could think of no greater responsibility than assuring a high quality of life for current and future generations.

BRINGING UP CHILDREN

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, recently I received what I consider to be a most thoughtful letter on a most important subject—the proper way to rear children. In order that more of our citizens may receive the benefits of this correspondence, I take pleasure in submitting the letter I received from one of my constituents, Cantor Aaron Horowitz, of Wilkes-Barre, who has written to me previously on this subject. Cantor Horowitz' letter follows:

WILKES-BARRE, PA.,
April 11, 1969.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Because of the controversy over the great problem what to do to stop the trouble of the rebellion of children against their parents, teachers and schools, I take the liberty to write to you about my letter which you inserted in the daily Congressional Record, Volume 107, No. 30, dated February 21, 1961, starting at Page A1094 about bringing up children.

In that letter my advice was not to hit children, because it is harmful to their health, both physically and mentally. The only way is love. When children have love for their parents they never do anything that would cause their parents harm.

In the first place, I wish to say something about the bad effect on the health of the child from bodily punishment. On the spot of the slap or blow there is a bruise; you see a gathering of blood. It results in a deleterious effect on the nervous system, inter-

fering with the normal processes of the stomach, liver and other organs of the body.

The mental effect is even worse. The child is embarrassed and ashamed, as well as resentful, over the spanking, and the capacities of his thinking are diminished. I feel certain that many young men and women are prisoners in jails because of these effects.

So, you will ask, what shall we do when children commit bad acts?

I say a parent should teach them, with infinite patience and kindness, NOT to do such things. The parent should tell them: "Your action is bad and it makes me ill. Do you want me to be ill?"

Here is one episode, a fact. A group of people and I were passengers in an automobile. The driver was from out of town and had with him his little boy, about five years old. The boy acted up quite badly in the car. The father told him many times to stop, to sit still, but to no avail. The father then informed him that he would be spanked when they came home. The boy didn't care. He continued his misbehavior.

So I said to the boy: "Would you like to hear a nice story?"

"Yes," he said.

The boy listened quietly. When I had finished, he asked me: "Do you have another story?"

He had changed entirely, and everyone was pleasantly surprised.

The point is, parents in general do not know better; they have been punished by their parents, and continue to do the same with their own offspring.

Here is another episode. There was a large gathering of women and children on Hancock Street, at the school yard. I was passing by, and a child, a boy, was jumping up and down on the sidewalk in front of me. His mother said: "Let the man pass by." The child obeyed, and let me pass by. But, nevertheless, the mother reached over and struck him on the back.

I stopped, and asked her: "Why did you spank him?"

She turned to me indignantly and said: "I am his mother!"

Just these days we read in the paper, a mother killed her 3-year-old child. And just the other day there was a report a step-father killed his 3-year-old baby.

I say we have to stop the old tradition of hitting children.

It is no excuse that the mother or father is tired, or busy, or has no patience to act lovingly with the children. Those same parents were not too busy to make love and procreate their children.

The advice I give them—patient, kindly, non-violent *teaching*—requires more time and effort, that's all. Parents merely take the shortest way, in slapping their child; it helps quickly only for the moment. For the child repeats his mischiefs, and they have to strike him many times during the day.

I would like to tell you another example about the way of love to children in producing the best results.

When we had our Hebrew School on East Northampton Street in Wilkes-Barre, there were a number of Hebrew teachers, all of them fine people and good instructors.

But one of them, Mr. Eskolsky, knew how to create a way of love with his disciples; and all of them—many of them now prominent lawyers, businessmen and civic leaders—admire Mr. Eskolsky for the wonderful influence he was on them, in acquiring knowledge about Judaism, in acquiring knowledge about life. The love and respect he gave them, elicited love and respect, and a lifelong admiration, for him.

Incidentally, Mr. Eskolsky was a brother-in-law of today's President of Israel, President Shazar.

I am writing this to you, Congressman Flood, in the hope that you might have these remarks placed in the Congressional Record as a guide to parents.

I also feel that you would be doing another fine service to your constituents (another of so many you have done) if my original letter to you, which you had placed in the Congressional Record, could be reproduced and sent by you as a guide to mothers and fathers wherever possible to send them.

With best wishes for continued success in the splendid job you are doing for all the people, I remain

Very sincerely,

Cantor AARON HOROWITZ.

PAPERMILL BEGINS WORK ON POLLUTION ABATEMENT

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the abatement of water pollution and conservation of our water resources are matters of high priority among Members of Congress and all thoughtful Americans.

Responsibly, we have undertaken a commitment to reclaim polluted lakes and streams, to end practices of waste disposal which pose a threat to our environment.

Federal funds have been provided to aid industries and municipalities to build waste treatment plants and other facilities to reduce water pollution. Unfortunately, the funds available have fallen far short of what is needed to accomplish our goal and many industries and local governments have delayed action.

It is my pleasure today to pay respect to a firm that did not wait for Government funds and chose not to delay. The Georgia-Pacific Corp., in connection with its operations at Woodland, Maine, recently started construction of a pollution control plant for their papermill, a project that will cost them \$4.5 million.

I submit for the RECORD a press clipping which describes the Georgia-Pacific project, a project which has earned the praise of Maine's Governor, Kenneth M. Curtis, as well as my own.

The article follows:

[From the Bangor (Maine) News, Apr. 15, 1969]

PAPER MILL BEGINS WORK ON POLLUTION ABATEMENT

WOODLAND.—Ground was broken here Monday afternoon at the Georgia-Pacific Paper Co. mills by Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis for a new \$4.6 million pollution abatement plant, which, when completed, will eliminate the major source of industrial pollution in the St. Croix River.

Construction of the plant is expected to begin at the end of the week and a completion date has been set for late December of this year.

In essence, the highly automated plant will remove objectionable colors from chemicals and suspended solid wastes from the pulp and paper mill operation. It will also eliminate biochemical oxygen demands required in the Georgia-Pacific process.

The pollution abatement plant will process 30 million gallons of water each day, which is sufficient to supply water to a city

of 330,000 people daily, according to General Manager Edward G. Wilson.

Arriving at 4:30 p.m., Gov. Curtis spoke before a gallery of onlookers, including several other state department heads, figures in the Canadian government, local community leaders, mill workers, and residents of area communities.

Curtis praised the firm's decision, "Because it was made when opportunities existed for delay." He suggested also that, "The primary lack of progress against water pollution is a lack of sufficient federal funds which hampers progress in two ways. First, absence of money. Secondly, the excuse it provides for certain groups to drag their feet or refrain from any action."

He also said that Georgia-Pacific's action is setting a "healthy example for the state." Maine's water pollution problem, industrial and sanitary, will cost an estimated \$320 million to cure. The Georgia-Pacific abatement plant will take \$4.6 million of this.

Georgia-Pacific and other forward-looking companies are investing in Maine's environment, as well as in Maine's economy, the governor said.

Among those in attendance at the groundbreaking ceremonies were: James E. Keefe, head of the Department of Economic Development; Donaldson Coombs chairman of the Water and Air Environmental Improvement Commission; Calais City Manager, Louis Ayoub; Richard Burgess, president of the Calais Chamber of Commerce.

Fred Nicholson, president of the St. Stephen, N.B. Board of Trade; Erwin Brown, mayor of St. Stephen, N.B.; Sam Wheelock, chairman of the St. Stephen Water Commission; C. Arnold Brown, Washington County Commissioner; Alfred Bowden, president of the Charlotte County, N.B. Board of Trade; John Driscoll, mayor of Milltown, N.B.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time that we are increasingly concerned about the adequacy of our own domestic air traffic control system, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the article on "Eurocontrol" which appears in the March issue of European Community.

Eurocontrol will affect the safety of the daily flights of American commercial airlines in Europe, and it will be to the benefit of hundreds of thousands of Americans who will fly to or in Europe aboard carriers of any nationality. The European achievement in planning, development, and coordination should be encouraging to all of us. I am pleased to note the cooperation of the United States.

The article follows:

EUROCONTROL: AIR SAFETY IN THE SEVENTIES

(NOTE.—The United States and 11 European governments are working to prevent air jams in Europe of the kind New York experienced last fall. To coordinate their airspace control systems, in 1963 they formed Eurocontrol, the European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation, with headquarters in Brussels near those of the European Community.)

Rapid increases in the numbers, size, and speed of aircraft since the last war has created air traffic problems. The crowded sky is rapidly growing more congested. Trans-

Atlantic traffic forecasts suggest that passenger traffic will increase four times by 1975, and cargo traffic is likely to increase even more quickly. Within Europe, too, the trend will be the same.

Massive increases in passenger and freight traffic will not mean a proportionate increase in the number of aircraft used, because bigger aircraft will be in service. Long-haul "jumbo jets," seating 400 or 500 passengers, will become common in the early 1970's. Over shorter distances, airbuses will carry 250 passengers. Nevertheless, experts forecast that in 1975 air traffic control services will handle twice as many planes as they do today. Control problems will multiply because much of the new traffic will be assigned altitudes above 20,000 feet, the upper airspace that has long been reserved for military aircraft. The coordination of civilian and military aircraft movements will therefore have to be intensified.

EUROCONTROL FORMED ON EUROPEAN INITIATIVE

Because of the nature and scale of modern air traffic problems make it impossible for any single country to solve them alone, the ministers responsible for civil and military aviation in the Benelux countries, France, Britain, and Italy began in 1960 to prepare what was to become the Eurocontrol Convention.

They decided to form an organization under the guidance of a Permanent Commission and the administration of an executive body, the Air Traffic Services Agency. Eurocontrol came into existence on March 1, 1963. A year later, the safety of air navigation in the upper airspace of Western Europe was entrusted to it. After participating in preparatory studies for the Convention, Italy withdrew from the group of founders, but later signed a cooperation agreement. Ireland joined the Organization in 1965; and the United States, the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, and Portugal have also signed individual agreements.

The Agency's task is to coordinate upper airspace traffic control systems for the member countries and to install the facilities required to operate these services satisfactorily. To discharge this task, it works closely with the military authorities and can, with the Eurocontrol Commission's approval, open research and experimental centers and schools for advanced and specialized personnel training. The Agency is financed directly by the member states, whose contributions are calculated on the basis of their gross national product.

FIRST ACHIEVEMENTS

The Eurocontrol Commission has so far decided to install control centers in Luxembourg and near Maastricht in the Netherlands, and to open an experimental center at Brétigny, near Paris.

The first international control center, Maastricht, will control flights in the Benelux-North Germany area of 80,000 square miles. With computers and other modern equipment, 180 controllers will be responsible for the safety of 23,000 miles of air routes. Building began in October 1966, and the center is scheduled to become operative in 1972. Each control team will be able to handle 16 aircraft, instead of six as is customary today.

Eurocontrol is preparing the equipment, personnel, and procedures it will need at the Brétigny experimental center. The installation includes one of the most powerful high-capacity control simulators in the world, which will enable technicians to monitor 300 flights in a region covered by six radar stations, equivalent to what would be found in a dense traffic area of about 20,000 square miles. The simulator is an ideal tool for planning supersonic aircraft arrivals in crowded airspaces and calculating their holding patterns.

Safety and economy justify the international public service performed by Eurocontrol. In a few years, one error in navigation could cause the crash of an aircraft with five hundred persons on board. By functioning around the clock, Eurocontrol will enable airlines to operate at any time instead of only in daylight and favorable weather conditions.

Eurocontrol should help ensure the smoothest flow of traffic at each aircraft's optimum altitude and lowest operating costs. If not, detours, delays, increased fuel consumption, and unforeseen stops will result, all of which mean greatly increased costs. It costs between \$3,000 and \$3,600 an hour to keep a Boeing 707 in the air, and over \$1,200 an hour for a Caravelle.

SENATOR DOLE'S SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY OUTLINES WAYS TO DEAL WITH PROBLEM OF MALNUTRITION

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas is a leading State in the production of food. It is appropriate, therefore, that the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas, the Honorable BOB DOLE, has been assigned to membership on the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Senator DOLE is uniquely qualified for this important post. While a Congressman, he served for 8 years on the House Agriculture Committee. As one of the most imaginative and dedicated Members of the House, Mr. DOLE authored an important amendment to Public Law 480 which ultimately was signed into law by the President. The Dole amendment provides "farmer to farmer" assistance to underdeveloped nations in their efforts to produce adequate food.

After intensive study and personal observation of nutritional deficiencies in Africa and Asia, Congressman DOLE was convinced that the rapidly increasing populations of those emerging areas desperately needed technical assistance from American farmers and scientists to avert widespread famine before the end of this century.

His amendment was an appropriate response to this challenge.

Americans are fortunate that a humanitarian of the stature of Senator DOLE has been assigned to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. His broad background in the general area of the committee's concern provides elements of expertise which any Congressional committee must have to function effectively.

Senator DOLE recently spoke to the All-University Open House Convocation at Kansas State University at Manhattan, Kans. His remarks were directed to the problems of malnutrition in America.

Senator DOLE stressed the essential role that local authorities and private enterprise must play in any successful effort to remove the disgrace of malnutrition from this Nation, with all its wealth.

Because of the national interest in this problem and because I feel Senator DOLE's views will be of benefit to all concerned Members, I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT DOLE AT ALL-UNIVERSITY OPEN HOUSE CONVOCATION, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS., APRIL 12, 1969

I appreciate participating in this All-University open house convocation of Kansas State University and welcome the opportunity to meet with you. It is very important that there exists a continuing dialogue between those of us in government and the university community. The primary mission of government should be to maintain and try to improve the environment and quality of life for all our people. To you, individually, this may involve your education and the contribution you can make subsequent to graduation.

As a community, it requires the university to become increasingly involved in the complex array of seemingly insoluble problems of our time—problems which must be solved if we are to continue to enjoy life as we recognize it.

For the past one third of this century, we have worried about the economic imperative—who received what share of the economic pie. For the last one third of this century, we must also be concerned with the environmental imperative—pollution, land use, transportation, and our greatest problem, the disadvantaged, whether they be in an urban ghetto or the rural areas of our Nation. In the years ahead, the solutions to these matters will require the thought and the energies of all of us, both in and out of government. As Mark Twain once observed, "life is just one damned thing after another."

The wonder of science and technology has raised the hopes of the disadvantaged that they will soon be able to improve their lot. With the ever increasing ability of our farmers to produce bigger yields and better quality food products, it is now possible to relieve man of want: It is to this point that I wish to address myself today.

The existence of widespread malnutrition in America has been brought to public attention in the past 12 months. At present, the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, of which I am a member, is compiling testimony and making personal investigations throughout the country in an attempt to identify the problem and arrive at recommendations for remedial legislation and possible administrative action.

DEFINITIONS

Before proceeding, it might be well to define the conditions to which I will refer throughout this discussion. Hunger, the term most commonly used when talking about this problem, has both a quantitative and qualitative definition. Webster's 7th new Collegiate dictionary describes hunger as "a craving or urgent need for food or a specific nutrient". The extremes of hunger create the condition of starvation which may result in death.

The malnutrition that so many Americans suffer from is inadequacy of a substance or substances required "to promote growth" and necessary "to repair the natural wastage of organic life".

Hunger exists and starvation may occur as a result, but the overriding problem is the extent of malnutrition among the poor.

There are many causes of malnutrition—ignorance of the need for or what constitutes an adequate diet, unsatisfactory housing and sanitation that results in parasitic infestation, as well as those factors that can be determined clinically and that may occur in people at all economic levels. But there are numerous people in this affluent

country who suffer from malnutrition because they have been unable to afford the right kinds of food.

PRESENT PROGRAMS

This audience should know more about food assistance programs—the accomplishments and the unmet needs.

There are two basic programs to provide families food to prepare and eat in their homes—the Commodity Distribution Program and the Food Stamp Program. In addition, there is a new program to provide special supplementary foods for pregnant and nursing mothers and small children based on medical determinations.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The other major group of programs is designed to provide nutritious meals in group situations to children, both in school and out of school. In this category is the National School Lunch Program, which has been in operation since 1946. More recently, under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, Federal assistance provides for breakfast programs in qualified schools. The 90th session of Congress approved legislation providing for Federal assistance to feeding programs in non-school situations such as child care centers and settlement houses for young children and group feeding programs during the summer months for children high school grade and under.

The National School Lunch Program is improving the nutrition of all children regardless of their family's income. This program is designed to not only provide at least one-third of the child's daily requirements of the basic nutrients, but teach the children good nutrition through becoming accustomed to eating well-balanced meals.

The Federal Government prescribes meal-type requirements for these programs that insure nutritionally adequate meals; provides technical assistance to the States and to the schools in many forms and more directly, cash reimbursement for meals served, donated commodities, and this year for the first time, substantial funds to assist the schools in obtaining necessary lunch room equipment.

The Congress has provided that lunches be served free or at reduced price to those children who cannot afford to pay. However, the fact is that there are millions of poor children who are not participating in the program. We have passed legislation to help correct this, and the newer programs under the child nutrition act and the provision for group feeding in non-school situations have been aimed toward reaching these poor children.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

A second program provides for commodity distribution. This program is operated through agreements with State agencies, the Federal Government buys the commodities and delivers them in carload lots to points within the States. The States are responsible for ordering commodities and accounting for them and supervising the operation of the program in the local areas. The local government, usually the county, is responsible for determining eligibility and actually distributing the commodities.

The supplemental food program I mentioned earlier operates through health facilities serving the poor, and is based on medical determinations that the mothers and young children need supplemental foods.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The food stamp program is designed to reach the same group with essentially the same eligibility standards as commodity distribution. Under this program the Federal Government provides the coupons, including the full cost of the subsidy as well as about one-third of the local cost of administering the program. Again, this program is operated through agreements with State public wel-

fare agencies who assume full responsibility for operation within the State. However, the Department of Agriculture assumes responsibility for supervision.

In general, under this program the families pay about what they would spend for food each month in the absence of the program and receive food coupons or stamps that are worth considerably more than they pay. On a national average of all incomes and family sizes they pay on the ratio of about \$6 for \$10 worth of coupons.

As an example, the general schedule governing eligibility in Kansas for a four-person family is as follows:

Income	User's contribution	Food stamps worth
\$20.....	\$2	\$52
\$30 to \$40.....	14	56
\$60 to \$70.....	28	66
\$110 to \$120.....	48	82
\$200 to \$220.....	68	92

By law, the commodity distribution program cannot be utilized in areas where the food stamp program is in effect.

Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, offered a pilot program to South Carolina to provide food stamps without cost to families who have very little or no income in Jasper and Beaufort Counties. Although these counties had previously had a food stamp program, the families paid 50 cents per month per person, to get food stamps worth \$58.

THE 1970 BUDGET

The FY 1970 budget provides for substantially increased appropriations for the child feeding programs for low income families for this current year. In the past few years the local communities have inaugurated the school lunch program in additional schools, and are now operating in schools that represent about 80 percent of the national average daily school attendance. Last year there were about 19 million children participating in the school lunch program with about 2.3 million of these children receiving their meals free or at reduced cost.

With increased funds for this year the program will go into more schools and will be serving about 1 million more needy children lunches at free or reduced prices. At the same time the breakfast program has been growing. A very high proportion of these breakfasts are free and the others served at very nominal cost—10 or 15 cents.

I have gone into detail here to show the progress which has been made. Nevertheless, many needs remain and the problems of meeting these needs are great.

A major problem is the motivation of and securing support from the local communities. Regardless of the mechanism in the last analysis, success of these programs in meeting the unmet need depends on the local community.

Although there is now either a food stamp or commodity distribution program in every one of the 1,000 lowest income counties, there is a substantial problem in making the programs available to those who need this assistance. Unfortunately, there are over 450 counties and independent cities left in the country which have no family food assistance although residents of these areas would otherwise be eligible.

Wherever there are people who would be eligible for one of the programs, it is the responsibility of the local authorities to take affirmative action to implement the appropriate program.

KANSAS

Here in Kansas as of February 1969 there were 3,060 people participating in the food stamp program in 8 counties. Since that time, 3 other counties have been designated for the food stamp program and Neosho County will enter by May. Additionally, on

April 2, the Department of Agriculture received a request from the Kansas State Department of Social Welfare requesting Harvey and Montgomery Counties be admitted to the program.

At the same time, the food stamp program is operating, 11,088 people in 14 counties in Kansas are participating in the commodity donation program.

It would appear from these statistics that the State and local officials in Kansas are attempting to make these programs available to a greater number of eligible families.

IDENTIFYING PROBLEM

As an aid to local, State, and Federal officials in identifying the problem, a national nutrition survey is being conducted by the Public Health Service of the U.S. Government. This is a survey of thousands of families in the lowest quarter income brackets in 10 widely scattered States, conducted by specially trained medical personnel. Preliminary results have disclosed that:

About one third of the pre-school children examined exhibit signs of anemia such as fatigue, listlessness, an inability to perform.

Growth retardation, often companion to permanent brain damage, is common.

33% of the children examined under 6 show signs of vitamin A deficiency, unknown to any child who simply drinks enough milk.

There are children in this country who have rickets and scurvy and beriberi, marasmus and kwashiorkor. These are diseases common in developing countries and usually associated with famine.

This national nutrition survey and my personal experience indicate malnutrition is a very real problem in America. (Discuss)

IMPORTANCE OF PROTEIN

Protein deprived children do not learn as well in their formative years as their well-fed counterparts. There is evidence that their mental capacity, because of retarded brain growth, is permanently impaired. Added to this is the impact of maternal malnutrition. Dr. John A. Churchill of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness says that maternal malnutrition may be the single most important cause of a host of subtle birth defects, from lower intelligence to speech and hearing impediments.

Protein malnutrition is condemning future generations to poor performance. The most pernicious cycle is that where people are too poor to eat well, they develop poorly. Unable to achieve, they possibly get poorer. Obviously, if personal and national goals are to be achieved, this cycle must be broken. Protein malnutrition is a block to national development.

FORTIFIED FOODS

Many groups, including international as well as individual Government agencies and private organizations, have developed food formulas to meet this problem of protein malnutrition. Such a food preparation must meet stringent standards of nutritional quality, and at the same time be available in large quantities at low cost. The food must be transportable without problems, easily prepared for use, and readily acceptable by the children.

The United States milling and bulgur industries have formulated such a food product based on wheat. It is precooked and designed for use as a beverage gruel, soup or dessert. It is called wheat soya blend. Another of the low cost, high protein foods is C.S.M.—a corn-soya-milk blend. Kansas may play an important part in the development of such food products, as bulgur is already being produced in Hutchinson by the Farmers Cooperative Association.

OUR EFFORTS

We must exploit to the fullest these new capabilities of our food sciences to help attain better nutrition. As part of this effort, I urged in a meeting with Secretary of HEW, Robert H. Finch, and Secretary of Agricul-

ture, Clifford M. Hardin, that we fully explore the role of the private sector in domestic development, marketing and distribution of fortified foods. Pursuant to that meeting, I joined my Republican colleagues on the nutrition and human needs committee in urging the appointment of a "private sector task force" composed of representatives of universities, food companies and other interested groups and organizations to study this matter in depth. To assist in identifying our problems in Kansas and make recommendations on possible legislative action, I am appointing a committee to be chaired by former Senator Frank Carlson, which will report to me within the next 3 months.

In eliminating malnutrition, the combined Federal, State, local, and private voluntary resources must be marshaled to provide nutrition education and homemakers training in buying, preparing and serving nutritious meals. Kansas State University, through its cooperative extension service is making a valuable contribution in this area. Special U.S. Department of Agriculture funds were offered to Kansas to "help families get more for the dollars they spend for food and other necessities."

The K.S.U. extension aides will work directly with limited income families in their own neighborhoods by suggesting ways to improve skills in shopping, selecting food, planning meals, and using available commodities.

PRESIDENT'S POSITION

I want to assure you that President Nixon recognizes the complexity and the gravity of the problem I have discussed with you today. On February 3, 1969, in talking to the top levels of USDA employees, he said:

"But I know that all of you are aware, as I am, that those surpluses are a great bounty for the United States of America. It means that we can effectively deal with the problems of hunger in this country and help with the problems of hunger in the world because we are able to produce so much.

"So that presents the challenge to the men and women in this room, the leaders of this Department, those upon whom the Secretary is going to rely to obtain the advice so that we can effectively use this tremendous productive capacity which this Department has helped to build through the years; so that we can effectively use it in a scientific way to attack the problems of hunger, of malnutrition and all of its assets in this Nation, and thereby also to set perhaps an example to other nations in the world.

"It is an exciting problem. It is one in which I have asked the secretary to assume a special responsibility in the meetings in the cabinet and in the other various groups in which he sits and which I am also present. We are going to work on this problem."

CONCLUSION

Certainly, improvements have been made and will continue to be made. We need the concerned interest of everyone here. But what contributions can you make in meeting this new fresh challenge? As students of science, economics, sociology, and all the other specialization, there is room for new suggestions—new leads. How can we use our limited budgets most constructively in this effort to save and improve lives? Nutrition is a key to a better future.

To you men and women, this is a domestic challenge worthy of your talents and involvement.

WHO WILL SIGN?

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel on April

23, 1969, serves as a reminder that there is a discharge petition on the clerk's desk to bring H.R. 7778 out for a vote. Members are urged to sign the petition. The editorial follows:

WHO WILL SIGN?

Those congressmen who accepted a 41% pay increase over what they said was their personal opposition, are now going to have a chance to prove their sincerity.

Rep. M. G. Snyder (R-Ky.) is filing a petition in the house calling for a vote on a bill "to rescind the pay increases for members of congress and other federal officials."

Although the senate voted for the pay increases, the house never did, and they became effective automatically. Asserting that "your constituents have a right to know where you stand," Snyder is urging his colleagues to sign the discharge petition which will force his bill to a vote.

It will require the signatures of a majority—at least 218—of the members to bring the bill to the floor. On the behalf of irritated taxpayers, we intend to watch closely to see who signs the Snyder discharge petition.

SUPPORT FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent resolution passed unanimously by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors expressing their endorsement and support of H.R. 4148 and H.R. 7734, the Comprehensive Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, of which I was a coauthor. We were all very pleased when this bill passed the House on April 16, 1969, and hope that this much-needed legislation will now pass the Senate and be enacted into law. With water pollution such an urgent national problem, Congress and the President have a responsibility to the people to clean up our waters now and protect our environment before it is too late.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

On motion of Supervisor Hahn, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and it is hereby adopted:

"Whereas, the availability of adequate water supply in Southern California is essential to the very life of our people and the growth of our commerce and industry; and

"Whereas, a source of water is the reclamation of waste water through scientifically designed treatment processes which can return high quality water free from pollutants to underground basins thereby restoring in large measure the rapidly diminishing natural water; and

"Whereas, it is necessary to strengthen the control of discharges of potential water pollutants and provide penalties for the violation of water quality control laws;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles endorse proposed amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act contained in H.R. 4148 and H.R. 7734, in order to improve water quality by making it possible for municipalities and other agencies to finance the high cost of construction treatment facilities;

"Be it further resolved, that the Executive Officer of the Board of Supervisors be directed to send a copy of this resolution endorsing the bills to Congressman Glen M. Anderson, co-author of the bills, to Senators Murphy and Cranston and to the Los Angeles County Congressional Delegation."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles, ss:

I, James S. Mize, Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the Original Minutes of Board Order No. 170 of April 1, 1969 on file in the office of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts for which said Board so acts.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the County of Los Angeles this 2nd day of April, 1969.

JAMES S. MIZE,

Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles.

CHAIRMAN RAND DIXON OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION CITES OUTSTANDING RECORD ON CONSUMER WORK AND SERVICES OF THIS COMMISSION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission in a recent statement outlined the outstanding record of accomplishments by the FTC under his direction, particularly in the field of consumer affairs. Among other things, Chairman Dixon cites his pioneering with respect to the matter of cigarette smoking, pointing out that "the Federal Trade Commission tried to do something about this problem before anyone else was willing to act."

The FTC has also done an outstanding work in protecting consumers from deceptive business practices and in efforts to curb mergers and economic concentration.

A number of important economic reports have been issued in many important areas, including food retailing, automobile tires, baking, gasoline retailing, and automobile warranties, among others. Other studies are underway and industry-wide proceedings were initiated in an effort to achieve broader results in the area of consumer protection. Antitrust proceedings involving price fixing resulted in savings of millions of dollars for the American consumer.

These are examples of the important work of the Federal Trade Commission under the direction of Chairman Dixon, who has endeavored to achieve maximum results with innovation and resources available.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place in the RECORD herewith Chairman Dixon's recent statement before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Com-

mittee on Government Operations of the Senate.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL RAND DIXON, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today and testify on S. 860, a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. With your permission, I'd like to begin by outlining very briefly the general purposes and the statutory responsibilities of the Federal Trade Commission.

As you know, the Commission has responsibilities in both the antitrust and the antideception areas. Our organic statute, the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, as amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act, itself puts us squarely into both of these fields. Its single substantive provision, a section with only 19 words in it, reads as follows: "Unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, are hereby declared unlawful." This language has been interpreted over the years as conferring a broad antitrust jurisdiction on the Commission, one under which we have brought hundreds of cases in the antimonopoly area, including cases involving such traditional antitrust offenses as price fixing, boycotts, sales below cost and the like. Another way to explain our jurisdiction here is to note, as the Supreme Court has said from time to time, that any conduct that violates the older Sherman Act—any collusive restraints of trade or efforts to monopolize trade—automatically violates Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

In addition to this general mandate in the antitrust area, the Commission shares, with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, responsibility for the enforcement of the Clayton Act of 1914, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Price Discrimination Act of 1936 and the Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act of 1950. That statute, the Clayton Act, thus deals with four rather specific business practices: (1) price discrimination; (2) exclusive dealing; (3) mergers; and (4) interlocking directorates.

One thing that distinguishes the statutory authority conferred on our agency by the Federal Trade Commission Act from, say, the Sherman Act (which is enforced exclusively by the Justice Department) is that it has been repeatedly held to prohibit not merely existing restraints of trade but "incipient" ones as well, those that have not yet reached the magnitude of full-blown Sherman Act violations. It is important to understand this "preventive" character of our statutes and of the remedies we are authorized to employ. We have no punitive powers. While we're authorized to issue "cease-and-desist" orders requiring a party to abandon an unlawful practice in its future business dealings, we enforce no criminal laws that exact punishment for past violations. This was neither oversight nor, in my opinion, indifference on the part of the Congress that passed the original FTC Act. The reasoning was that, if criminal penalties were attached to violations of that law (as they had been to the Sherman Act), the courts of the day would have construed it so severely as to effectively emasculate it, whereas with only civil remedies involved, the courts would probably interpret it more liberally and thus give it real meaning.

A host of other statutes have been added to the Commission's responsibilities over the years. These include: The Wool, Fur, Flammable Fabrics, and Textile Products Acts; the Export Trade Act; the Lanham Trade-Mark Act; the Insurance Act; the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act; the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act; and, most recently, the Truth in Lending Act, among others.

Perhaps the most significant thing to understand about the scope of the Commission's statutory duties is that we exercise a

general jurisdiction, not a narrowly special one. We are expected to assure that all firms engaged in interstate commerce, excepting only those in the so-called exempt or "regulated" industries, conduct their business "fairly," with no objectionable aggression against either their suppliers, their competitors, or the approximately 200 million consumers that are their ultimate customers. Our "beat," in short, is virtually the whole of this approximately \$900 billion economy of ours.

I would be less than candid, Mr. Chairman, if I told you I was completely satisfied with the Commission's success in carrying out the numerous missions assigned to it by the Congress. I am not. But I am proud of my agency and its personnel, and I am confident that you will be hard put to find another agency in government where so few accomplish so much for the public interest at so low a cost to the taxpayer.

Perhaps I can be of most assistance to the members of this Committee in their deliberations concerning S. 860 if I shared with you today some of the experiences and problems faced by the Commission in carrying out its various missions.

The truly critical point to understand in all of these questions, Mr. Chairman, is one that centers around the idea of what other witnesses here have aptly characterized as the weighing of National "priorities." It should be fairly clear to all that a tiny agency such as ours, one with just over 1,100 employees, cannot effectively police a \$100 billion economy, with over 5 million business firms in it. We simply cannot proceed against every "unfair" business act or practice committed in this broad land of ours on the resources the Congress has seen fit to give us. And of course the moment we concede we cannot proceed against all of them, we must begin to think about which we will select, and which we must pass over, not out of indifference but out of a realistic recognition of the physical constraints imposed on us from the outside.

Now, tightly bound up with this point, Mr. Chairman, is another I would like to make with you, namely, the fact that there is a closer connection between our antitrust work and our antideception work than is generally recognized by those interested in protecting the consumer's interest. First of all, there is the fact that those two classes of cases compete for our time, attention, and limited number of dollars available for enforcement work. If one knows that it will take, say \$50,000 to conduct an investigation and litigate a certain "deceptive practices" case, one that is estimated to be costing consumers, say \$1,000,000 per year, and if one also knows that it would cost exactly that same number of dollars to investigate and litigate a giant merger case, one with potential benefits to the consumers that could ultimately run into many millions of dollars (in terms of high prices and lost output in later years), it becomes very clear that the two sides of our work are hardly as "independent" as they appear at first glance.

Nor does the connection between the two end there, Mr. Chairman. There is a tendency, when cataloging "consumer" matters, to think solely and exclusively of cases involving fraud and deception. In fact, however, antitrust is a "consumer" matter in precisely the same sense as antideception, namely, it is concerned with economic injury (aside from health and safety cases)—with, to put it bluntly, a lightening of the consumer's pocketbook. The former causes the consumer economic injury by persuading him to (a) buy a product he would not have bought at all if he had known the truth about it, or (b) pay more for a product than he would have paid if he had known the truth about it. In much the same fashion, monopoly, price-fixing, and all the other antitrust practices, by lessening the intensity of the compe-

tion that otherwise would have prevailed, compel the consumer to (a) accept, for sheer lack of alternatives, a product he would not have purchased at all if there had been more favorable options to turn to, or (b) pay more for the product than he would have had to pay for it if competition had been effective.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the "success" or lack of it of a deceptive-practice scheme is measured in exactly the same terms as the "success" or lack of it of a monopolization or price-fixing scheme, namely, by the number of dollars it extracts from the consuming public over and beyond what it would have been able to claim in the absence of those unlawful acts or practices. Whether the public was in fact deceived, and by how much, is thus measured in terms of how much extra they were persuaded to pay for a product because of the false information they were given. A deception that costs the public \$10 million annually should logically be accorded the same degree of attention that a monopoly costing the public \$10 million per year in overcharges receives no more, and we hope, no less.

In some cases, deception and monopoly are in fact simply opposite sides of a single coin. The economists who specialize in these matters now advise us that the increasing concentration we are all so concerned about is in fact occurring most rapidly in precisely those industries where the more subtle forms of apparently misleading advertising are being applied most heavily. That is to say, massive, advertising is apparently capable of "concentrating" all or substantially all of the sales of a given product in the hands of one or a handful of very large sellers, thus imposing on the consuming public not merely a false impression of the product but the higher prices and other disadvantages of buying from a monopolist or small group of tight-knit oligopolists. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it is becoming increasingly difficult, when attempting to make some rough assessment of the overcharge being paid by the consumer for a product that is sold by some form of deceptive advertising, to separate out that part of it that stems from the deception, as such, and that part that stems from the fact that it is being sold by a firm with great market power, one that operates in a highly concentrated market in which genuine competition has ceased to exist in any form that is particularly beneficial to the consumer. In a number of industries, in short, the deception and the monopoly power have been fused into one, each supporting the other, protecting and preserving it from the inroads of would-be competitors.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you a rather concrete example of why we consider our antitrust work to be as squarely within the "consumer protection" field as our antideception program. In 1961, the Commission issued a complaint charging some 50 bread bakers and a large supermarket chain with conspiring to fix the price of bread in Seattle, Washington, and the surrounding area. Hearings were held before one of the Commission's hearing examiners, evidence was received from both the respondents and counsel supporting the complaint, and an initial decision was handed down by the examiner. On appeal to the Commission, the agency found that price fixing was going on and issued a "cease-and-desist" order.¹ This was in December 1964.

An economic analysis of bread prices in Seattle during the period of the conspiracy—from 1955 to 1964—uncovered some very interesting facts. As you can see in Figure 1,

¹ In the Matter of Bakers of Washington, Inc., et al., Dkt. 8309 (December 1964). This order was subsequently affirmed in Safeway Stores, Inc., et al. v. Federal Trade Commission, 366 F. 2d 795 (9th Cir. 1966). The Supreme Court subsequently denied certiorari in this matter, 386 U.S. 932.

bread prices in Seattle were approximately the same as the national average prior to 1954. Beginning in the middle of that year, however, the Seattle price started to climb higher and higher above the national average, ultimately exceeding it by some 3 to 4 cents per 1-lb. loaf, or nearly 20%. Then, a few weeks after the Commission's final December 1964 cease and desist order was entered, the Seattle price started to fall, and has remained at or below the national average since late 1965.

Now in this case, Mr. Chairman, we have a very interesting example of how much a price-fixing conspiracy was costing Seattle consumers and thus how much, in dollars, our work on this case has saved those consumers. We estimate that the added cost to consumers in the Seattle-Tacoma area alone amounted to approximately \$3.5 million per year, or approximately \$35 million in the 10-year period of the conspiracy, 1954-64. The savings to the consumer in the four years since our order was entered, 1965-1969, thus amounts to some \$14 million.

In our view, Mr. Chairman, it would be very difficult to imagine a clearer example of a "consumer protection" case. Or, for that matter, a more successful one.

Unfortunately, of course, it is not always possible to measure precisely the savings to consumers from our work. It is my conviction, however, that in the long run, vigorous antitrust enforcement provides our strongest shield against exploitation of consumers.

It is very important, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, to understand that the problem of law enforcement in the consumer area is not simply a matter of passing stringent laws and staffing the administering agencies with energetic zealots. This has been generally acknowledged, of course, for many decades. Were it otherwise, we would not be here today pondering the problem; some past administration, properly sensitive to the prospects of facing a grateful consumer-electorate, would have long since taken the cue.

As several of the prior witnesses have mentioned, the performance of the federal consumer agencies has been the subject of a running criticism from the very beginning. Indeed, the Federal Trade Commission itself was created in 1914 out of Congressional dissatisfaction with the performance of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The Commission, in turn, was subjected to a book-length criticism as early as 1924 by a scholar named Gerard C. Henderson (*The Federal Trade Commission*, Yale University Press, 1924). In 1949, there was the highly critical report by the Hoover Commission. Later, in 1961, a similarly critical report on our agency and others was made to President Kennedy by the Landis Commission. Again, none of this is to deny that the problems pointed to by these critics existed then or exist now, or to excuse the failure of the agencies over the years to solve them; rather, it is to emphasize that, as is illustrated by the fact that they do span many decades, they obviously go much deeper than the personal sobriety and work habits of any particular group of men that might happen to occupy the agencies' supervisory posts at any given time.

Mr. Chairman, the past eight years have been a time not of complacency at the Federal Trade Commission, but a time of searching, of seeking for better ways of doing things than those that had been used and found wanting in the past. Our agency had traditionally used what was called the case-by-case approach, one in which you simply brought as many cases of the traditional type as you could bring on the budget you were given. And of course this effort to maximize the number of cases necessarily meant that you gave the matter a great deal of thought before you took on a so-called "big case," one that would drastically bring down your statistical "average" for the year. It was my feeling in 1961 when I became Chairman of the agency, and I think it fair to say that it

was the feeling of the other commissioners we had then as well, that the time had come to stop bringing lawsuits just for the sake of bringing lawsuits, and to try to analyze exactly what it was we wanted to accomplish. We wanted ultimately, of course, the "biggest bang for our consumer buck," the largest, most widespread law observance program we could get, given the size of our budget.

We went through some sharp re-aligning of our priorities. We started substituting industrywide proceedings for the "one-at-a-time" approach; we set up a procedure for giving advice and guidance to businessmen who genuinely wanted to comply with the requirements of the law, not just subpoenas; and we set up a program for settling more cases by what we called "voluntary assurances" of discontinuance, a procedure that, of course, substantially reduced the number we had to resolve in the hearing room.

Some persons have criticized these procedures because they result in fewer lawsuits. I am assured however, Mr. Chairman, that of the literally hundreds of law violations we correct yearly under these procedures, *virtually none are repeated*. Now if we can get everything our laws permit us to claim in this simple, inexpensive way—if we can free the victims of these violations from their effects immediately rather than after the five or ten years of delay the court processes normally impose on us—then I am at a loss as to why we should insist on bringing formal lawsuits that, in the words of our economist-friends, have such a low "marginal return." There is, of course, an appropriate role for the formal lawsuit—to deal with recalcitrants, to give credibility to our less rigorous processes, to develop new law, to explore economic relationships that have been only imperfectly understood in the past, and the like—but the fact remains that an insistence on litigating all matters brought to our attention would result in less law enforcement, not more. The thesis that no business firms will bring themselves into compliance with the requirements of our consumer protection laws without a full-scale trial and the assessment of fines or penalties is simply not true.

Nor is it true, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission has devoted itself in the past eight years to small matters in insignificant industries. When I came to the agency as chairman in 1961, there was a tremendous backlog of cases, many of which were indeed of something less than earth-shaking significance to the consumer. The Commission was rather obviously being tied up in knots by what one scholar has aptly called "the universal Gresham's Law of Administration—that small matters with close deadlines push aside important matters with no fixed deadline."² The delay resulting from the backlog was most keenly felt, in short, in precisely those cases where it was capable of doing the most damage to the public interest, the "big" cases, those that affect the largest number of consumers in the broadest possible ways. Justice delayed, we felt, was justice denied, and accordingly gave the very highest priority to devising simpler, more expeditious ways of resolving the less significant matters that were interfering with work on the larger ones.

This preoccupation of the Commission in those earlier years "with small matters with close deadlines" is nowhere so evident, of course, as in the decline of one of the most vital aspects of the agency's work, its making of in-depth economic inquiries and preparing long-range economic reports. In the 9-year period prior to 1961, only 4 such economic reports had been issued. One of the first steps I took upon becoming Chairman was to begin building what has since come to be recognized as one of the most outstanding economic staffs in Washington. In the past 3

years alone it has prepared such important economic inquiries as: *Economic Report on the Structure and Competitive Behavior of Food Retailing* (January 1966); *Structure of Food Manufacturing* (June 1966); the *Economic Report on Mergers and Vertical Integration in the Cement Industry* (April 1966); the *Economic Report on the Manufacture and Distribution of Automotive Tires* (March 1966); the *Economic Report on Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Associations* (June 1967); the *Economic Report on the Baking Industry* (November 1967); *Staff Report on Automobile Warranties* (1968); the *Economic Report on the Use of Games of Chance in Food and Gasoline Retailing* (December 1968). We currently have underway a broadscale economic study of conglomerate mergers which will doubtless play a central role in the development of future policy in this critical area. In addition, the Commission has been asked by the Department of Transportation to undertake two large studies of the automobile insurance industry.

In addition to this enrichment of the economic side of our work, the Commission has decided and brought a series of truly big anti-trust cases. In our antimerger work, some of the more significant cases include: *Foremost Dairies*, Dkt. 6495 (1965); *Procter & Gamble*, 386 U.S. 568 (1967); *Beatrice Foods*, 1967 Trade Cases, Par. 72,124 (CA-9, 1967); *Dean Foods*, 384 U.S. 497 (1966); *National Tea*, Dkt. 7453; *General Foods*, Dkt. 8600, 386 F. 2d 936 (CA-3, 1967). In 1968, the Commission issued the first complaint involving an enormous conglomerate merger, the acquisition of Peabody Coal Co. by the Kennecott Copper Co. (Dkt. 8765). In early 1969, it issued another complaint involving two large conglomerates, the attempted takeover of Allis Chalmers by White Consolidated (Dkt.). In our general restraint of trade work, our more significant cases include *American Cyanamid, et al.*, 363 F. 2d 757 (CA-6, 1966); *Bakers of Washington*, 366 F. 2d 759 (CA-9, 1966); *Brown Shoe*, 1966 Trade Cases, Par. 71,785 (Sup. Ct., 1966).

On the antideception side, important Commission cases include: *Colgate-Palmolive (Shaving Cream) and Ted Bates*, 380 U.S. 374 (1965); *J. B. Williams Co. (Geritol)*, 381 F. 2d 884 (CA-6, 1967); *Libbey-Owens-Ford and General Motors*, 352 F. 2d 415 (CA-6, 1965).

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Trade Commission has brought literally hundreds of formal cases in the past eight years, not to mention the hundreds of other law violations it has resolved by the informal procedures I mentioned earlier. And, of course, the names of the respondents we've brought lawsuits against include many industrial firms that rank at the very top of the nation's corporate hierarchy. We've won most of our cases, and have lost a few, but I can assure you that we have not let the size or any other characteristic of a proposed respondent deter us from bringing a suit we thought was important to the public interest.

None of this is to suggest, of course, that there are no constraints on us that prevent us from dealing with a number of matters we would like to deal with. But those constraints that hem us in are not, as some have suggested, a failure of either our energy or our will. And, if I might be permitted a very small bit of immodesty on behalf of my supervisory staff, I do not believe we have been constrained by a lack either of zeal for the public interest or of general economic or legal capacity.

To be perfectly frank, Mr. Chairman, one of the chief constraints that face us emanates from the Congress itself. It has not hesitated to exercise that ancient legislative device of (a) satisfying the public's demands for relief from an unhappy situation by passing a law, while simultaneously (b) satisfying the demands of special industry groups for freedom from real regulation by the simple ex-

pedient of appropriating only token amounts of money for the actual enforcement of the law in question. We are sometimes cut quite thin indeed by these twin blades of the Congressional scissors. I believe others have testified here that the Federal Trade Commission ought to be given a ten-fold increase in its appropriations. Let me assure you that I have been fairly immodest over the years in my requests for more funds for the FTC. But in no year since 1962 has the Bureau of the Budget given the Commission a significant increase, and what little it did recommend was invariably cut by the Congress. As a result, the Commission staff has remained almost unchanged for the past six years despite an enormous growth in its workload.

This is not new, of course. From 1939 until 1961 the size of the Commission staff remained about the same despite the passage of several new consumer protection laws, plus the Celler-Kefauver merger act of 1950. As each of these laws was passed, the Commission was thus forced to divert resources from its already existing missions.

Nor is it any secret to the members of this group that the Congress imposes other constraints on the actions of agencies such as ours. In 1962, for example, we instituted an inquiry to gather some highly significant economic information from the 1,000 largest corporations in the United States. Had that inquiry been allowed to proceed, the Commission would have been much better equipped to deal with the enormous merger wave that now threatens to engulf us. What did Congress do? It not only deprived us of the funds that the Budget Bureau had approved for the inquiry, but also tacked a "rider" on our appropriations bill for three years running. It said, in substance, "No part of this appropriation may be used for a study of the intercorporate relations of the 1,000 largest corporations."

In 1965, the Commission attempted to initiate a body program to do something about the massacre that goes on in this country under the name of cigarette smoking. We did some very careful work in the area and came up with an industrywide rule that would have required affirmative disclosure of the health hazards associated with cigarette smoking. Before the rule could become effective, the Congress intervened, passing a bill that expressly prohibited us from doing anything about cigarette advertising on TV. The American Cancer Society estimates that 800,000 more Americans have died since 1965 from illnesses connected with cigarette smoking. All I can say, gentlemen, is that the Federal Trade Commission tried to do something about this problem before anyone else was willing to act. My friends in other regulatory agencies, as well as most consumer advocates have commended this effort of the Commission as an act above and beyond the call of duty. I don't really think so. We were doing our job as we saw it. In all candor, I think that when a history of this episode is written, it will be concluded that we were right and the Congress was wrong. But that's the way the game is played in this town, and I'm used to taking hard knocks.

I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the past several years have been a period of considerable ferment and excitement at the Commission. Within the past year, for example, we have set up an organization for transmitting to the Chairman the best and boldest thinking of the younger members of the staff, an organization called the Young Professional Committee, one composed of all attorneys and other professionals that have been with the agency for three years or less. I welcome the idea of these young people. Evening courses in trial work and related subjects are a regular part of our continuing educational program. And just over a year ago, the Commission set up a training program for the staff in the economics of consumer protection work, one that takes our

² Dr. William G. Shepherd, "Conglomerate Mergers in Perspective," 2 *Antitrust Law & Economics Review* 17 (Fall 1968).

lawyers into some of the most complex and sophisticated forms of economic analysis.

We have not yet been able, Mr. Chairman, to come up with even a reasonably accurate estimate of just how many dollars the work of the Federal Trade Commission saves the American consumer each year. But I think any fair critic will agree that, in the aggregate, the annual "return" from our efforts is many times the amount of our total budget. I think the Federal Trade Commission is one of the American consumer's "best buys." I mention this not to suggest that we are anywhere near the maximum figure we would like to reach, but simply to give you some notion of what is involved in some of the suggestions you have heard here, particularly the suggestion that the Congress consider abolishing the Commission and creating a new, presumably stronger agency in its stead. I am certain it is a well-meaning suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but I'm equally sure I don't have to tell the members of this Subcommittee that it is always a great deal easier to pass a new law reshuffling or tearing down existing institutions than to perfect them. And should the suggested new agency fail, the patient that would suffer is, of course, once again the consuming public. It would have been deceived into believing it was getting a new and better product when in fact only a new brand or wrapping had been placed on an old one.

I am therefore against S. 860, Mr. Chairman. Creation of a new department will not, in my view, solve any of the really fundamental problems we have been struggling with. The need is for more resources and for a more powerful and sympathetic constituency up here on "the Hill." Let me say categorically that it is time to stop kidding ourselves and the American public by passing consumer protection laws without also providing enough money to enforce them in a meaningful way. Passing a new law creating a new department would simply give the public once again the illusion that something was being done that in fact wasn't being done. If Congress wants to do something, it could begin by giving us the resources we need to do our job, by taking care of such chores as providing a statutory basis for the office so ably occupied by Esther Peterson and Betty Furness, and—above all—by giving us moral and other kinds of support through such Congressional oversight committees as this one.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, if I might, a somewhat personal note. As you know, I came with the Federal Trade Commission as a young man, just out of law school, and have been there continuously over the past 30-odd years except for a stint in the military during World War II and another with Senator Kefauver's (now Senator Hart's) Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. I have seen, both as a Commission trial attorney and as general counsel for the Monopoly Subcommittee, some long and lonely fights against what I considered some very powerful private interests, including the drug industry, the automobile industry, the steel industry, the cigarette industry, and all the other giants. It was pretty lonely there at times, especially during some of those years when being for the consumer wasn't really the most respectable cause to be for. I must confess it's more comfortable being part of a crowd.

SIERRA LEONE'S EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, April 27 marks the eighth anniversary of the in-

dependence of Sierra Leone. I am pleased to extend to Acting Governor General Tejan-Sie and the people of Sierra Leone congratulations and best wishes for the coming years. I have every hope for a continuance of the friendliness that characterizes the relations between Sierra Leone and our country.

SURPRISING PHILADELPHIA TAKES A SUMMER FLING

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, my home city, Philadelphia, has been the subject of more bad jokes than I care to recall. Some have even suggested that the lights went out in Philadelphia shortly after the War of Independence.

We have been trying for years to put to rest these false canards. Leading us in this fight has been Abe S. Rosen, now president of the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau, formerly city representative and director of commerce and always Philadelphia's first booster.

He and his able director of tourism, Alvin S. Hornstein, have put together a package of summer activity which may stem the annual lemming-like rush to the New Jersey shore.

To prove that Philadelphia can be more fun than New York and more surprising than Amsterdam, Mr. Rosen's bureau has put together a package of free summer recreation and labeled it Philadelphia Fling.

To point up the fact that Philadelphia is not only birthplace to the Republic but to a whole galaxy of 20th Century show business celebrities, the bureau has established the Ed Wynn Award. The first recipient is Comedian Joey Bishop.

W. C. Fields also was a Philadelphian and the award could have been named for him, but we all know what he had to say about his hometown.

I enter for the RECORD descriptions of Philadelphia Fling and the Ed Wynn Award:

"Philadelphia Fling," a new concept of excitement, free entertainment, and unusual events and activities in center city, has been announced by the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau as its theme and format of a summer-long program in "Surprising Philadelphia".

The new program, being developed through cooperation of the Bureau with the City Recreation Department, Office of the City Representative, and the Philadelphia Area Council on Tourism, will feature at least "50 Days of Fun" during the noon-hour at John F. Kennedy Plaza, plus a kaleidoscope of free entertainment in the evenings at Kennedy Plaza, Rittenhouse Square, the Judge Lewis Quadrangle on Independence Mall and Independence Square.

Abe S. Rosen, president of the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau, announced "we want to make the Summer of 1969 the most fantastic season of fun, entertainment and activities ever to be seen on the East Coast. Through the cooperation of all the above agencies, and many others, we hope to attract visitors from all over the nation and world to Surprising Philadelphia to experience one of the most unusual and different programs in our history."

A schedule of June 1 to Labor Day events is being put together now for Kennedy Plaza by the Bureau and the Recreation Department. This will include musical aggregations, dance, ballet, fashion shows, sports events, athletic demonstrations, guest celebrities, and a number of surprises. Each of 50 days will include a "Salute to the States," another phase of the Tourist Bureau's Discover America tourist promotion program. The Bureau's popular Miss Welcome Girls who visited the 50 states in 1968 to promote this program, will participate in the Kennedy Plaza schedule.

In the evenings, free action and entertainment will be divided into three areas, with the Center City Residents Association combining with the City to put on dance, theatre, ballet and concerts at Rittenhouse Square Mondays and Wednesdays; the Mummies String Bands performing Tuesday evenings at Kennedy Plaza, and 10 Friday nights at Independence Mall. Six nights a week at Independence Square, the sound and light production of "The American Bell" will be presented free of charge.

In addition, this Summer will find such new attractions as the opening of Old Fort Mifflin as a tourist site; the first monorail in a zoo at the Philadelphia Zoo; thoroughbred racing at Liberty Bell Park; resumption of the Naval Base tours; new Gray Line tours of the Liberty Trail, the new five-county motor tour created last year by the Tourist Bureaus of Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery Counties; plus many other new events and activities.

To entice more visitors to the "Philadelphia Fling," new and attractive hotel-motel sightseeing-entertainment package plans have been developed by the Bureau and Gray Lines, offering complete three-day, four-day packages for couples, individuals and entire families. These package plans include rooms, champagne and breakfast at hotels, sightseeing, dining out, nite life entertainment at some of the area's top spots and cultural events.

New folders and literature on the "Philadelphia Fling" and the new package plans are available, along with all information on "Surprising Philadelphia," by writing to the Tourist Center, 1525 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Philadelphia, Pa. 19102. Ask for "Philadelphia Fling" package.

Joey Bishop was recently named the first recipient of the Ed Wynn Award by the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau, and was presented with the Award Citation and Trophy on his ABC-TV network show Friday, April 25 by Abe S. Rosen, president of the Bureau.

The new award, created by the non-profit Bureau to recognize a native Philadelphian or an "adopted" son who has enhanced the city's image and prestige, was named in memory of Ed Wynn—comedian, actor and Philadelphian.

The Ed Wynn Award will be presented annually to the entertainer or personality who best exemplifies the tradition, loyalty and dignity for Philadelphia as did the late, great beloved "perfect fool" Ed Wynn. Rosen explained that it has been his desire for some time to honor the countless numbers of entertainers or public figures who bring fame and honor to our city. "It is fitting," Rosen said, "that the Convention and Tourist Bureau, dedicated to attracting visitors, conventions and business to town, establish such an award in the name of one of Philadelphia's most beloved personalities—Ed Wynn."

Rosen made the presentation in Los Angeles on the Joey Bishop show aired Friday, April 25.

The Citation to Bishop reads:

"There is a thin line between great humor and pathos and the late beloved Ed Wynn walked that line unerringly throughout his career. He recognized the truism in that fact and turned it to his advantage in his career first as a comedian, then an actor. He called

himself the 'perfect fool' but brought dignity to the field of comedy in the finest tradition.

"Ed Wynn was a native Philadelphian. Wherever his long career took him, he never relinquished the title of 'Philadelphian.' He was a genuine example that you can take the man out of Philadelphia, but you can't take Philadelphia out of the man. So it is with Joey Bishop, who has been selected to be the first recipient of the Convention and Tourist Bureau's annual Ed Wynn Award. A great comedian who follows in the footsteps of his noted predecessor by retaining his dignity and respect for his fellow man, Joey Bishop wears his crown of success with humility and appreciation.

"Joey Bishop is an actor in the truest definition, performing with skill, style and talent to bridge the comedy of the theatre and the tragedy of life. And most important to Philadelphia, Joey Bishop is a native son who never has and never will forget that Philadelphia is his home.

"It is because Joey Bishop has enhanced the image of Philadelphia as one of the greatest birthplaces of America's outstanding theatrical talents; because he has brought prestige and fame to his native city through his own reflected glory; because Joey Bishop is perpetuating the title of 'comedian', 'actor' and 'Philadelphian' according to the definition symbolized by the man in whose memory it has been created, that the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau so bestows upon him the honor and title of the first recipient of the Ed Wynn Award."

The Citation is signed by Ralph W. Pitman, chairman of the Bureau's Board of Directors and Rosen.

NOTABLE CAMPUS HAPPENING

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the novelty of campus disorder has worn away leaving in its wake uncontrollable students, confused and indecisive administrators, and an irate citizenry.

In the midst of this holocaust, the University of Nebraska has taken a logical and admirable step toward preventing any such disorder at their institution.

I have before me an editorial written by one of our outstanding newspapers, the Lincoln Evening Journal, which describes this "Notable Campus Happening." Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the university's policy will be very beneficial to other institutions. For this reason, I insert the editorial in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Apr. 18, 1969]

NOTABLE CAMPUS HAPPENING

The most notable happening on the University of Nebraska campus this week was not the very orderly presentation of concerns by black students, but the adoption by the Faculty Senate of a policy statement on campus disorders.

The statement says, in effect, that free expression is to be honored on the campus but that police force should be called upon if necessary to prevent violence or to insure the normal operation of the institution.

More noteworthy than this entirely logical guideline is the fact that the statement also has the backing of the student governing body and of the administration.

More than anything else, perhaps, it has been the failure to state a definite course of action, endorsed by all elements on the campus and well publicized in advance of any trouble, that has fostered the devastating clashes at some of the nation's great universities.

It is only a coincidence of timing that has brought the University of Nebraska statement of policy to the fore at about the time representatives of the Afro-American Collegiate Society are demonstrating for their "concerns."

These students have made their suggestions with respect and the administration has received them with interest. This should permit some accord in good spirit.

If the time ever comes when such matters cannot be handled amicably, the foresight and responsibility of the student body, faculty and administration, in joining in an advance understanding of eventualities, will be more fully appreciated.

REMARKS OF JAMES W. SYMINGTON AT THE JACKSON DAY BREAKFAST, APRIL 26, 1969, AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, each year Missouri Democrats celebrate, at Springfield, Mo., the birthday of one of our Nation's great Presidents, Andrew Jackson. The keynote speaker at the Young Democrats breakfast on Saturday morning, April 26, was the Honorable JAMES W. SYMINGTON. As a result of his many years of experience on the Washington scene and his outstanding dedication and ability, Mr. SYMINGTON is receiving recognition that is indeed rare for a freshman Congressman. I have acquired a copy of the speech he delivered, and for the edification of my colleagues and the President of the United States, wish to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF JAMES W. SYMINGTON AT THE JACKSON DAY BREAKFAST, APRIL 26, 1969, AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

We celebrate today the son of an immigrant linen draper—born in His Majesty's Province of North Carolina. He entered the stage of American history with a British sabre cut on his head. Years later his wife explained a family epidemic by saying—"The General kicked the kivers off and we all catch cold."

Andrew Jackson indeed kicked away the wrappings of vested interest and colonial paternalism enabling our political spirit to take wing.

Some would like to see it fold its wings and creep back in. But the lesson of this vivid teacher is that all cobwebs and cocoons are fair objectives for the broom of common sense and new thinking. And we have plenty in our time, hanging from the rafters of myth and obsolete policy.

Jackson was laid to rest 124 years ago. If he could kick off the covers of that sleep and join us again, I have no doubt we would find ourselves in the throes of daring innovation in foreign and domestic affairs. Would he stand mesmerized while the Soviet Union sends emissaries to Nationalist China, or would he conclude, in the light of this and other manifestations, that our posture of

austere detachment from the other China had outlived its usefulness? We tend to forget that the diplomacy of our founding fathers was no less hostile to the idea of permanent hostilities than of binding alliances.

A frontier soldier-turned-statesman himself—and not of the refined sort—would he find it untimely or impossible to converse with a fatigue-clad revolutionary 90 miles from the Floridas he seized from Spain—or would he, as we do, look southward with a fixed and glassy stare waiting for something worse to happen so he could twitch helplessly in his chair?

At home, given his populist background and understanding, would he isolate himself from the restless currents of demand from the emerging new voices among us—asking a chance to share in plotting the country's course—and the world's history? Would he hide his stern countenance from the outrageous excesses of any such demand? Would this first Democrat confine education and job training programs within the strict budgetary limits prescribed by the purse-keepers, but dismiss the purse-keepers when generals enter the parlor to court his favor—and approval for expeditions that cost 30 billions a year, and additional nuclear deterrent of 6 or more billions, and a new bomber for upwards of 12 billions?

One suspects that Andrew Jackson would have brought a certain cold—and healthy—skepticism to the task of analyzing the nation's resources, and the priorities for their application. Would he have done so in a partisan spirit? Very likely! Yet listen to the words he wrote to President-elect Monroe:

"The chief magistrate of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party feelings. His conduct should be liberal and disinterested, always bearing in mind that he acts for the whole and not a part of the community. By this course you will exalt the . . . national character, and acquire for yourself a name as imperishable as monumental marble. Consult no party in your choice; pursue the dictates of that unerring judgment which has so long and so often benefitted our country and rendered conspicuous its rulers. These are the sentiments of a friend. They are the feelings—if I know my own heart—of an undissembled patriot."

We may smile at this post-lude of the Jackson Presidency. But in my view any President can be great if he would but do great things. We can put down, or otherwise survive the militant dissent in America, but when the forces of law and dissent are pitted against one another, they are both wasted. If we would not be mere horrified spectators in that arena, we must conceive ways to involve both forces in common causes that pull our own imaginations and efforts on the field as well. Great Presidential decisions can accomplish this. They are things which catch the conscience of the people.

We don't want a Hamlet in the White House. We are not as interested in the play within the play, as we are in the play itself. And we want to be part of the drama of bold reality—on our side of the footlights.

Nor are we content to see through an unctuous, protective editorial darkly, the supposed reflections of the loneliest man in the world. We didn't elect him to be lonely, but to force us to share with him the crushing burden he bears. To listen to us, yes, but to tell us, too, not through public or private intermediaries, but personally to tell us what we need to know and to do to play the proper role of a great free people.

Our new President began to tell us. On the threshold of occupying the mansion of our hopes, he told us he would "open doors" and "keep no nation large or small in angry isolation." Tell us more. Don't wait for a divine

consensus to emerge from our troubled confusion. Tell us how we can, as legislators, businessmen, farmers, workers, educators and students, open doors and help each other come out of our angry isolation. When we have done so at home, we can do it abroad.

Presidents have the big key. It should be used when it's new. Four years can rust it. Andrew Jackson used it on the locks of his time, and in doing so he set not just a good, but a necessary example.

VOICE FROM VIETNAM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. S. Kimmel, Jr., of Davenport, Iowa, recently provided me with a copy of a poem written by Mr. Cornelius Vanderbreggen. Mr. Vanderbreggen's poem expresses so clearly the frustration which we all have with respect to Vietnam. Let us all hope that President Nixon's current efforts will result in an early end to the war:

THE VOICE I HEAR FROM VIETNAM

You said you sent me here to fight.
That is a lie.
I answered duty's call and came.
I soon may die.
Because of your absurd decree,
"You may not win!"
You call it "building bridges" or "restraint."
I call it sin!
You spend your country's sons in vain.
I see them fall.
Each day by scores, they're killed or maimed.
That is not all.
At home, their dads and mothers, stunned,
Bow low in grief.
From all this senseless, needless loss
Comes no relief.
No orders from headquarters,
"Rise and fight!"
How this has caused me many a tortured day
And sleepless night!
But now the explanations clear.
Solved is my plight!
While held your slave on Asian soil
I've seen the light!
No longer need I seek the answer.
Now I know, as shackled here I wait for
death.
You are my foe!
You who pretend to lead the brave and free,
But won't resist our godless enemy!
You who possess the suave and plous gall,
To mourn the foes of freedom when they
fall!
You who stand idly by, while anarchy,
Burns down this land God gave to you
and me!
You are my foe!
I soon may die,
If so, I'll be with God on high,
Rejoicing in the love
That He doth show His own, and
Knowing there, that when I lived
On earth below,
Not I my land's blest heritage
Did e'er betray,
Not I for anti-Christ's vile rule
Did pave the way.
But like our noblest patriots
I did gladly die,
For freedom's persecuted cause,
Which you've denied!
CORNELIUS VANDERBREGGEN.

CITIZENSHIP AND THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN STUDENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity last Wednesday night to participate in the honoring of 10 high school students who had distinguished themselves as good citizens. The Civitan Club of Silver Spring, Md., has for 21 years encouraged the young people of that community to submit essays on citizenship and to live in such a way that their examples would merit their selection for citizenship awards. Last week six young people were declared citizenship award winners and four were named citizenship essay winners. I am pleased to have an opportunity to make known the names of these people to my colleagues, and also to share with you the top-prize-winning essay.

I find it particularly impressive that on the 1-year anniversary of the Columbia University disruptions, which event has evoked much criticism of our youth, we had the singular honor of acknowledging the meritorious contributions these young people are making to their Nation. It is important for us to make every attempt to retain a perspective with regard to the status of America's youth; it has become too easy to assume a negative stance in light of the bombardment of pejorative reports we hear daily. I am therefore heartened both at the occasion which permits me to be able to make these remarks and at the substance of those remarks. Accordingly, I submit to the attention of my colleagues the names of those students who were honored and the winning essay written by Miss Sheryl Ann Spencer:

Citizenship award winners: Nancy Moore, Academy of the Holy Names; Joseph G. Stephens, The Bullis School; Christine Simpson, Montgomery Blair High School; Mark Stein, Montgomery Blair High School; June Lyon, Takoma Academy, and Benjamin Ling, Takoma Academy.

Citizenship essay winners: Michael Stein, Montgomery Blair High School; Michael Murphy, The Bullis School; Joan Fuchs, Academy of the Holy Names, and Sheryl Ann Spencer, top prize, Takoma Academy.

CITIZENSHIP AND THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN STUDENT

The American student, to be a conscientious and involved American citizen, must think of himself as an example to the student citizenry of his country and of other countries. He is not necessarily a young politician, and he definitely is not a fanatical demonstrator. He may be in the public eye, or he may be primarily his conscientious self in his own academic sphere.

He is, first of all, right with himself. He quietly and purposefully recognizes the greatness and potentials of his nation and his personal responsibilities to those conditions. He maintains a personal interest in knowledge and achievement as it relates to his own life and the lives of others, and he devotes himself to personal accomplishment in the light of national need. He is a visionary, yet not a dreamer. He asks questions, yet

not idly. His life is governed by a sense of right and wrong. He is not afraid to speak up for the "old" morality. He views the clean life as an important personal factor in his role as a good citizen. He seeks a healthy body, an unclouded mind, and nobility of soul. He is fearless, except in the face of evil. He is self-disciplined.

Furthermore, his attitude toward citizenship involves the quality of personal reformation, rather than public demonstration, riots, and sit-ins. He may be actively interested in the local and national political scene, but he is primarily involved in campus and community betterment projects. He has a keen concept of duty and is aware of the necessity of performing every task well. He considers all current events of enormous importance to himself because the individual makes up the community and the community makes up the nation. It is therefore obvious to him that if each individual is a successful citizen, the nation as a whole will succeed.

The student citizen who loves his country shares the excitement of patriotism with his countrymen, and does his best to help keep it alive in the American heart. He not only honors his country, but also cherishes the principles of the Constitution on which it was founded. He never loses his sense of wonder. He loves the natural beauties of the land and the specific characteristics of the American people, which are these: the pioneer spirit, love of life, recognition of the individual, imagination, and friendliness.

He makes himself conscious of human problems. As he studies the conditions in the world and sees the misfortune in his community, he keeps an open eye to pain and need and suffering. He does what he can, personally, to alleviate starvation, despair, and the loss of personal dignity. He knows that in this sense he is doing his part to ease the tensions of the world.

A good student citizen is sensitive to the feelings of others, and determines that no personal gain is worth breaking the spirit of another in an effort to achieve it. He does not use his fellowmen as a ladder on which to climb to his own pedestal. He tries, early in life, to know what he is striving for and what he believes in. This effort gives meaning to his life and helps him reach whatever lofty goals he has set for himself.

The role that the student plays in American citizenship becomes, therefore, a magnificent combination of self-improvement as it relates to the betterment of the ever-widening circle of humanity—his own academic society, the neighboring community, all fellow Americans, and the individuals of other nations.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with other colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of the late Senator E. L. "Bob" Bartlett of Alaska, who passed away while Congress was in recess.

I was indeed saddened to learn of the passing of Senator Bartlett who exhausted and expended his energies in dedicated service to his beloved State of Alaska and the Nation. This fine public

servant served in the House and in the Senate with great distinction.

Bob Bartlett made a distinct contribution to the new and great State of Alaska—he left his mark on the history of his State and he will be long remembered.

Mrs. Evins joins me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Bartlett in his passing.

HON. EDWIN EDWARDS PRESENTED TIE BY STUDENTS

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the blue and gold tie which I wear today was given to me by the patriotic 100-percent American students of Washington High School of Lake Charles.

I had the honor of speaking at the Washington High School Honors Day program on April 18, 1969, and I was most impressed by the demeanor and attention and interest of the students of Washington High. It is refreshing to visit a school where the students are interested in academic pursuits, exhibit a respect for professors and elders and a love and reverence for our country and its flag.

In a day and age where a small minority of loud-mouthed, unhappy, disgruntled students on college and high school campuses command national attention by their disruptive activities, I thought it appropriate to say here that the vast majority of American young people are honest, loyal, sober and patriotic. I believe, too, that the unwashed few who disrupt and cause trouble and show disrespect for our Nation represent but a small minority who seem to be able to command prime time on the national television networks. I believe we should spend more time with the sober, industrious students of America who represent the true spirit of the American student and the young people of America and we should do more toward publicizing the sober comings and goings of these industrious and patriotic young people. It is these who will protect and preserve our Nation in the generations to come. My faith and confidence is in them and I am satisfied we will leave our Nation in good hands in spite of the disgruntled few who capture the news media and falsely pretend to represent America's youth.

I wear the tie these wonderful young people gave me with pride and humility, for the gift handed me as a token of appreciation by the student body of Washington High School represents in my mind a bond of mutual respect and admiration. There is no generation gap between us and I am convinced that we understand and respect each other.

Thank God for fine young Americans such as these and all others that this group so well typifies.

U.S. JAYCEES HONOR VIETNAM WAR DEAD AS PROPOSED BY THE KANSAS CITY, KANS., AREA JAYCEES

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City, Kans., area Jaycees, have launched a new community service program which has met with great response from community leaders and citizens, and has subsequently been adopted by the national Jaycees organization.

The project was launched locally last January by project chairman and originator of the idea, William J. Kersten, and the response was so good that members decided to try to make it a national Jaycee project.

By searching, the Kansas City, Kans., Jaycees found that when a local young man lost his life while serving his country in Vietnam, the community hears about the loss, reads about it, and soon forgets it. There is no local organization that pays special tribute to the local hero, loved and remembered by his friends and family.

The Jaycees, in a special ceremony, present to the family of the deceased, a framed citation which shows the appreciation of the local Jaycee chapter, and all the citizens of the community. It is signed by the mayor of Kansas City, Kans., and the Kansas City, Kans., Jaycee president. In addition, a beautifully engraved plaque in memory of the young man is made to the parents of the deceased and, if the young man is married, an identical presentation is made to his widow. Special emphasis is placed on a large ceremony with news media coverage, showing the family the community as a whole appreciates the contribution of their loved one.

I want to personally commend Mr. William Kersten for developing this worthwhile and patriotic project, the Kansas City, Kans., Jaycees for implementing it, and the national Jaycee organization for adopting the program.

KCMO Broadcasting paid deserved tribute to the Jaycee Vietnam war dead project in a recent editorial which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

TO HONOR VIETNAM WAR DEAD

It may not be much, but a new strain of national pride is starting in Kansas City, Kansas. With a tidal wave of talk and demonstrations about the war in Vietnam, we may sometimes forget the sacrifices by young American men in this controversial war. A new program of recognition has been launched by the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Kansas City, Kansas, to honor those who died in the fighting. First of the honor citations was delivered to the parents of James M. Montemayor, of Kansas City, Kansas.

Although the citation is not fancy or elaborate, it shows deep appreciation of those who gave their lives for the United States under military service in Vietnam. So often we hear of comments by combat servicemen questioning the loyalty of the American peo-

ple, questioning the impact of the riots and demonstrations, wondering whether the fighting men are nothing more than paid soldiers.

The Kansas City, Kansas Jaycees hope to have the National Jaycees adopt their program to make it a nation-wide effort. We can think of nothing finer unless it would be participation by all civic and patriotic organizations in all the states. Our soft life at home does not come by chance. Someone must fight for it.

GUN CONTROL LAWS WOULD BE COSTLY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in his April 4 column of "Outdoor Notes," Ken Gookins in the Newark, Ohio, Advocate, supplies some very pertinent information and observations on the continuing controversy of gun control legislation. Entitled "Gun Control Laws Would Be Costly," Columnist Gookins cites the misuse of statistics by proponents of gun legislation, along with the astronomical cost of such programs at a Federal or State level. As a good example, the case of New York City is cited:

Knowing that it costs the city of New York \$72.87 to process each application for a pistol permit, you can imagine what the astronomical figure would be for federal registration where machines, personnel, millions tons of paper, filing cabinets, office space, new buildings, etc., would be involved.

Mr. Gookins reviews other arguments of the gun legislation advocates which have been offered in the past, in an attempt to stampede citizens into supporting and demanding gun restrictions. His comments on this thorny issue are worthy of consideration, and for that purpose I ask that the column, "Gun Control Laws Would Be Costly," from the April 4 issue of the Newark Advocate be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Newark (Ohio) Advocate, Apr. 4, 1969]

GUN CONTROL LAWS WOULD BE COSTLY
(By Ken Gookins)

A couple of columns ago James Lannan of 887 Terrace Dr. in Heath, dropped me a note and a pamphlet. Noting he was too busy writing his state and federal legislators to do justice to a letter, Lannan, president of the Ohio Trapshooting Association, checked off some of the pamphlet points.

I promised to delve into the topic in a later column. This is it.

Lannan directed my attention to the Trap and Field publication's comments on the relation between guns and crime and accidents.

A question raised was: Probably very restrictive gun laws would cut down some on crimes of impulse, does this make sense?

The comment: If, as so often stated, even one life saved makes such laws and the accompanying impediments worthwhile, then to be consistent, we would have to ban swimming, football and non-essential activities and especially all pleasure driving. This is obviously not going to be done. There is a calculated risk in all things.

It also noted that: The gun accident rate decreased 50 per cent from 1930 to 1965 and is now about 2,200 a year.

Proponents of gun legislation insist on misquoting available facts. They infer in veiled statements that 17,000 people a year are shot to death and then further infer that by licensing gun owners and registering guns, the nation's crime rate would decrease.

This makes the statement a bald lie. The 17,000 shooting deaths per year include 2,200 accidental shootings and 9,500 suicides. The latter would use poison, gas, a high cliff or some other means to end it all, if guns were not available.

The Police Gazette erroneously reported: 18,000 murders are committed annually by criminals with guns.

Two religious magazines quoted: 17,000 are accidentally shot each year.

Readers Digest noted that "17,000 are killed by guns," written in a manner to suggest they were deliberately shot.

Discount the 2,200 accidental shooting deaths and the 9,500 suicides and you have 5,300 gun slayings. This is a far cry from 17,000. However, I do not infer this is a pleasant figure. But then, neither is the 50,000 automobile deaths which our nation racks up each year, along with the maiming and crippling of three times that number.

Automobiles and their drivers are licensed. The killing continues. The same would happen in the case of licensing gun owners and registering guns. But, the main point to remember is that criminals will not register their guns, will steal one when they want a weapon and only the honest sportsmen will be bound up in the red tape of registration.

Furthermore, if you look at the present gun law, recently enacted, you will discover registration is already there. The sporting gun dealer must register every transaction, identify the owner and keep records to this effect. So far it is less costly to do it this way, although it will have no bearing on crime.

If the registration proponents beat down all the sensible arguments against restrictions and pass a federal or state registration bill, you will see one of the biggest messes in history.

A federal registration bill would create a computer nightmare and set up another bureaucratic octopus which probably never could be killed.

The giant computer complex necessary to handle such a registration program would be second only to the Social Security and income tax systems in overall size and complexity.

The problem would require the solving of at least five completely unique systems problems; data collection, data communications, data storage, data dissemination and data conversion.

It would take at least two years to complete the project and would involve a staff of several hundred people. It would require a team of qualified experts at least six months to devise a workable system.

Based on estimates that there are 200 million guns in the United States and three million new guns are purchased each year, the computer registration would require more than 130 characters.

In addition, each time a gun would be bought and sold, or an owner moved, the information would have to be changed and updated.

Knowing that it costs the city of New York \$72.87 to process each application for a pistol permit, you can imagine what the astronomical figure would be for federal registration where machines, personnel, millions of tons of paper, filing cabinets, office space, new buildings, etc., would be involved.

And for what? Absolutely nothing, because the whole project is supposedly based on the need to stop crime in the United States and such a massive registration would not prevent one single gun crime that now is looming on the horizon of the future.

If you are among that uninformed army of people who accept all the half-truths spouted by registration proponents and don't care how much money is wasted on the impending boondoggle, just sit on your hands and it will come to pass.

If you are a thinking person who knows that the criminals not only will not register, but will not be allowed to register because of the interpretation of the Fifth Amendment and that only sportsmen will suffer, get off your hands and write your state and federal legislators.

Be polite, be firm and be quick. Skip the petitions. One petition is one piece of mail. Fifty letters from gun club members mean 50 pieces of mail and carries 49 times the weight.

One New York City policeman testified under oath that in one case where a pistol application required some checking, the actual cost of processing the application amounted to \$500. This is figured on time expended by investigators, etc.

How silly can it get? The answers are noted above. Think and act, or be smothered in another—possibly the greatest hoax of the century.

JOB CORPS CENTER CLOSINGS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is time that some the nonsense about the Job Corps center closings is dispelled. I have seen news dispatches quoting youngsters in these centers to the effect that they are about to be thrown out in the streets or drafted and sent to Vietnam. I have also heard that President Nixon plans to "wreck" the Job Corps.

Let me hasten to assure this House that none of it is true. No one will be thrown out on the streets or sent to Vietnam as a result of the closings of some of the Job Corps centers. We have the word of Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz in testimony before Congress that the number of youths served by the Corps, and other training programs under his jurisdiction, will actually be increased—not diminished.

During this fiscal year the Job Corps and the other training programs will serve 362,900 young men. Under President Nixon's 1970 budget, the total is expected to reach 368,600—an increase of 5,700.

The Job Corps centers scheduled to close are mostly rural centers devoted typically to conservation work. There were two things wrong with this idea. First, according to Mr. Shultz, many of the youngsters dropped out from simple homesickness. Second, they were not learning marketable skills. Conservation is badly needed—but not in the cities where trainees will look for jobs. Another point—the Job Corps programs were not sufficiently integrated with other, excellent, departmental manpower training programs.

President Nixon's plan is to correct these mistakes by closing most of the rural centers, substituting inner-city training centers, and integrating the Job Corps program with the other training programs.

That is the sum and substance of the Job Corps story. It is nonpolitical, though some are trying to play politics with it. It is not a story of indifference to the needs of youth. It is not a budget-cutting story. Above all, it is a plan to improve the Job Corps, not wreck it.

PRESIDENT TO DECIDE ROLE TVA WILL PLAY IN FUTURE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today—April 28, 1969—I read in the Washington Post an extremely interesting article on the Tennessee Valley Authority. Marquis Childs, in a few paragraphs, give us insight into TVA and its accomplishments, and I would like to recommend to my colleagues this material:

PRESIDENT TO DECIDE ROLE TVA WILL PLAY IN FUTURE

(By Marquis Childs)

DECATUR, ALA.—A big piece of the excitement at the start of a new Administration 33 years ago was the Tennessee Valley Authority, which under the tutelage of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Sen. George Norris began the rehabilitation of a region plagued by all the ills of poverty.

Today most Americans take TVA for granted as a piece of political archaeology out of the New Deal age. A job finished that can be put away in the files.

A tour of the region shows it to be very much alive and expanding, performing services for the seven states, with beneficial consequences for most of the rest of the country and with an impact on every part of the world. It is America's outstanding example of what can be done in a partnership between Government and private enterprise, which is why each year some 600 foreign visitors come to study this successful adventure in planning for a whole region and its river system.

TVA, at its inception as a New Deal agency, was regarded by Republicans as a diabolical device to inflict socialism on the nation. They fought it tooth and toenail in Congress and the courts.

When Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower became President in 1953 he cherished the conviction that this experiment in socialism, as he saw it, must somehow be restrained. He appointed another retired general, Herbert D. Vogel, to be one of TVA's three directors.

But Vogel, after a thorough examination of the authority and its works, became more catholic than the Pope—that is, more pro-TVA than some of the Democratic appointees to the board. This is said to have been a deep disappointment to the first Republican to occupy the White House in 20 years.

Now TVA is subject to the ministrations of a second Republican President. In the interval, however, a lot has changed and TVA's status in the valley, if not also in the nation, is stronger than ever. That was evident during Richard M. Nixon's campaign in Tennessee last September.

He was accompanied by Sen. Howard Baker of that state, a Republican, who is one of TVA's staunch allies. After uttering some kind words for the transformation TVA has worked, Mr. Nixon had an hour's briefing by Chairman A. J. Wagner of TVA's board. Demonstrating one of his conspicuous talents, the ability to listen and learn, Mr. Nixon asked Wagner this question:

"Do you think that TVA could be helpful in furthering the effort to control air and water pollution?"

With more extensive practical research on water pollution than any other agency in the country and with extensive studies in air pollution growing out of TVA's own steam plants, this is just what TVA is doing today. A close relationship has been established with the Federal Air Pollution Center, and TVA is carrying out studies for the center.

At the National Fertilizer Development Center in Muscle Shoals the partnership between Government and private enterprise is seen in its most-flourishing form. Growing out of the original commitment to create nitrates for soil improvement, the center has developed new and far more potent fertilizers. The latest is urea-ammonium phosphate, which on the basis of extensive tests promises dramatic increases in food production.

Each new development is patented by TVA and then the process is made available to commercial companies free of charge.

The late Gordon Clapp, one of TVA's most effective chairmen, once said, "If you're consequential you're controversial." TVA would not be TVA without a lousy scrap in Congress relating to progress. The latest has been touched off by conservationists—preservationists might be a more accurate word—accusing the authority of spoiling the landscape for yet another dam.

No less an old-time New Dealer than Associate Justice William O. Douglas has charged that, by building a dam on the Little Tennessee, TVA is ruining one of the nation's finest trout streams, desecrating what were many years ago the happy hunting grounds of the Cherokee Indians and blotting out a fine piece of scenery.

Chairman Wagner replies that the lake to be created in the valley of the Little Tennessee will have its own beauty and, far more important, the development will provide employment and an attractive way of life for several thousand families who now have a marginal life.

"The work of TVA will never be over," John F. Kennedy said in a speech on TVA's 30th anniversary, only a few months before his assassination. "There will always be new frontiers for it to conquer in the minds of men the world over."

Wagner, whose terms expires next month, is in the great tradition of Clapp and David Lillenthal. He knows the whole region as intimately as a householder knows his front hall. He was endorsed the other day by the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce, which can scarcely be considered a revolutionary body. His colleagues kid him about this new badge of respectability. Whether he is reappointed will be an interesting test of the Republican Administration.

BOYSTOWN OF FLORIDA

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are familiar with the outstanding work of Father Edward Joseph Flanagan, who founded Boys Town, Nebr., more than 50 years ago. Father Flanagan's motto was "There is no such thing as a bad boy," and under his inspirational guidance, new life and hope were brought to thousands of boys. Father Flanagan died in 1948, but his work goes on—not only in Nebraska, but in south Dade County, Fla.

Boystown, Fla., was founded in 1964, under the inspiration and direction of Archbishop Coleman F. Carroll of the Miami Catholic Diocese. Father James Henry, a priest who was the first Catholic chaplain assigned to the State penal institution at Okeechobee, directed Boystown. Now the director is Father Neil Flemming, and the administrative director is Mr. John L. Perrotti.

Located on 153 lovely wooded acres at Southwest 137th Avenue and 114th Street, Boystown was built on the site of Camp Matecumbe, a former summer camp for children. Its goal is to mold mature, responsible, contributing citizens of the community by creating an atmosphere as close as possible to a normal family situation.

Boystown of Florida is a home for dependent boys between the ages of 13 and 18 who have no other home. Here, they find that somebody cares. Coming from all walks of life, the boys find real friends in the counselors who guide them through their problems and help them grow into the citizens of tomorrow.

A planned educational and recreational program is an important part of Boystown. There are fine facilities, including comfortable dormitories and an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The dormitories are heated and air conditioned, and the beds are comfortable. The food—as well as the chores—is designed to put muscle on growing boys.

As director of Boystown, Father Fleming is uniquely qualified to win the trust and faith of his dependent youngsters. His natural interest in helping boys who have lost their parents through desertion, divorce, or other means, is bolstered by his enthusiasm for flying—a hobby which attracts the admiration and respect of most teenage boys. Father Flemming took up flying when he was 17 and won a private license. The priesthood followed, but after a hiatus of more than 15 years he again climbed into the cockpit.

Flying "whenever I get the chance," Father Flemming is often found on weekends at the controls of a rented or donated aircraft. A number of Boystowns' youths have taken a training program in aviation and soloed on their own, while others have expressed an interest in airline work such as becoming pilots or mechanics.

Through such means, Father Flemming and the staff work with their charges in a friendly, informal atmosphere. From the first day of admission, Boystown begins to plan with the parents for future rehabilitation of the broken home from which the boy came, when and if that is possible. The hope is that the family will eventually be reunited.

Privately maintained through contributions from individuals, Boystown of Florida deserves the support of every citizen. Its work is truly an outstanding contribution to the community. When it first opened its doors, five boys found a home. Now, it is attempting to provide a homelike environment for 50 teenage boys of all races, colors, and creeds.

Unlike Boys Town of Nebraska, Boystown's program is community oriented. It attempts to provide the proper vehicle to

mold mature, responsible, and contributing citizens of the community. Naturally, the degree of success is hard to measure until after the boys leave. This year alone, success and sadness have been twofold—two of the boys were killed in Vietnam.

I congratulate the directors and supporters of Boystown for their immense achievement in helping their fellow man. For its leading part in service to the entire area, "Boystown of Florida" fully merits our confidence and assistance. Its address is: Post Office Box 336, Olympia Heights Station, Miami, Fla. 33165.

In an outstanding manner, Boystown of Florida lives up to its standard: "Our boys of today—your citizens of tomorrow."

FORESTER MILTON M. BRYAN
STATES THAT WISE AND BALANCED USE OF LAND IS CONSERVATION IN ITS NOBLEST FORM

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this year the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co. held its cooperative field forestry program in Madison County, Fla. Some 400 business and industrial leaders from throughout the Nation and Canada and representatives from six foreign countries left Jacksonville, Fla., at 8:15 a.m., April 17, on a special SCL train. Gov. Claude Kirk, members of the State legislature, other State officials, State Forester C. H. Coulter, and over 700 landowners, students and timber operators were already assembled at a longleaf pine woodland area on U.S. 90 between the Suwannee River and Lee, Fla.

Representatives DON FUQUA, in whose district the woodland is located, and BILL CHAPPELL, JR., were on hand to meet and welcome the visitors to Florida.

Governor Kirk, State Forester Coulter, Gene C. Brewer of New York State Director of Agricultural Education C. M. Lawrence, George C. McManis of Trailmobile were key speakers. Milton M. Bryan, representing the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., spoke on the pressures of land use in America. His speech is so timely that it merits the attention of all conservation groups throughout our Nation, and I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PRESSURE ON LAND USE

Last month, both the Senate and House held hearings to determine why commercial timberlands weren't providing enough timber to meet a sudden surge in demand for lumber.

Then, just last week, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service were named as defendants in an injunction suit asking that a planned sale of timber near a possible Colorado wilderness be stopped. In Oregon, more than 1,000 petitioners have asked that an area in which some selective logging is planned should be withdrawn from logging because scenic values might be damaged.

These events dramatically underscore one of the nation's major problems which affect each of us here today—the conflicting pressures for use of our greatest national resource, our land.

The pressures cited are not limited to government managed land. Private landowners find they aren't immune from the demands of conflicting interest either.

It's a sign of our times, basically related to population increases and the changing interests and activities of people. More people have more money to buy the products of the land. More people have more leisure time available to them. Greater mobility has awakened an awareness of the miracles of nature, leading to strong public movements to preserve land masses in their natural state. More highways, more suburbs, more reservoirs are gobbling up great chunks of land.

I am not finding fault with these various uses of the land. I'm only saying they are, in combination, elements of conflicting pressures which will definitely continue to grow.

What can we do about it?

Our gathering here at Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co.'s cooperative field forestry day is one of the ways to help turn the key. The speeches and demonstrations on today's program reflect the extensive work which is already being done to get more from the land—to make it more productive for more people.

It is an active testimonial to the concept of multiple use of the land resource. I believe multiple use is the one answer developed so far that offers a resolution to the problem of a growing population on an unchanging land base.

The recent lumber price hearings in Congress and the establishment of a special committee of Cabinet members to study timber supply problems are responsible for the tremendous demands for production from the forests. Last year's legislation for establishment of the North Cascades National Park and the Redwood National Park show just as clearly the strength of demands to preserve land in its natural state. The growing list of recreation areas, natural areas, monuments and other single-use areas reflect the demands of still another segment of the population.

Each of these demands must be measured against the yardstick of multiple use so we can secure the greatest good for the nation from our lands. And this applies to all lands, public and private, forested and unforested, bottomland and mountaintop, urban and rural. This doesn't mean that each acre of land must have many uses. But it does mean that wise use of land is a balanced use. We cannot have all of the proposed wilderness and national parks without production of timber being affected. We cannot have megalopolises and vast highway networks without wildlife, scenery, and productive farmland being affected.

We must become evangelists for the cause of wise and balanced use of land—conservation in its noblest form.

The growing scramble for land and its products can lead to disaster if the planning processes are dismissed without consideration of land use in its broad national context. No longer is there enough land to allow every special interest group to have the unlimited land classification it wants. No longer can we say there are still millions of acres beyond the mountains. There just aren't.

Now we must look again to see just how our land can be used to do the most good for the bulk of America's population. We want—and need—wilderness, recreation areas, national parks and monuments. But we also want—and must have—producing forests for the homebuilder. And we need minerals, forage, clean water, and other products.

We must be able to show that all interests can be recognized, but not to an unlimited

degree. "All interests" must be considered—and they can be—but only in a wise and balanced way.

Our continued greatness as a nation may well depend on it.

BROADCASTER REPLIES TO FIDEL CASTRO

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of loyal, freedom-loving Cubans who have fled Fidel Castro's Communist dictatorship continue to believe that someday honor and justice will return to their homeland. I, too, support this goal. In the meantime, exiled Cuban patriots monitor the failures of the Communist puppet who rules their island, and take note of the increasing bluster and trumpeting Castro uses to mask his disastrous economic and social defeats.

One victim of Castro's tirades is Manuel J. Reyes, a veteran Cuban broadcaster who left his native country when communism suppressed all freedom of speech and press. Because Mr. Reyes gained wide public identity and support during his many years with CMQ in Cuba, Castro has felt it necessary to attack him as a public figure and as an individual. Mr. Reyes, now the outstanding Latin American news director with WTVJ in Miami, has broadcast a reply to Havana's Red Radio venom, and for the benefit of my colleagues I make his reply part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BROADCASTER REPLIES TO FIDEL CASTRO

Just a few days ago, on March 11, 1969 to be exact, a Havana Communist radio station dedicated a 20 minute short-wave program to attack me, not only as public figure but also as an individual. But this is a well known trait of Communists, used when they feel powerless to face the truth.

The attack was motivated by my editorial "Answer to Fidel Castro," presently circulating throughout Cuba, in which I actually answered Castro's speech of Sept. 28, 1968.

It should be pointed out that this was not Radio Havana's first one such attacks. On Feb. 18, 1969, the same radio station had attacked my statement to the Assoc. Press in which I revealed that 10,000 copies of the "Declaration of Liberty" (proclaimed at Key West, by over 1,500 Cubans on Jan. 23, 1966) had been sent and released in Cuba and that 10,000 additional copies were on their way to the captive island.

After carefully analyzing both attacks, particularly the one of March 11th, I decided it was necessary to reply, with serenity but firmly, and unmask the true author of such an insult.

First, I must say that there is not a trace of animosity in myself against the radio announcer who read each one or both articles before the microphones of Red Cuba radio stations. I do not know who did it. But if they knew the 22 years during which I worked for C M Q, ever since I was 13, back in Feb. 18, 1938. . . . they must have felt terrible while reading the deceptive sheet of paper they were given. I sincerely excuse them, knowing as I do that they were forced by terror. Being also a Cuban, I understand the ordeal of these radio announcers when the Red over-

seer makes them read, before a microphone, something repudiated by their innermost feelings.

That is why, practicing the democratic right to reply which, by the way, is prohibited in Cuba, I address myself to the true author of that attack. . . . Fidel Castro, who, repeating the same tactics he used at the Sierra Maestra (hiding inside a cave to keep himself away from combat and aiming only with telescopic gun-sight to be able to do it from the rear guard) hides, this time behind a microphone, to get rid of his hatred, his frustration and resentments by attacking me with mile-long demagogic lies.

Today, I address myself directly to you Fidel Castro, in defense of our people's liberty and decorum, but specially in defense of the young people of our country, those whom you have been unable to penetrate with your ten-year-long indoctrination. They rebuff you and rebel against you from one end to the other of the island and in so doing are giving proof of your enormous failure.

Today I am going to give you a few facts; they will teach you that you can not impunely attack honest and decent people. Besides, it is high time you start getting used to the bitter taste of defeat.

You forced the radio announcer to say that I had started working at CMQ as a child-prodigy, singing and acting in "Cafe Pilon Show." In your resentment you have uncovered your own lies. You have said and repeated that Cuban poor people never had a chance to better themselves. Nevertheless, when you say that I started at CMQ as a child, you admit that poor people did have a chance in Cuba, previous to your disastrous take-over, since I come from a very hard-working family but a very poor one as well. Back in 1931, while you were in Oriente province, enjoying the comfort of a wealthy family, I was in Havana with my parents, helping them make a living by selling penny-a-piece candy at the Polvorin public market, right across the street from the Presidential Palace. This is the truth but you would not dig it out because it would shatter your own demagoguery. This is the truth but you would not dare facing it, so you force others to read your lies. Everyone knows I started to work since I was 13, and gave 22 consecutive years of my life to only one enterprise: CMQ. First, while still located at Monte and Prado, under the management of unforgettable Angel Cambo and Miguel Gabriel; then from 1943 on, under the direction of the Mestre brothers. During those 22 years of daily work, I was also studying and struggling to finish my career. You said that it was difficult for me to obtain my degree as an Attorney. You forgot to mention that I also hold a Master's degree in Consular Diplomacy. Yes . . . it was not easy for me to get those two degrees . . . it was difficult . . . but you also forgot to mention that it was . . . economically difficult. I had to work to pay for my own career and my grades were obtained through hard studying.

You, who never held a job, who do not know what it means to earn a quarter by working for it, were also attending the University; but your family was paying for your career and your grades were obtained by tortuous means. You were never a true student. You spent most of your time trying to become Delegate or President of your course and even President of Law School, just to create privileges and exemptions which you condemn today but through which you made your way up year by year.

I remember seeing you, quite frequently, at the University's Plaza Cadenas, a gun at your side, intimidating your fellow students with your bully attitude. I will never forget the day when, in the company of several of your followers, you halted a local bus at the San Lazaro square; every passenger was forced down at gun-point, then you drove the bus

to the Alma Mater, there you sprinkled it with gasoline and set it on fire as a protest for a raise on the fare. And just the same way you burned that bus you have also burned and destroyed our beloved Cuba. No one can be a Statesman on the basis of fire and destruction. And you do not know how to build.

I received my Attorney's degree in 1949 and started to practice right away without giving up my job at C M Q. You received yours in 1951 if I'm not mistaken. Nevertheless, I never saw you at our homeland's Courts of Justice, practicing the right to defend people of which you brag so much. I saw you only once at the old Havana Courthouse, in back of the Supreme Court of Justice, you were there trying to get some votes at the Lawyer's Hall, where my good friend Larrea was caretaker. You were then running for Representative for the province of Havana on the Orthodox Party ticket. And now you complain about politicians!

But, why should I keep insisting on facts like these. Your fate is already decided. It is written on the Bible: "He who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword".

The only thing I really want to stand-out is the fact that I shall continue to defend the young people of my country, the same ones you are trying to enslave.

Those powerful, noble and good young people that you are trying to poison with foreign doctrines, stranger to our country, like Marxism-Leninism. As long as there is a breath in me, I shall defend the Cuban young people, our fatherland's New Gold; they represent our best reserve . . . and your end! Have no doubt, Fidel Castro; they will ultimately overthrow you and, united in true brotherhood with those in exile, under the principles of God, Fatherland and Home, they will rebuild the new Cuba that was our forefather's dream. You have betrayed their blood, because traitor is he who has again put together for Europe the yoke that from Europe came and was shattered last century in Cuba, at the expense of enormous sacrifice and precious lives.

Since you brag so much about your young followers, why is it precisely the Cuban young people who are the ones brandishing the "Declaration of Liberty", pasting it on doors and walls as a symbol of their defiance and their rejection to your regime?

If it is truth that the Cuban young people feel satisfied with your system, why do you force them, a bayonet to their backs, to go to the fields and perform the so called "voluntary labor"?

If you feel so sure about Cuban young people, why do you prevent them from going to church and Sunday school? If they really follow you, why are they not permitted to speak freely before microphones, without having to give an account of what they intend to say?

If Cuban young people do not oppose you, why are the jails of our country full of Cuban youths?

If Cuban young people are loyal to your so-called revolution . . . why did you, on your speech of March 13, 1969, insulted them . . . why did you offend them . . . why did you call them "hopeless delinquents" and why, assuming a Hitler-like pose did you threaten to exterminate them all?

You want to enslave young people. . . I want them to be free.

You take them away from their families. I want to see them go back to their parents.

You threaten them with destruction. I want them to live. I want to save them! Even the few ones that might still be on your side . . . that might still believe in you . . . for they have grown hating enemies they do not even know; for they have been the victims of your abominable indoctrination; for they have never seen the light of truth.

I want them also to be saved; for in spite

of your communistic venom, they are before and above everything else . . . Cubans.

And to prove the truthfulness of what I say, this answer to your insult shall go to Cuba . . . it shall be brandished, from one end to the other of the island, by Cuban youngsters as a sign of future hope they do not have with you . . . as a sparkle of liberty, which was banished from Cuba by your treason.

This answer is not only my duty as a defender of the young people of Cuba, it is also the answer deserved by those who dare insulting honest men with lies and demagoguery.

BILL SMALLWOOD RETIRED AS SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of the very fine labor leaders and a pioneer in the effort to organize American working men and women retired as secretary-treasurer of the Communications Workers of America.

Bill Smallwood for 43 years worked at active union building and untold numbers of men and women have had their lives bettered by his efforts.

On the occasion of his retirement, Bill Smallwood looked back on those years.

I should like to take this opportunity to wish him well in the years ahead, and to share with my colleagues his remarks:

Ladies and gentlemen, Joe, fellow officers and very distinguished guests, I detected a few raised eyebrows when I spoke of "fellow officers" so I want to remind each of you that my retirement doesn't officially become effective until midnight tonight—and you're going to have to put up with me until then!

Don't panic . . . I don't plan to speak more than an hour.

Please try to understand that a man has an opportunity like this possibly only once in a lifetime—and this is my opportunity, with a captive audience—and I'm going to take proper advantage of you . . . I mean it.

So, sit back and relax, friends.

I want to look back a few minutes . . . before we look ahead.

First, let me make it clear that when I started to work in the "communications industry" in 1929 I didn't even have a dream that I would ever have such a grand, sumptuous opportunity to say "thank you" to so many dignified, delightful people.

One of the most precious privileges my work with CWA has given me has been the opening of doors that permitted me to travel extensively and meet and work with so many wonderful people in the labor movement, the political and civic world and many are here tonight.

Rather, my thoughts in 1929, centered on "making it" . . . and, I don't mean making it the way teen-agers use that phrase today . . . very simply, I mean I was worried about holding my job and having enough money to pay the room and board.

Remember, that was on the eve of the great depression . . . a rough time for millions of people, including me, it was a long time ago . . . so long ago that Joe Beirne was only 18 years old and hadn't even bought his first car—one with a rumble seat.

Yes, it was long ago but I remember it well because the depression in those years created the fertile soil from which we ploughed out the modern labor movement as it exists today.

Keep in mind that in those days—the waning days of prohibition when none of us youngsters—not even Joe—could legally buy a drink—as well as the days of the depression—people were stone sober and worried . . . I mean worried about their jobs . . . and about enough food . . . and about a roof over their head. And, most of us "common folk" had cause to worry because people were being hired and fired as fast as it takes to snap your fingers. Job turnover—to use a polite phrase—certainly hit a peak in the early 1930s.

So, now you know what I was thinking and worrying about 40 years ago—roughly speaking.

Three years later brightness came into my life and she's here tonight and I want her to stand and when she does, I want you to have the thought in your mind that she is the one who should be honored tonight, rather than me.

Hazel, stand up, please. (She sits down again.)

I met Hazel while she was a traffic operator and I was a toll central office repairman—and I want you to know that as my wife she should take a big, big part of the credit for making Bill Smallwood the man he is today.

And, in the same vein, she should receive a big part of the credit for bringing real trade union representation to telephone workers in the south because she was there. She worked—like a lot of us—around the clock, at times.

It sometimes seems that men get too darned much credit, so I want to say here and now that Hazel Smallwood—and thousands of other women like her—paid the price and made the sacrifice that was necessary to build the Communications Workers of America to the great stature that it holds today.

To all the women like Fran Smith, Anne Bencotter, Nancy Franks—and the men—the Jake Schachts, Joe Beirnes, John Crulls and the literally thousands of others who have made this union and my participation in its growth possible—I would like to say "thank you" in a million languages—if I could.

But, I've been too busy doing other things to ever learn a million languages, so I'm limited to saying it in English. But, even for that, I'm grateful—grateful for having been born in the United States, grateful for having had the opportunity to be a part and particle of what I consider one of the truly great organizations in America—and I'm grateful, too, for the kind attention and warmth you have shown me here tonight.

For those of us who have been around for 40 years, it's wonderful to see younger leadership moving into an active role. Some of the changes in our own headquarters office you all know about. I'd also like to mention the upward move of John Hazel, as he begins a leave of absence from his office duties to take on a full-time union job as business agent with his union.

When a person retires, he selfishly hopes that things will go on unchanged . . . unchanged because he helped to make them the way they are and he feels comfortable with them.

I too must confess to this tinge of selfishness.

But, overriding this self-serving personal feeling is a strong hope on my part—a hope that CWA will go on making changes and growing—a hope that CWA will always be a strong and vibrant organization—ever responsive to the needs of the members and the community.

So, to every person in this grand room, I say thank you—and keep up the good work!

A STAR IS BORN

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an impressive ceremony attended by more than 400 of Chicago's top civic, business, political, church, education, and labor leaders a star was born with the emergence of a new newspaper, to be known as Chicago Today.

Those at the breakfast meeting heard a personal message from President Nixon wishing this new publication success in its exciting venture.

Mayor Richard Daley and Governor Ogilvie joined in this inaugural of Chicago's newest addition to journalism.

Throughout this entire impressive ceremony, there was a laudable theme: while all over America newspapers are going under, Chicago sees the emergence of a new and exciting daily publication.

The Chicago Tribune Co., parent organization of Chicago Today, and the men and women who are responsible for this new, creative idea in journalism deserve the highest commendation.

The emergence of its new format for Chicago's American brings to the people of Chicago an exciting new venture in American journalism.

I wish to join in congratulating Lloyd Wendt, publisher, and Luke P. Carroll, editor, of the new publication which we will hereafter learn to know as Chicago Today.

I am particularly excited about the new compact format of Chicago Today. It is a work of typographic excellence; the news stories are easy to read; the makeup is pleasing to the eye, and I believe that Chicago Today will meet with great acceptance not only by those who have been reading with great pleasure Chicago's American, but I am sure among the vast array of new readers who will be attracted by this very compact and convenient method of getting their news during the day.

The emergence of Chicago Today dramatizes another highwater mark in Chicago journalism. We have always had the good fortune in Chicago of having people in journalism who brought to our city a keen sense of competition and an impressive sense of responsibility. Chicago Today is the newest development in an illustrious history of Chicago journalism. I believe all of the employees from copy boy on through publisher can be proud of this new concept which they are bringing to the people of Chicago.

I am convinced that the more convenient and more easily readable size of Chicago Today is in keeping with the trend toward compactness in the journalism needs of American readers.

The exciting array of columnists, feature writers, photographers, and the many, many impressive features in the new format place Chicago Today in the forefront of America's most exciting and modern newspapers.

I wish Chicago Today a great deal of success in this new venture and I am cer-

tain the public response will prove most rewarding to those who have conceived this new format for Chicago's American. The format is new but the same high quality of journalism which has made Chicago's American one of the most exciting newspapers in the world remains intact, and in this marriage of quality and progress Chicagoans will find an exciting adventure in journalism. We rejoice with all of the people of Chicago on this historic day.

PRIORITIES AND BUDGET CUTTING—CARL ROWAN CITES THE DISCREPANCY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an admirer of Carl Rowan and I respect his ability to communicate a message so clearly in so few words. Once again, he has sorted out the facts from the fiction in summing up for us the meaning of the budget cuts effected by President Nixon.

Members of Congress and citizens who share my concern for the people who must absorb the impact of these budget cuts will fully appreciate the insight of Mr. Rowan and his willingness to shed some badly needed light on the subject of "Priorities and Budget Cutting."

The following commentary was aired on WTOP television April 17, 1969. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

(By Carl T. Rowan)

The headlines say that President Nixon has given top priority to helping the poor and the cities in his budget for the coming fiscal year.

The headlines are a bit misleading. What is true—and somewhat heartening—is that in cutting back on the Johnson administration's budget Mr. Nixon did not cut as deeply into funds for social programs as he did in other areas.

In reducing Johnson's estimates by 4 billion dollars, Nixon cut the Defense Department 1.1 billion.

The fact is, however, that the 100 million dollar cut in Job Corps funds is much more meaningful than the 1.1 billion cut at Defense. At Defense, this is a bit of cream off the top that the military men may very well get back before the year is out.

But the 100 million dollar cut means death for much of the Job Corps program.

Similarly, a billion dollars of Mr. Nixon's savings come from increasing social security benefits much less than Johnson proposed. A billion dollar cut here is much more painful to the aged, the widow, the retired than is a similar cut to the Pentagon.

In cutting funds for farm price supports and for the space agency Mr. Nixon has done his trimming where the big money has been and where cuts could be made without maiming any basic programs.

Many Americans will be pleased to see the emphasis put on helping the poor residents of our city slums. But the headlines ought not mislead anyone into thinking there has been a colossal commitment of resources to this problem. Nor should anyone jump to the conclusion that America's priorities have been put in order.

The basic picture is still one of a vastly disproportionate part of the nation's wealth going for military expenditures and a relative pittance being devoted to the problems of hunger, ignorance and illness.

This is Carl Rowan in Washington.

BOLSA ISLAND REVISITED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Congress authorized participation by the Interior Department and the Atomic Energy Commission in an exciting project to construct a nuclear-powered sea water desalting plant off the coast of southern California.

The project collapsed last summer for a variety of reasons, but the principal one being cost escalation. The total price tag for the 1,800-megawatt electrical, 150-million-gallons-per-day facility jumped from the \$444 million estimate of 1965 to \$765 million.

The interesting history of this project was reviewed recently by Mr. Henry J. Mills, general manager of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, at the Western States Water Council meeting in Lubbock, Tex.

In his remarks, Mr. Mills indicates that nuclear-powered desalting may still become a reality in southern California, hopefully soon. He notes that it is absolutely essential that MWD have a large desalting plant in operation not later than 1980, and present planning has that as an objective.

Mr. Mills' talk follows:

THE BOLSA ISLAND NUCLEAR POWER AND DESALTING PLANT

During the past four years, the study of a dual-purpose sea water desalting and electric power plant has been the subject of a major effort by representatives of the electric utilities of Southern California, the Federal Government and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. This facility, known as the Bolsa Island Project, has received great publicity not only throughout the United States but also throughout the world.

Although the electric utilities elected to terminate their participation in the Metropolitan-Utilities Agreement effective last September 30, Metropolitan's Board of Directors on December 10 voted to go ahead—but on a delayed basis—with plans for such a sea water desalting plant. Only by building and operating a plant can we acquire the knowledge we must have to know the role desalting should play in our long-range planning.

In my remarks today, I want to give you some of the history of this project which, in turn, should give you an understanding of why construction of this great project apparently will not proceed for some years to come.

In recognition of its responsibilities to the 10,000,000 people of Southern California that it serves, the Metropolitan Water District is continually searching for possible new sources of water. In view of the steadily rising costs of imported water, primarily because of the greater and greater distances involved, it has been necessary to include consideration of methods of desalting sea water in our over-all planning. The unlim-

ited source of supply represented by the Pacific Ocean is very evident to all who live in Southern California. It is a challenging reminder to engineers, metallurgists and chemists that in some way, somehow, there must be a method for producing potable water from the sea at reasonable cost. Because of the atmospheric pollution problems in the Los Angeles Basin, the attention of the District has been especially directed to the use of smog-free nuclear power as a source of heat for desalting.

Ten years ago the District authorized the Fluor Corporation of Los Angeles to make an analysis of a nuclear-fueled desalting plant. Fluor's projection of the cost of desalted water, with a desalting plant operating in 1972, was \$102 per acre-foot, or 31¢ per thousand gallons based on 1959 pricing. Fluor also found that a dual-purpose nuclear desalting plant—one that produced power both for its own needs and for sale, using its own steam for the desalting portion of the plant, was capable of producing desalted water at even lower costs.

After further studies and reports by the staff, the District's Board in April, 1964, adopted a motion that the staff investigate the possibilities of acquiring a site appropriate for a sea water conversion plant and that the staff be authorized to consult with the appropriate Federal agencies and with qualified engineering firms in regard to a District-sponsored sea water conversion project.

In mid-1964, the District's Board authorized the execution of a contract with the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission for an engineering and economic feasibility study and the preparation of a preliminary design of a combination nuclear power and desalting plant. The plant using the multi-stage flash distillation method was to produce in the range of 50 to 150 million gallons of water per day and 150 to 750 megawatts of electric power. On August 18, 1964, this contract was signed by all three parties, each to bear one-third of the cost. The study was to be made by a subcontractor employed by the District.

On December 15, 1964, the District named Bechtel Corporation as the subcontractor. This feasibility study was to be conducted in three phases, namely, Phase I, Preliminary Survey, Phase II, Detailed Investigation, and Phase III, Preliminary Design and Detailed Analysis.

Shortly after the start of this study, initial discussions were held with representatives of the Southern California Edison Company and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power concerning the possibilities of marketing the electric power to be produced by the proposed plant. These electric utilities showed a strong interest in the project and submitted a joint proposal to Metropolitan. A third utility was then included, the San Diego Gas & Electric Company. In this proposal, they suggested that the utilities build and operate the nuclear power plants and supply steam for the desalting plant. Metropolitan would be charged only the incremental cost of the dual-purpose power plant over the cost of an equivalent electric generating plant producing power only. This proposal was accepted for consideration in developing the conclusions of the feasibility study.

Early in 1965, Bechtel prepared a list of economic ground rules for the plant. For all estimating purposes, the capital costs were to be based on constant January 1, 1965, dollars with no allowance included in this estimate for future escalated cost changes. The 1965 costs were to be escalated when a construction schedule had been established. Construction labor costs were to be based on the then prevailing pay scales and interest during construction was to be based on a rate of 3½ percent for the District's share of the cost.

In June, 1965, Bechtel transmitted copies of the Phase I and Phase II portion of the feasibility report incorporating the ground rules noted above. Bechtel determined that the production of 150 million gallons per day of desalted water at a coastal location within practicable range of the District's filtration plant in Orange County was technically feasible. The cost of desalting water at such a sea coast site was estimated to be \$70 to \$96 per acre-foot, depending on the size of the power plant. The cost of conveying the water inland to a point where it would be mixed with other supplies was estimated to be \$15 per acre-foot for a total cost of water of \$85 to \$111 per acre-foot, all based on 1965 prices.

Bechtel further indicated that the lowest water cost and the minimum capital investment for the District would result from participation in a nuclear power and desalting plant along the lines of the electric utilities' proposal and recommended that the proposal be carried into Phase III of the feasibility study. Bechtel also recommended that a 40-acre man-made island site, a half-mile offshore from Bolsa Chica State Beach in Orange County, be analyzed further as a specific site for the Phase III portion of the study. Also technically feasible for nuclear-power desalting plant sites were two shoreline locations in Orange County. However, the island was deemed to be the most economical of all the sites considered, particularly because of its proximity to a usable distribution point. The District's Board approved a recommendation that the concluding phase of the Bechtel study relate to the man-made island as a first choice site. The scope of the study was again expanded later to include test drilling on the ocean floor at the island location.

In the last week of December, 1965, Bechtel delivered copies of Phase III of the feasibility study. The general conclusions derived from the Phase III study, were: (a) confirmation of the feasibility of a 150-million-gallons-per-day nuclear power and desalting plant; (b) the man-made island site offshore from Bolsa Chica State Beach was an acceptable and practicable site for the plant, offering a lower overall project cost to the participants, and (c) the estimated cost of desalted water at the island site was \$71 per acre-foot. Delivered in land for distribution, the cost of water would be \$88 per acre-foot, based on 1965 prices.

Bechtel Corporation, after reaching these conclusions, recommended that the Bolsa Island site be used as the plant location and that the offer of the electric utilities to participate in the dual-purpose plant be accepted as a basis for negotiation of a definitive contract. Total cost of the project was then estimated at \$444 million, without an allowance for cost escalation during the construction period. Parenthetically, it can be noted that in mid-1966 Metropolitan's staff advised the Board that the District's share of this total cost had already gone up \$44 million because of escalation of the then anticipated completion date.

In May, 1966, the Department of the Interior, with the full concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission, appointed a committee of ten experts in seismology, geology, soil mechanics, and seismic design to evaluate Bechtel's recommendations concerning the Bolsa Island site. This "Blue Ribbon" Committee, as it was frequently called, was convened in San Francisco the following month and subsequently held numerous meetings.

In early 1967, hearings were held by Congressional committees and subsequently financial participation of the Federal Government in the project was approved by both the Senate and the House. An authorization bill covering Department of the Interior participation in the amount of \$57.2 million was signed by President Johnson on May 9

of that year. Atomic Energy Commission participation in the amount of \$15 million had been authorized earlier as part of a general bill covering AEC operations.

In August of 1967, a first draft of the Department of the Interior Site Advisory or "Blue Ribbon" Committee report was received. The committee reviewed all the investigative work that had been done at the site and reported favorably on the findings. However, it recommended much higher earthquake design criteria than had been contemplated, including a recommendation that Class I structures be designed to withstand a sudden surface displacement of from 5 inches to 10 inches. The concerns of the committee regarding a tsunami (seismic sea wave) and liquefaction of the island fill under the reactors were also emphasized.

The recommendations gave rise to a conviction that acceptance of these new requirements would be made a condition to the obtaining of a construction permit from the Division of Reactor Licensing of the Atomic Energy Commission. Later investigations by Bechtel showed the financial impact of these added requirements on the total cost of the project.

The contract negotiating teams drafting the District-Government Contract and the District-Utilities Agreement worked almost constantly for a nine-month period in 1967 to arrive at language satisfactory to all parties. On September 12 of that year, the District Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to execute both contracts on behalf of the District. Both documents were executed on November 20 at a ceremony attended by numerous civic leaders as well as representatives of the contracting parties.

In the meantime, the utilities had received bids on the nuclear steam supply systems, which were approximately 30 to 40 per cent higher than had been expected. This fact coupled with the complicated nature of the bids caused a severe problem in trying to arrive at a joint decision as to the successful bidder.

The Agreement between the District and the Utilities contained an "escape clause" which allowed any participating owner to terminate the agreement by written notice on or before December 31, 1967, if prices for equipment were such as to make such owner's participation in the project uneconomical. The Utilities and Metropolitan agreed that more time was needed to review the nuclear steam supply system bids and the project costs. With Government concurrence, the time for possible termination was extended to March 31, 1968.

During January, February and March of 1968, Metropolitan and the Utilities were at work analyzing the new cost data available to them and preparing an up-to-date estimate of the cost of the portion of the project to be constructed by each of them. No decision was possible by late March and a second 90-day extension of the contract termination date was agreed upon to June 30, 1968. During the period from January to June inclusive of 1968, numerous meetings were held involving the staffs of the participants, the Project Management Board and Metropolitan's own Special Advisory Committee on Nuclear Power and Desalting Plant.

In February, 1968, the Bechtel Corporation was requested to update its cost estimate of the project with costs escalated to completion in 1974. The new estimate with changes of scope of work included, was \$750,000,000. An additional \$15,000,000 was added for further contingencies, making the total \$765,000,000.

The cost changes from the 1965 estimate to the new estimate predicated on 1974 completion and the main reasons for them are summarized as follows:

First, for the desalting plant the new estimate was \$166 million against the previous estimate of \$108 million, or an in-

crease of \$58 million; this was caused by escalation almost exclusively.

Second, for the power components and related facilities, including the back pressure turbine, the new figure was \$436 million against \$235 million, or an increase of \$201 million; this was explained by the increases in the costs of nuclear power plant equipment, the new AEC design criteria, and escalation.

Third, for construction of the island and causeway, the new estimate was \$44 million against the former figure of \$24 million, or an increase of \$20 million; two reasons were given for this—the new seismic sign criteria and escalation.

Fourth, for the water conveyance facilities the new figure was \$42 million against \$33 million, or an increase of \$9 million; escalation again was the cause for this increase.

Fifth, for power transmission facilities, the new figure was \$77 million against the previous one of \$44 million, or an increase of \$33 million; escalation accounted for part of this and the decision to have underground cables instead of overhead transmission made up the remainder.

The new total cost for the project for all participants, as I said earlier, was \$765 million against the 1965 figure of \$444 million, which contained no provision for escalation, or an increase in the total cost of some 70%. On the basis of the new cost estimate, the price of water at the plant was calculated to be approximately \$120 an acre-foot or 37¢ a thousand gallons. Delivered 25 miles inland for distribution, these costs were estimated to be \$143 an acre-foot or 44¢ a thousand gallons. The lowest cost for any existing plant is 85¢ a thousand gallons at the plant (in the United States).

In a special District Board of Directors meeting on June 20, 1968, the Board voted to proceed with the Bolsa Project as initially conceived. However, the Southern California Edison Company during the previous several weeks had voiced the opinion that it would not be able to proceed with the project because of excessively high estimates of cost.

Because long range policy decisions were obviously necessary by each of the participating owners, a third extension of both the Metropolitan-Utilities Agreement and the Metropolitan-Government Contract to September 30, 1968 was agreed to by all parties.

On July 23 and 24, 1968, meetings were held in Washington, D.C. At these meetings, the Southern California Edison advised the Government representatives orally that the Bolsa Project, as then constituted, was so much more costly than other available energy resources that Edison could not continue its participation in the project. Effective September 30, 1968, the Metropolitan-Utilities Agreement was formally terminated by the three electric utilities for the reason that the project was no longer economical.

Finally, last December the District's Board approved recommendations by me which included the following:

1. Advise the electric utilities that the District intends to adhere to the dual-purpose nuclear power and desalting concept at the Bolsa Island site.
2. Continue active participation with the utilities and the Government in the matter of nuclear power-desalting plant studies.
3. Acquire sufficient land for access corridors for power cables, pipeline, switchyard and related facilities inland from the beach.
4. Proceed with the basic planning for a 50-million-gallons-per-day expandable plant which would be producing water not later than 1980. Construction would be started in the mid-1970's.

In my letter to the Board, I made several statements and, in closing today, let me repeat what I said then.

First, I made plain our hope that, as coastal sites for nuclear power plants become

more scarce or unavailable, a new partnership arrangement may be worked out by the District with the electric utilities regarding Bolsa Island. At the same time, I did not rule out the possibility that at some future time Metropolitan might undertake this venture on its own. We also intend, of course, to explore the possibilities of again obtaining financial participation by the Federal Government in the new program, whatever exact form it may take.

Finally, I emphasized to the Board the very great problems that we face in meeting the future water requirements of a steadily growing Southern California population and economy. In fulfilling our responsibilities, we must constantly review and evaluate the respective merits of additional importation of water from long distances, local reclamation of waste water, management of ground water storage and, of course, processes, proven and unproven, for the desalting of the waters of the Pacific Ocean. In that final regard, I believe that the Board of Directors of the District shares fully with me the conviction that, in planning for our needs of the long-range future, it is absolutely essential that Metropolitan have a large demonstration desalting plant in operation not later than 1980. And, as I have said, our present planning has that as our definite objective.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Richard H. Harris, general manager of KPIX, in San Francisco, called public attention in several editorial reports, to the urgency of acquiring the remaining land designated by the Congress in 1962 for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

There is pending before the Congress now, with bipartisan sponsorship, a bill I have introduced to increase the authorization, so this unique Pacific shoreland can be purchased and added to the public domain as part of the national park system.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Mr. Harris' editorial, and I call attention of my colleagues to its important message:

POINT REYES PARK

Congress can't afford to play a waiting game with the purchase of additional land for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Delay wouldn't just be costly. It could very well mean curtains for the magnificent park envisioned when it was established in 1962.

The government already owns about 23,000 acres. Now there's a bi-partisan effort underway in Congress to authorize a higher ceiling on spending for more park land.

But so far, no hearings are scheduled.

It's absolutely vital that Congress act soon on the Pt. Reyes purchase. Action is especially needed in the case of one 2,500-acre parcel, now in private hands. The Sierra Club describes this section as not only the most beautiful unacquired parcel, but as one of the most necessary for a completed park.

But there's the real threat that unless funds are appropriated, the 2,500 acres will be sold to other private interests and be subdivided.

There's another reason for urgency. Land values keep soaring. Inflation will make purchases even costlier in the future.

Legislation providing \$57.5 million for additional Pt. Reyes land is before both the

Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees.

KPIX urges you to write your congressman and request prompt hearings on the Pt. Reyes measure.

Purchase of additional lands represents an investment in natural beauty. Once that's gone, it can't be bought at ANY price.

ORANGE COUNTY POLITICAL DIRECTORY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my honorable colleagues and of the newspapers and teachers associations in their various States and communities to an outstanding civic service rendered by the Orange County Evening News of Garden Grove, Calif., and the Garden Grove Education Association.

These two public-spirited enterprises periodically update and republish an Orange County political directory wall chart. This instructional aid lists every political officer for which any citizen in Orange County votes, from the members of the local school boards to the President of the United States. Their terms of office are also provided.

In the case of State and Federal executives and legislators, the directory gives brief biographical information, mailing addresses and excellent line-drawing portraits. For California and national lawmakers, committee assignments are offered as well.

These directories, researched and prepared for publication by the Garden Grove Education Association, are published as a public service by the Orange County Evening News. The newspaper makes them available to the public free for the asking. They are placed in every library reference room, most civics classrooms, and almost every city clerk's office in Orange County. In the case of the last edition, 5,600 were given to graduating students at all the high schools in the Garden Grove Unified School District and the Huntington Beach Union High School District.

This, I believe, is a magnificent project. Certainly, Larry Collins, Jr., publisher of the Orange County Evening News, should be commended for the generous effort that newspaper makes in support of better citizenship.

Surely, the 1,850-member Garden Grove Education Association—eighth largest chapter of the California Teachers Association—merits high praise for the impressive work it does to make this project a success. Thanks are due its courageous, far-sighted 1968-69 president, Mr. James Boxx, and its imaginative and hard-working 1968-69 Political Education and Concerns Committee Chairman, Mr. James Wicker.

I want to express special appreciation to GGEA Executive Director Galal Kernahan, who conceived, designed and produced the first of these Orange County political directories. I value him not only for this fine innovation in teaching

our American form of government, but for many other ways in which he has sought to help me in my vigorous support for local schools including his assignment by the National Education Association to serve in a liaison capacity with my office.

Everyone can be certain that, as soon as the May 15, 1969, Orange County political directory reaches me here in Washington, D.C., it will immediately and proudly be hung on my office wall.

COLLEGE STUDENT SPEAKS OUT AGAINST UNIVERSITY UPRISINGS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times, when we are sick at heart at what is happening in our institutions of higher learning, we must bear in mind that only a small percentage of the college and university students are revolutionists and that much of the anarchistic activity is promoted by people who are not students on the campuses they are disrupting. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of those attending our institutions of higher learning would like to see firm action by both the college and university authorities and the various agencies of government, so that the rank and file of the student body can get on with the serious business of getting an education.

I recently received a very encouraging letter from a young lady in my district, Miss Ruth Ann Sommer, who is representative of the majority. We have heard altogether too much from the revolutionists, anarchists, and other destructive and subversive elements—now let us hear from the decent, law-abiding students, of which there are a vast nonvocal number for a refreshing change.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Miss Sommer's letter:

MARCH 24, 1969.

DEAR MR. COLLIER: This past weekend I read some very disturbing "news," and I felt that this was the time to let off some steam.

Enclosed is an article from the Bradley University Scout, the school's newspaper, entitled the "Winter-Spring Offensive" proposed by the SDS. Now, I am sick and tired of reading about what the SDS has done, and will be doing, and I am wondering why the U.S. Government does not do anything about it. At least I have not heard or read of any measures being taken. Everyone seems to think that the hippies, yuppies and other radicals are a "minority"—however, I do not agree. I feel that these groups are farther along than many people think. Being a conservative person, I have been subject to the "liberal ideals" professed by many college instructors. In fact, I had a professor at Bradley that condemned everything the U.S. Government did. After suffering through his class for a semester, I decided that his brainwashing was not for me. But, his "preachings" affected other students. When I refer to liberals, I mean those leaning to the left, not, for example, a liberal Democrat.

I would really like to know if any measures are being taken against these radicals—other than cutting off their loans by the Federal

Government. I am very proud to be an American and I want my country to be free so that my children will know what freedom really is.

Thank you kindly,

Sincerely,

RUTH ANN SOMMER.

PILOT TRAINING: EXPERIENCE IS THE BEST TEACHER

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of Georgia and the Eighth District take pride in Moody Air Force Base and its air training program.

I would like to insert the following article which appeared in the April issue of the Air Force magazine. This article is an excellent indication of the advantages of having experienced pilots used for the training of our student pilots:

PILOT TRAINING: EXPERIENCE IS THE BEST TEACHER

(By T. Sgt. Gerald O'Hara, U.S. Air Force)

Most people think of today's US Air Force pilot as a dashing and debonaire young man.

Some do fit this description. But, in the aerospace age, the sometimes forgotten "old man" in the cockpit still has a firm hold on his place as one of the most significant factors in keeping USAF strong and professional.

These older pilots—men in their mid-thirties to late forties—have been flying all types of aircraft in the Air Force arsenal worldwide—during peace and war. They not only have been tested under enemy fire, but their vast over-all experience in flying all types of equipment provides a valuable reservoir of knowledge for new pilots to draw on.

These combat-tested experienced pilots are helping to see that newcomers to flying receive the best possible training through the Air Training Command's Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) program at nine bases in the United States.

At Moody AFB, Ga., more than one-third of the T-37 instructor pilots (IPs) of the 3552d Pilot Training Squadron and about as many T-38 IPs from the 3553d PTS have seen combat in Vietnam. Others are Korean War veterans. Some have had combat experience in both conflicts.

Many of these instructor pilots have several thousand flying hours and more than ten years of flying experience in various aircraft—irreplaceable credentials for those teaching the techniques of flying to student pilots, many of whom will end up at the controls of some of the most sophisticated aircraft in the world.

Such a sprinkling of older instructor pilots among the younger ones sets the pace in today's Air Force UPT program.

Moody IPs who fly the 400-mph T-37 primary jet trainer average thirty years of age, and instructor pilots using the more advanced supersonic T-38 average twenty-nine.

PUTTING EXPERIENCE TO WORK

One of the "older heads" who has served as a T-38 IP flight commander at Moody since his return from Vietnam in April 1967 is Maj. J. D. Tindall. He was thirty-five when he flew 100 F-105 Thunderchief fighter-bomber missions against some of the most heavily defended targets in North Vietnam and during his career has accumulated more than 3,600 flying hours—250 of them in combat—in T-28, T-33, F-84E, F-86F, F-100, and F-105 aircraft.

"My total flying experience helps me

quickly recognize the abilities of student pilots," says Major Tindall, who now is Chief of the Standardization Evaluations Section of the 3553d PTS.

Although Major Tindall does not see combat experience as a necessity for instructor pilots, he believes an instructor's over-all flying experience makes him a more accomplished pilot and thus better able to provide the student with the best possible training.

Moody IPs have a combined total of more than 313,000 hours of flying experience, including 17,874 combat hours, in numerous types of aircraft. The individual averages are 114 combat hours and about 1,955 flying hours for each IP.

The 3553d's Commander, forty-year-old Lt. Col. Walter D. Moss, Jr., says his instructor pilots can fly any aircraft and mission the Air Force can come up with . . . with no problem whatsoever. "Today, the efficiency level is reached and maintained by instructor pilots so the product—trained pilots—has to be better," declares Colonel Moss, a veteran of fifty-five B-26 combat missions in Korea during 1952.

"They're fine pilots, and the knowledge they maintain is fantastic," the Colonel says. "The quality of pilot training has increased—no comparison with that of fifteen years ago."

With eighteen years of military service, Colonel Moss himself has logged more than 8,739 flying hours in prop-driven and jet trainers and in cargo and bomber aircraft.

During this time, in which he spent nine years with Air Training Command, Colonel Moss has worked with thousands of student pilots.

He rates today's student pilots as twice as good and with twice the knowledge of those of the early 1950s era.

The Colonel points out that several students completing the Moody UPT program have gone directly into the front seat of two-seat RF-4Cs, F-4Cs, and single-place F-105s—three of the Air Force's finest aircraft—as aircraft commanders . . . a tribute to the kind of training student pilots receive.

FOUR HUNDRED PILOTS PER YEAR

Moody graduates nearly 400 student pilots each year after completion of the twelve-month UPT school. As one class completes its training, another takes its place so there is a continuous cycle of eight classes annually.

No longer do students seek to win their commissions as second lieutenants and their wings at the same time—all have earned their commissions as officers before they start flight training. And, unlike many of their predecessors, all student pilots hold a four-year college degree.

Air Force student pilots include graduates of the Air Force Academy, Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps programs at many of the leading colleges and universities in the country, and Air Force Officer Training School (individuals who had previously been graduated from a college or university). Air National Guard officers (from reserve units) and a limited number of officers of the US Marine Corps are also trained at Moody.

In addition, a limited number of military personnel from allied nations are trained under the Military Assistance Program, some to learn to fly and others for technical training.

Most of today's students have had no previous flight experience when they come to Moody for what may be the most demanding year of their life.

UPT students receive three weeks of pre-flight, which consists of physical training, principles of flight, aircraft engineering, aviation physiology, and military subjects. The newcomers then receive about thirty hours of training in the lightweight, propeller-driven T-41A aircraft.

This phase of the training is given at the Valdosta (Ga.) Municipal Airport under civilian contract prior to advancing to jet aircraft training on base in the T-37 and T-38.

The changeover to jet aircraft introduces students to a combination of the Air Force's finest jet trainers and experienced teachers, which together provide the highest caliber training in history.

Fledgling pilots receive ninety hours of primary jet training in the T-37 and then begin 120 hours of final-phase training in the supersonic T-37.

"The students are well motivated," says Maj. Charles A. Boatwright, "and they give 105 percent effort to the program."

Major Boatwright, a thirty-three-year-old T-37 flight commander in the 3552d, flew 214 AC-47 "Puff the Magic Dragon" missions in Vietnam before coming to Moody in June 1967. He feels beyond question that his combat experience helps in teaching student pilots.

An instructor with combat experience or one with vast amounts of flying time in various aircraft has four or five ways to teach, while IPs with only a short time in the cockpit have only the textbook approach, Major Boatwright points out.

On one occasion, Major Boatwright's AC-47 was shot down on takeoff from Bien Hoa AB, Vietnam. One engine was hit by enemy ground fire. The Major was able to land in a field near the runway. All seven crew members escaped serious injury. "Such an experience can easily be applied in teaching," he says. "In some cases, students learn more from a real-life experience than from the textbook approach."

HEAVY WORK SCHEDULE

The heavy work schedule of student pilots includes 236 hours on officer subjects, consisting of leadership responsibility, heritage, career development, drills and ceremony, physical development and conditioning, marksmanship, and counterinsurgency.

About 357 hours are also devoted to academic subjects, including aircraft engineering in the T-37 and T-38 aircraft, aviation physiology, principles of flight, flying safety, navigation, airmanship, oral and visual code weather.

As demanding as the student pilot training is, the work schedule of IPs is just as demanding and at times exasperating, says Lt. Col. Lou E. Bretzke, Commander of the 3550th Student Squadron.

"One of the prime qualifications for an IP is dedication," Colonel Bretzke observes. He is a forty-one-year-old, nineteen-and-one-half-year service veteran who has logged a total of more than 3,750 flying hours.

The students have to be dedicated, too. T-38 training includes comprehensive instruction in formation, contact—traffic patterns and acrobatics—flying, instruments, and navigation. Of the normal nine-hour student work day, an average of seven hours is spent with a T-38 IP, who works with three to four students each day. Briefings, debriefings after flights, and classroom study are part of the daily routine.

During training in the three UPT aircraft at Moody, students learn to judge speed and how to adjust to it. Once this is done, students should be able to fly any aircraft in the inventory.

IPs agree that their work requires patience, an understanding of people, and a friendly but firm relationship in dealing with absolute fairness with students.

The training job has its rewards. Maj. John T. McCambridge, the Operations Officer for the 3552d PTS, says simply, "I love my work." And when he adds, "There's no better way to serve my country," you know he means it and that it sums up the feelings of most IPs.

But most satisfying of all is the finished product—students who are no longer students, but qualified pilots ready to begin flying the combat- and support-type aircraft employed by operational Air Force units around the world.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES URGES ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter just received by me from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources urging the early establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

I hope my colleagues will join the people of the State of Michigan, our Department of Natural Resources and the Members of our congressional delegation who enthusiastically support the preservation of this magnificent area for the benefit and enjoyment of all of the people.

STATE OF MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT
OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
LANSING, MICH., April 11, 1969.

NOTICE

The Natural Resources Commission of the State of Michigan has taken formal action unanimously approving the enclosed resolution urging legislation to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. The resolution was adopted at the April 10, 1969 meeting held at the Jack Tar Hotel, Lansing, Mich.

The Chairman of the Commission has instructed me to bring this urgent matter to your attention for your kind consideration and support.

Sincerely,
SAMUEL A. MILSTEIN,
Acting Secretary to the Commission.

RESOLUTION URGING LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, APRIL 10, 1969

Whereas, Legislation to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore has been continuously considered by the Congress of the United States since 1960; and

Whereas, the Sleeping Bear Dunes area should be preserved for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public; and

Whereas, public values of obvious national significance such as portions of our diminishing shoreline are among our most important outdoor resources; and

Whereas, the Sleeping Bear Dunes areas is one of the few remaining natural scenic and scientific areas on the Great Lakes shoreline and ranks high among the remaining shoreline opportunities in the entire country; and

Whereas, the 91st Congress has the opportunity to continue the momentum of conservation achievements by taking action to establish the much needed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; and

Whereas, previous objections to proposed legislation have been resolved to protect the legitimate rights of property owners and residents; and

Whereas, the Natural Resources Commission has consistently endorsed and unequivocally supported the establishment of the lakeshore; and now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Natural Resources Commission urges the 91st Congress to enact legislation establishing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be

sent to the appropriate elected officials of the United States Congress and Great Lakes States.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION,
AUGUST SCHOLLE, *Chairman*.
CARL T. JOHNSON, *Member*.
E. M. LAITALIA, *Member*.
ROBERT C. McLAUGHLIN, *Member*.
HARRY H. WHITLEY, *Member*.

POSTAL REFORM SHOULD PRECEDE A RATE INCREASE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the message received from the President requesting a postal rate increase is both ill-timed and ill-advised. During last fall's campaign, the President spoke of the need for postal reorganization and reform, while frequently citing what he is now calling "the cycle of greater and greater postal deficits and more and more rate increases" as being signs of mismanagement and poor policy on the part of past administrations. Yet Mr. Nixon's first proposal for congressional action on post office matters is to attempt to pile still another increase on the spiraling scale of postal rates. What has happened to the promised revamping and modernization program which were to have cut costs and increased efficiency?

The Kappel Report, hailed last year as a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the postal service, has evidently been forgotten for the present by this administration. Those of us on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee who have begun the task of determining methods of achieving a more stable and economically sound Post Office Department have been told that the administration's proposals on this subject should not be expected until after the first of June. But we are asked to go ahead immediately with a rate increase which is neither based on the findings of a comprehensive investigation nor the realities of a reformed, modernized post office such as we have begun working toward. The American people ought not to be asked to pay higher postal rates until after their postal service has been streamlined and improved, not before. This is an unfortunate case of putting the cart before the horse.

It is also regrettable that Mr. Kappel has not chosen, thus far, to appear before our committee to assist in the effort to determine what effective legislation can be drafted to improve the post office. His counsel would be most valuable and I would hope that he will appear sometime during our hearings.

The President stresses his belief that "further improvements will take time—and during that time it is essential that financial pressures should not impair or reduce available services." It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that available services will be best insured by moving ahead with a decisive program for postal re-

form. Correcting a financially sick institution is done by attacking the causes of the sickness, not merely by pumping cash into a festering wound.

In attempting to defend this increase, the Postmaster General has suggested that the Johnson administration budget did not take into account the postal pay increase which takes effect this July. Postmaster General Blount, therefore, concludes that it was actually President Johnson who created the need for a rate increase. What is conveniently forgotten here is the fact that postal revenues and wages go into and come out of the Government's general fund, which pays for most Government operations. Government agencies are not expected to make a profit; the Post Office is only one of many departments intended to perform a service and it is certainly not the only department which runs at a loss or which must contend with a pay increase in July. I respectfully submit that the Postmaster General's reasoning is a bit faulty.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we will be able to progress steadily in our efforts to reform and reorganize the Post Office for a more modern, efficient operation. Once this project is completed and legislation is passed, then, and only then, should we consider a fair and necessary rate scale to balance our postal budget for the future.

SOLDIER EARNS BRONZE STAR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, one of our fine young men from my district, 1st Sgt. Albert J. Halucha, has been recently awarded the Bronze Star for meritorious service in Vietnam where he has served for the past 10 months. Prior to his Vietnam tour, he served 3 years in Alaska and 18 months in the Korean conflict.

It is indeed gratifying in these days of rebellious youth, to have our faith in the younger generation reaffirmed by the devotion to duty and heroic exploits of our brave fightingmen.

I commend Sergeant Halucha for his courageous action, and submit for the RECORD the following article:

SOLDIER EARNS BRONZE STAR

First Sgt. Albert J. Halucha, son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert P. Halucha of 606 Wall St., has been awarded the Bronze Star for meritorious service in Vietnam.

Sgt. Halucha received the nation's fourth highest medal for service with the 101st Army Airborne Division during the period from last July to this February.

He was involved in ground operations against hostile forces in the Republic of South Vietnam. He entered the service in 1960 after graduation from Glassport High School and intends a career in the service.

He has served as a member of the special forces in Vietnam where he has served the past 10 months. He served in Korea for 18 months and in Alaska for three years.

The young serviceman is married to the former Mary Elizabeth Conners who resides with her parents in Boston, Mass. They are the parents of three children. A brother, Sgt. Raymond Halucha, is currently serving with the U.S. Air Force in California.

VISTA OF A BETTER COMMUNITY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, contributions from 20 of the leading business firms of Greater Hartford, Conn., are backing the Nation's first effort by private enterprise to develop a massive program of total community development.

In concept, it is a \$2 million program to work out over the next 2 years a model of the kind of region its people want. Phase lines have been drawn to set targets for the plan, and the president has described their group as tremendously excited about rebuilding an existing community and region.

Said Wilson C. Jajnsen:

We believe that such a program is uniquely possible in greater Hartford because we have here talents out of all proportion to our size plus a spirit of cooperation and substantial economic resources, thanks to the fact that the region houses the home offices of many national corporations.

The plan has drawn the enthusiastic response of the community, and I offer for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant, describing its hopes:

VISTA OF A BETTER COMMUNITY

The announcement that some 20 of the largest business corporations and companies in this area will launch a \$2 million study to draft a massive design for total community development, is plainly of outstanding importance.

The reasons that make the formation of the Greater Hartford Corporation—the working name for the group—so landmark, are easily counted. Number One, it will be the first effort of its kind by private enterprise in the country. It comes about, as its president, Wilson C. Jajnsen says, "in one sense as a response to the new Administration" which has urged private enterprise to invest in regional development.

But this investment, as represented in the study or "model" planned by the Greater Hartford Corporation, is not just in a financial or economic sense, important and urgent as this is. It is also a commitment to civic responsibility—a renewed commitment indeed, for both here at home and now on an ever larger national scale, Hartford corporations have become steadily more involved in helping solve or lighten the vast problems facing the country.

It is also a commitment of corporate brainpower to these problems. And since on all sides the prosperity of the business community here may be monumentally seen in quite a literal sense, the value of such acumen and energy is more than obvious.

Details of the two-year study, in which the American City Corporation will work with the Greater Hartford Corporation, are given on The Courant's front page today. They are too complex to rehearse here. In general the study aims at producing a concept of how a city that is healthy and workable can operate in the areas of shelter, employment, education, mental and physical health, recreation, communication and transportation. The finished plan will describe commitments and capacities that will be required of governmental agencies, community institutions and voluntary associations. And it will bring together these products and processes to afford insights, information, motivation and innovations applicable to Greater Hartford, or other American cities.

Or, as Mr. Jajnsen puts it, the plan en-

visioned by the Greater Hartford Corporation will seek to define what kind of region (for the study will consider the total region) people here want to live in, and what specific steps must be taken to produce it.

That many urban, suburban and regional problems in this area are being coped with and studied by numerous agencies, public and private, is of course a long-time fact. The thrust of most of them has been at some one specific problem, and mighty important is the work being done, too. The Greater Hartford Corporation study, in cooperation with many groups already involved, will attempt to relate all problems and programs whatever their specific aims, and systematically attack them in their interrelation as well as their special frames of reference. As the American City Corporation puts it in its proposal, the study will be a search for an over-all strategy to achieve victory in the development of the kind of city and region people here want to live in.

It is plain this is a vast vision. It will take the ultimate doing of many agencies and persons beyond the Greater Hartford Corporation. But the Corporation is initiating the search, the action—to say nothing of the financing of the model study—and even at the outset is worthy of the admiration as well as cooperation of those who wish a finer life for all roundabout.

WELCH FOODS, INC., CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a milestone marking the successful combination of American ingenuity, American industry, and American agriculture is being observed this year as the centennial of one of the leading companies of our food processing industry.

The 100 years of progress and change that have made Welch Foods Inc., successful are continuing today, and those of us concerned with the production and marketing of our agricultural commodities take inspiration from the story of the success that this occasion recalls.

On the eve of its centennial year, the Welch Grape Juice Co., Inc., became Welch Foods Inc. The new name more accurately reflects the operations and products of the company that has introduced eight new fruit-based products in the past year. Needless to say, the world-famous Welch's trademark remains unchanged.

The founding of this company, in 1869, was far more than just the beginning of a new business. It was, as I shall relate, the origin of an entire industry.

The concord grape is an American variety developed by Ephraim Bull of Concord, Mass., between 1843 and 1849. The grape was subsequently patented, and it was honored in 1865 by Horace Greeley, the noted publisher, who accorded it a Greeley Prize.

Dr. Thomas Bramwell Welch, of Vine-land, N.J., was a communion steward for his church in the 1860's. He objected to the use of wine in the communion service, and suggested that unfermented grape juice should be substituted.

Dr. Welch applied the principle of pasteurization to grape juice and thus produced the world's first concord grape

juice that could be preserved and packaged for year-round use.

It was on September 23, 1869, that Dr. Welch, his wife, and their young son, Charles, pressed, pasteurized, and bottled the first concord grape juice. Its introduction into the church's communion service was an immediate success and Dr. Welch soon was selling the "unfermented wine" to neighboring churches in southern New Jersey and southeastern Pennsylvania.

As the business grew, the son, Charles Edgar Welch, took over the business on a part-time basis while he followed his father's career in the study of dentistry.

Demand for "Dr. Welch's Grape Juice," as it came to be known, continued to flourish and by 1896, Dr. Charles Welch was devoting his full time to the processing and production of grape juice. He moved the processing plant from New Jersey to Watkins Glen, N.Y., in 1896, nearer to the vast concord grape growing areas along the southern shore of Lake Erie.

A year later, the business was again moved, this time to the Chautauqua County community of Westfield, N.Y., where the company has been headquartered to this day. Westfield is the hub of the entire concord grape industry, and since it is in my district, I am particularly conscious of the importance of the industry that has grown and prospered since that time.

As the popularity of Welch's Grape Juice continued to grow, enhanced in the early 1900's by several fortitudinous endorsements by Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan and Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, the company continued a sustained advertising program in major publications of the day.

In 1910, Welch purchased a plant at North East, Pa., and followed this with the opening of a plant in Lawton, Mich., in 1919. In 1923, a plant was constructed in Springdale, Ark.

During World War I, Welch introduced a concord grape jam that was sold exclusively to the U.S. Army. It was an American doughboy who suggested the name be "Grapelade," and to this day the product carries that name.

The concord grape industry has not been without its troubled times, and the successful combination of a farmer-owned cooperative and the Welch Company are largely responsible for the success of the industry as a whole.

During the depression and on into the early 1940's, the Welch Grape Juice Co. was static, as was the grape industry. In 1928, the family-owned company was sold to a group of outside investors. At this same time, concord grape growers had a very weak and unstable market for their grapes, as indicated by the fact that concord grape production in the Chautauqua and Erie Grape Belt—that portion of New York State, Pennsylvania, and Ohio near Lake Erie and the Finger Lakes—had fallen from a high of 84,000 tons to approximately 35,000 tons, in 1944.

Against this background, National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc., was incorporated in 1945 as a marketing organization for its members' grapes, hope-

fully to strengthen the market and increase the returns to growers through an arrangement with National Grape Corp., of Brockton, N.Y., which was an important processing company whose management supported formation of the cooperative.

Shortly after the end of World War II, J. M. Kaplan, owner of National Grape Corp., purchased the controlling interest in the Welch Grape Juice Co. and merged the two companies with Welch as the surviving company. At this time, Welch's sales were in the neighborhood of \$6 million.

Immediately after the merger, an extensive modernization program of the Welch plants was begun, with modern stainless steel storage tanks replacing the 5-gallon glass carboys that since the founding of the company had been used to store the pasteurized juice.

The Welch Co. pioneered the manufacture and marketing of frozen concord grape juice concentrate in the late 1940's and expanded its operations by acquiring a plant at Grandview, Wash., in 1950. Three years later, Welch purchased the Church Grape Juice Co., of Kennewick, Wash., a firm that had been bottling grape juice since 1907.

Through the encouragement of J. M. Kaplan, who as owner of National Grape Corp., had brought about the merger with Welch, the directors of National Grape Cooperative looked for a way to acquire the Welch Co.

This was to be accomplished by a business relationship unique in our history. In 1952 the Welch Co. and the cooperative signed an agreement which gave National Grape Cooperative Association an option to acquire Welch.

By 1956, the combination of National, the exclusive supplier of U.S. No. 1 quality grapes, and Welch, the processing company, had become so successful that the cooperative's board of directors exercised the option to buy the company. At this point, National had accumulated \$15,000,000 toward the purchase of the company and assumed a mortgage of \$13,400,000 covering the value of acquisitions and capital improvements made by Welch between 1952 and 1956, and other net assets.

In just 3 years, the cooperative paid off the mortgage and became the sole owner of the company, including Welch's famous trademark and its plants in New York, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Michigan, and Washington.

Welch sales at the time the option agreement was signed in 1952 totaled almost \$26 million and by 1961, that figure had risen to more than \$50 million.

To support the steady increase in sales, modernization of the company's plants continued at a rapid rate. The agricultural progress fostered by the formation of National Grape Cooperative continued too, and in the late 1950's, work was begun on development of a mechanical grape harvester.

Cornell University and private equipment manufacturers worked closely with National's staff of trained viticulturists in the development of a complex harvesting machine, that would harvest the delicate grapes.

This investment began paying off as more than 10,000 tons were harvested mechanically in 1968. This fall, the total tonnage of grapes harvested mechanically by members of National alone is expected to be in the magnitude of 60,000 to 70,000 tons.

Quality has always been a paramount requirement of the grapes grown by members of National and delivered to Welch plants. In the early days of the cooperative ownership of the company, a sugar-solids scale for determining the acceptability of grapes for processing was developed, and also as the basis for payments which rewarded growers for higher quality grapes.

So it is today that the nearly 2,500 farmer members of National Grape Cooperative and the 1,300 employees of Welch Foods Inc., combine to produce and market the highest quality Concord grape products at an ever-increasing rate.

As I mentioned earlier, the company has diversified to include other products. In 1927, for example, tomato juice became a part of the product line, and in recent years, other fruit jams, jellies, and drink products have been developed and marketed.

This joint effort has resulted in a stabilized market for the products of the grower-members of National, and a strong company which during the last fiscal year recorded net sales in excess of \$65 million.

I congratulate Welch on its centennial year, and salute this combination of industry and agriculture that has made it the leader that it is today.

AFRICAN CULTURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many who follow developments in Africa are amazed to learn of the retrogressive policies of strong-armed revolutionary governments.

Now that the Tanzanian Red dictatorship has announced that there will be no elections on Zanzibar for at least 60 years, we of the free world can but hope that the chiefs of other emerging nations on the black continent are not led to follow this precedent by suppressing their subject's right to a franchise.

Where is the cry for "one man, one vote" from the UNO.

Under unanimous consent I submit a UPI release from Dar-Es-Salam, Tanzania for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TANZANIANS TOLD OF ELECTION BAN

DAR-ES-SALAM, April 26 (UPI).—Tanzanians celebrated five years of nationhood today with dances, parades and mass meetings. But the government dampened the festivities by saying no elections would be held on Zanzibar for at least 60 years.

Tanzania's first vice president and head of government, Sheikh Abeid Karume said elections were "imperialist tools" and therefore unnecessary.

Asked to review the five years since Tanganyika and Zanzibar merged, Karume said, "It is unpleasant to look back, as we inherited a lot of filth which we have had to clear up."

**COTTON PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION
DEDICATE NEW SOYBEAN PLANT
IN VALDOSTA, GA.**

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, one of my prime concerns since it has been my privilege to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia has been the development of my district which is predominantly rural and which has a low per capita income and high unemployment.

I am presently developing legislation which I plan to introduce soon which would provide incentive for industry to locate in rural areas such as my district.

Whenever industry moves into our Eighth District it means more jobs and less reason for our people to crowd into the cities seeking a livelihood. Recently the Cotton Producers Association built such industry which will provide more jobs and which will be a shot in the arm of our economy. We in the Eighth District are proud of the new soybean plant which was built by CPA.

I traveled to Georgia to dedicate this new plant, as it was a special day in Valdosta. Under unanimous consent I submit a copy of a news story which was released on the dedication of this new plant for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows.

NEW SOYBEAN PLANT DEDICATED IN VALDOSTA
VALDOSTA, GA.—Representative W. S. (Bill) Stuckey, Jr., addressed the Cotton Producers Association and guests upon the dedication of the CPA's new \$6 million soybean plant in Valdosta, Georgia.

Representative Stuckey commended the Cotton Producers Association and Mr. D. W. Brooks, Chairman of the Board for their leadership and for moving Georgians ahead for the past 25 years.

"These new facilities which we are here to dedicate are tangible symbols of progress in rural Georgia," Representative Stuckey said.

"This \$6 million plant which will process 1,500 tons of soybeans per day is proof positive that the agriculture industry is a creator of employment."

Mr. Stuckey said that the agriculture industry is one of the nation's largest industries and that it is composed of approximately 13 million producers. He pointed out that the agricultural industry has become so efficient—"one hour of farm labor today produces more than 6 times as much food and other products than it did in 1919 to 1921."

Representative Stuckey told the crowd of some 1,500 gathered for the dedication that they could count on continued change in the agricultural industry.

"While the agricultural industry continues to progress," Stuckey said, "We will continue to find more and more job opportunity right here in our own rural Georgia."

"Our young people are going to find less need to wander into the urban areas seeking a livelihood and our rural poor who have been forced to leave the farms will be able to find new opportunity and new life in this rural area."

"All this makes the dedication of this fine plant even more important. We are most fortunate that Lowndes County is such a suitable locality for the new plant which will create additional employment opportunity here in our 8th District."

"This is the type of agricultural industry we need more of," Stuckey continued.

The 8th District Representative said the fact that Georgia livestock and poultry producers used 34 million bushels of soybeans and yet only 13 million bushels were produced in Georgia during the year 1967 was a clear sign that there is a growing demand in this relatively new area. "With the continued research of the Cotton Producers Association, there is little doubt in my mind that the demand for soybean production and processing is going to continue to increase," he said.

"In addition to the new jobs created within this new industry, the new market facilities now available will create a demand for the production of more soybeans."

"The work of the Cotton Producers Association and their new industry and their contribution to building for a better future must and will stand as an example to us."

Mr. Stuckey urged that with this example as a foundation it was up to citizens of the 8th District to work together in encouraging more such industry to locate and expand in the District.

**JOHN J. CASSIDY: A GREAT PUBLIC
SERVANT WITH A GREAT HEART**

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, within the next few months Mr. John Joseph "Jack" Cassidy, who has headed the San Jose Social Security Administration Office since it opened on October 18, 1938, will be retiring because he has reached the mandatory retirement age of 70.

For the past 17 years I have referred hundreds of social security matters to Mr. Cassidy and I can state that I have dealt with no person in the Federal Government who has shown more compassion, efficiency, and desire to help his fellow man than has John Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy has been completely non-partisan in his approach to his job and has done everything possible to give the highest type of service to the tax-paying citizens with whom he deals. He has been so prompt in handling cases which I referred to him that I seriously doubt that any request I made of him ever remained on his desk more than 24 hours without becoming the subject of some form of constructive action.

Frankly, I am sorry to see men like John Cassidy leave Government service and I wish it were possible for him to be retained in some manner to continue the implementation of some of the fine programs which he has pioneered to acceptance in his 31 wonderful years of Government service.

Probably the best description of John Cassidy I have ever heard was in a letter from a constituent who stated that in his opinion Mr. Cassidy is "a practical idealist who implements congressional mandate with a minimum of redtape. He is an exception to Parkinson's law."

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished politi-

cal reporter for the San Jose Mercury, Mr. Harry Farrell, recently wrote an article entitled "That's Jack Cassidy, a Different Bureaucrat." Mr. Farrell paid a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Cassidy which should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will only add this statement: We will all miss Jack Cassidy from Government service. If his successor is half as efficient and half as much a humanitarian, he will be a resounding success.

The article follows:

**THAT'S JACK CASSIDY, A DIFFERENT
BUREAUCRAT**

(By Harry Farrell)

Let's start off today with a little quiz for the old-timers.

What major public administrator in this area has been in office continuously longer than any incumbent member of the San Jose City Council, of the Board of Supervisors, of the entire State Assembly, or the entire State Senate?

What local public official has held his job longer than any Californian now serving in either house of Congress?

What official has a span of service covering the federal administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon?

What official has held his job during the governorships of Frank F. Merriam, Culbert L. Olson, Earl Warren, Goodwin J. Knight, Edmund G. Brown and Ronald Reagan?

Reilly?—If you've been around a long time, you may think we're talking about George Reilly, the perennial 1st District member of the State Board of Equalization.

If so you're wrong, because Reilly, although meeting almost every test encompassed in the foregoing quiz, flunks on one of them. According to our records, his term of office is exactly matched by one state senator, Randy Collier from Yreka. Both Reilly and Collier first took office in January, 1939.

The gentleman we're thinking about was on the job here about three months earlier than that.

He is John Joseph (Jack) Cassidy, who has headed the San Jose office of the Social Security Administration since it opened on Oct. 18, 1938.

This October, after 31 years on the job, Cassidy will retire, on reaching the mandatory quitting age of 70.

Different—In the traditional definition of the word, we suppose, Jack Cassidy is a bureaucrat. But from here to Washington, he is recognized as a bureaucrat with a difference.

Too often in dealing with a public official, the citizen feels he is in a losing fight against overpowering forces of government boondoggling. This has been true with the Social Security Administration as well as other agencies.

But here in San Jose, when a genuinely aggrieved citizen is fighting the system, he finds Cassidy fighting on his side—not the bureaucracy's.

We have not been on our job as long as Cassidy has been on his, but over the years we remember him in the newspaper office time after time, always to spread some bit of publicity that would unspool red tape, speed up official action, or right a wrong.

Cassidy's superiors know him for the fighter he has always been.

A few years ago we had occasion to deal with Social Security Administration officials all the way up to the headquarters in Baltimore, in connection with a news story. We found that all of them knew Cassidy. Many had felt his wrath.

When Cassidy took over Social Security here in San Jose, he had a staff of three, working out of the Post Office Building at First and St. John streets.

Expansion—He originally had a four-county jurisdiction—Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey.

Today, with geographic responsibility that does not even embrace all of Santa Clara County, he has 53 employees working at 500 S. 1st St. The advent of Medicare enormously enlarged his operation.

Just a few days ago, Cassidy gave us permission to divulge his role in tipping off the papers a couple of years ago when Medicare payments were hopelessly snarled. The result was a major publicity blast that shook the Social Security Administration from top to bottom, and achieved at least temporary improvement.

"I don't care who knows it now," Cassidy said. "I only have six months to go, and even if they wanted to fire me, it would take 'em six months to prepare the papers."

There's one great irony in the approaching retirement of Jack Cassidy. He has a government pension, of course, but as a U.S. employe—he isn't eligible for social security.

ISRAEL MUST NOT BE ANOTHER CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, an address of historical significance has been made by the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman GERALD R. FORD. It is a brilliant analysis of the developing situation in the Middle East and the relevance of Israel to the national security interests of the United States.

The address very correctly assesses the Communist attempts to exploit Arab-Israeli tensions. Mr. FORD has come to the conclusion that "Israel must not become another Czechoslovakia."

His address is perhaps the most masterful survey of the Middle East problem offered in a long time by a Member of the Congress. It is as timely as today's last-minute headlines and must be read by all who seek a deeper understanding of events in the Middle East:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN OF MICHIGAN, REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT THE AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE LUNCHEON

I firmly believe that the fate of Israel is linked to the national security interests of the United States. I therefore cannot conceive of a situation in which the U.S. Administration will sell Israel down the Nile.

Concern has been expressed that the Soviet Union and France may prevail at the current Big Four talks on the Middle East. I can assure you that your government will not permit this to happen. We are conscious of Soviet ambitions.

Israel may enter its 21st anniversary confident of its manhood. Israel's record of achievement and courage makes the state worthy of that status. Israel can feel certain that Americans are aware of her dedication to freedom and of basic affinity linking Israel with the United States.

I join with those who are concerned about overall Soviet designs on the Middle East and Mediterranean. One need only follow the news reports of Operation "Dawn Patrol,"

the NATO naval maneuvers now in progress in the Mediterranean. We are aware of the unprecedented Soviet naval build-up in that region. We know that the Russians are trying to exert pressures in the Mediterranean at a time when we are preoccupied in the Far East.

Your government is not naive. Nor are the members of Congress. Let me state one fact simply and directly: Israel must not become another Czechoslovakia.

I have no illusions about Soviet policy and the attempts by the Kremlin to create a sphere of influence in the Middle East that would undermine vital American security interests and threaten the entire southern flank of NATO. The game being played by the Russians, exploiting Arab hostility against Israel, is transparent.

It is my conviction that American policy will not seek to "impose" a settlement as a result of the present Big Four Conference or outside the context of such talks.

President Nixon has pledged that Israel's vital interests will be preserved and that withdrawal can occur only by consent of the parties directly concerned, based upon a contractual agreement establishing a peace involving recognized, defensible, and just boundaries.

American participation in the Big Four Conference is consistent with efforts to test the Soviet Union's professed desire to preserve peace and to avoid a nuclear confrontation. But no accord will be purchased at the expense of Israel. As I have said, we are well aware of Soviet aims and attitudes. We are also mindful of the continuing brutal suppression of Czechoslovakia, as denounced only last Friday by President Nixon.

The U.S. Government is aware that the Soviet-made MIG's that treacherously attacked an unarmed U.S. reconnaissance plane in international airspace off the Korean coast represented the same type of aircraft and weapons systems supplied to the radical Arab states.

Our Government must therefore continue to maintain the military combat and deterrent capacities of Israel through the earliest possible supply of Phantom jets and other military hardware requirements. I am pleased to note that Israeli air and ground crews to man the Phantoms are presently receiving special training at a U.S. Air Force Base in California. The Phantoms will be ready for shipment at a time coinciding with the completion of training—a matter of months. Many of the Phantoms will be in service in Israel before the end of 1969.

We appreciate Israel's isolated geographic position, surrounded as she is by enemies. Her very life depends on airpower and civilian air links with the free world. In this connection, one must note with regret that attacks on unarmed aircraft have escalated worldwide from the hijacking of American commercial airlines to Cuba, to attacks at various European airports on Israeli airliners by Arab terrorists armed with Russian weapons, and now the criminal attack by Communist North Korean MIG-21's on an unarmed American plane in international airspace.

Are the Russians sincerely seeking a relaxation of tensions or have they merely relegated their dirty work to the fanatics and fourth-rate despots of the world?

We have heard the Kremlin profess great concern about Middle Eastern peace. But we have watched them pour naval forces into the Mediterranean. We have heard them demand American withdrawal. We have watched them build up the war potential of radical and irresponsible Arab States that refuse to enter into real peace negotiations with Israel.

Moscow is attempting to achieve indirectly what Communist and Arab pressure have failed to accomplish by military pressure

and threats. They have sought to roll back the Israelis from the cease-fire lines of June, 1967, without a meaningful peace settlement. Thus they would keep the sore open, restore the intolerable situation that existed immediately before the outbreak of the Six-Day War, and exploit any retreat by Israel and her friends to push further against free world interests.

The Soviet Union has not clarified her policy to my satisfaction. Indeed, they seem to have a variety of policies, to suit their convenience. They have one policy in the Middle East, another in Czechoslovakia, and yet another in North Korea. In North Korea they help us one week to search for possible survivors of the plane shot down by the MIG's they provided. Then, the very next week, they protest because we send a Naval force to protect our reconnaissance flights and our right to use international waters and airspace.

An assessment must be made at American-Soviet bilateral talks on the Middle East and at the Big Four meetings. It is whether Moscow is sincere in seeking a reduction of tensions or whether Russia is trying to exploit the fear of war in hope of turning a complex situation to her advantage.

Not only the Soviet Union but also Communist China is fishing in the troubled waters of the Middle East. Arab terrorists are being trained in Peking. Chinese "button" mines, mortars, rockets, and other weapons used against U.S. forces in Viet Nam have emerged in the Arab guerrilla assaults against Israel. Arab guerrilla leaders have openly proclaimed that they will reject any peace settlement that might be reached by the Big Four or signed by King Hussein or President Nasser.

Citing Chairman Mao of Communist China as their inspiration, in the Arab terrorists have proclaimed a so-called war of national liberation in the Middle East. Their aim is the liquidation of Israel and all pro-Western Arab regimes.

There is evidence that the leading Arab terrorist movement, El Fatah, is working through Arab students at various American colleges and universities to build up U.S. support for an Arab "national liberation front" similar to the campus underground mobilized for the Viet Cong National Liberation Front. Indeed, we now find that some Arabs here on student visas are working with the U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong); the youth arm of the pro-Peking Workers World Party known as Youth Against War and Fascism, and its front group, the Committee to Support Middle East Liberation.

Indications of the flow of trained agitators from the Middle East have been revealed in contacts between the Arabs and the Black Panthers, the Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), and other anti-democratic groups.

Our nation already is beset by disruption at our institutions of higher learning. We have no need of agitators from abroad.

I am confident that the Department of Justice will carefully examine the activities of the estimated 10,000 Arab students in the United States to ascertain possible violations of visa requirements. If they are abusing our hospitality in an unlawful manner, there should be some immediate administrative action.

We are painfully aware of how the Middle East conflict has already spilled over to our shores in the case of the convicted murderer, Sirhan Sirhan. This nation will not tolerate assassination and terrorism.

Let me reiterate that the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives identifies with your concerns. We are committed to the growth of Israel-American friendship. We share your aspirations for the preservation of freedom and justice for all.

SCIENTISTS SAY ABM ENDANGERS NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, orthodox views of the contemporary scientists often picture a white-smoked individual hidden among the test tubes, isolated from the outside world. The scientist is seen as removed from subjective value judgments, maximizing solutions once initial decisions are made by outside forces.

However true that picture may be—and, of course, in some cases it is—alongside the orthodox scientist always there have been those men and women who actively strive for intertwining the scientific community with the political process. For example, after World War II, the Federation of American Scientists figured in a long and futile struggle to retain civilian control of nuclear energy.

As the military-industrial-political-educational complex has risen, it has tended to draw science more and more into the political arena. For the most part, the relationship has been mutual, with the establishment supporting science and the scientific community providing the technological advances needed to advance the schemes of the establishment.

In doing so, however, the role of the scientist as a critic of the complex often was muted. Scientists were drawn into a dangerous system; security, tenure, prestige, and future became dependent upon unbridled support of the establishment.

Lately, for the first time since Korea, the military complex is coming under extremely heavy criticism from many sources. Costs of military adventurism are being measured against costs of domestic turmoil and internal decay.

Among the active participants in the current debate over our national directions are an impressive and growing list of professors and scientists, many of them with extensive backgrounds of research and consultation to the system they now severely question.

Today and tomorrow I am host for one such group, the Boston-based Union of Concerned Scientists. UCS has just completed a study of the Safeguard ABM proposal, and concluded that deploying the system would seriously endanger national security. The report—which I have distributed to each Member of the House—also raises important questions about testing the MIRV warhead system.

As one of the earliest critics of any ABM system, I fully support the conclusions reached in the UCS study. Under unanimous consent I submit the report, "ABM—ABC" for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

ABM—ABC

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, January 18, 1961: "We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and political machinery of defense

with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

We believe that any concerned citizen can follow President Eisenhower's advice, and acquire enough knowledge to evaluate the implications of ABM for national security. Our purpose in preparing this pamphlet is to provide the necessary information and our own conclusions.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, April 15, 1969. Curtis G. Callan, Assistant Professor of Physics, Harvard University.

Jerome I. Friedman, Professor of Physics, M.I.T.

Louis B. Friedman, Graduate Student in Aeronautics and Astronautics, M.I.T.

Kurt Gottfried, Professor of Physics, Cornell University, presently Visiting Professor of Physics, M.I.T.

Sorel Gottfried.

Robert A. Guyer, Assistant Professor of Physics, Duke University.

Roman Jackiw, Society of Fellows, Harvard University.

Kenneth A. Johnson, Professor of Physics, M.I.T.

Gladys Johnson.

Marian Low, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Boston University.

Robert T. Lulse, Graduate Student in Chemistry, M.I.T.

Paul C. Martin, Professor of Physics, Harvard University.

Colleen Meier, Graduate Student in Physiology, Harvard Medical School.

Irwin Oppenheim, Professor of Chemistry, M.I.T.

Leo Sartori, Associate Professor of Physics, M.I.T.

Jane Zoba, Secretary, M.I.T.

The basic questions that we have asked in our study of ABM are:

Will the deployment of an ABM system make nuclear war less likely?

To what extent will the proposed ABM system increase our security in case of attack?

The first question can only be answered by evaluating our nuclear weapons policy as a whole. On examining this policy we conclude that simultaneous installation of ABM and multiple-warhead missiles (MIRV) would seriously escalate the arms race, and make the balance of terror more precarious. Nuclear war would become more likely, and the resulting devastation could be even more catastrophic than if war broke out today. These grave dangers far outweigh any marginal protection ABM might provide—particularly since the system would be so unreliable.

Arms control offers the only escape from the terrifying treadmill of escalation and counter-escalation. With our imposing nuclear superiority we can safely refrain from further weapon deployment while we vigorously pursue existing opportunities for negotiation.

NUCLEAR ARSENALS

An appraisal of ABM must begin with a description of the nuclear arsenals held by the great powers. Each of the superpowers has about 1000 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), but the US has many more strategic bombers and ICBM-carrying submarines than Russia. Our total number of deliverable warheads exceeds Russia's by more than three to one.

The destructive power of these arsenals defies comprehension: the total explosive power of our strategic nuclear forces is roughly 200,000 times as large as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Defense Department estimates of deaths in nuclear war, which run into many tens of millions, only refer to fatalities directly due to nuclear explosions. Untold millions would die from fallout, from disease, and from starvation. The fabric of civilization would be torn to shreds, and large areas would be uninhabitable.

In the foreseeable future, neither the US nor Russia will have the ability to destroy the other's nuclear forces in a pre-emptive strike (first-strike capability). Both powers have second-strike capability, the ability to ride out a first strike and then devastate the attacker. Secretary of Defense Laird's claim before the Senate on March 21 that "the Soviets are going for a first-strike capability, and there is no question about it" is totally without foundation. Just one of our 41 submarines can launch 16 large thermonuclear warheads, which could destroy as many as 16 Soviet cities. A Soviet first strike would require the simultaneous destruction of our submerged submarines, of our ICBMs in their concrete silos, and of our strategic bombers. Russia does not have the capacity to carry out even one of these acts. If anything, it is the US which is closer to a first-strike capability. Our means of delivery are more diversified, numerous and sophisticated than are Russia's. This disparity will swing even further in our favor as we proceed with deployment of MIRV, a missile that carries several thermonuclear warheads aimed at widely separate targets. The significance of MIRV is that the overall striking power of a missile force is largely determined by the total number of independent warheads, not by the total megatonnage. It is generally acknowledged that we are well ahead of Russia in the development of MIRV.

As for China, she has yet to test an ICBM, but she has carried out thermonuclear explosions. The Defense Department estimates that China will only have 20-30 ICBMs in the mid-1970s. Our first-strike capability, and China's lack of a deterrent, will be maintained for at least a decade.

THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM AND ITS MISSION

The basic components of the system, and their functions, are described in the Appendix. The system combines two concepts: an area-defense which employs the large, long-range Spartan missile, and a terminal-defense that uses the small short-range Sprint missile. Radars and computers track the enemy's incoming warheads, and launch and guide the intercepting defensive missiles.

In the Safeguard deployment announced by the President on March 14, the first two ABM sites will be at ICBM bases in North Dakota and Montana. The complete system calls for 10 other sites spread throughout the country (see map). [Not printed in the RECORD.]

On March 14 President Nixon stated that Safeguard has two purposes: to provide a partial defense of our deterrent forces in case of a Russian attack, and a thin defense of our population against an accidental or Chinese attack.

PENETRATION AIDS

An enemy can use a wide array of countermeasures in an attempt to incapacitate or penetrate an ABM system. The US has devoted a great deal of effort over many years to develop a host of penetration aids. These include fake warheads, missiles that can jam enemy radar, and other ingenious devices. A high-altitude nuclear explosion can also be used to produce an opaque region between the ABM radar and incoming warheads. (This is called blackout.)

RUSSIAN ATTACK

For the foreseeable future a Soviet first strike would spell disaster for Russia. Despite this universally accepted fact, detailed public discussions of a Russian attack have become very fashionable.

Everyone agrees that the proposed Safeguard system could not defend our population against a massive Russian attack. The Soviet Union must be expected to increase her ICBM force to compensate for any decrease of her deterrent caused by our ABM, just as we reacted to the rudimentary ABM system surrounding Moscow.

With our 1000 ICBMs in underground silos, and our 656 submarine-based missiles, our deterrent will need no defense for many years. Finally, Russia could never be certain that we would not respond to a massive attack by immediately launching our Minutemen.

CHINESE ATTACK

Our overwhelming superiority would make any Chinese attack totally irrational. While China's propaganda has sometimes been very bellicose, her foreign policy has been exceptionally cautious. Nevertheless, there are those who fear a suicidal Chinese attack. Though we do not understand this fear, we shall examine Safeguard as a defense against a Chinese ICBM attack on our cities. In a very light attack—say 5 warheads, Safeguard could be effective. But by the mid 1970's, when China is expected to have 20-30 missiles, she presumably will have some penetration aids. If all these warheads were then to be concentrated in a skillful attack on one or two cities that do not have terminal defense (say New York and Chicago), we would have to expect that one or two would penetrate and utterly devastate their targets. To repeat, China lies completely at the mercy of our vast retaliatory forces.

ACCIDENTALLY LAUNCHED MISSILES

If the system is to be effective against an accidentally launched ICBM, it will have to be on alert 24 hours a day. Because a decision to use ABM must be taken in less than 15 minutes, complete presidential control of nuclear weapons will be eroded. A complex system in continuous operation is also prone to false alarms. These could be caused by computer failure, or by mistaking one of the numerous orbiting pieces of "spacejunk" for a warhead. Cheaper and safer methods than ABM could and should be devised to deal with the problem of accidental attack.

SAFETY HAZARDS

There has been much concern that our ABM missiles could explode accidentally on the ground and thereby kill great numbers of civilians in the vicinity. We feel that this fear is exaggerated. The only significant hazard arises if a Spartan is erroneously fired (see preceding paragraph). The light flash from the nuclear explosion could then cause permanent eye damage to persons as much as hundreds of miles away—most likely to Canadians.

TECHNICAL CRITICISMS

The ABM system is probably the most complicated engineering feat ever undertaken. To make matters worse, any ABM system suffers from the severe handicap that it cannot be tested under realistic conditions. The components can be tested separately, and relatively simple attacks can be simulated. But common decency—and the Test Ban Treaty—preclude a test under the conditions of an actual nuclear attack. Systems far simpler than ABM have rarely operated reliably without many tryouts. The Apollo program has required numerous tests, even though the moon's orbit cannot be modified by the tactics of a clever adversary. Remember also that Apollo flights have day-long countdowns with interruptions for unexpected adjustments.

Finally there is the radar blackout of the area defense for which no satisfactory countermeasure has yet been presented.

Small wonder that there has been unprecedented opposition to ABM by leading scientific advisors to the Defense Department, and that all the former Science Advisors to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have opposed deployment.

Confidence in the comprehensive technical review recently undertaken by the Defense Department has been shaken by the revelation that the views of two eminent scientific advisors (Drs. W. Panofsky and H. York) were misrepresented by Undersecretary of Defense

Packard in his testimony before the Senate's Disarmament Subcommittee.

ABM, MIRV, AND THE ARMS RACE. THIS TOPIC IS THE HEART OF THE WHOLE ISSUE

In a first strike attempt an attacker will concentrate virtually his whole strength on the victim's strategic forces; there is no point in wasting weapons on a helpless population. If the aggressor also has an effective heavy population defense, his attack need not be perfect because a weak retaliatory strike will then be ineffective. Thus it is a bitter truth that in the Atomic Age a heavy population defense tends to be provocative and will therefore arouse a response. This point has been recognized by President Nixon in his March 14 press conference.

In the nuclear arms race every threatening action produces an excessive reaction. The reasons for this are the need to assume (a) that the enemy's new weapon will work according to design, and (b) that the execution of countermeasures will take years of design and development work. Even when the threat turns out to be illusory, the counter-weapon is often deployed extensively.

The present rapid growth of the Soviet ICBM force is probably the long-delayed response to the enormous expansion of our missile force during the Kennedy Administration.

If we simultaneously deploy MIRV and ABM, Soviet planners would have to respond. They could not take on faith the announcement that we are only installing a thin ABM defense of our cities, particularly since many of our military and Congressional leaders have been vigorous advocates of shelters and a thick ABM system. A thin system in being makes the step to a thick system that much shorter, and Russia could view a thick city defense in combination with MIRV as a potential first-strike threat. This assertion may seem puzzling in view of all the technical criticism of ABM. But the Soviet military—though well aware of all the flaws of ABM—will have to regard a thick city defense as a serious threat to their deterrent, and strengthen it.

If the Senate approves Safeguard, and MIRV deployment proceeds on schedule, we can be sure that Soviet efforts will accelerate, and that we shall expand our arsenal in turn. The level of devastation in case of war could then be even more horrendous than if war broke out today. This danger far exceeds any short-term security we might conceivably gain from ABM. We must recognize that a sequence of small and superficially prudent steps can lead to disaster.

With our imposing nuclear superiority we can safely refrain from further weapon deployment while we vigorously pursue existing opportunities for negotiation. The time for negotiations is not unlimited, because MIRV deployment will seriously impair satellite surveillance of an arms control agreement. If this fleeting opportunity for arms control negotiation is lost, we shall move onto a higher and more dangerous plateau in the arms race.

COST OF SAFEGUARD

The Administration estimates the cost of the whole system at about \$7 billion. On the basis of past experience it is probable that this cost will more than double before completion. Further expense will surely result from numerous technical modifications during and after deployment. Above all, one must expect enormous pressures to expand the system beyond its present level. Thus Mr. McNamara was concerned that the relatively small system that he proposed would eventually grow until its cost would exceed a minimum of \$40 billion (Aviation Week, October 23, 1967). Mr. Eisenhower had the same worry when he said, "It would buy a pilot establishment, nothing more. And then we would have to go on and on until we had 'The Work.'" (VISTA, Jan.-Feb. 1968.)

1. TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

Components

The major components of Safeguard are the same as those of its two predecessors, Sentinel and Nike-X: two sophisticated radars, called PAR and MSR; two nuclear missiles, Spartan and Sprint; and associated computers.

PAR (Perimeter acquisition radar) detects and tracks incoming objects at distances up to about 2000 miles; computers calculate where the object is headed and transfer the information to the appropriate MSR.

MSR (Missile site radar) picks up the tracking of the incoming object and attempts to decide whether it is a missile or a decoy (or some natural object, such as a meteorite). It controls the firing of the defensive missile (either Spartan or Sprint), and then guides it to intercept the attacker. The MRS can therefore be called the heart of the ABM system. If it is put out of action, the whole system collapses. The range of MSR is several hundred miles.

Both PAR and MSR are aimed electronically; the antenna does not have to be turned mechanically to look in a different direction, as did the older radars in the Nike-Zeus system. This means the radar can scan the entire sky in a small fraction of a second, which makes it possible for a single instrument to track many incoming objects and guide many defensive missiles simultaneously. It is this feature that makes ballistic missile defense even remotely feasible.

The Spartan missile is the interceptor in the "area defense" concept (see figure) [not printed in RECORD]. It has a warhead of about two megatons (roughly 100 times the Hiroshima bomb), and a range of approximately 400 miles. At this range interception takes place high above the atmosphere (100-200 miles). The explosion of even a megaton weapon at such altitude poses no serious danger to the population below (except possibly eye damage to someone looking directly at the explosion; this is discussed elsewhere). The Spartan explosion releases a huge burst of x-rays, which can disable enemy missiles at distances up to several tens of miles. Thus a single Spartan could dispose of more than one attacker if they are close together.

The Sprint missile has a much shorter range than Spartan (about 25 miles) and is used for terminal interception (see figure). Sprint carries a warhead of some kilotons (about the same as the Hiroshima bomb, or perhaps somewhat smaller). It can reach a very high speed very quickly. This means that if an attacking missile has managed to elude the Spartans, a Sprint can be fired at practically the last moment and still manage to intercept. Because of the small yield, the explosion must occur quite close to the enemy missile. Interception takes place at a 10-20 mile altitude. The Sprint explosion itself is not dangerous at this altitude, but if the heavier enemy warhead should detonate, it would cause serious ground damage. The Sprint kills primarily with neutrons. It is supposed to destroy the enemy missile without causing the warhead to detonate, unless the enemy has purposely designed the warhead to explode upon interception.

Cost estimates are roughly 100 million for each radar installation, about 3 million per Sprint missile, and 4 million per Spartan.

Deployment

The Sentinel system proposed by the Johnson Administration was a thin area-defense system. It consisted of 15 installations, each containing an MSR and Spartan missiles; most (but not all) the sites were to have Sprints, and 6 of them (all in the north) were to have PARs. (Six PARs are sufficient to give complete coverage of the northern perimeter.) The site locations were such that every point in the country would be within Spartan range of at least one site. Of course only a small fraction of the country (the

area immediately surrounding each site) would be within Sprint range. The number of missiles was not officially announced, but was estimated at about 30 Spartans per site, and a somewhat larger number of Sprints. With a total cost estimate of \$5.5 billion, the numbers could not be much larger.

The Nixon-Laird modification of Sentinel, now called Safeguard, differs in the location of sites and in the stated objective. Except for one near Washington, D.C., the twelve sites presently proposed are remote from major cities. Each site is to have an MSR, Spartans, and Sprints; seven of them will include PARs (see map). The number of missiles involved must be comparable to that of Sentinel, since the announced total cost is not very different.

The stated main purpose of Safeguard is to protect our ICBM sites and thus assure the preservation of our retaliatory capability in case of a first strike by the Russians. The first two sites in the deployment plan, in North Dakota and Montana, are close to ICBM installations that contain about a third of our present Minuteman force. Since the twelve Safeguard sites still cover practically the entire country, the new system would, it is claimed, provide about the same protection against a Chinese attack or an accidental launching as Sentinel. As with Sentinel, there is no claim to provide a defense of cities against a massive Soviet attack.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of ABM has been challenged on three grounds:

1. Reliability
2. Vulnerability of components
3. Susceptibility to penetration aids, and radar blackout

Reliability

How likely is the system to perform "as advertised" even if the attacker employs no penetration aids? At the Kwajalein test site it has been demonstrated that a missile can indeed intercept another missile. But the exceedingly complex system has not been tested (nor can it be) under the much more challenging conditions it would face in a real attack: many weapons exploding within a short time, a horde of objects to be tracked, perhaps a temporary loss of communications (see blackout section below). And there will be no time for adjustments: any simple "bug" which develops, even one which could be rectified by a small correction that takes ten minutes, could prove disastrous. In view of this, many critics (for example, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, Science Advisor to President Kennedy and a long-time radar expert) contend that the likelihood of the system performing properly the first time it is called on, under attack conditions, is small.

If the attacker employs penetration aids, the reliability of the system becomes even more questionable. The computers and radars will have to distinguish the true warheads from a swarm of decoys. The computer programs—which will be of unprecedented complexity—will have to incorporate a response to all possible tactics of the offense. Human judgment will have no time to intervene if the attack uses an unexpected tactic.

Malfunctioning of complex defensive systems is not unheard of. For example, some years ago the radar early warning system mistook the rising of the moon for a massive Russian attack.

Vulnerability

Missiles can be put in hardened silos where they can survive a megaton explosion less than half a mile away. However, the MSR installation is nowhere near as hard; it is therefore the most vulnerable part of the system. As it is also the most crucial component, it will draw the heaviest enemy fire in case of an attack. The defense must concentrate a large number of Sprints around the radar to offer it maximum protection.

Another possibility is to have stand-by radar, but radars are so expensive that this is not incorporated in the present plans.

Penetration aids

Many stratagems and devices are available to the offense in its attempt to overcome ABM defenses.

Above the atmosphere the flight-path of a body does not depend on its weight, and a light and inexpensive object can be used as a fake warhead. These decoys must have approximately the same appearance to the radar as a true warhead. The incoming missile can also eject a swarm of wires (called chaff) that will confuse the ABM radar. One can also enclose the warhead in a metal-coated balloon, and accompany it with numerous empty balloons. The area defense will not be able to distinguish these decoys from the true culprit, but this disadvantage is partly offset by the large kill-radius of the Spartan.

Once the warhead and its host of decoys enter the atmosphere, the latter will rapidly be left behind, and the warhead will become clearly identifiable. The longer one can wait before committing the Sprint defense, the surer this identification. Because of this the remarkable acceleration possessed by Sprint is essential.

The US is carrying out research and development on various devices to fool a terminal defense. For example, warheads that do not have ballistic trajectories after entering the atmosphere are being studied. There are even studies of decoys that simulate such maneuvering re-entry vehicles.

The offense can also try to jam the defensive radar with transmitters attached to missiles. (The PAR frequency will presumably be known to the Soviets because it can be measured by vessels in international waters.) The offense could possibly devise a warhead that homes on the ABM radar—the US has done research on such devices.

Radar blackout

An additional serious problem for the Safeguard system is the phenomenon of radar blackout. When a nuclear explosion occurs in the upper atmosphere a large number of electrons are produced. The electron cloud can cover a wide area, can have substantial thickness, and can last for several minutes. These electrons bend and absorb radar waves to such an extent that an object behind them might not be seen by the defensive radar. This is known as radar blackout. It is particularly damaging to the long range, long wave PAR radar which is used in conjunction with the Spartan missiles.

The nuclear explosion may be due either to one of the Spartan missiles which has intercepted an incoming missile, or to an attacking missile which has been purposely exploded at high altitude. The former is called self-blackout. It may be possible to phase an attack so that the defense will be forced to blackout its own radar.

While there is some controversy about how damaging radar blackout would be and about how easy it would be to redesign the Safeguard system to mitigate the effects of the blackout, it is clear that it would reduce the effectiveness of the area defense to a substantial extent.

2. THE STRATEGIC BALANCE

Here we shall summarize the information pertaining to the balance of strategic forces at this time. Projections into the future are discussed in the section entitled "ABM, MIRV and the Arms Race." FOBS and SS-9 are treated in a separate section.

Our land-based ICBM force consists of 1000 solid-fueled Minutemen, and 54 liquid-fueled Titans IIs. All of these weapons are in deep reinforced concrete holes called silos. The Minuteman series—there are two models—carry a warhead of about one megaton (50 times Hiroshima), while the Titan has a pay-

load in excess of 5 megatons. In October 1968 the Soviet land-based missile force consisted of about 900 ICBMs, in the megaton range, of which the great majority are liquid fueled. Not all of these are in silos. Solid fueled boosters are far more reliable, and can be fired on very short notice (30-40 seconds for Minuteman); we have therefore phased out essentially all our liquid fueled strategic weapons.

Our Strategic Air Command (SAC) has about 650 intercontinental bombers, 40% of which are on 15 minute alert. Each can carry several warheads in the megaton range. The Soviets have about 150 long range bombers. Our bombers are also equipped with missiles having nuclear warheads (SRAM) that can be launched while the plane is over 50 miles from the target and outside the most severe anti-aircraft fire. Plane-launched missiles with a range of over 1000 miles have been developed (SCAD), and the Air Force is pressing for their deployment.

The US has 41 missile launching submarines, each of which carries 16 solid fueled Polaris missiles with a warhead of about one megaton. In October 1968 the Soviets had similar submarines equipped with 45 launchers and carrying a total of about 80 missiles. This is to be compared with the 656 Polaris missiles on our submarines. At this time production of Soviet submarines is proceeding at a rate of about 6-7 per year. Our fleet is not expanding, but is being re-equipped with the Poseidon missile, which has MIRV capability.

The total number of deliverable warheads (and not the total megatonnage) is usually considered to be a rough measure of over-all strategic strength (see Sections on Arms Race and SS-9). At this time we have roughly 4500 warheads to Russia's 1400. Beyond this numerical superiority, it is virtually certain that the US also has a very imposing superiority in the quality of its weapons systems. This is hardly surprising if one considers the vast difference in sophistication between the US and Soviet electronics and computer industries, or our widening lead in the space program. As an example of this, we point out that we are on the verge of deploying a third generation of solid-fueled Minutemen, while the Soviets are only beginning to deploy solid-fueled missiles. Each new generation of Minutemen has incorporated very significant improvements in engines, guidance, and survivability against ABM; Minuteman II can carry penetration aids, and Minuteman III is MIRVed.

In his recent Senate testimony Mr. Laird has hinted that our submarine fleet might become vulnerable within a few years. There are no hard facts in the public record concerning this. The maneuvering of the current Geneva talks on disarming the ocean floors would appear to indicate that we are well ahead of the Soviets in submarine detection devices. In a speech on April 8 Senator Kennedy stated that in 1968 the Chief of Naval Operations had "given strong testimony" that our submarine fleet was not vulnerable (N.Y. Times, Apr. 9, 1969).

Both the U.S. and Russians have large arsenals of tactical nuclear weapons—weapons intended for "normal" warfare, missiles that can be launched from Europe or Asia into Russia (or vice versa), and supersonic bombers of more limited range than the B-52 that can carry a bomb in the megaton range. These tactical forces are far from negligible—we have some 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons in Europe alone. Many knowledgeable people consider these tactical forces to be a very credible deterrent in themselves.

Russia has deployed a rudimentary ABM system. Known as Galosh, it appears to be of Nike-Zeus vintage (see below). Moscow is surrounded by 67 ABM launchers, but further deployment has not been reported for sometime. GALOSH is not considered by our military to be a significant obstacle to our

Minutemen (see McNamara's 1968 Posture Statement, p. 55).

It is not possible to compare the overall strategic arms balance in really precise terms. Our population is more concentrated than Russia's, and many of our most important cities are near sea coasts. This makes them more vulnerable, and the strategic balance is therefore not as much in our favor as the bald numbers might indicate. But refined calculations are hardly needed. The essential fact is that all estimates show that at this time both sides have "assured destruction capability," which is the official jargon for the ability to instantly destroy upwards to $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the enemy's population following an enemy's first strike.

The data on the strategic balance can be found in the annual Posture Statements presented by the Secretary of Defense to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

Robert S. McNamara, "The Fiscal Years 1969-1973 Defense Program and the 1969 Defense Budget," January 22, 1968.

Clark M. Clifford, "The 1970 Defense Budget and the Defense Programs for Fiscal Years 1970-1974," January 16, 1969.

These may be obtained from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

3. ABM, MIRV, AND THE ARMS RACE

Let us consider the basic "laws" that appear to govern the arms race. First there is the so-called "conservative" military tradition: " . . . we must be 'conservative' in all our estimates of both a potential aggressor's capabilities and his intentions. Security depends upon taking a 'worst plausible case'—and having the ability to cope with that eventuality."

This tradition has been reinforced by the vast destructive power of nuclear weapons, and by the blood-curdling policy of deterrence, which Secretary McNamara defined as follows:

"It means the certainty of suicide to the aggressor—not merely to his military forces, but to his society as a whole."

The long time span—the "lead-time"—required to develop modern strategic weapons hardly requires documentation. Our ABM effort is more than a dozen years old, and even the system's supporters agree that it is far from perfect.

Weapons systems are frequently deployed even if the enemy threat that led to their development turns out to have been an overestimate:

"There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry. If a weapon system works—and works well—there is strong pressure from many directions to produce and deploy the weapon out of all proportion to the prudent level required."

Even when an enemy's move turns out to be illusory, deployment marches on. Thus the Russians appear to have developed the extensive Tallinn air-defense system against our B-70 bomber; their deployment of this system continued long after we cancelled the B-70 program.² The "missile gap", which was known to be non-existent by early 1961, led to a vast expansion of our ICBM force in the ensuing years. Mr. McNamara recounted this episode in 1967: ". . . in the course of hedging against what was only a theoretically possible Soviet buildup, we took decisions which have resulted in our current superiority . . ."

Furthermore, he points out that this superiority "is both greater than we had originally planned, and is in fact more than we require."

The action-reaction cycle can even proceed within one country's defense establishment. Our own extensive program to develop penetration aids was in large measure a response to our own ABM research. An outgrowth of

this research is our present lead in MIRV technology; MIRV is to be viewed as the ultimate penetration aid: every decoy has become a warhead. The U.S. development of MIRV was presumably spurred by Russia's deployment of Galosh, but it was not a response to that deployment. Indeed, our large scale deployment of MIRV is about to begin, even though the Soviets have until now restricted their rather primitive Galosh system to Moscow.³

Let us now turn to the future—a future in the company of ABM and MIRV. By converting a portion of our missile force to MIRV, we are rapidly increasing the number of warheads, and losing some megatonnage. The logic behind this is that—

"The most meaningful and realistic measurement of nuclear capability is neither gross megatonnage nor the number of available missile launchers but rather the number of separate warheads that are capable of being delivered with accuracy on individual high-priority targets with sufficient power to destroy them."

Why? Because the destruction wrought by an explosion is not proportional to the megatonnage. It is far more effective to have two warheads of one megaton than one of two megatons, provided they each have the same accuracy.

The preceding graph² shows how the number of US warheads will grow as Minuteman III and Poseidon are installed into our silos and submarines, respectively. Both have MIRV capability; Minuteman III can carry 3 warheads, Poseidon from 8 to 10. The shaded region indicates the uncertainty in this projection.

We do not know how Russia will respond to this rapid growth of US strategic strength. There is a well-established folk-lore in the Defense Department that Soviet ICBMs are considerably less accurate than Minutemen (see, for example, N.Y. Times, April 14, 1969), and that the Soviet propensity for huge warheads is dictated by the need to compensate for this inaccuracy. Knowledgeable sources often indicate (N.Y. Times, April 4, 1969) that the Soviets trail the US in MIRV development. If we assume that our MIRVed missiles are roughly as accurate as Minuteman II and Polaris, we shall gain rapidly in destructive capability in the coming years. A technological breakthrough in our MIRV targeting accuracy could have profound consequences for the strategic balance, especially if it is indeed true that Russia is already trailing badly.

Even if our lead over Russia suddenly expands, we shall not have first-strike capability. Nevertheless, the Soviets would surely respond by rapidly increasing their submarine fleet, or installing mobile land-based ICBMs, or both. Their response would be even more vigorous if we were developing a potential thick population defense by deploying a thin ABM system, and "the arms race would rush hopelessly on."

Not only would the arms race rush on, but the entire strategic balance would be more precarious. This is largely due to the uncertainties that ABM and MIRV introduce into the whole equation: No one can really know how effective an ABM system is, short of war, while satellite reconnaissance cannot tell whether a silo has a MIRVed missile, nor how many warheads it carries. Aside from any particular characteristics of ABM and MIRV, it is clear that rapid and profound transformations in military technology are bound to bring large uncertainties—and uncertainty spells danger. During a time of relative tranquillity, this simple adage may not apply, but it most surely does in a time of extreme tension and crisis, and it is only at such a time that nuclear war is likely.

It is essential that we take advantage of the Soviets' professed willingness to negotiate an arms agreement. The time for negotiations is not unlimited, because MIRV de-

ployment will impair satellite inspection of an arms control agreement. Furthermore, if our lead becomes too substantial, Russia will refuse to negotiate, just as she did in the decade following World War II. To increase the prospects for successful negotiations, we should refrain from installing offensive and defensive nuclear weapons systems at this time.

If this fleeting opportunity for arms control negotiation is lost, we shall all move onto a higher and more dangerous plateau in the arms race. "The road from the axe to the ICBM seems to run in a single direction." We must reverse that direction.

4. SS-9 AND FOBS

In recent testimony about the Soviet nuclear arsenal, two items—the SS-9 and FOBS—have attracted special attention. The first is a large liquid-fueled missile with a 25 megaton warhead comparable to our Titan II. The second is a fractional orbiting ballistic missile system that permits attack from different directions and shortens the time an ABM has to respond.

The public first learned of the deployment of the SS-9 in 1966. In an address on April 8 Senator Kennedy stated that the existence of SS-9 has been known to US intelligence since 1962 (N.Y. Times, Apr. 9, 1969). According to Secretary Laird the Soviet has now installed more than 200. Clifford and Laird, using the same intelligence reports, make different predictions on the number of future deployments. Although some doubt has been cast on the intelligence estimates, the most dire prediction is that the USSE will have deployed 500 SS-9s by 1975. The SS-9 is capable of carrying multiple warheads. No one has suggested that the Russians have warheads that can be independently targeted.

It is important to recognize that the 25 megaton SS-9 would not be 25 times as effective as a 1 megaton missile. A 1 megaton blast produces the same destruction at $\frac{1}{2}$ mile as does a 25 megaton blast at one mile. Thus a single SS-9 would only be able to knock out one of our thousand Minutemen, unless it were equipped with multiple warheads. If it were MIRVed, the accuracy of the warheads would have to be greatly enhanced. Furthermore, as a first strike weapon it would have to reliably knock out more than 80% of our Minutemen if we had no other retaliatory weapons. This would require assigning at least two warheads to each of our missiles.

It is unreasonable to believe that the SS-9 has this mission. Our Titan II's are tagged for retaliatory strikes against large population centers, and Dr. Enthoven, former Asst. Sec. for Systems Analysis, has testified that the SS-9 has a similar purpose. The other mission to which the SS-9 is ideally suited is radar blackout of an ABM defense. For this purpose the large weapon need not be accurate.

FOBS carries a smaller warhead and is less accurate than a conventional missile with the same booster. It was discarded by the US some years ago but it might be resurrected against some future Russian ABM.

5. CHINESE AND ACCIDENTAL ATTACK

In the summary we discussed the possibility that the Chinese would launch their meager ICBM arsenal against us. Even though an ABM defense might be effective against such an attack, we would not be immune from irrational attack by the Chinese. If the Chinese are determined to commit suicide by attacking us, there are many ways they could do so other than with ICBMs. A nuclear weapon smuggled onto a neutral ship, a submarine-launched torpedo, or a biological weapon carried in a suitcase and dropped into a city's water supply are but a few of the possibilities. It is almost impossible to protect oneself completely against a determined assassin who is not concerned with

Footnotes at end of article.

the consequences, as recent history unhappily testifies.

As for the security offered by ABM against an accidentally launched missile better protection could be obtained in cheaper and safer ways. For example ICBMs could be equipped with a device that would permit them to be disarmed by radio after launching. The Hot Line could even be used to transmit the code required to disarm an accidentally launched missile.

6. EYE DAMAGE

The possibility that the light flash from a Spartan explosion at high altitude would cause permanent eye damage to persons on the ground was first brought to public attention by Dr. G. Kistiakowsky formerly Science Advisor to President Eisenhower (N.Y. Times, March 12, 1969). This was immediately denied by Dr. John Foster, the Defense Department's Director of Research and Engineering. Dr. Foster stated that Spartan would be detonated at a sufficiently high altitude to preclude retinal burns to persons on the ground. The Defense Department's official publication "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons" unambiguously contradicts Dr. Foster's pronouncement.

On August 1, 1958, a nuclear device called TEAK was detonated about 50 miles above Johnston Island in the Pacific. We quote from page 574 of the document:

"In order to obtain data concerning the possibility of eye injury, rabbits were exposed to the radiation from the TEAK shot of a megaton-range weapon at an altitude of 252,000 feet. Under nighttime conditions, chorioretinal burns occurred at slant distances up to about 345 miles; however, no measurements were made at greater distances and so this cannot be considered as a threshold range for eye damage."

On page 360 of the same document a lengthy analysis of radiation effects concludes with the statement:

"In fact, it is possible that a high-altitude nuclear explosion in the megaton range could produce effects on the eye at all distances up to the line of sight permitted by the earth's curvature."

One might think that the TEAK test is not relevant to the much higher (100-200 miles) Spartan explosion. This is not the case. The degree of absorption by the atmosphere does not increase significantly in going from an altitude of 50 miles to 200 miles. The only relevant quantity in the test is the distance of 345 miles from the explosion.

There is no way of estimating how many people would suffer eye injury. Under many circumstances there would be no injuries. The number would depend on atmospheric conditions and the time of day. Clouds need not diminish the effect; they could possibly act as diffuse reflecting devices. If two Spartans were to be assigned to intercept the incoming object, the number of injured could be very substantial, because the first burst would draw many eyes to the dangerous portion of the sky.

7. A CAPSULE HISTORY OF ABM

The United States had developed nuclear weapons and acquired considerable expertise in many aspects of strategic bombing by the end of World War II. From 1945 to 1955 it was possible for the US to deliver nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union without fear of retaliation.¹ Not until 1955 did the Soviet Union obtain the weapons and delivery capability to balance this inequality. It developed the atomic bomb in 1949, the hydrogen bomb in 1953, and intercontinental bombers in 1954-55. Since then it has been impossible for us to engage the Soviet Union in a nuclear war without severe damage to our people and territory.

The Soviet Union launched the first earth satellite in 1957. At that time the US and

Russia were developing IRBMs (intermediate-range ballistic missiles, having a range of 1000-2000 miles), ICBMs, and ABMs. Both countries were shifting the emphasis in their strategic planning from bomber to missile delivery. During this period (1955-1960) our strategic weapons doctrine was that of "massive retaliation."²

By 1960 the Soviet Union had 700-800 IRBMs targeted on Western Europe, and an unknown but small number of ICBMs; the US had IRBMs on the periphery of the Soviet Union, and 28 ICBMs. Both countries had large bomber forces.^{3,4}

In the 1960 campaign John F. Kennedy repeatedly raised the possibility of a "missile gap." But a careful reappraisal of the entire defense establishment at the outset of the Kennedy Administration revealed that there was no such gap. Nevertheless, the Administration embarked on a rapid expansion of our ICBM force, and an accelerated and expanded Polaris submarine program. During this time it was briefly believed that we could achieve "first-strike" capability against Russia. However, by 1963 it was clear that . . . it would become increasingly difficult, regardless of the form of the attack, to destroy a sufficiently large portion of the Soviet nuclear forces to preclude major damage to the US regardless of how large or what kind of strategic forces are built.⁵

Once it became apparent that a first-strike capability could not be achieved, the Defense Department shifted to an "assured destruction" posture. The same doctrine appears to underlie Soviet strategic planning. Both superpowers have built strategic forces which—in the words of Mr. McNamara⁶—have " . . . an ability to inflict at all times and under all foreseeable conditions an unacceptable degree of damage upon any single aggressor, or combination of aggressors, even after absorbing a surprise attack."

(The present "assured destruction" postures of the US and the Soviet Union are described in the section entitled "The Strategic Balance".)

As one might expect, the history of missile defense is closely linked to that of missile offense. The concept of ballistic missile defense became an integral part of the thinking of defense planners when it became clear that ICBMs would take over the task of nuclear weapons delivery from manned bombers. (This has never deterred the Air Force from advocating a variety of manned bombers more sophisticated than the B-52.) From 1954 to 1958 the Army and the Air Force competed for control of our ABM program. The Nike-Zeus and Wizard ABM systems were developed by the Army and Air Force respectively. In late 1956 the Defense Department assigned to the Army responsibility for terminal or point defense systems, and to the Air Force responsibility for area defense systems. A later decision by the Defense Department (1958) to attempt point defense against ballistic missiles gave the primary ABM responsibility to the Army.

During 1958-1960 the Army designed and tested a preliminary version of the Nike-Zeus system. At the same time (1959) they strongly urged that we budget immediately for production and deployment of the system. It was to be operational in 1964. In 1959 the Army estimated that the proposed Nike-Zeus system was 25% reliable against Russians ICBMs of the 1959 variety.⁸

The decision on deployment of Nike-Zeus was left to the incoming Administration by President Eisenhower. The Defense Department, headed by Robert McNamara, decided not to build the Nike-Zeus system because there were doubts as to whether it would work, and even more serious qualms about the whole concept of point defense against ICBMs. In his recent testimony before the Senate, Dr. G. Kistiakowsky, President Eisenhower's Science Advisor, made the following remarks about the Nike-Zeus episode:⁹

"It is interesting to contemplate that, had the deployment of Nike-Zeus been authorized in 1960-61, we would have just about now the full system in operational readiness, after spending what was then estimated as \$20 billion and could have been, judging by analogy with other large weapons systems, twice as much. Considering the current numbers and sophistication of offensive missiles now being deployed by the superpowers it is technically certain that the Nike-Zeus ABM system would now be of little value. It would be obsolescent or even obsolete. . . ."

The basic concept in missile defense planning shifted from point to area defense during the period 1960-1965. The abandoned Nike-Zeus point defense used mechanical radar scanning. The new area defense, which acquired the name Nike-X, became feasible with the advent of high-speed electronic scanning, because this technique permits the simultaneous tracking of numerous incoming warheads. Another important and new feature in Nike-X was the ultra-high acceleration Sprint interceptor. Both the Sentinel and Safeguard deployments use the Nike-X components. It is important to remember that Nike-X was conceived and designed as an area (or population) defense.

Both the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations decided not to deploy the Nike-X system, which was intended as a population defense against a Soviet attack. There were two reasons for this:

1. The measure of protection it afforded against a given Soviet ICBM force could be off-set by changes in that force which cost less than the protection. The offense-defense cost-exchange ratio favors the offense.

2. The strategic arms standoff which is essential to the operation of the "assured destruction" concept acquires stability when both sides possess and know their opponents possess an "assured destruction" capability. The steps which we or the Russians would take in response to ABM deployment would lead to an accelerated arms race whose new equilibrium, if one is achieved, will be far less stable than the present one.

In early 1967 the Soviet Union began deploying a defensive system around Moscow. It consists of 67 ABM launchers, and its radars are said to be of the Nike-Zeus vintage (mechanical scanning). It has not been extended to any other Russian city.

The lengthy debate inside the government on ABM deployment finally came into full public view when Sec. McNamara announced the decision to deploy the Chinese-oriented Sentinel system in a remarkable speech delivered in San Francisco on Sept. 18, 1967.¹⁰ Concerning the Soviet ABM, Mr. McNamara points out that ". . . it does not presently affect in any significant manner our assured destruction capability. It does not impose such a threat because we have already taken steps to assure that our . . . forces have the required penetration aids."

He then warns that ". . . we are facing a situation analogous to 1961" . . . i.e., the non-existent missile gap, and that we must not over-react lest we trigger a senseless spiral upwards of nuclear arms."

He then turns to the Chinese threat: ". . . despite the shrill and raucous propaganda directed at her own people that 'the atomic bomb is a paper tiger', there is ample evidence that China well appreciates the destructive power of nuclear weapons. China has been cautious to avoid any action that might end in a nuclear clash with the United States—however wild her words."

Having built what seems to be a watertight case against ABM deployment, he makes the astonishing announcement that ". . . there are marginal grounds for concluding that a light deployment of ABMs against this possibility is prudent", where "this" refers to a Chinese attack. This is the Sentinel decision. He immediately goes on to warn that—

Footnotes at end of article.

"The danger in deploying this relatively light and reliable Chinese-oriented ABM system is going to be that pressures will develop to expand it into a heavy Soviet oriented ABM system. We must resist that temptation firmly —."

The San Francisco speech ends with an eloquent and impassioned appeal for a negotiated end to the "foolish and feckless" nuclear rat-race.

On reading the speech as a whole one is left with the indelible impression that Mr. McNamara was acting against his better judgment, and bowing to the well-known pressure from within the Democratic party for a "Republican-oriented" ABM in an election year. The pressure for expansion which he feared was not long in coming. Indeed, on the following day Tom Wicker reports in the New York Times that "influential members of Congress—backed by powerful military voices" were advocating a Soviet-oriented expansion.

The Sentinel decision aroused intense and unprecedented opposition from eminent scientific advisors to the Defense Department. Eventually, strong grass-roots opposition grew up in the Chicago, Seattle, and Boston areas, which had been slated for early ABM sites. The furor finally led to President Nixon's comprehensive review, and the modification of Sentinel now known as Safeguard. The new deployment, as announced by the President on March 14, removes all ABM sites from cities (with the exception of Washington). According to Mr. Nixon, the new rationale has several components: (1) It would be less provocative to the Soviet Union because it provides a weaker city defense than Sentinel (2) it provides the beginnings of a point defense of our ICBM bases (3) it provides a thin China-oriented population defense. Mr. Nixon buttressed his stated desire not to provoke Russia by saying that—

"I would also point this out—an interesting thing about Soviet military and diplomatic history; they have always thought in defensive terms, and if you read their history—not only their political leaders but their military leaders—the emphasis is on defense. . ."

This interpretation of Soviet intentions is completely at odds with that of Mr. Laird and Mr. Packard. In pressing the Pentagon's case for ABM deployment these officials have repeatedly stated that Russia is seeking a first-strike capability. Strangely enough, the outgoing Sec. of Defense, Clark Clifford, using the same intelligence data, concluded only two months earlier that "we shall continue to have, as far in the future as we can now discern, a very substantial qualitative lead and a distinct superiority in the number of deliverable weapons. . ."

8. DOMESTIC FACTORS

In view of the many technical and strategic objections to the proposed system, a short examination of some political, economic, and psychological factors seems in order.

One serious political consideration is the vulnerability of a candidate who has refused to deploy a new weapons system. Together with Sputnik, the valid refusal of the Eisenhower administration to deploy Nike-Zeus made possible the "Missile Gap" scare of the 1960 campaign—a false scare on which Nixon's narrow defeat could be blamed. It is generally conceded that the 1967 Johnson Sentinel decision which startled even DOD planners was based on his desire "to deprive Administration critics of a comparable issue." (Aviation Week and Space Technology, August 12, 1968, p. 77) Nixon cannot have been oblivious to this political consideration when he called for "restoration of nuclear superiority" in his successful 1968 campaign and when he recommended deployment of Safeguard.

Although political exploitation of the fear of insufficient defense against foreign attack is difficult to measure, the economic significance of Safeguard is not. Since 1958, missile sales have amounted to about \$5 billion annually with relatively small fluctuations. Using the most conservative Defense Department estimates; this spending rate would rise by 40 percent. This figure does not include the increase anticipated for Poseidon and Minuteman III deployment and MIRV. (Aviation Week and Space Technology, March 10, 1969, p. 41) If Safeguard were the first step in the thick system many ABM proponents advocate, the ultimate annual missile expenditure would triple. In discussing these cost estimates several other factors should not be overlooked: 1) During the past ten years the cost of the typical weapons system has exceeded the pre-production estimate by 200 to 300 percent. 2) If Safeguard is deployed advocates agree that it will continually require expensive and extensive remodeling. 3) The decision to begin production does not insure that the system will function acceptably or that it can be modified to function acceptably. The Defense Department estimates that more than \$20 billion have been spent on systems (Boston Globe, March 13, 1969) that were never completed or are obsolete. Had Nike-Zeus been deployed—at an additional cost of \$14 billion—Secretary McNamara has testified that "it would have had to be torn out and replaced almost before it became operative." He continued, "By the same token other technological developments in offensive weapons in the next seven years may make obsolete the system presently envisioned."

The pressure for military spending exerted by the aerospace industry arises in part from its economic inflexibility. Selling a custom product to a single customer (DOD) at an assured profit, the industry is committed to the military business. Like other industries, it has analyzed how its customer makes decisions and how to influence them. The industry would seriously consider conversion only "if government provided the risk capital, if the product contained enough technology or patentable elements to close out competition, and if the product could be marketed." Unsuccessful forays into the civilian economy have reinforced this policy. As a result, each increase in the industry work force tends to increase political pressure for continued defense spending.

In addition to economic considerations, the desire for power and influence play a role. The Army's only major space age mission is ballistic missile defense. The Army has therefore vigorously urged deployment of every version of the Nike-Zeus and the present Nike-X system. The Navy, which mans the Polaris submarines, and the Air Force, which handles the ICBMs, are less enthusiastic about Safeguard than the Army. Last year, the Air Force Secretary argued before Congress that an active army ABM defense would be less effective than superhardening of ICBM silos by the Air Force (Aviation Week and Space Technology, May 13, 1968, p. 32). Air Force spokesmen also press for the Air Force satellite missile system, and for new offensive aircraft systems, AMSA, and SCAD. The Navy extols its submarine launched ABM systems, SABMIS.

Potent political pressure can be mounted by the military establishment. In describing the McNamara-Kennedy decision to multiply our missiles by three (many years before a compensating Russian increase was undertaken) Arthur Schlesinger writes that "McNamara, already engaged in a battle with the Air Force over the obsolescent B-70, felt he could do no more without risking public conflict with the Joint Chiefs and the vociferous B-70 lobby in Congress. As a result the President went along with the policy of multiplying Polaris and Minuteman missiles." It is interesting to observe that some U.S. intelligence sources believe that the

Russian decision to deploy the Tallinn anti-aircraft system was apparently taken by civilian leadership "as the price for support on other political matters."

Pressure is not generated solely by the military. The challenge of new and difficult technical problems, and the opportunity for advancement and distinction also stimulate scientists and engineers.

In the face of these pressures, the nature of the decision making process cannot be totally ignored. In the case of Safeguard-Sentinel the task of re-evaluation was delegated to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who says he believes that his mandate is to represent the views of his department, and to Undersecretary David Packard, whose continuing ties with the aerospace industry were the subject of Congressional concern when his nomination was confirmed some months ago.

It is the constitutional responsibility of Congress, and in particular of the Armed Services Committee, to review the proposals and expenditures of the Defense Department. It is therefore disturbing to read (Boston Globe, March 9, 1969) of "appreciation parties"—Defense Department "fly-ins" of the type that marked the elevation of John Stennis to the chairmanship of this committee. With Defense Department funds, twenty-five to thirty plane loads of military brass (4 of the 5 Joint Chiefs), civilian leaders including Laird, and all three service bands were flown to Jackson, Mississippi, to celebrate his ascension. We read that former Air Force Secretary Stuart Symington, who once favored large bombers but now opposes the deployment of Safeguard has been deprived of a subcommittee chairmanship his seniority called for. (Boston Globe, March 22, 1969).

Evidence that the committee is performing its watchdog function is more difficult to find. Indeed it is reported that despite widespread concern about blackout and its effect on ABM, no member of the Armed Services Committee was aware of the problem when it was raised by Senator Cooper at a secret debate on Oct. 14, 1968. It also emerged from these hearings that the Armed Services Committee had only heard testimony from Pentagon witnesses before recommending deployment of the Sentinel system (N.Y. Times, Feb. 9, 1969).

9. ARGUMENTS FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Recently two noted Defense Department consultants from the Hudson Institute have testified in favor of BMD systems. Donald G. Brennan has not argued for Safeguard but for a thick system which he believes should precede any arms control.¹³ Herman Kahn's support of Safeguard deployment, and its eventual expansion to a thick system, does not stem from fear of a future Soviet nuclear superiority. He points out that¹⁴

"From possessing somewhat more than fifteen hundred or so targetable warheads available for immediate launching, the U.S. would have about five times as many alert nuclear weapons, or about seventy-five hundred. If this is so, and the MIRV is reasonably accurate and flexible, it might easily provide the U.S. with an annihilating 'first-strike capability' against even one or two thousand Soviet ground-based missiles. Thus even though the Soviets have, in recent years, doubled or trebled the number of deployed missiles, the introduction of MIRV greatly increases their vulnerability to U.S. attack."

Kahn advocates that we consider the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war. He argues that in such a war a thick, or even a thin BMD system would be useful. Moreover, the belief in the defensive capability of the system, whether warranted or not, would permit a country to take additional risks and make additional threats in a game of nuclear brinkmanship. We leave it to each citizen to consider whether he wishes to make it more attractive for his government to take additional risks in such a nuclear game.

Footnotes at end of article.

NO. 1 REFERENCES

H. A. Bethe and R. L. Garwin, Scientific American (March 1968). D. J. Fink, Science and Technology (October 1968). M. P. London, Space and Aeronautics (June 1968). C. Brownlow, et al., Aviation Week (October 1967).

The drawings and map are taken from the official Department of Defense press release of March 14, 1969.

FOOTNOTES

¹ All quotes in this section are from the address by Robert S. McNamara, in San Francisco, Sept. 18, 1967. Printed in full in the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1967.

² G. W. Rathjens "The Dynamics of the Arms Race," Scientific American, April 1969.

³ "The Effect of Nuclear Weapons," S. Glasstone, editor. Prepared by the Department of Defense, published by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, April 1962. (Government Printing Office, \$3.00)

⁴ Kintner, Wm. R.; Peace and the Strategy of Conflict, Praeger (New York, 1967).

⁵ John Foster Dulles in a speech before the Council of Foreign Relations, Jan. 12, 1954.

⁶ McNamara, Robert S.; The Essence of Security, Harper and Row (New York, 1968).

⁷ Statement of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee on the Fiscal Year 1964-1968 Defense Program and 1964 Defense Budget, Jan. 30, 1963, p. 29.

⁸ McNamara, Robert S.; 1968 Posture Statement, see Foreign Affairs, 47, 433.

⁹ Aviation Week and Space Technology, October 23, 1967.

¹⁰ Statement to the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 11, 1969.

¹¹ The full text of this speech appears in the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1967.

¹² New York Times, March 15, 1969.

¹³ Clark M. Clifford, "The 1970 Defense Budget and the Defense Programs for Fiscal Years 1970-1974", January 16, 1969. Quoted in the New York Times, March 21, 1969.

¹⁴ This argument is summarized in D. G. Brennan, "The Case for Missile Defense", Foreign Affairs, April 1969.

¹⁵ H. Kahn, "Some Current Nuclear War Issues", Hudson Institute Report HI-1175/2-P, prepared for the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, March 18, 1969.

SOVIETS DENY MINORITY RIGHTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, unrest in the Soviet Union continues as a result of discrimination among her minorities.

Along with the persecuted Ukrainians, Georgians, and the Byelorussians is the Crimean Tartars.

Many Americans who are aware of the violent suppression of various nationalities and minorities in Russia are appalled that our administration continues diplomatic recognition, cultural exchange, and economic encouragement without demanding basic human rights for all Soviet citizens.

What is the difference between minority suppression in Russia from apartheid, used to justify economic sanctions and promote violence against Rhodesia and South Africa?

I insert a Moscow report from the Chicago Tribune of April 26 and a clipping from the Washington, D.C., Post of April 28:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 26, 1969] TARTARS PUSH FIGHT AGAINST RUSSIAN BIAS—CIVIL RIGHTS EXIST ONLY AS SCRAP OF PAPER

(By Frank Starr)

Moscow, April 25.—Eighteen months ago the soviet government quietly published in several central Asian newspapers two decrees restoring full rights to one of this country's 100 national minorities.

Today the Crimean Tartars, legally relieved of a 25-year-old condemnation cast upon them by Stalin, are still underground conducting one of the sharpest civil rights struggles anywhere.

The struggle's main feature is careful and detailed recording of the recurring repression, arrests and convictions, mass deportations, and harassment under way since long before their formal rehabilitation.

RISKY RESISTANCE

A risky, tho tenacious resistance, it also involves reproduction and distribution of protest literature, lobbying of government officials, and peaceful demonstrations.

[The London Observer reported that a document reporting a sharpening struggle by the Tartars for rights has reached sources outside Russia.]

Its aim is to achieve in actuality what was provided in one of the decrees, the right to return to the Crimea from which they were forcefully deported during World War II and which is now inhabited by Russians and Ukrainians.

A Turkic people numbering less than half a million, they were rounded up en masse in the winter of 1943, accused of collaboration with the Nazis, and shipped to soviet central Asia.

LAST GROUP REHABILITATED

In September, 1967, they became the last of seven nationalities thus deported to receive official rehabilitation by decree which said that the collaboration of a certain section of the Tartar population had been "unjustifiably used to blame the entire" population. A second decree gave them the right to live anywhere in the Soviet Union including the Crimea.

But the first returnees reported nothing changed. Officials still refused them jobs, apartments, or the registration necessary for residence.

Two families, according to Tartar records, left Tashkent for the Crimea on Sept. 17, ten days after the decree, one with five children aged 6 to 15 and a 78-year-old grandmother, the other with five children aged 2 to 12.

REFUSED WORK

The two fathers were immediately refused work at a state farm despite a labor shortage. Also refused shelter they spent the night in an abandoned bakery.

In the morning, the families reported, a state prosecutor arrived with eight policemen who drove them out of the wrecked building with such force that an 8-year-old girl received a brain concussion.

They spent another 10 days in tents at the edge of the village until police again arrived and loaded them into a truck for deportation.

Convincing the driver to let them off in Simferopol, they went to the local party headquarters to protest and recorded the following answer:

"The decree of 5 September does not give you the right to return to the Crimea. There will never be room for you here. We'll drive you off this peninsula with the force of the police."

After six more days spent in the Simferopol train station the two families reported they were shipped out of the Crimea in a police truck.

A group of 21 Tartars seeking to protest to a party official that local authorities had refused to register them for residence were

arrested without being admitted to the officials' office, Tartars reported.

SENTENCED FOR HOOLIGANISM

Eleven were sentenced to 15 days for petty hooliganism and the other 10 put on an airplane for the central Asian city of Dushanbe nearly 1,800 miles away and in which none of them had ever lived.

Another group of families which were given housing reported being routed from their sleep at 4:45 a.m. the next day by police to be hustled onto trucks and shipped out.

It was reported recently that since publication of the two decrees on rehabilitation 12,000 Tartars have been driven out of the Crimea.

WELL-KNOWN INCIDENT

One of the best known incidents involves the right of assembly provided in the soviet constitution and an effort of the Tartars living in the central Asian town of Chirchik to celebrate Lenin's birthday a year ago this month.

Having been denied official approval for a rally, a crowd which gathered in a city park on Sunday morning April 21, 1968, for games and national songs, was dispersed by water cannon, and more than 300 were arrested in a battle which lasted from noon to sundown.

The majority of the arrested were sentenced to 15 days for petty hooliganism while 10 persons accused as organizers were tried and sentenced to terms of up to three years.

None of these incidents has ever been mentioned in the soviet press.

In keeping with the official position that Tartars have the right to return to their homeland, authorities last summer launched a plan under which 148 families were repatriated.

However, Tartar representatives say it became immediately clear that the plan was organized by the soviet security services to circumvent a mass return planned by the Tartars themselves. Only families that had had no connection with the Tartar movement were selected, they said.

By last May the permanent lobby of Tartars in Moscow had grown to more than 650. On May 16 units of police, soldiers, and plain clothes men filled the square on the north side of the city where most lived in friends' apartments and began rounding them up. By the next evening more than 300 were put on a train for Tashkent.

TARTARS GAIN SYMPATHY

But the Crimean Tartars have gained the sympathy and assistance of Moscow's intellectual dissidents, among them a vociferous spokesman, former army Maj. Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko.

Despite repeated convictions for spreading "anti-soviet fabrications" the Tartars have no quarrel with the soviet state, and vow firm loyalty to Lenin, its founder, who also founded in 1921 the "Tartar autonomous republic which Stalin abolished.

But their prolific protests, nevertheless drawing attention to the acute discontent of a soviet minority, are a source of continuing embarrassment to soviet leaders deeply engaged in convincing the world of their reasonableness.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1969] SOVIET UNION SIGNS AGREEMENTS TO ATTRACT MORE U.S. TOURISTS

(By William H. Jones)

Two agreements announced last week between the Soviet Union's state travel organization, Intourist, and American companies indicate Moscow's desire to attract more tourists and more foreign currency.

Hertz International a wholly-owned subsidiary of Radio Corp. of America, reached an accord with Intourist under which Hertz will act as the Russian agency's overseas representative for car rentals.

Diners Club International announced that effective June 1, it will be the first credit

card company to make it possible for its members to use their cards in the U.S.S.R.

Both agreements were unprecedented and some observers predicted that similar arrangements may be negotiated between Intourist and non-Russian organizations that would make Soviet tourism more attractive and convenient. A Hertz spokesman noted that its agreement with Intourist had no "exclusive" clause that would prevent the Soviet agency from making additional business deals.

The Hertz-Intourist agreement provides that although Hertz will have no offices in the Soviet Union, its familiar sign will be displayed on the Intourist counters in three cities—Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev—and some Black Sea resorts. At these counters, reservations for car rentals in other countries can be made through the worldwide Hertz communications system.

Hertz and Intourist officials both emphasized that the Russian agency would do the actual renting in the Soviet Union—providing the cars and staff to customers. In addition, Hertz spokesmen denied a statement attributed anonymously to Hertz in one report that eventually Intourist counter girls would wear yellow-and-black Hertz uniforms.

Some personnel will be exchanged, however, on a temporary basis for observation and training. Intourist and Hertz will also exchange technical data and cooperate on promotional materials.

Soviet-made cars will be available on a drive-yourself and chauffeur-driven basis. A Moskovich, for example, would rent (without chauffeur) for about \$5 a day plus 6 cents a kilometer (five-eighths of a mile), with rates decreasing a bit after ten days. The renter pays for gasoline.

Matthew Liffander, Hertz vice president and corporate counsel, said a potential American tourist to Russia could make reservations at Hertz branches, using Hertz forms. Payment would be made to Intourist, in rubles, after the American had arrived on Soviet soil and after dollars had been exchanged. On rental reservations made in Russia for overseas travel, Hertz would likewise accept the payment abroad and later settle with Intourist.

The Diners Club cards will be honored at all Intourist facilities in the Moscow area at first, and can be used for air, rail and boat tickets. Expansion to other cities is expected on a gradual basis, according to Gwynn Robinson, Diners Club president.

THE FIRST MAJOR EXHIBITION BY THE RENOWNED AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Mass., is the first national and the third oldest historical society in the United States.

The society was founded in 1812 in my home city of Worcester, Mass., by Isaiah Thomas, who fled Boston in 1775 to save his press and types from the British. It is dedicated to the collection, preservation, and dissemination of our country's early printed record, a true personal history of the United States.

The society's shelves contain more than three-quarters of all books and

pamphlets printed in the United States between 1640 and 1821, comprising 750,000 volumes, as well as an equal amount of caricatures, posters, menus, sheet music, greeting cards, maps, telegraph forms, broadsides, prints, and over 1 million newspapers.

On last April 16, the society opened an exhibition of their collection at the Grolier Club in New York City, which is the first time that the society has ever held a major public showing. I know that the society's 300 extremely rare and impressive holdings from its extensive collection of American history, literature, and culture will be of major interest to the viewing public.

The city of Worcester and our entire Commonwealth are, indeed, very proud of the scholarly efforts and objectives of the American Antiquarian Society, and we are pleased, indeed, that the society has now seen fit to display a significant portion of its extraordinarily fine collection to the general public.

The New York Times of April 14, last, contained a very pertinent and most interesting article about the operation and exhibition of the American Antiquarian Society which I would like to include at this point:

ANTIQUARIANS BREAK OUT OF WORCESTER

(By McCandlish Phillips)

The American Antiquarians Society, that astonishing archive of Worcester, Mass., has decided, for the first time in its 157 years, to venture as far west as New York for a semiannual meeting. It has never met outside of Massachusetts.

In coming to New York, the society is shattering more than one precedent. Though it possesses a collection of immense historical worth, it has never held a major public showing.

That omission will be repaired on Wednesday when the society will open an exhibition at the Grolier Club, 47 East 60th Street. The semiannual meeting will be held at the Morgan Library tomorrow.

In the afternoon Frederick R. Goff, chief of rare books for the Library of Congress, will speak on "Rubrication in American Books of the 18th Century," and James Franklin Beard, professor of English at Clark University, will speak on "The Metamorphosis of Leatherstocking." Mr. Beard's address will trace the development of the character of Natty Bumppo, the frontiersman hero, through five stories by James Fenimore Cooper.

Tomorrow evening's session will hear Henry Steele Commager, the historian, on "The Past as an Extension of the Present." Clifford K. Shipton, director emeritus of the society and a biographer of its founder is also on the program.

The society was established in 1812 at Worcester, which at the time seemed so far west as to put it safely out of reach of invading foreign troops.

Since its staggeringly broad mission is to collect the whole printed record of the country's early years—its policy is to obtain "everything printed in America before 1821"—and to preserve it for the ages, inaccessibility to enemy attack seemed a matter of importance.

YEAR OF EXPANSION CHOSEN

The society uses 1821 as its pivot year, because that is about the point at which printing expanded from a craft to an industry. It also collects, more selectively, in the period from 1821 to 1876.

Worcester is not now so invulnerable as it once was. For a society whose collection is

national in scope, coming to New York is not an act of wild improbity.

"We've tended to hide our light under a bushel," Marcus A. McCorison, director and librarian, acknowledged while browsing through some of the 300 items in the exhibition.

"We've never made any effort to show the breadth of what we are about to show the public. We're very well known among the scholarly community, and that, of course, is our real constituency. But we think it's important for the educated public to know something about us. That's why we're here."

The society, whose approach is roughly as broad as that prescribed for the Army recruit—"If it moves, salute it; if it doesn't move, paint it"—collects with an acquisitive zeal that might be caught in a phrase: "If it was printed in America before 1821, buy it."

Its collection of early Americana extends to telegraph forms, valentines and circus posters.

The society's library at Worcester is a vast depository stuffed with rare and early books (including fiction, children's books, schoolbooks, cook books), almanacs, newspapers, broadsides, caricatures, maps, sheet music, Federal documents, menus—750,000 volumes and an equal number of other printed items. It claims No. 1 rank as collector of American novels and of older newspapers. The library has five miles of shelves for the newspapers alone.

Choice items have been brought to New York under the exhibition title, "A Society's Chief Joys."

The exhibition includes John Cleves Symmes' work, "To All The World! I declare the earth is hollow, and habitable within" and a volume with a curious credit, "By Harrison Berry. The Property of S. W. Price, Covington, Georgia." Berry was a slave who wrote in defense of slavery, under who knows what editorial encouragement by his owner.

Refus Porter's Revolving Almanac of about 1820 is an ingenious device that is still useful today. "Porter was an interesting man, founder of the Scientific American, and the almanac is an engraved disc with some rather complicated instructions which, if you line up the right holes over the right places, gives you an accurate calendar for the month," Mr. McCorison said. "We've got it set for April, 1969."

Most of the society's 18,000 almanacs were of the annual, rather than the perennial, variety, and they include some of the Nathaniel Ames almanacs, said to be "the most popular almanacs of 18th-century America."

At almost every point, the first word off Mr. McCorison's tongue was "first."

He spoke of "the first book of genealogy printed in this country," "the first American book on aviation" (by balloon), "the first compilation of American revival and camp-meeting hymns," the "first American medical book," and "the first known book on American horsemanship," titled, "Ten Minutes Advice to Every Gentleman Going to Purchase a Horse Out of a Dealer, Jockey, or Groom's Stables."

"The first published cookbook by an American" is Amelia Simmons' "American Cookery, or the Art of Dressing Vians, Fish, Poultry and Vegetables," printed at Hartford in 1796. It contains a recipe for "A Nice Indian Pudding" that the cook had to "boil 12 hours."

James Hodder's book of "Arithmetick: or, that Necessary Art Made moft Easy" must have been rather casually put together because the 25th edition (1719) by Henry Mose boasted that it was augmented and revised with "above a Thousand Faults Amended."

"Pity the poor scholar," Mr. McCorison said. The society's library is a sedate Georgian building of red brick with white marble trim, set off by an ample margin of grass,

situated on a gentle slope on the outskirts of the Worcester business district.

The library welcomes serious scholars and graduate students. Its founder, Isalah Thomas, a newspaper editor and book publisher, fled Boston with his press and types in April, 1775, to save them from the British. The fiery young patriot's Massachusetts Spy paper was rabidly anti-Crown.

The exhibition here will be free to the public from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays and from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Saturdays from April 16 through May 31.

EDITOR DITT McCORMICK SCORES POVERTY PROGRAM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the greatest area of my congressional district is rural in nature. Within this rural area flourish a number of weekly newspapers whose editors are daily in touch with the pulse of the people within their circulation area. One of these is the Blooming Grove Times, Blooming Grove, Tex., whose editor and owner, Mr. Ditt McCormick, I count as one of my many friends in the area. He has recently written an editorial which I think provides food for thought of many of us in this body as to what direction this great Nation of ours is traveling. I commend the following editorial to my colleagues:

NOT VICE VERSA

(By Ditt McCormick)

In many parts of our nation, including our own state of Texas, those who live on Welfare are forming organizations which will develop into strong political groups, wielding power as a solid-vote entity. Their purpose is to get more of everything—money, food, almost luxuries—from the government at absolutely no cost to themselves. They are now brazen enough to say it's the duty of the government to support them. Some of these people have made, and more are making, this Welfare thing their way of life. Many of them have never worked for a living, and every day many more are refusing to work at jobs that go begging.

Welfare, or Relief, as it was originally called, was to help people between jobs, or those who were in need through no fault of their own. It was not intended as a way of living as many people try to make it today, in this time when there is work for all.

Many office-holders indicate by their actions that they believe the influence of the conservative citizen is fast disappearing, and that the political strength of the future lies with herds of voters in Welfare groups. I am beginning to wonder if that is true. It surely may be. This catering to the Welfare element, this effort to win the support of the gimme crowd, may be the sure way for the politician to stay in office. More and bigger federal hand-outs are terrible things to contemplate, but it seems to me that more and bigger office-holders are crawling on their bandwagon.

There are about 1000 Community Action Programs scattered over the country. They have developed into big business—not one person in 100 in this area realizes how big the thing is right here among us. Very few private enterprises in Navarro County, and I'm talking about retail and wholesale establishments, manufacturers, builders, and all the

others, are as big as the local Power House of Poverty. These poverty boys have vehicles running in every direction, big trucks and little trucks, cab overs and pickups, sedans and stationwagons, panel jobs and all the rest. The people hired to head-up the many so-called programs they have going are the owners of some very high sounding titles. I was told yesterday that the poverty boys are putting in a Drivers School in Frost.

Some folks talk about the high cost of operating our public schools. It might amaze these folks to know that the poverty boys in Navarro County spend as much money as do the school districts of Frost and Big Grove put together. The budget for the Navarro County Action Committee is about the same as the combined budgets of two schools that are in the business of educating and training literally hundreds of boys and girls; schools conducted by dozens of men and women with college degrees, some of them have two or three, dedicated, intelligent, valuable citizens who are required to continually up-grade their professional training; schools that are administered by trustees chosen by free elections and who are responsible directly and day by day to the taxpayers; schools which are held strictly accountable for every act of omission or commission, real or imagined.

The poverty boys have available as much money as is used for the educational needs of every school child from White's Chapel to Mertens and beyond, from Navarro Mills to Emhouse, from Silver City to the Ellis County line.

I fervently wish I could hear just one tenth as much criticism of the Poverty Power House as I do of the School House.

THE MEDIEVAL TORTURE OF RUDOLPH HESS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my constituent, Mr. Julius Epstein, a research fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, I submit herewith an article written by Mr. Epstein which was recently published through the facilities of the North American Newspaper Alliance and advocates the release of Rudolf Hess, a prisoner in Spandau Prison in Berlin. The article follows:

THE MEDIEVAL TORTURE OF RUDOLF HESS

(By Julius Epstein)

STANFORD, CALIF.—Spandau was one of the chief garrison towns of Prussia. Within its fortifications it contained the imperial war treasure. Today there is no more Prussia, and no imperial treasure rests within the confines of this Berlin suburb. Only a prisoner is kept here—Spandau's last prisoner—whose continued incarceration is an international scandal.

That prisoner is Rudolf Hess, one-time deputy leader of the Nazi Party, second in command to Adolf Hitler.

On May 10, 1941, flying alone in a Messerschmitt-110 fighter plane, Hess, the personal confidant of Der Fuehrer, secretly left Germany, landing his plane in Scotland. (The man chosen by Hitler to succeed Hess was Martin Bormann.)

Ever since his flight from Germany, Hess has spent most of his time in prisons—first in England, then in Nuremberg and, from 1946 to the present, in Spandau.

There are several legally valid reasons for his immediate release. One of the lesser known reasons is the fact that Hess was declared insane by two different psychiatrists.

British psychiatrist Dr. J. R. Rees examined Hess shortly after he fled Germany in 1941. At that time, he diagnosed schizophrenia and declared him insane. Seven years later, in Spandau, Hess was examined by an American psychiatrist, Dr. Maurice Walsh. Unaware of the Rees diagnosis, Dr. Walsh declared that Hess suffered from schizophrenia and was insane.

Both psychiatrists were strictly forbidden to reveal what they considered to be the truth in their official reports. Dr. Rees was forced to falsify his official report on Hess by Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill; Dr. Walsh received a similar order from the surgeon of the American garrison in Berlin, Col. Chamberlain.

Churchill did not want to expatriate Hess to Germany. For one thing, Hitler had given orders that Hess was to be executed the moment he set foot again on German soil. For another thing, Churchill wanted Hess to remain in England so that he could stand trial as a war criminal after the war ended. Col. Chamberlain did not want to contradict or embarrass the Soviets, who insisted that Hess was sane and should therefore serve out his life sentence in Spandau.

Whether the diagnoses of Drs. Rees and Walsh were correct, however, is really immaterial. What matters is the fact that the diagnoses represent the official opinion of the experts of Great Britain and the United States. Under the assumption of its veracity, the incarceration of Hess is a violation of Western law and civilized tradition.

It is also a violation of Soviet law.

Today, the Soviets frequently declare intellectuals insane who protest too much against Soviet oppression or the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and lock them up in institutions in order to avoid a public trial that could backfire.

Even if Hess should be completely sane, as most people believe—especially based on his public letters to his wife—he should now be released. He has been too long imprisoned.

At the Nuremberg trial, Hess had been acquitted on two counts out of the three for which he was indicted—War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity. On the third count he was found guilty—he waged an "aggressive war."

"Aggressive war," however, was no statutory crime at the time Hess had committed it. His indictment on this charge—and his subsequent life imprisonment because of it—is a classic example of an ex post facto law condemned by all civilized nations and outlawed by the Constitution of the United States—one of Hess' jailers.

The Western powers, represented at Nuremberg, never wanted Hess to serve more than twenty years. This corresponds to Western tradition. For this reason, the three powers—the United States, Britain and France have repeatedly demanded the release of Hess from Spandau.

They constantly pointed out to the Soviet Government that the continued imprisonment of the man who at one time was deputy fuhrer, was meaningless. But the Soviets would not relent. Because of their steadfast position, Hess, imprisoned under the Four-Power Administration, cannot be officially released. All four governments must give their consent—only the Soviet Union has withheld consent.

In 1967, an organization, "Freedom for Rudolf Hess," was founded in Germany. Its appeal for the release of Hess has been signed by more than 800 people, among them Nobel Prize winners, distinguished statesmen, well-known lawyers, humanitarians, writers and scholars.

The following is but a partial list of those who support "Freedom for Rudolf Hess":

Jean Anouilh, author (Paris); Seften Delmer, publicist (England); Andre Francois-Poncet, former French Ambassador to Germany (Paris); Prof. Dr. Otto Hahn, Nobel Prize winner (since deceased); Dr. Kurt Hiller, author (Germany); Prof. W. Heisenberg, Nobel Prize winner (Germany); Ernest Junger, author (Germany); Bishop D. Dr. Lilje (Germany); Dr. Martin Niemoeller, Lenin Peace Prize winner (Germany); Francis Noel-Baker, Member of Parliament (England); Lord Robertson of Oakridge, House of Lords (England); Lord Russell of Liverpool (England); Lord Sanford, House of Lords (England); Dr. Frank Thies, author (Germany); A. J. P. Taylor, historian (England); Friedrich Franz von Unruh, author (Germany); Dr. Giselher Wirsing, Editor (Germany); and Bishop of Woolwich (England).

Aside from the 800 people who signed the appeal, the following jurists, who had indicted and sentenced Hess in Nuremberg, have publically called for his release.

Sir Hartley Shawcross, British Chief Prosecutor at the First Nazi War Crimes trial at Nuremberg; the Rt. Hon. Lord Trevelin and Oaksey—former Lord Justice, Lawrence, President of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg who pronounced the life sentence against Hess on October 1, 1946.

On January 8, 1968, he wrote to Wolf Ruediger Hess, son of the imprisoned Hess:

"I have on several occasions expressed my opinion that Rudolph Hess has suffered enough and should now be released. I will once more express these feelings to the appropriate authorities and hope very much that it may be of some avail."

Finally, the late American judge at the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg and former Attorney General of the United States, Francis B. Biddle, also demanded Hess' release.

And it is a matter of public record that the late Sir Winston Churchill long ago felt that the continued imprisonment of Hess served no purpose.

In consideration of all these facts, I wrote, on October 28, 1968, to Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin, urging him to reconsider his government's steadfast opposition to the release of Rudolf Hess. I suggested that the release of Hess would be an appropriate gesture in 1968, the year designated by the United Nations as "Human Rights Year."

Kosygin's reply finally came in the closing days of February, 1960. It was written by Alexander Evstafiev, Press Counselor of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. His answer, on behalf of Kosygin, ignores all humanitarian considerations and misrepresents the case. The letter states:

"In its statement of December 24, 1964, the Soviet Government pointed out that the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany), being one of the successors of the former Hitler Reich, is legally responsible to punish every war criminal. And nobody can free the FRG from this responsibility. The Nazi criminals who plunged mankind into the catastrophe of World War II and spilled a sea of man's blood must not be given a chance to evade justice."

Mr. Evstafiev's answer is completely meaningless as far as Hess is concerned. He has never been the responsibility of the Bonn Republic. He was, and still is, a Four-Power liability of the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union.

They alone are responsible for Hess—they alone can free him.

It is time that the Western powers combine their efforts to prevent the Soviets from letting Hess die in Spandau. Prolonged confinement of the 74-year-old Hess is nothing less than medieval torture.

WISTFUL GENERAL WESTMORELAND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a column by John Chamberlain, a penetrating observer of the Washington scene, appeared in the Chicago's American, Saturday, April 26, editorial page, and I believe it is a very timely commentary on the military history of the Vietnam conflict. It follows:

WISTFUL GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Gen. William S. Westmoreland's report on his four years as United States commander in Viet Nam is, if the published parts are representative, a wistful apologia of a man who had, over the entire period, to repress everything taught him about generalship. We, as a nation, did not allow him to let his victories run; he couldn't follow for the kill across the borders into Cambodia, Laos, and the demilitarized zone; we forbade him to blockade the ports that kept food and armaments flowing to the enemy; we did permit him to bomb certain routes and concentration areas in North Viet Nam and Laos, but always with distinct limitations lest we scare a civilian; and then we wondered why, in the end, he kept asking for more men.

STILL DID WELL

Even tho he was denied the opportunity to use any of the classic arts of generalship. Westmoreland did well. He built up American power on an intensive, inside-the-circle basis to such an extent that he thought only a "suicidal" enemy would try to oust him. But the enemy, at last year's tet, crossed him up by staging an offensive, counting on the local populace to rise to throw out the United States and its supposed "puppet" government. The populace didn't rise [instead, it looked upon the Viet Cong breach of the tet vacation-time truce as a tasteless horror].

When you don't let your generals use their skills, and when you use the draft to raise the soldiers to fight a war under conditions where it would take 50 years for even a genius to win against an enemy who is ready to spend a century or more to reform his lines, you are up against an impossible proposition.

The kids in the colleges, reading the Westmoreland report, aren't going to be edified by the glories of serving one's country with one hand tied behind one's back.

COUNTRY WON'T ACCEPT IT

Nobody can really believe that you can win a war by letting your enemy up off the floor every time you have him down. President Nixon might as well realize it: the country isn't going to continue fighting a war that way.

When the Red Chinese started coming over the Yalu river from Manchuria into North Korea, Gen. Douglas MacArthur asked for permission to bomb the bridges. He was denied that permission.

In an off-the-record interview with Bob Considine, Ike Eisenhower said he wouldn't have asked Washington's permission to go after the Red Chinese in their own sanctuary: He would simply have done it as a military necessity.

President Nixon has beautifully eulogized Gen. Eisenhower. But did he think of the Considine interview when he read the wistful accounting of Gen. Westmoreland's four years in Viet Nam? Westmoreland always had to ask permission, and he never once had permission to outmaneuver his enemy.

HOSPITAL MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's hospitals are desperate for help. One third of them have already been judged "intolerably obsolete," while the other two-thirds are struggling to maintain a balance between ballooning costs of medical services and the pressing need for up-to-date education and research facilities.

Even today's prohibitive costs for rooms and services have not been able to stem the tide. And the fact that one-third of our hospitals are already woefully inadequate is only a warning of what will come if we do not take action.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation which is designed to save the Nation's hospitals from further deterioration: The Hospital Modernization and Improvement Act of 1969, a measure which would guarantee up to \$400 million in loans for the modernization of hospitals and other health facilities during each of the next 3 years, and which would provide Federal payment of up to 3 percent of the interest charges on these loans.

The estimated cost of the program to the Federal Government in its first year would be \$12 million with a maximum cost of \$36 million in the third.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal represents a concerted effort to save our Nation's hospitals at a minimum cost to the Federal Government. If we ignore the problem now, we will have it to face next year—only then it will cost more. Hospital modernization costs are rising at a rate of 7 percent per year. Thus, if we postpone acting on this legislation even 1 year, we will need another \$719 million to accomplish the same amount of work.

This problem is not new. President Johnson, in a final budget message to the Nation advocated a program of hospital modernization based on loan guarantees and interest subsidies.

At the same time, the 1968 Republican platform pledged support for programs to finance hospital modernization. The bill which I have introduced is in accord with both of these proposals, and is in accord with the needs of our hospitals at this time. I, therefore, urge the Congress to take immediate action.

FOUR-STAR SCAPEGOATS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, with all the hullabaloo that has been raised recently about the military-industrial complex, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House an editorial that appeared in the

Wall Street Journal on April 24, 1969, entitled "Four-Star Scapegoats."

I commend the Wall Street Journal for pointing out that "there is plenty of room to criticize the generals' incoherent answer to the problems of limited war, but many of the most decisive mistakes were made by civilians," with respect to the war in Vietnam.

I think it is also time that everyone endorse the Wall Street Journal's comment that "for the foreseeable future an effective military force will remain absolutely essential to national survival."

I also commend the last sentence of the editorial which says:

What gets lost . . . is the first truth about the actual menace of a military-industrial complex—the danger is not that the generals will grab but that the civilians will default.

This applies to civilians in all walks of life:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 1969]

FOUR-STAR SCAPEGOAT

The "military-industrial complex" has become an increasingly fashionable bogeyman, and indeed the notion is spreading that the generals have created nearly all our national ills by running up defense spending and involving us in Vietnam. These problems are certainly serious, but making the generals scapegoats for them obscures the actual lessons to be learned.

The international climate being what it is, the garrison state remains a real enough long-term danger, though it ought to be plain that at the moment military influence is not burgeoning but plummeting. This long-run danger surely will not be solved by turning military officers into a parish class, as much as that would please those intolerant whose personality clashes with the military one. The danger requires a far more sober diagnosis, and this would find that many of the present complaints should be directed not at the generals but at their civilian superiors.

We tend to agree, for example, with the complaints that the Pentagon budget is swollen. But it tells us nothing to observe that the officers press for more funds for their department; in this they are no different from any bureaucrat anywhere. Indeed, the same people who think the generals malicious for requesting large funds would find it quite remiss if, say, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare failed to make similar demands for his concerns.

Choosing among competing budget demands is the responsibility of civilians, in the Pentagon, at the White House and in Congress. Part of the Current problem seems to be that in the ballyhoo about "scientific" management of the Pentagon, the old-fashioned unscientific Budget Bureau review was relaxed. More generally, it needs to be recognized that the problem of fat in the budget is due less to the generals' greed than to a want of competence or will in civilian review.

Much the same thing is true in Vietnam. There is plenty of room to criticize the generals' incoherent answer to the problems of limited war, but many of the most decisive mistakes were made by civilians.

Take the failure to understand the escalation of our commitment implicit in supporting the coup against Ngo Dinh Diem. After we had implicated ourselves in overthrowing the established anti-Communist government, we could not with any grace walk away without a real effort to salvage the resulting chaos. Reasons of both honor and international credibility left us vastly more committed than before, and it was almost solely the work of civilians.

Or take the fateful decision to have both

guns and butter, made in 1965 when the U.S. part of the ground fighting started in earnest. It was a civilian—and in no small part political—decision to avoid mobilization, to build the armed forces gradually, to expand the bombing of North Vietnam at a measured rate, to commit the ground units piecemeal. All of this is in direct contradiction to the thrust of military wisdom. And if the generals did favor defeating the Communists, the little public record available also suggests they favored means more commensurate with that goal.

The point is not that the generals necessarily should have been given everything they wanted. The point is that the civilians decided to do the job on the cheap. They would have been wiser to listen when the generals told them what means their goal required, then to face the choice between allocating the necessary means or cutting the goal to fit more modest means. This discord between means and goals is in a phrase the source of our misery in Vietnam, and primary responsibility for it rests not on military shoulders but civilian ones.

Blaming the generals for these problems maligns a dedicated and upstanding group of public servants. More than that, it obscures the actual problem with the military-industrial complex itself. For the real long-term danger is that the garrison state will evolve through precisely the type of failing that led to fat in the budget and trouble in Vietnam.

For the foreseeable future an effective military force will remain absolutely essential to national survival. An effective force depends on generals who think and act like generals. If they worry about funds for defense and Communist advances in Asia, it is because that is what we pay them to worry about.

That the nation needs people to worry about such things certainly does release potentially dangerous forces that need to be controlled. The military's responsibility for controlling them is passive, to avoid political involvement, and our officer corps has a splendid tradition in that regard. The more difficult task of active control is essentially a civilian responsibility, and the modern world makes it a terrible responsibility. But make no mistake, civilian control depends squarely on the will and wisdom of civilian leaders.

This simple but crucial understanding gets lost in the emotional anti-militarism growing increasingly prevalent. What gets lost, that is, is the first truth about the actual menace of a military-industrial complex—the danger is not that the generals will grab but that the civilians will default.

YOUNG GENERATION IN WAR

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, without question, the war in Vietnam has touched a nerve in all Americans. Unfortunately, many of these nerve endings surface in protest marches and antiwar headlines, while the majority of long-suffering Americans go ahead and do the job that must be done.

I, too, am antiwar. Never could I condone the brutality, the horrors, and the cruelties of war. But I am not anti-American. I am not against old-fashioned patriotism. Yet I am saddened that the peaceniks, well intentioned or not, have

emerged with such vocal and headline strength. I wager the ideologists and the theorists and the iconoclasts will rue the day that they attempted to divert the United States from our leadership in the free world.

All intellectual reasoning and rationale combined does not equate with the young soldier in the jungle with the hammer cocked for the live round in the chamber of his M-1. The American youngster in the rice paddies and the jungles is the flesh and blood stuff this country is made of. Always it has been and always it will be the ready response of Americans to the call to arms that keeps this Nation strong. In the words of George Washington:

If we are to secure the peace it must be known at all times that we are ready for war.

Frankly, I am weary of reading about blood baths in filing cabinets, draft escape routes to Canada or Sweden, and bonfires of draft cards. I am tired of the SDS attempts to control our college campus by violence or force. Protest is nothing new; this country was founded on protest. But the headline space does not reflect the true spirit of America and probably never has. Abraham Lincoln once said:

We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read.

Fortunately, a reflective voice is now being heard. Wick Fowler, a veteran Texas newspaperman, is in Vietnam as a war correspondent. Wick is no stranger to wars, past and present. This is his second tour of duty in Vietnam.

Wars consume young men, both soldiers and writers, but Wick Fowler is not a young man. He is a lumbering, overweight, middle-aged journalist who writes from experience and maturity. He is not content to sit in a headquarters war office to receive handouts and bulletins. Wick gets out with the men in the ill-defined lines of battle. He sweats with them from heat and fear.

And he writes his stories of individuals, not massive maneuvers. Today, I want to share with you Wick's observations from Duc Pho. He gives a vivid account of how our fighting men react to the stress of battle and propaganda and yet rally from their hidden reservoirs of strength. This article, which appeared recently in the Austin-American, gives us the true perspective on our younger generation:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Apr. 22, 1969]

YOUNG GENERATION IN WAR

(By Wick Fowler)

DUK PHO, VIETNAM.—This embattled country has revealed so vividly the real character of the generation of young people which we oldsters feared might someday lead our nation downhill.

Maybe we oldsters should chastise ourselves for some derelictions in maintaining the good qualities of a great nation turned over to us years ago. This oldster has no qualms about the future of our country when it is turned over to the type of youngster fighting in Vietnam for the survival of our generation and those to follow.

The kid over here in the uniform of our country dislikes war even more than the one who escaped to Canada or Sweden to avoid

military service. But he demonstrates heroic manliness that brings tears to the eyes of commanders, who can trace their own fighting careers back to World War II. The youngster, usually 18 or 19 years of age, is, in many cases, a high school dropout. In a brief period over here he has grown up matured and is educated to the realistic facts of life and survival.

He can lead his squad with high quality in judgment, courage and ability when the squad leader is knocked out. He braves the worst type of heavy enemy fire to attempt the rescue of those fellow Americans or allies who have been wounded or trapped by the vicious, tricky Communist enemy.

His pay is small by comparison with jobs back home. But he pitches money into a pot gladly for the rebuilding of a school or for an orphanage of young Vietnamese children. He shares his rations with them when he enters a village where the enemy has murdered and terrorized the civilians.

In a field of fire, the wounded call out the word "medic." There is instant response. Take it from a combat platoon leader.

"We were lying flat behind some rocks under heavy fire," he recounted. "Not far away came the call of 'medic.' The kid lying next to me ran toward the voice. He was killed. Another moved over to the area. He made it."

Every commander pays high tribute to the men he commands.

So many voluntarily request extended tours of fighting in Vietnam. They go home for 30 days of leave and then return. Why? They believe in what they are doing, even though most had no idea where Vietnam is located or how our country became committed to its survival from the murderous surge of a Communist ideology dedicated to taking over control of the world.

From a hilltop at this brigade base close to the sea, this reporter can recall clearly the nearby beach where Operation Double Eagle sent thousands of Marines ashore in January 1966. Other military forces fought toward them from the interior to entrap the tricky enemy. Here, they are still fighting an enemy that is dug into hillside bunkers and caves, difficult to reach even when artillery shells and jetted bombs pound the hillside.

Just an hour ago a battalion commander was flying overhead in a helicopter. It banked for a sharp turn. Three ground shots hit the colonel. His battalion quickly heard the sad news and the men he had commanded sought approval of immediate assault of the suspected enemy positions without waiting for big bombs to go in first.

No wonder that a commander's eyes moisten when he talks about the kids fighting over here.

And there is also that sense of humor among the youngsters that relaxed the boys fighting in World War II when tension held the upper hand.

He seeks relaxation. Mail from home, funny cartoons, comics, music, sports, occasional movies and entertainment groups add so much to the passing of time.

One of the men handed this oldster a propaganda pamphlet distributed by North Vietnam. There were quotes from a speech opposing the Vietnam war which they claimed was made by a US senator in 1967. The other side showed a photograph of an antiwar demonstration in a big US city. The purported speech maker was defeated at the polls.

Seldom do you hear the Paris peace talks mentioned. The youngsters know they will be here until their duty tours are ended. They know that occupation will continue, as in Korea.

There is a question. What kind of Texas, or any of the other 49 states, are these young men going to find? Will the anti-war demonstrators have the guts to face them? They do not have the nerve to come over here with their signs and shouts. Will criminals and reckless drivers greet their return?

Also, there are a couple of conscientious objectors serving here as medics, whom this oldster met. They had been taught to believe that learning to use a weapon breeds premeditated murder. They are noncombatants who work under enemy fire and difficult circumstances to help save life and limb.

But they said their views have been changed by what they have experienced and witnessed. One is learning to fire the M-16 rifle. The other said he would do anything he could to keep a soldier from being wounded. He realizes what the Communists would do if they took over the world.

CONGRESSMAN ROSENTHAL DELIVERS ADDRESS BEFORE NATIONAL MASS MERCHANDISING RETAIL FOUNDATION CONVENTION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, more than ever in our expanding economy the consumer is increasingly faced with more numerous and complex choices as to what to buy. Lacking effective representation within the Federal Government to protect their interests, our Nation's consumers often find themselves in a quandary in determining whether they are getting good value for their money. Earlier this session it was my privilege to cosponsor a bill calling for the establishment of a Department of Consumer Affairs. The sponsor of this laudable and sorely needed piece of legislation was my close friend and colleague, Congressman BEN ROSENTHAL, who has long been a champion of the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent for inclusion in the RECORD of a speech delivered by Congressman ROSENTHAL on consumer issues before a businessmen's convention on April 21. Congressman ROSENTHAL was introduced that day by the former Governor of Massachusetts, Endicott Peabody, whose remarks I also include in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTION BY FORMER GOV. ENDICOTT PEABODY FOR CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL AT THE NATIONAL MASS MERCHANDISING RETAIL FOUNDATION CONVENTION IN THE TRAYMORE HOTEL, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., APRIL 21, 1969

Ladies and gentlemen, when Ollie Cohen and Murray Candib of King's Department Stores, Inc. asked for my assistance in securing Congressman Rosenthal's presence today, I was more than happy to help bring you the foremost leader in Congress who exemplifies your motto for this convention: "Progress through Dedication to Shopper and Community."

From the beginning of his career in Congress, when as a Congressman from Queens, he served on the Agriculture Committee of the House, his initiative and drive enabled him to use this as a forum, not for higher prices for the farmers, but for lower prices for the consumers. Soon after this, he became a member of the Committee on Government Operations and despite the fact that he was so junior in service, he has become early in his career the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Inquiries on Consumer Representation in the Federal Government. He is a member of the National Council on Food Marketing and recently completed a brilliant report on supermarkets.

As the principal sponsor of bills filed this year to create a Department of Consumer Affairs which has been cosponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, Congressman Rosenthal is not only respected by his colleagues but admired as well. He has established a brilliant record in the short space of six years and if his future matches his past, he is going to be a great deal more involved in the roles of our country and in its industries.

Congressman, while we know that you are familiar with your audience, let me introduce them to you. The Mass Merchandising Retail Foundation has a membership of 2,500 discount department store leaders in the country. In a short time, it has blazed a trail of success, unusual even for a country like the United States.

Promoting progress through dedication to shopper and community has resulted in markup reductions of almost fifty percent (50%) with consequent large gain to the consumer. As a result, the industry is credited with annual sales approaching 20 billion dollars in the United States alone where it employs three quarters of a million people serving the consumer. This group of retail leaders is never content to stand still or to rest on its laurels. Through their own initiative and through this foundation, many new techniques and methods are being evolved to meet the dynamics of the new market. They are rendering a service as you are in the Congress of the United States. I am happy to have brought such excellent together in one room.

I proudly present to you your speaker, Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE NATIONAL MASS MERCHANDISING CONVENTION, TRAYMORE HOTEL, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., APRIL 21, 1969

I greatly appreciate this chance to address the Fourth National Convention of the Mass Merchandising Retail Foundation. I am always grateful for the opportunity to talk to responsible businessmen about consumer issues.

Although the Willie Mae Rogers appointment as Special Consultant to the President for Consumer Affairs has provided official Washington with its fair share of laughter, the reasons behind that appointment provide some answers to these important questions: Why has the evolution towards consumer rights been so difficult and painful a process; and why has American business resisted, to the extent it has, legislative reforms so necessary to the establishment of consumer justice in the American marketplace?

Those advisors to President Nixon who recommended Miss Rogers' appointment—many of them ex-businessmen—fell prey to the mistaken belief that what is good for American business is good for the U.S.A. and that a wealthy industrial society is necessarily a great society. The business community frequently refuses to accept its responsibilities to its consumers because it has a misconceived responsibility to its stockholders. The business community cannot dispel the distrust of consumers and their spokesmen in and out of government, because it cannot divest itself of the false logic that, because business depends on consumer acceptance for its survival, all of its actions are necessarily in the consumer's best interest.

What renders this "logic" false, is the incredible effectiveness of motivational research and mass advertising technique in manipulating public tastes; the inability of consumers to make rational judgments in an overwhelmingly complex marketplace; and, most importantly, the fact that competitors are similarly preoccupied with a single-minded concern for profit.

Were General Motor's loyalties with the consumer or the stockholders when it continued to design cars for style and speed and not safety, in the face of 50,000 auto deaths annually on our highways?

Were the loyalties of some of our largest drug companies with their consumers or with their stockholders when they falsified safety data to physicians and to the Food and Drug Administration and insisted on earning unconscionable profits?

Is the loyalty of Greyhound with the consumers or stockholders when it resists the installation of seat-belts in its busses?

Where is the loyalty of our nation's railroads when they deliberately permit the deterioration of passenger service in order to justify to the Interstate Commerce Commission their abandonment of the passenger business?

Where is the loyalty of our biggest food processors when they continue to flaunt the spirit of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and when they subtly reduce the net contents of food packages without an accompanying reduction in price?

Where is the loyalty of our supermarket chains and oil companies when they continue to feature games and gimmicks instead of price and quality?

Is the loyalty, finally, of TV and appliance dealers with their customers or with their bank accounts when they sell old "model year" goods and advertise them as "new in cartons"?

And so, quite candidly, while the theme of this convention—"Progress Through Dedication to Shopper and Community" represents an admirable idea, it will most likely be translated by the majority here into a dedicated program of profit boosting with the conscience-salving belief that for every satisfied stockholder there are a thousand satisfied customers. Or, in the language of the program for this convention "Profits . . . Progress . . . Productivity". But the fact is that the consumer interest and the producer interest are not always synonymous. The fact is that the buying habits of the type of satisfied consumer that I envisage, or a Ralph Nader envisages, would not always result in the highest profits for all business ventures. Conversely, increased profits do not necessarily mean satisfied consumers.

The free enterprise system with its give and take in the market place is essentially healthy and constructive. But it sometimes appears to me that businessmen at all levels—from producers to retailers—are involved in a gigantic bait and switch scheme; today's typical consumer is tempted into the marketplace by promises of product perfection. But the system that produces, promotes, sells and services that product can more accurately be characterized by the reality of planned obsolescence and poor quality control; by the fanciful, frivolous or deceptive advertising it permits; by the withholding of unfavorable performance data from the public; by the absence of meaningful and understandable warranties and guarantees; by the promotion of irrelevant product endorsements; by the existence of underpaid and underinformed salesmen on the showroom floor; by the omnipresence of unreliable auto, TV, or appliance repairmen. And so, the great free enterprise promise all too often proves an illusion!

What can we all do, government and industry together, to make the free enterprise system not merely efficient and profitable, but also equitable and just to all those involved in its operation—consumers, workers, and businessmen?

We can begin by debunking some old myths and by reciting some new realities:

Myth Number One is that the American consumer is the best protected and most effectively represented consumer in the world. The reality is that almost every nation in Western Europe administers consum-

er laws and programs that are far more responsive to consumer needs than those available in the United States. The existence of Cabinet-level Departments of Consumer Affairs, government testing of consumer products, consumer-oriented codes for advertising content, and comprehensive labeling of products are commonplace in the European economic system. None exist here.

Myth Number Two is that the American consumer is the best educated, most sophisticated and informed consumer in the world. The reality is that while many Americans are knowledgeable about purchases in the marketplace, the great proliferation and diversity of products and their increasingly exotic nature, make it almost impossible to identify the "best buy" generally or the most useful purchase for an individual consumer.

Myth Number Three is that the free enterprise system is somehow the private domain of the businessman and, concomitantly, that government should stay out. The reality is that the consumer, along with the producer and the worker, is an indispensable part of the free enterprise triumvirate. All share its risks and all are entitled to its rewards. Government—federal, state, and local—has a responsibility to protect and represent consumers to the same extent and with the same vigor that the interests of commerce and labor are protected.

Would those who oppose a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs in this country also renounce the Department of Commerce and its representation of American business interests here and abroad? Would those who regard truth-in-lending and packaging, auto safety and other consumer laws, as improper legislative interference, also reject the right of Congress to enact laws erecting trade barriers for the protection of U.S. industries? Would those who would deny the right of the U.S. government to make public the results of its product testing—kindly stop advertising that your products are approved by the government or meet U.S. standards!

Myth Number Four is that U.S. products compete in a highly competitive marketplace and that consumers are thereby shielded from unworthy goods or services. The reality is that the most meaningful form of competition in our marketplace is not between Ford products and General Motor's products or between Kellogg's products and General Mill's products, but rather, between their advertising agencies. Product competition is not a toe-to-toe confrontation on the merits, performance feature for performance feature, but is too often a contest between competing slogans, endorsements, and advertising mumbo-jumbo. Ask yourself this: What would an oil company rather have—the best gasoline or the exclusive rights to the only service station game on the market?

Myth Number Five may very well be the most cruel and most crucial of all. It is that the only valid consumer protection interest exists in combating the unconscionable door-to-door salesman, the disreputable ghetto merchant, or the fly-by-night home repair operator. The reality, however, as recent disclosures have shown and as I have attempted to demonstrate, is that the plight of the consumer is a 24-hour-a-day, 365 days-a-year phenomenon and involves some of our largest industries and producers.

Not all businessmen, it must be said, ignore their responsibilities to the American consumer. The business community is not a monolith in its relations with the consuming public. Leadership in the struggle for consumer rights will most likely come from business organizations, such as yours, whose members deal directly with the consuming public.

There exists between retailers and consumers an unusual community of interests not found elsewhere in the marketplace. Let me name some of these common interests:

First, the consumers' fight for lower prices from retailers is your fight for lower prices from manufacturers and wholesalers;

Second, the consumers' wish for more understandable, meaningful guarantees and warranties is your wish to avoid liability and blame for defective products that you sell;

Third, the consumers' goal for more information to make better choices is your interest in preventing the return of merchandise by dissatisfied customers.

A plan to overcome this "information gap" is currently being tried on a large scale in Great Britain; and, at my prompting, on a much smaller experimental basis by Federated Department Stores in America. It is the "Tel-Tag" program whereby performance criteria are established for a given consumer product and then different brands of that product are performance tested against those common criteria. Federated Department Stores is now in the process of establishing such performance standards for electric percolators, steam/spray irons, and kitchen blenders.

Apart from the obvious advantages this labeling system will offer to confused shoppers, consider its public relations value to Federated. Or consider the public relations value to the small Chicago supermarket chain that lists the on-the-shelf prices for each of its food products by unit weight, that makes it unnecessary for the consumer to figure out on his feet that the 28 ounce jar of Skippy peanutbutter for 99c is slightly less expensive per ounce than the 18 ounce jar at 67c.

The discount department store industry, because of its direct dealing with consumers, because of its desire to sell good quality products at a reduced price, and because of its basic neutrality regarding which brand is sold, is in a unique position to make a major contribution to business-consumer relations.

Not only can the discount department store operator emulate the example of Federated Stores by making it easier for the customer to know what he is actually buying, you can insist that—

(1) Advertising claims are truthful. Don't sell two pairs of \$10 shoes for \$15, and call it a "One-Half Price Sale";

(2) You can insist that your service repairmen are scrupulously honest;

(3) You can plainly show on your billing statement the true interest rate on the unpaid balance;

(4) You can identify which of the goods you carry meet Federal flammability or other product labeling standards;

(5) You can put maximum pressure on suppliers to keep their costs and prices down;

(6) You can testify constructively before Congressional Committees which consider consumer legislative proposals;

(7) And, of course, you can refuse to ease up on your store-wide discount after customer loyalty has been established.

But let us not believe that even the most enlightened industry initiatives can ever completely replace constructive governmental consumer programs and activities in Washington. Because the consumer interest, like commerce itself, is frequently interstate in character, it is inevitable that the consumers' fortunes are likely to be affected, for good or for ill, by Federal programs, practices, and procedures. After several years experience on the House Government Operations Committee, and as Chairman of its Special Consumer Inquiry, I am convinced of two things:

First, there is no continuing, even-handed and effective representation of consumers' interest in the councils of government. Spokesmen who are committed exclusively to the consumer interest either don't exist at all or have little control over the decision-making processes of government.

Second, efforts to improve the quality of consumer-protection at the Federal level

must be directed, in the main, to structural and organizational deficiencies in the existing consumer-protection apparatus. If a sense of direction is to be brought to the many consumer programs of the government, if meaningful coordination is to be achieved so that program duplications and gaps can be eliminated, a greater degree of central control must be established.

A better coordinated and more efficient Federal consumer-protection apparatus is not only of importance to consumers—it is important to businessmen as well. Those of you who oppose the creation of a centralized statutory Federal agency for consumers might consider that you will likely have a more objective and balanced hearing before such an agency on matters of interest to you than in an aroused national press or before a Congress reacting hastily to a thalidomide tragedy or a similar industry abuse.

Let me give you some examples:

(1) While it may be impossible for consumers to locate the one correct Federal agency out of the nine that now handle Truth-in-Lending matters, it might be inconvenient or confusing for businessmen as well;

(2) While it may be necessary for consumers to canvass the Commerce Department, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Federal Trade Commission on a fair packaging and labeling problem, businessmen, too, might be caught up in any inconsistent policies;

(3) While the purposes of the Flammable Fabrics Act might be thwarted by the division of responsibility between the Commerce Department, the FTC, and the FDA, it will likely be the business reputation of some manufacturers who will suffer the most;

(4) The Public Health Services' failure to properly implement the Radiation Control Act in the face of recent reports of excessive x-radiation emission of TV sets on Long Island may ultimately pose a greater danger to the sales of color TV sets than to the health of the viewer;

(5) The difficulty experienced by industry in working with one or more of the five federal agencies concerned with consumer problems of the poor certainly works a hardship on the ghetto resident; but it almost certainly will also defeat the theme of this convention—"Dedication to . . . Community".

I am confident that present-day muckrakers—we now call them consumer spokesmen—will live to see their efforts accepted or even praised by the businessmen who today fear legislation which might interfere with their historical laissez faire prerogatives.

What, then, is the future of consumerism? Let me first say that its future is not tied to the fate of any one President or any one political party. The "consumer interest" is not a politician's dream or a man-made phenomenon any more than the "producer interest" is a publicist's dream or a Madison Avenue-made creation. The consumer interest is a real and vital economic force with growing political appeal.

The consumer may not be a king or a queen in the marketplace but he will be heard through other more articulate and more effective spokesmen in the future. For the Upton Sinclairs, the Lincoln Steffans, and other muckrakers of our parents' generation are being replaced by individuals and groups which will match in influence, sophistication and organization the best of American business.

What does all this mean for an organization like yours? I am asking you to join ranks with the consumer movement when you can and oppose them only when you must. If industry delays or thwarts the legitimate rights of consumers, the Federal Government may be forced to act sooner or more drastically. Don't force the consumer to choose between industry and the Federal Government. If you do, both the consumer and industry will lose.

Instead, join the consumer in furthering his legitimate goals. He may still go to Washington with his problems, but he will go less frequently and with an improved understanding of your special problems and your good will. The ultimate result will be a better economic system and a better society.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD D. McCARTHY

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for public information the following statement of my personal finances:

THE 1968 FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD D. McCARTHY

As of December 31, 1968, my assets consist mainly of two homes; one in Buffalo and one in Bethesda, Maryland. I estimate my equity in these at \$17,500.

My personal property consists of a 1965 Ford automobile, miscellaneous personal property including furniture and clothing with a total value of \$13,000. In addition I have cash and other family assets of \$9,900.

Aside from mortgage debts on both homes, I have no major outstanding indebtedness. All gifts valued over \$8.00 were returned. I have no other business except that of 39th District Representative. During 1968, I took no trips outside the United States at government expense.

My income in 1968 was as follows:

Salary	\$30,000.00
Rent from home in Buffalo.....	1,300.00
Articles written for publication..	500.00
Total income.....	31,800.00

Itemized listing of expenses incurred in the conduct of Congressional duties which were not paid by the federal government:

Travel:	
To, from, and within the 39th District	\$3,137.62
Factfinding trip to Europe—airfare and expenses.....	774.00
Total.....	3,911.89

Washington office expenses:	
Equipment	498.24
Recording	534.62
Tapes	67.42
Total.....	1,100.28

Subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals	
Dues	351.11
Entertainment	268.00
Miscellaneous (small contributions, flowers, etc.).....	849.68
Total	77.48
Total	1,546.27

Total expenses..... 6,558.44

No member of my family serves on my paid Congressional staff.

Members of Congress receive annual allowances for stationery, stamps, telephone, telegraph and for their Washington and home offices. They are also reimbursed for one trip to and from their home districts for each month that Congress is in session plus one round trip at the beginning of each session. However, for me, and I assume I am

like most members in this respect, the allowances are not sufficient to cover expenses actually incurred.

My 1968 taxes (Federal, State of New York, City of Buffalo, Erie County and Montgomery County, Md.) totaled \$5,568.12.

My net 1968 income, after expenses and taxes, on which my wife, five children and myself lived, was \$19,673.44.

DECLARATION FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST ON OCCASION OF ISRAEL'S 21ST BIRTHDAY

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a declaration for peace in the Middle East signed by 226 Members of Congress on the occasion of Israel's 21st birthday:

DECLARATION FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

On the occasion of Israel's 21st birthday, we offer our congratulations to the people of Israel on their progress; the absorption of more than 1,250,000 refugees and immigrants; the reclamation of the land; the development of their economy; the cultivation of arts and sciences; the revival of culture and civilization; the preservation and strengthening of democratic institutions; their constructive cooperation in the international community.

On this 21st anniversary we express our concern that the people of Israel are still denied their right to peace and that they must carry heavy defense burdens which divert human and material resources from productive pursuits.

We deeply regret that Israel's Arab neighbors, after three futile and costly wars, still refuse to negotiate a final peace settlement with Israel.

We believe that the issues which divide Israel and the Arab states can be resolved in the spirit and service of peace, if the leaders of the Arab states would agree to meet with Israelis in face-to-face negotiations. There is no effective substitute for the procedure. The parties to the conflict must be parties to the settlement. We oppose any attempt by outside powers to impose halfway measures not conducive to a permanent peace.

To ensure direct negotiations and to secure a contractual peace settlement, freely and sincerely signed by the parties themselves, the United States should oppose all pressures upon Israel to withdraw prematurely and unconditionally from any of the territories which Israel now administers.

Achieving peace, Israel and the Arab states will be in a position to settle the problems which confront them. Peace will outlaw belligerence, define final boundaries, end boycotts and blockades, curb terrorism, promote disarmament, facilitate refugee resettlement, ensure freedom of navigation through international waterways, and promote economic co-operation in the interest of all people.

The U.N. cease fire should be obeyed and respected by all nations. The Arab states have an obligation to curb terrorism and to end their attacks on Israel civilians and settlements.

We deplore one-sided U.N. resolutions which ignore Arab violations of the cease fire and which censure Israel's reply and counteraction. Resolutions which condemn those who want peace and which shield those who wage war are a travesty of the U.N. charter and a blow to peace.

The United States should make it clear to all governments in the Near East that we do

not condone a state of war, that we persist in the search for a negotiated and contractual peace, as a major goal of American policy.

GORDON ALLOTT of Colorado; BIRCH BAYH of Indiana; WALLACE F. BENNETT of Utah; ALAN BIBLE of Nevada; EDWARD W. BROOKE of Massachusetts; QUENTIN N. BURDICK of North Dakota; ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia; CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey; MARLOW W. COOK of Kentucky; NORRIS COTTON of New Hampshire; ALAN CRANSTON of California; BARRY L. GOLDWATER of Arizona; CHARLES E. GOODELL of New York; ALBERT GORE of Tennessee; EDWARD J. GURNEY of Florida; FRED R. HARRIS of Oklahoma; PHILIP A. HART of Michigan; VANCE HARTKE of Indiana; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND of Florida; HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington; JACOB K. JAVITS of New York; EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts; WARREN G. MAGNUSON of Washington; CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS of Maryland.

GALE W. MCGEE of Wyoming; GEORGE MCGOVERN of South Dakota; THOMAS J. MCINTYRE of New Hampshire; LEE METCALF of Montana; JACK MILLER of Iowa; WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota; JOSEPH M. MONTOYA of New Mexico; FRANK E. MOSS of Utah; GEORGE MURPHY of California; EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine; GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin; JOHN O. PASTORE of Rhode Island; CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island; CHARLES H. PERCY of Illinois; WILLIAM PROXMIRE of Wisconsin; ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut; WILLIAM B. SAXBE of Ohio; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER of Pennsylvania; HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania; THEODORE F. STEVENS of Alaska; JOSEPH D. TYDINGS of Maryland; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey; RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas; STEPHEN M. YOUNG of Ohio; signatories of Members of the U.S. Senate.

WATKINS M. ABBITT of Virginia; BROCK ADAMS of Washington; JOSEPH P. ADBABO of New York; CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma; BILL ALEXANDER of Arkansas; GLENN M. ANDERSON of California; FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois; THOMAS L. ASHLEY of Ohio; WILLIAM H. AYRES of Ohio; WILLIAM A. BARRETT of Pennsylvania; J. GLENN BEALL, JR., of Maryland; MARIO BIAGGI of New York; EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., of Pennsylvania; JONATHAN B. BINGHAM of New York; BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN of Georgia; RAY BLANTON of Tennessee; JOHN A. BLATNIK of Minnesota; EDWARD P. BOLAND of Massachusetts; JOHN BRADEMANS of Indiana; FRANK J. BRASCO of New York; W. E. (BILL) BROCK of Tennessee; WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD of Michigan; CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio; GARRY BROWN of Michigan; JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia; JOHN BUCHANAN of Alabama; JAMES A. BURKE of Massachusetts; PHILLIP BURTON of California; JAMES A. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

HUGH L. CAREY of New York; ELFORD CEDERBERG of Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER of New York; FRANK M. CLARK of Pennsylvania; DEL CLAWSON of California; JEFFERY COHELAN of California; HAROLD R. COLLIER of Illinois; BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of New York; SILVIO O. CONTE of Massachusetts; ROBERT J. CORBETT of Pennsylvania; JAMES C. CORMAN of California; R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN of Pennsylvania; WM. C. CRAMER of Florida; GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO of Connecticut; DOMINICK V. DANIELS of New Jersey; JAMES J. DELANEY of New York; JOHN H. DENT of Pennsylvania; SAMUEL L. DEVINE of Ohio;

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan; W. J. BRYAN DORN of South Carolina; THADDEUS J. DULSKI of New York; FLORENCE P. DWYER of New Jersey; DON EDWARDS of California; JOSHUA EILBERG of Pennsylvania; FRANK E. EVANS of Colorado.

GEORGE H. FALLON of Maryland; LEONARD FARSTEIN of New York; DANTE B. FASCELL of Florida; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN of Ohio; HAMILTON FISH, JR., of New York; O. C. FISHER of Texas; DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania; GERALD R. FORD of Michigan; DONALD M. FRASER of Minnesota; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL of Maryland; JAMES F. FULTON of Pennsylvania; RICHARD FULTON of Tennessee; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER of New Jersey; EDWARD A. GARMATZ of Maryland; JOSEPH M. GAYDOS of Pennsylvania; TOM S. GETTYS of South Carolina; ROBERT N. GIALMO of Connecticut; SAM GIBBONS of Florida; JACOB H. GILBERT of New York; HENRY B. GONZALEZ of Texas; KENNETH J. GRAY of Illinois; WILLIAM J. GREEN of Pennsylvania; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS of Michigan; GILBERT GUDE of Maryland.

SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York; JAMES J. HANLEY of New York; RICHARD T. HANNA of California; JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Washington; JAMES HARVEY of Michigan; WAYNE L. HAYS of Ohio; MARGARET M. HECKLER of Massachusetts; HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey; CHET HOLFIELD of California; FRANK J. HORTON of New York; JAMES J. HOWARD of New Jersey; WILLIAM L. HUNGATE of Missouri; EDWARD HUTCHINSON of Michigan; CHARLES S. JOELSON of New Jersey; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER of Wisconsin; EDWARD I. KOCH of New York; PETER N. KYROS of Maine; DELBERT L. LATTA of Ohio; CLARENCE D. LONG of Maryland; ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN of New York; DONALD E. LUKENS of Ohio.

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY of New York; ROBERT MCCLORY of Illinois; JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts; JOSEPH M. MCDADE of Pennsylvania; JOHN J. MCFALL of California; MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY of New York; TORBERT H. MACDONALD of Massachusetts; CLARK MACGREGOR of Minnesota; JAMES R. MANN of South Carolina; THOMAS J. MESKILL of Connecticut; ABNER J. MIKVA of Illinois; GEORGE P. MILLER of California; JOSEPH G. MINISH of New Jersey; PATSY T. MINK of Hawaii; WILLIAM E. MINSHALL of Ohio; CHESTER L. MIZE of Kansas; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania; F. BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts; ROGERS C. B. MORTON of Maryland; JOHN E. MOSS of California.

ROBERT N. C. NIX of Pennsylvania; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts; RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York; EDWARD J. PATTEN, of New Jersey; THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; JERRY L. PETTIS, of California; J. J. PICKLE, of Texas; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; BERTRAM L. POPELL, of New York; MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois; ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois; TOM RAILSBACK, of Illinois; THOMAS M. REES, of California; HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin; HOWARD W. ROBINSON, of New York; PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey; BYRON G. ROGERS, of Colorado; PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida; DANIEL J. RONAN, of Illinois; FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania; JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California; WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York; FERNAND ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island; WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut; JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York; GARNER E.

SHRIVER, of Kansas; B. F. SISK, of California; HENRY P. SMITH III, of New York; J. WILLIAM STANTON, of Ohio; SAM STEIGER, of Arizona; ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georgia; LOUIS STOKES, of Ohio; SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York; LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri.

ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio; FLETCHER THOMPSON of Georgia; JOHN TUNNEY of California; MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona; JAMES B. UTT, of California; LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, of California; CHARLES A. VANIK of Ohio; JOSEPH P. VIGORITO of Pennsylvania; JEROME R. WALDIE of California; G. ROBERT WATKINS of Pennsylvania; JOHN C. WATTS of Kentucky; CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR., of Ohio; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL of New Jersey; LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania; BOB WILSON of California; LESTER L. WOLFF of New York; CHALMERS P. WYLIE of Ohio; SIDNEY R. YATES of Illinois; GUS YATRON of Pennsylvania; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin; signatories of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DON'T LOOK NOW, BUT—

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, at times in the past one felt like a voice in the wilderness when criticizing the Federal Government for its vast spending programs, usurpation of State, local, and individual functions, informational blackouts, to name a few issues. Consequently, when members of the opposition party or ideological opposites echo some of the themes, it is a bit satisfying, to say the least. As author John D. Lofton points out in the Periodical Review of March 26, 1969, a trio of prominent Democrats have recently come forth "with some amazingly candid comments, admissions and predictions," taking to task the Democrat Party. Unfortunately, according to Mr. Lofton, the root cause was not discussed: "the bankruptcy of modern liberalism as manifested in our two-party system by the Democrats."

The above-mentioned article by John D. Lofton entitled "D - - - Those Democrats" appearing in the March 26 issue of Periodical Review follows:

D - - - THOSE DEMOCRATS: A BIASED LOOK AT LIBERAL ARTICLES

(By John D. Lofton, Jr.)

In a recent trilogy of articles appearing almost simultaneously in three different Liberal magazines, a trio of prominent Democrats have taken an unusually introspective look at their party and come forth with some amazingly candid comments, admissions and predictions.

Writing in "The Nation's" magazine, former speaker of the House of the California State Legislature Jesse (Big Daddy) Unruh, has examined the much-discussed old Democratic coalition and found it to be on its deathbed.

"The old, dependable power blocs are deteriorating, and they are not being replaced," laments Unruh.

"This process of deterioration has been going on for many years and has been ignored by Democrats. Now we have reached the point where Richard Daley cannot deliver Illinois,

and Texas as the only Southern state to vote Democratic. . . . "It is not so much that the New Deal coalition has left the Democratic Party as the goals of the Democratic Party have changed in response—if in sluggish response—to the changing needs of society, and the blocs in the old coalition do not share these new goals."

Unruh noted that long Democratic incumbencies in many statehouses and in Washington, and an erroneous belief that, come what may, certain large groups, of citizens will support Democrats anyway, have led to a breakdown of communication with the voters.

"But American voters in the mass have demonstrated a growing ability to split their tickets with great sophistication, especially when offices at stake have high visibility," he said, "party loyalty cannot sustain the Democrats over the long haul; we shall have to start explaining what we advocate and why."

Sic transit gloria mundi.

Unruh also criticized the Johnson-Humphrey Administration in an area in which he has special knowledge: Federal-State relations. Viewed from the state level, he said, the great failing of this Administration was its Big Government approach to the problems. "Apparently in its continuing fascination with the New Deal, the Administration insisted upon the central governments superior ability to formulate and administer programs."

This failure to allocate control for maximum effect will loom large in the next few years. Unruh predicts.

Lastly, Unruh spoke openly on a subject of hyper sensitivity to Democrats everywhere: The Credibility Gap.

"The Democratic Party must commit itself to complete honesty, both in the formulation and execution of policy and its day-to-day functioning as a political apparatus. . . . We must start by telling the truth during election periods."

Writing in this same vein in an article in "The Atlantic" magazine, former White House Press Secretary, Bill Moyers, very perceptively observed that while Hubert Humphrey's "bucket pail program" stirred the old depression-recession fears for one more hurrah, this type of appeal is one that probably cannot be warmed over again in 1972.

"Old coalition voters, however, will in themselves not be enough. The deep South is lost, possibly for good. Older factions are dribbling off. The farmers who nudged Truman to victory in 1948 went for Nixon in 1968. . . . Younger union members cannot be taken for granted," he said.

Moyers also took issue with the often advanced argument that the ultimate salvation of the Democratic Party lies with the emergence of a new upper middle class.

"Consider youth," he writes. "Voters under 25 still fall short of the more than 19 million registered Americans who are 65 and over. . . . For all the sound and fury from the Left in early 1968, Nixon and Wallace took more than half of the under-30 vote in November."

"The affluent and college educated have exceptional voter turnout records, but this is a mixed blessing for Democrats. It may prove just a Liberal conceit that their numbers inevitably swell as education levels rise; last year Nixon attracted 54 percent of the college educated."

Then in a remarkable moment of candor, Moyers conceded the truth of candidate Nixon's remarks last year that the Democrats invariably preach more than they can practice.

"Liberals tend to be apocalyptic at heart and in speech," he admitted, "and Richard Nixon was justified in accusing Democrats of promising far more than they could produce in social welfare."

In a touching little aside, Moyers related just how bad things have gotten by telling how even his own father last year seriously considered defecting to the enemy.

"And so my own father. . . felt constrained to explain in apologetic tones to me why he was distressingly tempted to vote Republican: 'I can't vote for Wallace because he's a hater, but my own party doesn't seem to understand how to keep the country from falling apart, or that that is what some of the people want to happen.'"

"We lost millions like him last year," says Moyers, "who felt, not without some cause, that Democratic compassion for the underdog. . . has in latter days evoked a bewildered tolerance of extremism."

Democrat number three to weigh in with his assessment, is Gus Tyler, vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU). Tyler, writing in the "New Leader" magazine, believes that despite the GOP's being in control of the White House and thus historically at a disadvantage as far as off-year election gains are concerned, there is still a good chance of Republican advances in 1970.

"In the marginal districts (where House members won by less than 10 in 1968) the GOP holds 28 seats, the Democrats 41, leaving the Democrats more exposed in hotly contested areas," says Tyler. "Only 14 percent of the GOP delegation is marginal, while about 20 percent of the Democratic delegation is in the risk zone."

Tyler feels that a Republican victory in 1970 would be more than a refutation of a political theory. It would prove that the American people did not fall the Democrats in 1968 out of pique or confusion, but rejected the party out of deep-seated anger.

"Such a public demonstration," Tyler concludes, "would strongly suggest that we are on the threshold of a Nixon era."

Now I happen to believe that the most interesting and salient thing about these articles is not that we see the spectacle of Democrats criticizing Democrats but rather that in all the thousands of words of criticism none of the three address themselves to the principal reason for the dissolution of the old Democratic coalition: the bankruptcy of modern Liberalism as manifested in our two party system by the Democrats.

News commentator David Brinkley put it best last year when he told a Johns Hopkins University audience that a swing to Conservatism was inevitable because Liberalism had abandoned its basic principle: "to keep the people free from a domineering, hard-nosed government always pushing us around."

The two mainstays of the Liberal movement, labor and the Federal government, Brinkley charged, have become arrogant, self-serving and forgetful of the people it had been designed to serve.

In short, he said, "Liberals are losers."

THE UNO PEACE ARMY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a renewed move for an international military force to be commanded by the UNO—subject, of course, to a Russian veto—has been reinstated by a panel of some 26 Americans including Charles W. Yost, present U.S. chief delegate to the UNO. All the more reason for adoption of my bill, House Resolution 169.

Under unanimous consent I submit a U.N. special report from the Sunday Star of April 27 and the text of House Resolution 169 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 27, 1969]

PANEL OF U.S. EXPERTS REVIVES IDEA OF U.N. PEACE ARMY

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Is the prospect of a U.N. army to keep the peace really dead?

A panel of 26 Americans headed by Yale President Kingman Brewster Jr., does not think so. Even the Soviet Union might be persuaded a U.N. army would be in its interest, the experts believe.

The panel's reasoning was contained in a 55-page report issued today by the United Nations Association of the United States. The report is the result of nearly a year's study.

Charles W. Yost, now chief U.S. delegate to the United Nations, was on the panel until he was assigned to his present post.

DAANGEROUS DECADE SEEN

The group starts from the premise that the decade of the 1970s will be so explosively dangerous, and that the prospect of direct U.S. involvement in many of the likely wars will be so distasteful ("no more Vietnam," in their words) that almost any reasonable price should be paid for an alternative U.N. authority to keep the peace.

The price the panel suggests Washington pay, in terms of concessions to the Soviet Union, is large. It consists of two essential parts:

1. Agreement to Russia's basic demand that U.N. peacekeeping efforts be placed under the Security Council veto.

The panel hedges a bit on this, proposing that the option of relying on the veto-free General Assembly be kept open (and saying Russia might be glad of this opportunity, too, if Red China were to get veto power).

The group similarly would hedge by keeping appropriations power veto-free and by leaving executive command in the hands of the secretary general.

But for all other essential purposes, and especially for the purpose of deciding when to dispatch a U.N. army, the five great powers would be given control.

This, the panel argues, would not necessarily be a disadvantage, since there could be times when the United States would wish to block U.N. action.

DUES ARREARS CITED

2. Willingness by the United States to help pay off Soviet and French dues arrears for past peace armies. The panel suggests that once Moscow and Paris were to cough up two-thirds of the money they owe, Washington put in the other third.

This would be a hard pill for many Americans to swallow, but the panel says in effect that it is the only way the United Nations will ever get an army.

Much of this program would have the effect of ratifying and rendering irreversible the Soviet victory of 1964-65 in the so-called "Article 19 crisis," the struggle in which Russia and France successfully fought off demands that they help pay for U.N. peace armies of which they disapproved.

They would never again be asked to do so. But the panel said it could envisage circumstances in which Russia, as well as the West, might be glad to have a U.N. army available.

There would be Communist troops available, among others in the proposed 20,000 to 25,000-man army (plus 15,000 reserves).

These troops would not come from any of the great powers; rather they would be drawn from medium-sized countries, of which more than 30 already have had experience in serving in U.N. forces.

Private soundings taken with Soviet diplomats are known to have elicited indications of affirmative interest in this kind of project.

Indeed, the Russians have said publicly that they are willing to revive negotiations,

dormant since 1947, for a U.N. army under Article 43 of the Charter—which would put it under the veto.

Among the group which made the study, in addition to Brewster and Yost, were Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former NATO and Korea commander; Cyrus R. Vance, Vietnam, and Cyprus peace negotiator, and Ernest A. Gross, former deputy U.S. delegate to the United Nations.

H. RES. 169

(Mr. RABICK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs)

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, under any circumstances which may arise in the future pertaining to situations in which the United States is not already involved, the commit-

ment of the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities on foreign territory for any purpose other than to repel an attack on the United States or to protect United States citizens or property properly will result from a decision made in accordance with constitutional processes, which in addition to appropriate executive action, require affirmative action by Congress specially intended to give rise to such commitment.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 29, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God, whose mercies are new every morning, impart to Thy servants who labor in this house the grace of the One who said, "Whoever would be greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

Be with all the people, but especially with Thou attend the youth of this land that as they pursue new ways they may be mindful of their heritage and seek to fulfill all worthy aims under Thy sovereignty, in the spirit of ordered freedom, ever respectful of their fellow man and of his property. Graciously attend the youth of our Nation in communities of learning, on missions of mercy, on errands of peaceful service abroad, and in the Armed Forces, guarding them in moments of temptation and strengthening them in hours of peril, that they may honor Thee in all their ways and ever advance Thy kingdom.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE RECEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-110)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received on April 28, 1969, under the authority of the Senate of April 25, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 120 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, I am transmitting herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Annual Report on the administration of the Act.

The report covers the period January 1 through December 31, 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 28, 1969.

REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE RECEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-109)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received on April 28, 1969, under the authority of the Senate of April 25, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, I am transmitting herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Annual Report on the administration of the Act.

The report covers the period January 1 through December 31, 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 28, 1969.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE RECEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-108)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received on April 28, 1969, under the authority of the Senate of April 25, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

Carved out of swampland at our country's birth, the Nation's Capital city now sets a new test of national purpose. This was a city that men dared to plan—and build by plan—laying out avenues and monuments and housing in accordance with a common rational scheme. Now we are challenged once again to shape our environment: to renew our city by rational foresight and planning, rather than leaving it to grow swamp-like without design.

At issue is whether the city will be enabled to take hold of its future: whether its institutions will be reformed so that its government can truly represent its citizens and act upon their needs.

Good government, in the case of a city, must be local government. The Federal Government has a special responsibility for the District of Columbia. But it also bears toward the District the same responsibility it bears toward all other cities: to help local government work better, and to attempt to supplement

local resources for programs that city officials judge most urgent.

My aim is to increase the responsibility and efficiency of the District of Columbia's new government, which has performed so ably during its first perilous years. Early in this Administration, we recommended proposals that would increase the effectiveness of local law enforcement and provide the resources needed by local officials to begin revitalizing the areas damaged during the civil disturbance. Those proposals, however, cover only a part of the program which will be essential for the District Government to respond to the wishes of its people.

I now present the second part of this program, worked out in close consultation with the District Government, and based upon the needs articulated by the Mayor and the City Council.

This program will provide:

- An orderly mechanism for achieving self-government in the District of Columbia.
- Representation in Congress.
- Added municipal authority for the City Council and the Mayor.
- Additional top management positions to bring new talents and leadership into the District Government.
- A secure and equitable source of Federal funds for the District's budget.

—An expanded rapid rail transit system, linking the diverse segments of our Capital's metropolitan region.

The Federal Government bears a major responsibility for the welfare of our Capital's citizens in general. It owns much of the District's land and employs many of its citizens. It depends on the services of local government. The condition of our Capital city is a sign of the condition of our nation—and is certainly taken as such by visitors, from all the states of the Union, and from around the globe.

However, this Federal responsibility does not require Federal rule. Besides the official Washington of monuments and offices, there is the Washington of 850,000 citizens with all the hopes and expectations of the people of any major city, striving and sacrificing for a better life—the eighth largest among the cities

SELF-GOVERNMENT

Full citizenship through local self-government must be given to the people of this city. The District Government cannot be truly responsible until it is made responsible to those who live under its rule. The District's citizens should not be expected to pay taxes for a govern-