VOID IF DETACHED

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the town of Montclair, a progressive suburban city in my district, is currently blessed by the great leadership of its mayor, Matthew Carter. Mayor Carter was recently honored by the Bankers National Life Insurance Co. of Montclair with its 1969 distinguished service award. The following editorial from the Montclair Times states very clearly and eloquently the ideals that have made Mayor Carter such a deserving recipient of this award:

[From the Montclair Times, Apr. 10, 1969]

VOID IF DETACHED

Mayor Matthew G. Carter, in accepting the 1969 Distinguished Service Award last week from Bankers National Life Insurance Company of Montclair, delivered a brief but forceful address on the topic, "Void If Detached."

The Mayor noted that he, as an individual, would be void if he were detached from his family and friends in the same manner that most things in life are void if they are detached from sockets or connections. He also related the word "appliances" to characterize many of these things to the fact that we as individuals are void if we do not apply ourselves.

An extension of Mayor Carter's theme might include the fact that Montclair as a community would become a void if it were to be detached from the individuals and groups working for the betterment of the town.

Bringing this thesis to the level of the individual, it might be said that the selfish individual who sees happenings only within the sphere of his own restricted area is likely to become void since he has detached himself from others in the community whose differing viewpoints may well contain the solution to problems encountered by this iconoclastic person seemingly so secure in the ivory tower of self-love with which he has walled himself.

Nor would a discussion of a talk by an ordained minister and a dedicated YMCA worker be complete without the statement that all of us live in nothing but a void if we remain detached from the all-knowing and all-loving presence of God.

The Times extends its congratulations to Mayor Carter on this latest in a long list of honors he has received in a past which antedates both his selection in 1968 as Mayor of Montclair and his choice as a member of the Board of Commissioners in 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 28, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.—Ecclesiastes 12: 13.

O God of love and Father of mercy, we rejoice and our hearts take courage when we realize that Thou art always with us, available for every need and ready to help when we turn to Thee.

Each day at this noontide moment of prayer we seek Thy sustaining presence because we are meeting problems beyond our wisdom to solve and managing responsibilities beyond our strength to carry.

Give to our President, our Speaker, every Member of this body, and those who work with them a clear sense of Thy guiding spirit as they endeavor to master the difficulties that beset our country.

In all our efforts to do what is right and good for all may we maintain a faith that never falters, a courage that never fails, and a good will that never fades.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and make us ever eager to participate in the adventure of leading man and nations into the glorious light and life of liberty.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 24, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution extending to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, the best wishes of Congress on the occasion of his 85th birthday.

PRESIDENT RENÉ BARRIENTOS ORTUÑO, OF BOLIVIA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am certain, were shocked by the untimely death this past weekend of President René Barrientos Ortuño, of Bolivia.

According to news reports reaching Washington, President Barrientos perished in the crash of a helicopter which he was piloting himself.

Forty-nine years of age, the President was a pilot and headed the Bolivian Air Force before becoming President in 1964.

Elected to a 4-year term as constitutional President by an impressive majority in 1966, President Barrientos had shown himself to be an able, energetic chief executive, committed to the implementation of fundamental economic and social reforms resulting from the 1952 revolution in his country.

During his tenure, President Barrientos overcame a number of serious and disparate crises, including the difficulties which arose from Communist guerrilla insurgency led by Ché Guevara, of Cuba.

In the death of President Barrientos his country has lost an able and dedicated leader and the world indeed has lost a man of vision.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, I join with other Members of Congress and executive branch officials in extending our condolences to the Government and people of Bolivia.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Florida in this note of sadness over the loss not only of a great Bolivian but a great American and a great man. I extend to his family, his country, and to both continents in the Western Hemisphere and to all liberty-loving people my own condolences over his tragic death.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL DE GAULLE

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be worthy of comment to note that Mr. Nixon's recent trip to Europe to genuflect at the altar of General de Gaulle was a wasted motion because the French people finally caught up with De Gaulle and he is not there any more.

NEW LEFT NOTES

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I placed two documents by the misnamed SDS—"Students for a Democratic Society"—in the April 24 RECORD. These two documents are blueprints for the creation of disorder on the college campuses of our Nation as well as within the business and labor areas.

Today I am placing in the body of the RECORD an SDS document entitled "New Left Notes," which was distributed at a basketball game at East High School in Denver, Colo., the last week of February 1969.

The main titles of this document are: "Minimum Definition of Revolutionary Organization"; Sex Relationship Inventory," which is an obvious attempt to pollute the minds of these young people; and "A Series of Formulas and Techniques for Explosive, Incendiary Devices."

I was pleased to note that our colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) plans to call some of these revolutionary leaders before her subcommittee. This organization and its aims must be exposed.

I have written the Attorney General requesting that he use whatever legal power he has available to curb this group's activities.

Also, I have suggested to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), the chairman of the House Internal Security

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Committee, that this group should be the subject of an investigation.

RATS AND REDTAPE

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were in the House 2 years ago and participated in the "rat debates" might be interested in the remarks that appeared recently—as a matter of fact, in the April 23 issue of the Washington Daily News on the editorial page. The editorial states as follows:

RATS AND REDTAPE

Nearly two years ago the House of Representatives struck from an appropriation bill a sum the Johnson Administration had requested to exterminate rats in city slums.

This led to a spectacular rhubarb and President Johnson, blaming Republicans, charged the Congressmen with preferring rats to children.

The House had turned down the appropriation because, some of the members said, it was mainly a local problem and besides they didn't think much would come of a Federal program other than spending money.

An example of what the House members feared is now on display right under their noses—in the District.

Under pressure from LBJ, the House has reversed itself and funds finally were authorized. A grant of $1 million went to the national capital. But up to now, no rat even has been threatened, although more than a third of the money was earmarked for a large staff, which has been hired.

The main trouble: Redtape and quibbling among agencies.

Don't send a boy to do a man's job? Rats! Don't send a government.

INVITATION TO THE SAN FELIPE DE NERI PARISH FIESTA OF SAN JOSE DE DURANES

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

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, a part of the heritage in my part of the country, in the State of New Mexico, is the fiesta. It is an honorable, and ancient, and colorful festival. The particular festival to which I call your attention is the San Felipe de Neri Parish Fiesta of San Jose de Duranes. The dates this year are June 6, 7, and 8.

I wish to invite any Member of the House, or any constituent of any Member of the House, to attend the San Felipe de Neri Parish Fiesta for an experience he will long remember.

CHICAGO IS AHEAD IN JOURNALISM

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic new development in newspaper publishing rolled off the press with this afternoon's debut of Chicago Today American, serving the Chicago metropolitan area.

The slogan, "Best of Today—and Tomorrow," adopted by Chicago Today dramatizes the spirit with which it will strive to serve the vast Chicagoland metropolitan area.

I am pleased to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Chicago area is served by four major daily newspapers who in total provide coverage clearly surpassing any other metropolitan region in the country. With the innovations commencing this afternoon with the first publication of Chicago Today, newspaper readers of Chicagoland will benefit from even greater news service.

The new Chicago Today will be a lively, diversified, eye-catching publication, very convenient to read, and produced by the most modern and advanced printing technology.

Under the direction of its publisher, Lloyd Wendt, and its editor, Luke Carroll, the Chicago Today will develop its stories with its readers in mind recognizing the obligation to the complex area it serves.

The newspapers across the country are watching this development with great interest as Chicago Today establishes a new concept in journalism and dramatizes the vitality and spirit of our freedom of the press.

The Sunday edition of Chicago Today will contain special innovations in its supplements and overall coverage in an effort to provide its readers with a totally comprehensive source of news and information.

Mr. Speaker, with this afternoon's debut of Chicago Today, Chicago can properly claim to be the "newspaper center of the United States."

STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which is cosponsored by the able gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) which will deal with a most important problem—education.

Today we are spending billions of dollars at the Federal level in the field of education. It is estimated that there are at least 200 Federal educational programs scattered throughout almost every department of the Government. In many of the larger agencies there is not even, at a central point, complete knowledge of all of the educational programs they administer. Because of the great proliferation of educational programs there is undoubtedly much duplication of effort. My resolution sets up a select committee of seven members, appointed by the Speaker to delve into this complex subject.

This committee would make a complete listing of all Federal educational programs and should give us answers to the following question. First, how well and effectively is this aid being administered? Second, is there overlapping in some areas? Third, is the best possible return being received for the dollars spent? Fourth, are there urgent needs in other educational areas? Fifth, is it in the national interest for the Federal Government to help meet them?

This is a pressing problem and I hope that prompt action will be taken to approve the resolution to set up this select committee. With the billions of dollars now being spent at the Federal level on educational programs, this is an urgent matter which needs the immediate attention of a thorough and exhaustive study by a select committee.

DE GAULLE'S EXIT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President de Gaulle's latest exit, undoubtedly his last, was in the grand De Gaulle tradition. He went down fighting for a cause. It is difficult for me to imagine him leaving office in any other circumstance.

Time and again in his long career he played big stakes, risking his personal position and prestige on issues he considered crucial.

He usually won. His big gambles kept the French empire from Vichy control during World War II, forced Allied Powers to recognize his Free French provisional government, saved postwar France from Communist domination, closed down the Algerian war, gave France political stability through a new Constitution, and established the independence of French military forces.

He frequently irritated the American people, but in every major crisis he always stood without hesitation with the United States. His service to the cause of liberty is matched by few men in all history.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to the list of bills unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, which will be considered subsequently, the bill (H.R. 8654) providing combat pay income tax treatment for the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY RICHARD SHEPPARD

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of a very distinguished American and longtime dean of the California delegation, former Congressman Harry Sheppard, who departed this world this morning, leaving his wife, Kay, and a multitude of friends to mourn his passing.

I would say at this time that Harry Sheppard served for 28 years in this House with a very distinguished record.

It is the desire of the California delegation that a day be set very shortly in which all Members of the House will have an opportunity to pay tribute to our former colleague and friend.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN).

EXPANSION OF CANINE CORPS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 254) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 254

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to maintain and expand the Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department as may be necessary to protect the peace, quiet, and safety in the Nation's Capital.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago. It has since spread to many other countries. In the United States, there are more than 40 police departments which use dogs in patrol work, and the number of cities using trained dogs is increasing rapidly.

The Canine Corps was first etsablished in the District of Columbia in December 1959. The first six handler and dog teams went into service on the streets of the city April 19, 1960. During 1960, the number of teams increased to 20. By 1966, the number of handlers and dog teams, trained and in training, reached a total of about 90 with an average of about 80 teams active and on the streets. Due to the promotion of some of the handlers and the resignation of others, the effective strength of the corps at this time is about 64 teams.

CANINE CORPS PERFORMANCE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Canine Corps man-dog teams are used for a variety of assignments as a law enforcement arm of the Metropolitan Police Department. The following statistical tables indicate the activities of the Canine Corps for an average of 64 teams during the 6-month period, August 1968 through January 1969. Canine Corps teams responded to 12,312 calls during this period.

CANINE CORPS HANDLER AND DOG 8-HOUR DUTY TOURS

There are 258 foot patrol tours, 3,524 cruiser patrol tours, 1,332 special assignment tours, and 449 dog training tours.

TYPE OF WORK PERFORMED BY DOGS

	Assignment	Arrests
Tracking	164	21
Open seeks	226	23
Building seeks	815	56
Chasing	24	13
Deterrent	50	23
Other	15	1

The following table shows the number of felony arrests by canine corps officers and the number of cases in which dogs were used in the course of effecting the arrest:

Offense	Arrests		
	Dogs used	Dogs not used	Total
Burglary—I	3	12	15
Burglary—II	142	119	261
Robbery	176	77	199
Assault	21	29	50
Larceny	10	42	52
Carrying deadly weapons, rape, assault on police officers, and other felony offenses	137	555	69

From these figures it is seen that a high percentage of the arrests made in connection with these crimes were accomplished with the aid of dogs.

In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the Canine Corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

DRUG TRAFFIC DETERRENT

An important new use for dogs in the control of crime is in the field of drug suppression. In recent months it has been discovered that dogs have a high degree of acuity in seeking marihuana. If the preliminary experience in this type of police work proves valid, the use of dogs on a major scale may provide a real benefit in breaking up the traffic in that drug. Trained dogs seem effective in finding the drug in buildings, airports, warehouses, and detecting its presence on persons.

In view of the reported significant increase in the use of drugs in the District of Columbia, particularly among juveniles, expansion of the Canine Corps trained for detection of this drug could have an important effect on preventing its use and progression to other drug addiction and development of incorrigible criminals. The Canine Corps has just received its first dog trained for such work and anticipates expanding the training program in this activity rapidly.

ACQUISITION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Our committee was informed that for several reasons any program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that no more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year.

Thus far, all the dogs in the Canine Corps have been donated, and thus have cost the Police Department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $580 per year. With the exception of a few sergeants who perform this duty, all the officers who serve as dog handlers are grade 2 technicians.

The cost of training and adding a man-dog team to the Canine Corps is presently estimated at about $2,500. This includes the handler's extra compensation, the food, and veterinary care for the dog, but does not include any cost for purchase of a dog.

Enactment of this proposed measure would provide legislative authorization for the maintenance and expansion of this corps, which has proved to be an invaluable asset to law enforcement in the District of Columbia, to the extent future needs may dictate.

This bill is the same in substance as H.R. 1935 of the 88th Congress, House Report 76; H.R. 1064 of the 89th Con-

gress, House Report 19; and H.R. 824 of the 90th Congress, House Report 198; all of which bills passed the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Adair	Fallon	Philbin
Anderson, Ill.	Fish	Powell
Andrews, Ala.	Ford, William D.	Pucinski
Annunzio	Gallagher	Quillen
Ashbrook	Gettys	Randall
Barrett	Gray	Rees
Bates	Green, Oreg.	Reifel
Bell, Calif.	Gubser	Rivers
Biaggi	Halpern	Ronan
Bingham	Hathaway	Rooney, Pa.
Boland	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Bolling	Hébert	Roudebush
Brasco	Helstoski	Rumsfeld
Brock	Henderson	St. Onge
Broomfield	Hosmer	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Scherle
Buchanan	Hull	Scheuer
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Jones, N.C.	Stanton
Celler	Kirwan	Steiger, Wis.
Chappell	Kuykendall	Stephens
Chisholm	Landrum	Stuckey
Clancy	Lipscomb	Symington
Clark	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Clay	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Collins	Mann	Van Deerlin
Conte	Matsunaga	Waggonner
Conyers	Mikva	Watkins
Corbett	Mollohan	Watson
Cramer	Monagan	Watts
Cunningham	Moorhead	Weicker
Daddario	Morton	Whalley
Delaney	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Nedzi	Wolff
Donohue	Nix	Wydler
Dulski	O'Neill, Mass.	Zion
Dwyer	Ottinger	
Edwards, La.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXPANSION OF CANINE CORPS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) is recognized.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would only supplement what has already been said about the unanimous action of the committee on the proposal which is now brought before the House, and I join with the gentleman from South Carolina in asking support for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUNTARY ADMISSION OF PATIENTS TO DISTRICT INSTITUTION (FOREST HAVEN) PROVIDING CARE, EDUCATION, AND TREATMENT OF MENTALLY RETARDED PERSONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY).

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4182) to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia institution providing care, education, and treatment of mentally retarded persons, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4182

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

SECTION 1. The first four sections of the Act entitled "an Act to provide for commitments to maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32–601) is amended—

(A) by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded",

(B) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department", and

(C) by striking out "The District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(2) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32–603) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the term 'mentally retarded persons' means of persons afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that they are incapable of managing themselves and their affairs, and who require supervision, control, and care for their own welfare, for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and who are not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require their commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(3) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32–604) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department",

(B) by striking out "inmates" and inserting "patients", and

(C) by striking out "board" each place it appears and inserting "Department".

(4) Section 4 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 32–605) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Board" and inserting "Department",

(B) by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded", and

(C) by striking out "board" and inserting "Department".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 11 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to commitment and maintenance of feeble-minded persons) is amended as follows:

(1) Such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" each place it appears in sections 21–1102 through 21–1108, 21–1110, 21–1111, 21–1113 through 21–1115, 21–1118, and 21–1123 and inserting in each such place in those sections "mentally retarded".

(2) Such chapter is amended by striking out "the District Training School" each place it appears in sections 21–1102, 21–1108 through 21–1113, 21–1116, and 21–1118 through 21–1122 and inserting in each such place in those sections "Forest Haven".

(3)(A) Such chapter is amended by inserting after section 21–1108 the following new section:

"§ 21–1108A. Voluntary admission to Forest Haven

"(a) The Director of Public Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Director') may admit to Forest Haven as a patient any adult who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application or any child under the age of twenty-one whose parents or legal guardian has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application. A person may be admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under this section only if—

"(1) such person is certified by the Director of Public Health to be mentally retarded and in need of care at Forest Haven;

"(2) such person either by himself, his parents, his spouse, or his legal guardian makes written application for admission to Forest Haven; and

"(3) any contract required by subsection (d) has been executed.

"(b) Any person admitted to Forest Haven purusant to subsection (a) of this section shall be released therefrom no later than five days after receipt by the Superintendent of Forest Haven of a written request for release, except that if within such five-day period a petition concerning such person, as provided by section 21–1103, is filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, such person shall be detained until a final judgment is entered by the court upon such petition.

"(c) The Director may discharge any patient of Forest Haven admitted under this section if the Director is satisfied that such discharge will not adversely affect the welfare or interests of the mentally retarded person, the community, or others.

"(d)(1) If the Director finds that any person with respect to whom an application for admission to Forest Haven has been made, as provided in this section, or any parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian of such person, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of maintenance and care of such person, the Director shall not admit such person unless a contract for payment, satisfactory to the Director, is executed by such person, parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian.

"(2) The Director is authorized to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with any applicant to become a patient in Forest Haven, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian, for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance and care. Upon default of payment provided by any contract entered into under this section, the Director is authorized to discharge the patient of Forest Haven with respect to whose cost of maintenance and care the contract was entered into, and, in addition, he may utilize the procedures provided for in sections 21–1110 and 21–1111 to secure payment.

"(e) The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(B) The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 21–1108 the following:

"21–1108A. Voluntary admission to Forest Haven."

(4) Section 21–1101 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 21–1101. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter—

" 'Forest Haven' means the institution es-

tablished pursuant to section 32–601, and designated 'Forest Haven' by section 32–602, or any successor to that institution; and

" 'mentally retared person' means any person afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that he is incapable of managing himself and his affairs, and who requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare, for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and who is not insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require his commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(5) The first sentence of section 21–1110 is amended by inserting immediately after "as a public patient" the following: "or when a person is admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under section 21–1108A".

(6) The first sentence of section 21–1111 is amended by striking out "and finds" and inserting "or when a person is admitted to Forest Haven as a patient under section 21–1108A, and the court finds".

(7) Section 21–1117 is amended by striking out "in feeble-mindedness" and inserting "initiated by a petition filed under section 21–1103".

(8) Section 21–1121 is amended by striking out "and inmate" and inserting "a patient".

(9) The section heading for section 21–1102 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(10) The section heading for section 21–1103 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-mindedness" and inserting "mental retardation".

(11) The section heading for section 21–1108 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "District Training School" and inserting "Forest Haven".

(12) The section heading for section 21–1114 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded".

(13) The section heading for section 21–1117 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "of feeble-minded cases" and inserting "of cases brought under section 21–1103".

(14) The section heading for section 21–1118 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "feeble-minded" and inserting "mentally retarded".

(15) The section heading for section 21–1121 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "inmates" and inserting "patients".

(16) The section heading for section 21–1122 and the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such chapter is amended by striking out "inmate' " and inserting "patients' ".

(17) The chapter heading for such chapter is amended by striking out "FEEBLE-MINDED" and inserting "MENTALLY RETARDED".

(b) The table of chapters for title 21e of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out in the item relating to chapter 11 "Feeble-Minded" and inserting "Mentally Retarded".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 3, line 9, after "Chapter 11", insert "of title 21".

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to accomplish the following:

First, to authorize voluntary admission of mental patients to the District Training School, whose name is changed to Forest Haven;

Second, to require that a prerequisite to such voluntary admissions be a financial arrangement with the District of Columbia on behalf of such patients when they or their relatives are financially able to pay for all or a part of the expenses involved; and

Third, delete certain archaic terminology in the present law and substitute modern terminology in its place.

BACKGROUND

The District Training School, Forest Haven, is an institution at Laurel, Md., operated by the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare for mentally retarded citizens of the District, where such persons are not only cared for but are given such education and training as their mental capacities will permit.

Under present law, admission to the District Training School, Forest Haven, can be accomplished only by court order, the issuance of which must be preceded by a petition to the court and a hearing. It is the opinion of this committee that families could well be spared the emotional ordeal involved in bringing their mentally retarded relatives before the court, and that the time of the court could more profitably be used for other purposes. In this connection, we are informed that these petitions are nearly always uncontested.

H.R. 4182 would provide, in addition to this present system of admission to the District Training School, Forest Haven, by court order, for voluntary admission in cases where the District of Columbia Director of Public Health determines that the applicant is eligible for admission, and where the patient expresses no objection to being admitted.

A patient voluntarily admitted would have the privilege of petitioning for his own release, and would be discharged 5 days after filing his petition with the superintendent of the training school, unless during this period the Director of Public Welfare petitions the district court to detain the patient for court hearing. In this event, the patient would be retained until the court has disposed of the case.

This bill provides further that where the term "District Training School" occurs in the present law, the more commonly used title "Forest Haven" shall be substituted. Similarly, the more humane term, "mentally retarded," would replace "feeble-minded," and the word "patient" would be inserted in lieu of "inmate." This committee feels that these changes in terminology would serve to a degree to spare the feelings of the families of these retarded persons and thus lighten the burden upon them.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted on July 26, 1963, the Administrator of the District of Columbia Children's Center, of which the District Training School—Forest Haven—is a part, testified that the Department uses a scale similar to the public assistance scale in determining what amount the families of patients admitted to the training school should be required to pay. Such payment is then stipulated in the court order authorizing the admission. However, changes in the families' financial circumstances frequently occur during the patient's period of residence at the Training School, which may make them able to pay substantially more than was originally stipulated, or unable to pay as much. In either case, present law requires the Department of Public Welfare to go back into court for any change in the original agreement. The Department is very much in favor of the provision in H.R. 4182 which would authorize them to handle the financial arrangements with the families directly, as this would facilitate frequent review and adjustment of charges when altered circumstances indicate a need for such changes.

The former District of Columbia Board of Commissioners originally requested this legislation, approval of which also has been expressed by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. No opposition to its enactment has been expressed.

The progenitor of this legislation is H.R. 7440 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on August 26, 1963—House Report No. 704. It was repeated in H.R. 1700 of the 89th Congress, approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 23—and also in H.R. 3371 of the 90th Congress, passed by the House on March 13, 1967—House Report No. 118.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXEMPT PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9526) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b)(5) of section 1 of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 46–301(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of clauses (P) and (R) and inserting at the end of such clauses a semicolon, and

(2) by adding after clause (S) the following new clause:

"(T) service performed after April 1, 1962, in the employ of a public international organization designated by the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288—288f-1)."

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

BACKGROUND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H.R. 9526 which was requested by the State Department, is to exempt certain public international organizations, which have headquarters or regional offices in the District of Columbia, from registering with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board and from the payment of the unemployment compensation tax required by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act—District of Columbia Code, title 46, section 301.

The international organizations exempted by the bill would only be those designated by Executive order of the President as entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided under the International Organizations Immunities Act—22 U.S.C. 228–288f-1.

Section 288 of that act defines an "international organization" as "a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided" in the United States Code.

Under the International Organizations Immunities Act, it is further provided that where the United States participates in a public international organization either by treaty or by act of Congress authorizing an appropriation therefor, the President may designate that organization as being entitled to certain privileges and immunities, such as exemption from payment of taxes, inviolability of its records and property, and exemption of its non-American employees from U.S. income taxes, and from process as to their official actions.

Similar legislation passed the House in the last Congress.

PRECEDENTS

The State Department advised your committee that with the exception of the United Nations organization, located in New York City, and the Pan American Union, located in Washington, most public international organizations have their headquarters abroad, in Geneva, Switzerland, or other locations. However, some of these organizations do have small regional offices in Washington, which act as clearinghouses for information channeled to their main offices abroad.

Many such public international organizations with regional offices in the District, such as the International Bank for Construction and Development, are already exempt by treaty from local taxes.

There are only a few small regional offices in the District not so exempt, as the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, employing a total of but 75 to 100 persons.

H.R. 9526 would give these remaining public international organizations the same exempt status as others now enjoy, and your committee recommends the bill be approved by the House.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

Not only is the bill requested and urged by the State Department but it was approved by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the Federal Bureau of the Budget. No opposition to the bill has been expressed to your committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman what the cost of this will be in terms of the tax exemption?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill was requested by the State Department and approved by the District of Columbia government. Most public international organizations are located probably in Europe and one or two in New York, and there are some very small regional offices in the District that are not so far exempt. They employ a total of about 75 to 100 persons.

This bill puts all these international organizations under the same rule, and they can be exempted by orders of the President if he finds they come under the provisions of the International Organizations Immunities Act, which is 22 U.S.C. 288.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is there no estimate as to the loss of revenue to the District of Columbia by virtue of this tax-exempt status?

Mr. DOWDY. No. I do not believe we have that. It would be a trifle and would amount to only a few hundred dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Would this apply to individuals as well as organizations?

Mr. DOWDY. No. This applies only to unemployment compensation tax. This is all.

Mr. GROSS. Is this reciprocal for citizens of the United States? Do organizations representing the United States get this treatment in foreign countries?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes; that is my understanding. It is done by treaty, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, this is not being done by treaty.

Mr. DOWDY. No. The organizations this applies to are the regional offices here in the District of Columbia; the United Nations Information Center, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. Those are small regional offices. That is all that are here.

Mr. GROSS. Who finances those offices?

Mr. DOWDY. The U.S. Government and other governments finance them. They are international organizations.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not sure that this is reciprocal insofar as the United States is concerned, say, for an office located in Switzerland or in France?

Mr. DOWDY. They do the same thing over there.

Mr. GROSS. They give these organizations a tax exempt status; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct. I believe it to be correct, or otherwise I would not say it. They have alien employees as well as domestic. Of course, the gentleman understands that when they bring in temporary employees here as aliens they are not subject to our taxes. And this bill applies only to the unemployment tax, which the employer pays.

Mr. GROSS. Is this going to exempt any U.S. citizens from the payment of taxes?

Mr. DOWDY. Does the gentleman mean income taxes? No. This applies only to the employers on the unemployment compensation tax. That is all it applies to. It does not involve the income tax at all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE IV SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, before the Nixon administration assumed office on January 20, the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—like many other Federal agencies—prepared transition papers on its responsibilities to help interpret them for officials in the new administration and to facilitate the transition from one administration to another. One of the OCR papers was on the status of the school desegregation program—where we are today, how the program has developed, and where we go from here.

The paper clearly indicates how the various court decisions relate to the title VI school desegregation program and shows how consistent the administration of the program has been to the rulings of the courts—particularly the Supreme Court.

The document also points out questions—now settled by the courts, the Congress, or both—which in the past have been at issue in efforts to eliminate the vestiges of the unconstitutional dual school system. It shows the progress which has been achieved under the title VI program and the further progress we can anticipate, assuming the requirements, the policies and the procedures in this carefully developed program remain substantially intact and are followed in the future.

When the OCR transition paper was prepared and presented to incoming officials at HEW, the most recent available figures on school desegregation were those released last year reflecting the situation at the start of school in the fall of 1967. Since the preparation of the paper, the fall 1968 figures on desegregation in 11 Southern States have been compiled and released. These figures show a 6-percent increase over the desegregation figures of a year earlier and

represent almost a twentyfold increase since 1963 when the desegregation figure in the South stood at about 1 percent. Most of the progress has come about through the program carried out under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and administered by the Office for Civil Rights at HEW.

As Members of Congress are well aware, the title VI program has been very much in the news recently—during last fall's campaign, the post-campaign period and particularly since January 20 of this year. It occurs to me that other Members of Congress might find the OCR transition paper as interesting as I have.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the transition paper to which I referred as well as the press release issued recently by the OCR reporting the school desegregation figures for the 11 Southern States:

ENFORCEMENT OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT: SCHOOL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY HEW

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

In 1964 the Congress of the United States passed the Civil Rights Act. Title VI of that Act specifically and unequivocally prohibits racial discrimination in federally assisted programs; and it also requires Executive agencies to end Federal support of any program in which discrimination is practiced.

Title VI is based on the concept that services and benefits provided by Federal tax dollars collected from all Americans should be available without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin to all Americans. The basic assumption is that the Federal Government should not financially support or underwrite racially discriminatory practices. While this proposition is eminently fair, it is nevertheless a fairly recent concept in the administration of Federal grant programs.

Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act instructed the Executive Branch to provide technical assistance to those local educational agencies requesting such aid during the process of desegregation. Title IV also empowered the Attorney General to initiate legal action, but under severe limitations: he must first receive a written complaint from a parent or group of parents to the effect that their children were "being deprived by a school board of the equal protection of the laws" and he must certify the suit would materially further the orderly achievement of desegregated public education.

Another section of the Civil Rights Act—Title IX—gave the Attorney General the authority to intervene in school desegregation and other cases, if he could certify that the cases were "of general public importance."

In assessing the impact of the 1964 Civil Rights Act during the past few years, there can be no question that its greatest significance has been the desegregation of elementary and secondary schools in the South.

This is a brief account of the Federal efforts to utilize the mandate of 1964 in ending segregation in public education through the orderly processes of government. Certain principles have been firmly established in administration, law, and educational practice during the past four years. Chief among these are the following:

The right of every citizen to "equal protection of the laws", as provided by the 14th Amendment to the Constitution is consistent with the requirements for desegregation under the Civil Rights Act (the Title VI compliance section). School officials are obligated to take affirmative action toward providing equal educational opportunity, both under the Constitution and under the Civil Rights Act compliance provisions.

When dealing with school systems formerly segregated by law, the courts have said that "desegregation" and "integration" mean the same thing. The courts have made clear their intention that every dual school system—every system set up by law or local policy to segregate the races—be eliminated and that students and faculty in schools of these systems be assigned in ways that bring about integration.

The Federal Government has a role to play in bringing about school integration through technical assistance, administrative enforcement, and litigation. Both the Congress and the courts clearly have recognized the responsibility of the Executive Branch in this effort.

Delays in the implementation of desegregation plans will no longer be tolerated. The Supreme Court has said: "The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work *now*." (Emphasis supplied by the Court.) The doctrine of "all deliberate speed" has been replaced by "forthwith." So-called "freedom of choice" desegregation plans have been invalidated by the Courts when they did not effectively and immediately satisfy the Constitutional requirement to eliminate segregation in the schools. The Supreme Court has ruled that "freedom of choice" is constitutionally unacceptable if it does not result in the elimination of the dual school system. HEW's desegregation policies are consistent with the position of the Courts.

School desegregation has occurred in substantial numbers of communities in all parts of America. The process has gone forward, not without controversy, but for those school districts that have moved ahead, much of the controversy is behind them. They do not want the racial issue reopened.

WHAT THE "BROWN" DECISION MEANT

In May 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that segregated education was unconstitutional. During the ten years following the *Brown* decision, the Federal Government provided nothing in the way of financial and technical assistance and service and did not require desegregation as a condition for receiving Federal funds.

The primary burden for taking legal action for desegregation rested with the Negro community and civil rights organizations. The Attorney General of the United States did not have the authority to institute school desegregation cases. However, between 1954 and 1964, the Attorney General did take part in a number of cases as *Amicus Curiae*, beginning with the *Brown* case itself. In addition, the Department of Justice directed the enforcement of Federal court orders, as in the desegregation of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, the University of Mississippi, and the University of Alabama.

In the 1963–64 school year, about 2500 of the country's 28,000 operating school districts officially maintained dual systems based on race. In the 11 Southern States, 99 percent of the Negro students remained in segregated classrooms taught by Negro teachers. The Department of Justice, without specific authority to initiate action, had built up only limited experience in school cases. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—with no statutory authority or financial leverage—played virtually no role at all. However, Congressional enactment in 1964, 1965, and 1966 of a variety of measures substantially increased the flow of Federal aid to schools: the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Vocational Education Act, and other education legislation. These enactments gave the principal leverage for securing compliance (the sanction of terminating funds in the absence of voluntary compliance) a new and important significance.

COMPLIANCE ACTIVITIES IN THE SOUTH

The key strategy for the enforcement of Title VI has been to develop a forward momentum of voluntary compliance by school districts throughout the South, and while there were innumerable policy decisions concerning the implementation of Title VI, the one basic and overriding decision has been that school districts violating the Constitution are not eligible to receive Federal funds. HEW adopted the policy that if a school district is violating the Constitution as defined and interpreted by the Federal Courts, the school district is not eligible for Federal funds. In fact, HEW announced that its administrative policy would be in tandem with the judicial standard established by the courts.

In 1964, the court decisions and the legislative history of Title VI indicated that public school systems with a dual structure should have a period of time to desegregate their schools. Accordingly, the Title VI program began by permitting the 2500 school systems still maintaining a dual structure to come into compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI gradually under the provisions of a desegregation plan.

Systems which had been ordered to desegregate by a Federal Court could satisfy the requirements of Title VI by submitting to HEW the desegregation plan ordered by the court. One-hundred-eighty systems did so. For these systems, the challenging party and the court, and not HEW, remained primarily responsible for assuring that the plan was in accord with current law and carried out by the school officials.

However, approximately 2300 school systems were not subject to a court order. In order for these systems to qualify for Federal assistance, they were required to submit to HEW an acceptable desegregation plan. It was HEW's hope that with the Congressional mandate reflected in Title VI, most of these systems would take meaningful steps to desegregate on their own initiative. Many did. During the first half of 1965, 300 systems advised HEW that their dual structures would be eliminated when school opened in the fall.

A great many more systems, however, indicated that they would do nothing to desegregate until they were told exactly what was required for compliance with Title VI. Accordingly, HEW issued guidelines in April 1965, based upon then current court decisions, describing acceptable desegregation plans.

Under the voluntary plans which HEW negotiated with 1950 school systems that year, there was a start—albeit a token start—toward the desegregation of students in nearly every district. These systems also agreed to teacher desegregation in principle, but since the plans did not require it, few actually changed teacher assignments.

Few of these communities were ready to accept the end of separate schools for Negroes. Most of the desegregation plans accepted by HEW were based upon "freedom of choice". They made parents responsible for choosing the school their children would attend. Many communities adopted "freedom of choice" because it would satisfy the Federal requirements and still give them a means of keeping Negro students in "their" schools. Some local officials did not honor the choices of Negro parents. Harassment and intimidation of Negroes was commonplace. In many cases the landowner, the employer, the creditor or the Negro principal, who was afraid his school would be closed, prevailed upon Negro parents to withdraw their choice of white schools. Even without these kinds of pressures, however, most Negroes chose Negro schools.

Based on this experience and consistent with the current court decisions, HEW re-

vised its policies in March 1966 after consultation with school officials and civil rights leaders. The new "guidelines" made it clear that the law was not satisfied merely by giving Negro students a "free choice" of the white or Negro school they wished to attend. The new policies stated that if "freedom of choice" did not establish a unitary school system, then local officials would have to come up with another plan that did. In addition to the position on "freedom of choice", the new policies emphasized desegregation of school faculties.

To carry out these policies, HEW Title VI compliance staff routinely visited systems which were making the least progress to examine the free choice procedures. Where free choice had been ineffective, HEW staff conferred with local officials about steps that could be taken to accelerate progress. Usually this meant the abandonment of free choice, a step most communities were reluctant to take.

Early in 1967 the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the HEW policies, and the Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal. Then in May 1968, the Supreme Court held (in the *Green* decision) that a freedom of choice school desegregation plan is acceptable only if it leads to prompt and effective elimination of the dual structure.

Congress has faced the issue of "freedom of choice" and has rejected proposals which would have required HEW to accept "freedom of choice" plans regardless of whether they are effective in eliminating unconstitutional dual school systems. As a result, HEW retains the authority to require alternative plans where free choice has proved to be ineffective. Thus, the Executive, Judiciary, and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government have a consistent position of opposition to ineffective "freedom of choice" plans. In March 1968, again after consultation with school officials, civil rights leaders, and members of Congress from all parts of the country, HEW issued new compliance policies requiring, by September 1969 the elimination of dual school systems. Nearly 300 school districts have responded since that time and have come forth with acceptable plans to achieve the announced objective. (If new school construction is involved or if the district has a Negro student majority, the deadline may be delayed to September 1970.) HEW is still negotiating with another 340 districts to work out acceptable voluntary plans to eliminate the dual structure—14 years after *Brown*.

The Federal Government focused primary attention following the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on compliance of districts organized on a dual, racially-segregated basis. The record indicates that change has taken place. In 1963, prior to the enactment of the Civil Rights Act, only 1.17 percent of Negro students in the 11 Deep Southern States were attending school with whites. The most recent computation shows that this percentage increased to 13.9 percent as of September 1967. (For districts operating under plans approved by HEW the figure was 19 percent as compared to 9.5 percent for districts desegregating under court orders.) The September, 1968 enrollment figures will be available early in 1969. Nearly all school districts with white and Negro teachers have begun the process of faculty desegregation.

NORTHERN COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

The March 1968 compliance policies were not restricted to problems with dual-system school districts. Four months before, in December 1967, the Congress passed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Among these was a provision that HEW's Title VI compliance program be uniformly applied and enforced throughout the fifty States." Statistical data on the the distribution of minority students and faculty—Spanish-surnamed, Oriental, and Indian, as well as Negro—have subsequently been collected from Northern and Western school districts. HEW's Office for Civil Rights, following a directive in the 1969 Appropriations Act for HEW, has balanced its staff so that as many personnel are involved in reviewing the data from Northern and Western schools as are involved with the Southern school compliance program. More than 30 preliminary reviews of school systems have taken place in 13 Northern and Western States. Full reviews are being carried on in five of those States.

In 1968 the Department of Justice began its Northern and Western litigation program, with suits initiated under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against South Holland and East St. Louis, Illinois, and Indianapolis, Indiana school districts. (The Court of Appeals for the 17th Circuit upheld the district court in South Holland, Illinois decision requiring the school district to desegregate both faculty and students.) It has also intervened against the Pasadena, California School District in a major suit under Title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. A number of investigations and negotiations are being carried on in other districts where there are indications that racial discrimination may exist in the schools.

In a very real sense, the Nation is at a turning point in its efforts to bring alive the principles of equality and justice in its schools. A great deal of energy has been expended in the South, with the record showing steady—albeit slow—progress. The sphere of activity has been expanded by the Congress and the Executive Branch to all educational agencies in the Nation: elementary, secondary, and higher education. (A HEW questionnaire has been circulated among the 2300 colleges and universities receiving Federal assistance; they are also subject to the compliance provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, including systematic reviews.)

A preliminary examination of the Northern and Western school data shows that many Negro, Puerto Rican, Indian and Mexican-American students and faculty in those districts may be denied equality of educational opportunity on the basis of their race, color, or national origin.

SUMMARY

The key issue facing the new Administration is whether it will, by administrative policy, support and implement the decision of the Supreme Court and other courts, or whether it will choose to adopt a lower standard of administrative policy than enunciated by the Supreme Court. The Courts and HEW have said that free choice is an acceptable desegregation plan provided it is effective in disestablishing the dual school system.

Protracted consideration of the basic policy issue or a reversal of present administration policy would have a disastrous effect on the progress of education throughout the country. If the policy were reversed, hundreds of school officials who have already moved into compliance would be forced to reconsider their decision in light of the new Federal policy. Many school districts would be forced by local pressures to resegregate their schools by reinstituting a freedom of choice plan.

The reopening of the issue by a shift in Federal policy would drag the race issue back into school board meetings, PTA meetings, the classroom and local elections. A shift in Federal policy would significantly undercut the leadership of moderate Southern white educators, businessmen and political leaders, and would even more significantly weaken the leadership of moderate Negroes in the South who have kept faith in the goal of integration and equal educational opportunity.

Clearly, the Title VI compliance program is not a panacea. It is but one of a variety of instruments of national public policy to assure equal opportunity in the field of education. Aid to education, Head Start, poverty programs, are also very important. But firm enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act has been—and should continue to be—an indispensable ingredient in the total Federal approach to equal educational opportunity.

RELEASE OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, JANUARY 16, 1969

Preliminary analysis of the 1968 data on school desegregation in the 11 States of the Deep South shows that 20.3 percent of the 2.5 million Negro students in these districts or a total of 518,607 Negro children are attending schools with white children (*Table 1*). This figure compares with 13.9 percent for the 1967–68 school year.

At the same time, the data reveals that in the school districts desegregating under the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 25.6 percent of the one million Negro children in those districts or 272,281 are attending schools with white children.

The overall desegregation figure, 20.3 percent, includes districts desegregating under court orders as well as those desegregating under voluntary plans.

The voluntary plans under which the districts are desegregating have been developed locally and have been submitted to the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The 25.6 percent figure, contained in survey data released today by the Office for Civil Rights, HEW's Title VI compliance agency, compares with the 19 percent or 202,794 Negro children reported in desegregated schools in the same districts during the 1967–68 school year. The districts are in the following States: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia

All of the school districts in the 11th Deep South State, Alabama, are desegregating under court order.

A comparison of the voluntary plan desegregation progress in the 10 Deep South States for 1966–67, 1967–68 and 1968–69 is shown in Table 2. A desegregated school is defined, as in 1967–68, as one attended by minority group children in which at least 50 percent of the students are white.

Preliminary analysis also showed that:

1. Desegregation progress in Deep South school districts desegregating under court orders was sharply below the voluntary plan desegregation figure. Data from court order districts showed that only 11.5 percent or 149,000 of the Negro students in those districts are attending school with white children. (Table 3.)

2. In those school districts in the 10 Deep South States which have submitted forms certifying they have eliminated their dual systems (Form 441), 51.6 percent of the Negro students are attending schools with white children.

These preliminary figures account for approximately 85 percent of the students attending schools in the 11 Deep South States. The reports were to be completed and returned to HEW by October 15, but school districts which account for approximately 15 percent of the students in these States failed to return reports or returned incomplete information.

The only large system which has not yet reported data is Dallas, Texas. Dallas is under court order.

A breakdown of the extent of school desegregation in the 11 Deep South States for all types of school districts (voluntary plan, 441, court order) is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 1.—ALL DISTRICTS REPORTING, FALL 1968—PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES

State	Districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation [1]	
		Total	Negro	Negro students	Percent Negro students
Alabama	89	588,639	204,365	15,039	7.4
Arkansas	173	376,470	94,791	22,048	23.3
Florida	57	1,160,644	282,226	67,961	24.1
Georgia	144	883,287	268,044	38,196	14.2
Louisiana	50	774,140	299,152	26,354	8.8
Mississippi	100	398,725	193,602	13,839	7.1
North Carolina	143	1,120,602	330,449	92,028	27.8
South Carolina	76	486,509	196,203	29,198	14.9
Tennessee	120	843,525	140,187	34,098	24.3
Texas	501	2,264,881	306,648	119,259	38.9
Virginia	115	992,047	236,023	60,587	25.7
Total	[2] 1,568	9,889,469	2,551,790	518,607	20.3

[1] The Office for Civil rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the estimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.

[2] Includes all districts with total enrollment over 3,000 students and a sampling of districts with less than 3,000 students enrolled.

TABLE 2.—VOLUNTARY PLAN DISTRICTS [1]—PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES (3-YEAR COMPARISON)

State and year	Districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation [2]	
		Total	Negro	Negro students	Percent Negro students
Arkansas:					
1966	99	173,130	73,545	6,058	8.2
1967	124	217,378	82,215	13,832	16.8
1968	97	179,755	66,199	14,417	21.8
Florida:					
1966	47	296,344	81,917	11,018	13.5
1967	41	264,273	76,226	14,213	18.6
1968	42	297,726	78,772	25,253	32.1
Georgia:					
1966	114	543,254	149,117	11,081	7.4
1967	125	588,291	141,208	19,128	13.5
1968	115	567,991	146,739	26,975	18.4
Louisiana:					
1966	3	20,482	4,301	454	10.6
1967	3	19,502	3,853	623	16.2
1968	3	20,351	4,168	1,001	24.0
Mississippi:					
1966	34	133,234	52,459	2,200	4.2
1967	35	150,058	59,898	3,768	6.3
1968	40	161,588	65,322	7,842	12.0
North Carolina:					
1966	102	774,225	244,770	31,339	12.8
1967	97	836,452	243,081	40,236	16.6
1968	90	724,322	232,896	63,554	27.3
South Carolina:					
1966	72	467,868	180,922	9,433	5.2
1967	57	349,835	143,975	10,257	7.1
1968	70	459,043	182,987	28,207	15.4
Tennessee:					
1966	40	171,802	23,466	7,699	32.8
1967	43	160,457	30,223	11,550	38.2
1968	31	155,674	25,240	12,051	47.7
Texas:					
1966	334	886,046	166,341	47,936	28.8
1967	323	989,704	177,798	63,008	35.4
1968	177	850,013	142,071	62,374	43.9
Virginia:					
1966	50	371,386	107,311	18,410	17.2
1967	54	431,799	117,148	26,190	22.4
1968	53	370,799	119,676	30,607	25.6
Total:					
1966	895	3,837,771	1,033,693	145,628	14.1
1967	902	4,007,749	1,075,625	202,794	18.9
1968	718	3,787,262	1,064,070	272,281	25.6

[1] The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 86 percent of the estimated 10,846,023 public school students in the 10 Southern States. (All districts in the State of Alabama are under Federal court order to desegregate.)

[2] For 1966, a desegregated school was defined as one which had 5 percent or more white enrollment. For 1967 and 1968 this definition was changed to schools which had 50 percent or more white enrollment.

TABLE 3.—COURT ORDER DISTRICTS [1]—PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES (2-YEAR COMPARISON)

State	Districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation [2]	
		Total	Negro	Negro students	Percent Negro students
Alabama:					
1967	113	690,393	232,021	12,528	5.4
1968	89	588,639	204,365	15,039	7.4
Arkansas:					
1967	10	60,055	20,426	3,516	17.2
1968	10	61,503	21,427	3,629	16.9
Florida:					
1967	16	766,494	164,894	30,507	18.5
1968	12	617,412	143,881	31,149	21.6
Georgia:					
1967	4	163,121	83,564	5,730	6.9
1968	10	251,367	114,169	8,966	7.9
Louisiana:					
1967	43	644,041	255,784	16,771	6.6
1968	47	753,789	294,984	25,353	8.6
Mississippi:					
1967	36	131,176	78,998	2,405	3.0
1968	55	226,811	126,002	5,408	4.3
North Carolina:					
1967	14	186,697	59,041	10,496	17.8
1968	18	214,199	71,807	17,286	24.1
South Carolina:					
1967	2	14,549	6,473	401	6.2
1968	6	27,466	13,216	991	7.5
Tennessee:					
1967	25	365,166	124,571	11,365	9.1
1968	19	302,125	100,992	9,495	9.4
Texas:					
1967	13	445,928	124,903	12,163	9.7
1968	11	429,178	116,836	18,975	16.2
Virginia:					
1967	22	240,653	96,681	12,961	13.4
1968	20	215,699	91,381	12,709	13.9
Total:					
1967	300	3,708,273	2,273,127	118,843	9.5
1968	297	3,688,188	1,299,060	149,000	11.5

[1] The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the estimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.

[2] For 1966, a desegregated school was defined as one which had 5 percent or more white enrollment. For 1967 and 1968 this definition was changed to schools which had 50 percent or more white enrollment.

TABLE 4.—TOTALS BY CATEGORY FALL 1968—PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES

Category	Districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation [1]	
		Total	Negro	Negro students	Percent Negro students
Voluntary plan	718	3,787,262	1,964,070	272,281	25.6
441's [2]	553	2,414,019	188,660	97,326	51.6
Court orders	297	3,688,188	1,299,060	149,000	11.5
Total	[3] 1,568	9,889,469	2,551,790	518,607	20.3

[1] For purposes of this fall 1968 tabulation, Negro students are considered to be enrolled in a desegregated school only when the white population of that school is at least 50 percent.

[2] Includes all districts with total enrollment over 3,000 students and a sampling of districts with less than 3,000 students enrolled.

[3] The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the stimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN AND SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor, a privilege and a pleasure for me to be a part of the small delegation welcoming committee for an economic mission from Japan to the southern part of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of great

significance that not only has Japan been growing economically, but it has been growing in terms of its responsibilities, particularly in view of the level of impact which their cooperative participation has had in the economic development of Southeast Asia. But in regard to that I think it is quite timely in the presence of the gentlemen here in Washington that we look with an increasingly concerned eye at some of the problems that lie just ahead for our two nations. Within a very short span of time, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to face the Okinawan situation and determine what the new relationships between ourselves and this small island are going to be and, of course, the Japanese have a particular political problem to solve in relation to our decision. But it is my opinion that these gentlemen who are here looking for greater trade opportunities and wider cooperation between our two nations will be able to take back to the Japanese people the concern that free trade can only exist in a world where there is some measure of security. In the statement of purpose for their mission the Japanese have stated they seek improved markets in an open world. But if there is to be an open world there must be present a sufficient deterrent to discourage those who seek to close it. As the Japanese Constitution is now written there are substantial limitations on their own ability to provide assurance that the doors of the present free world will remain open.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that in this sense our Japansese friends have a very definite and important stake in the present Okinawa—defense potential. Regardless of change of political status it would be in everyone's interest to retain this potential.

Mr. Speaker, just recently in Korea it has been brought to our attention by the Foreign Minister, Choi, that they are seriously concerned about Okinawa in terms of maintaining the security of Korea. They have pointed out that if it were not for the bases on Okinawa, during the Korean conflict, the present map of free Korea would certainly have been altered. The Koreans have a stake in our decisions on Okinawa; the whole of Southeast Asia has a stake in what we decide. I would hope that the great wisdom which has been displayed on so many occasions in the past relationships between the Japanese and ourselves will be generously exercised as we negotiate the new status and new relationship for Okinawa. I would hope that the Ryukus Islands could move into the full political family life of the Japanese nation while still retaining, through pragmatic and acceptable treaty arrangements, such base operations in Okinawa as will provide a security balance in east Asia. Only with this security can the open doors for an open world of free and expanding trade be maintained at this point in history for the Pacific.

Let us assure our friends in Japan and our present adversaries in North Vietnam, in North Korea and in mainland China that we seek in the full sense an open world—open to all including each of them and their people. We stand ready to cooperate for peaceful settlement of the problems that presently separate us. All of Asia needs, for our times, policies on both sides of open minds; of open hearts and of open doors; of culture and ideas. While we seek these we will not allow others to close doors which we have so painfully opened.

THE TREMENDOUS TASK FACED BY CONGRESS IN DEALING WITH MONETARY AND TAX POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I am greatly impressed with the tremendous task faced by the Congress in dealing with the monetary and tax policies of the United States.

One of the most urgent problems facing America today is the question of how to deal with the ever-increasing Federal budget. For some time I have felt that we should return to the States the responsibility for administering and financing certain programs that are gradually being taken over by the Federal Government. I believe, for example, that the financing and control of certain welfare programs and elementary and secondary education should be returned to the State and local governments. The recent expansion of welfare programs and the indicated expansion of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools underscore the need for a change in direction. I am sure we are all aware that with Federal funds go Federal control—more Federal funds, more Federal control.

With this in mind, I am introducing legislation designed for taxpayers to receive certain credits against their Federal income tax liabilities for State, corporate, and individual income taxes and general sales taxes paid. The objective of this bill is to provide sufficient funds to cover the cost of returning full responsibility for welfare and secondary and elementary education to State and local governments. This policy would be accomplished through tax credit to individuals and corporations, to be used by the States to provide the tax base secondary for State and local governments to assume the full authority and responsibility for costs and administration of these programs.

I realize that this is a far-reaching proposal and am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to get control of the ever-increasing Federal expenditures, we must return to the States some of the programs which are moving more and more toward Federal financing and control.

I would hope that at the conclusion of these hearings that we could begin hearings on some of these more far-reaching proposals designed to deal effectively with our tax problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will include, following these remarks, a table showing Federal payments to State and local governments and individuals and private institutions, by State, for elementary and secondary education and general welfare. These figures are for the year 1967, the last statistics available.

I will also include a table showing State revenues from selected tax sources from each State of the Union for the year 1967.

At intervals during the next few weeks I hope to offer for the RECORD an explanation of each section of this proposal.

The material referred to follows:

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND INDIVIDUALS AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS BY STATE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AND GENERAL WELFARE, 1967

State	Education	Welfare	Total
All States	$1,621,592,839	$4,148,232,582	$5,769,825,421
Alabama	40,271,762	93,937,500	134,209,262
Alaska	13,770,995	1,964,749	15,735,744
Arizona	16,088,037	23,809,000	39,897,037
Arkansas	26,297,190	63,676,324	89,973,514
California	163,512,624	818,615,973	982,128,597
Colorado	25,006,462	54,594,421	79,600,883
Connecticut	12,845,343	44,061,124	56,906,467
Delaware	3,208,872	6,102,320	9,311,192
District of Columbia	13,726,853	13,284,693	27,011,546
Florida	48,383,795	103,087,348	151,471,143
Georgia	53,944,817	100,449,816	154,394,633
Hawaii	13,618,182	11,282,359	24,900,541
Idaho	6,046,634	12,698,709	18,745,343
Illinois	58,358,296	171,624,225	229,982,521
Indiana	20,243,696	35,156,965	55,400,661
Iowa	18,422,771	37,559,769	55,982,540
Kansas	13,036,388	36,372,702	49,409,090
Kentucky	35,588,719	95,595,846	131,184,565
Louisiana	39,988,281	153,373,716	193,361,997
Maine	7,760,199	18,711,281	26,471,480
Maryland	40,030,471	52,689,847	92,720,318
Massachusetts	30,645,593	143,487,869	174,133,462
Michigan	45,278,796	129,888,432	175,167,228
Minnesota	25,780,764	75,834,935	101,615,699
Mississippi	26,237,990	51,684,978	77,922,968
Missouri	$34,425,790	$105,694,253	$140,120,043
Montana	8,241,976	8,080,792	16,322,768
Nebraska	12,145,188	23,533,294	35,678,482
Nevada	4,345,136	5,074,552	9,419,688
New Hampshire	3,922,189	6,438,014	10,360,203
New Jersey	34,632,039	68,006,263	102,638,302
New Mexico	22,702,763	25,819,121	48,521,884
New York	147,654,898	444,024,082	591,678,980
North Carolina	57,658,878	79,745,610	137,404,488
North Dakota	7,650,861	12,200,545	19,851,406
Ohio	56,084,754	127,223,159	183,307,913
Oklahoma	31,020,884	139,719,051	170,739,935
Oregon	13,685,828	26,913,085	40,598,913
Pennsylvania	64,107,211	170,563,483	234,670,694
Rhode Island	8,426,410	22,446,312	30,872,722
South Carolina	37,124,320	27,704,877	64,829,197
South Dakota	9,497,605	11,156,060	20,653,665
Tennessee	32,449,780	68,822,970	101,272,750
Texas	100,691,130	192,677,454	293,368,584
Utah	10,689,736	19,285,508	29,975,244
Vermont	2,484,834	8,725,000	11,209,834
Virginia	61,550,370	31,803,427	93,353,797
Washington	24,709,551	63,849,857	88,559,408
West Virginia	14,053,968	41,465,126	55,519,094
Wisconsin	20,019,380	63,996,684	84,016,064
Wyoming	3,523,830	3,719,102	7,242,932

STATE REVENUES FROM SELECTED TAX SOURCES BY SOURCE AND STATE, 1967

[In thousands of dollars]

State	General sales or gross receipts [1]	Individual income	Corporation net income	Total, 3 sources
All States	8,924,409	4,909,140	2,226,633	16,060,182
Alabama	170,801	58,082	29,949	258,832
Alaska		22,692	3,450	26,142
Arizona	103,666	26,481	14,407	144,554
Arkansas	88,644	31,200	25,131	144,975
California	1,061,491	499,470	452,574	2,013,535
Colorado	98,765	78,388	25,799	202,952
Connecticut	145,636		80,071	226,507
Delaware		54,296	12,723	67,019
Florida	300,873			300,873
Georgia	241,784	100,562	64,608	406,954
Hawaii	104,309	63,512	10,525	178,346
Idaho	32,772	31,227	9,579	73,578
Illinois	712,946			712,946
Indiana	300,881	158,475	14,462	473,818
Iowa	113,555	106,120	11,974	231,649
Kansas	118,160	71,028	23,931	213,119
Kentucky	135,322	80,620	40,450	256,392
Louisiana	146,006	35,758	34,446	216,210
Maine	54,669			54,669
Maryland	135,974	181,807	25,663	343,444
Massachusetts	128,106	268,052	[2] 56,070	452,228
Michigan	680,360			680,360
Minnesota		247,939	69,604	317,543
Mississippi	128,732	10,405	16,977	156,114
Missouri	256,142	95,484	15,127	266,753
Montana		24,224	7,608	31,832
Nebraska				
Nevada	23,381			23,381
New Hampshire		2,708		2,708
New Jersey	208,312	10,845	48,479	267,636
New Mexico	67,981	11,580	6,460	86,021
New York	604,326	1,527,087	443,738	2,575,152
North Carolina	201,642	188,563	98,494	488,690
North Dakota	23,238	11,086	3,335	37,659
Ohio	367,282			367,282
Oklahoma	75,760	32,433	21,510	129,703
Oregon		153,317	32,190	185,507
Pennsylvania	637,386		244,503	881,889
Rhode Island	48,955		17,485	66,440
South Carolina	113,812	62,694	43,395	219,901
South Dakota	30,905		583	31,488
Tennessee	188,445	8,973	43,278	240,696
Texas	259,435			259,435
Utah	55,846	39,946	11,000	106,792
Vermont		25,065	4,902	29,967
Virginia	87,079	192,662	49,340	329,081
Washington	425,822			425,822
West Virginia	127,302	27,119		154,421
Wisconsin	97,727	369,240	102,813	569,780
Wyoming	20,178			20,178

[1] Excludes motor fuel and other selective taxes.
[2] Excludes portion paid on corporate excesses.

Source: The Book of the States, 1968-69, Council of State Governments.

UNITED MINE WORKERS' WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on April 7 I asked for a congressional investigation of the financing, investments and benefits of the United Mine Workers' welfare and retirement fund.

Mr. Speaker, there are 145 employees at the headquarters of this fund in Washington, D.C., drawing salaries of over $10,000 a year, and 37 employees drawing salaries of over $20,000 a year. I point this out not to criticize the salaries but, rather to raise the question as to whether it would not be possible at these salaries to hire individuals of the competence to explain clearly to the beneficiaries of the fund and to the American people the nature of the income, investments, and benefits, and why the rules seem to be arbitrary and unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the chairman of the respective labor committees in both bodies, under their current authority, to conduct an investigation of this fund.

I am advised that under the terms of House Resolution 200, passed by the House of Representatives on February 19, 1969, investigative authority is conferred on the House Committee on Education and Labor to conduct such an investigation within the jurisdiction of the committee. Rule XI, clause 6(m) of the Rules of the House of Representatives specifically confers jurisdiction over "welfare of miners" to the House Committee on Education and Labor. House Resolution 273, passed by the House of Representatives on March 26, 1969, funds $769,600 to finance such investigations. I have been asked whether or not I intended to introduce a resolution for an investigation of the United Mine Workers' welfare and retirement fund, and I have not done so because the authority for such an investigation clearly exists without a specific resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a very well-researched and clearly documented letter written by Ralph Nader to the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, was released this morning. I might mention that I have already received a response from Chairman YARBOROUGH to my request for an investigation of the United Mine Workers' welfare and retirement fund. On April 24, Chairman YARBOROUGH informed me that he had referred my letter and request to the chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the letter from Ralph Nader contains some interesting information which deserves attention and investigation by the House of Representatives and by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included with my remarks my April 7 remarks on this issue, as well as the text of Mr. Nader's letter to Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

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

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE KEN HECHLER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rep. Ken Hechler, D-W. Va., today called for a "full-scale Congressional investigation of the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund."

The West Virginia lawmaker stated that "such an investigation is necessary to insure that all retired and disabled coal miners and their widows and families as well as miners now working, are receiving now and will in the future receive the fullest benefits to which they are entitled."

Congressman Hechler charged that many inequities had apparently developed in the way the Fund was being used. "I think it is necessary to clear up a lot of questions which have been raised about this gigantic Fund, and whether or not its rules are applied fairly to all coal miners. Many West Virginia miners have told me that their pensions or health and medical cards have been arbitrarily cut off without explanation. Many questions have been raised about the accounting of the Fund, how its money is invested, and whether the Trustees are adequately serving the hundreds of thousands of working and retired miners whose blood and sweat have helped create the Fund. It is difficult to obtain clear and complete information about the inner workings of this Fund, how its money is spent, how its rules are made, and how the rights of the coal miners themselves are being protected.

"I acknowledge that many benefits have reached the miners as a result of payments which have been made. The building and maintenance of the miners' hospitals, and the current contribution of $7½ million annually to these hospitals is a godsend to many miners. Some officials of great integrity, like Dr. Lorin E. Kerr, assistant to the Executive Medical Officer, lend prestige to the Fund's work. But still the gnawing questions remain: are the working and retired coal miners really getting a fair break out of the vast sums which are collected from the 40-cent-a-ton royalty on every ton of coal mined? Does an auditing and accounting of the Fund reveal precisely how these millions of dollars are actually being spent and invested? What must be done to insure that every active and retired coal miner and his family is really protected and fairly compensated?

"What kind of salaries or other payments are being made to the officers and Trustees of the Fund? How do the pensions of some of the top officials compare with the pensions given to the workers in the coal mines?

"These and other questions must be answered and cleared up by a Congressional investigation," Rep. Hechler said.

LETTER FROM RALPH NADER

APRIL 26, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Last year, the tragic epidemic of black lung disease became news to millions of Americans who were not aware of the physical toll exacted of coal miners working in this country's most hazardous occupations. Black lung (coal miner's pneumoconiosis) was not a new disease. It has existed for decades as the major deple-

tion of coal miners' health. It has become more serious with the onset of mine mechanization in the years following World War II. It has been documented in the medical literature of Europe during the Thirties. Yet to this day, there are no coal dust standards for U.S. coal mines and, with the exception of Pennsylvania, virtually no workmen's compensation for disability from this disease. With some outstanding and active exceptions, the medical profession in the coal miner regions have disgraced their calling by refusing to recognize this disease and by misrepresenting medical records of miners struggling for breath through lungs deteriorated by hardened clusters of coal dust. Well over 150,000 miners, active and retired, have advanced black lung disease; tens of thousands more are affected to one degree or another.

That it took until 1968–69 before this epidemic was recognized officially and considered for legislative policymaking reflects on institutions of government, industry and labor—and very adversely so. An observer of the scene is wont to ask again and again: where were these alleged guardians of the public interest in labor and governmental circles? The continuance of the black lung epidemic over the years without attention, prevention or remedy parallels another disease—that afflicting the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) leadership.

The UMWA is the control center of a authoritarian private government that affects the livelihood, safety and welfare of thousands of miners and their families. The other two institutions of this triology of oppression are the National Bank of Washington (736,944 out of 1,000,000 shares are owned by the UMWA) and the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund (legally independent of the UMWA but dominated by the UMWA). A number of labor laws are supposed to apply to the workings of the UMWA and the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund. It is within this context and pursuant to the purpose of a legislative committee to monitor the adequacy of legislation—administration and to inform the public (in particular the union members in the coal mine areas), that I request a comprehensive investigation by your Committee of the UMW and the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund.

The following information is submitted by way of preliminary material outlining some of the major problems and abuses:

1. Reports coming from coal miners and delegates at the 1964 and 1968 UMWA convention indicate irregularities and violations of both the UMWA Constitution and the labor laws. There are at least 400 "bogey locals," as they are known, composed either entirely of pensioned miners or without the required number of active miners (ten) under the Constitution of the union. Convention proceedings have involved shouting down of dissenters and wholesale violations of the union's own procedures. Some delegates from locals have never been heard of by members of the local. For example the UMWA local in Longacre, West Virginia was represented by one Paul K. Reed of Venice, Florida—a delegate unknown to miners in that local. Obviously the secret ballot requirement in such cases has not been complied with in local elections.

2. The UMWA cultivates close ties with the coal industry while perpetuating a remoteness and non-responsiveness with its rank and file that is staggering in its scope. UMWA leaders regularly meet in secret with coal corporation executives and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association to decide about various degrees of inaction on coal mine health and safety. In plain language, each year, union leaders and industry leaders made closed door deals which led year after year to no proposals to Congress for strengthening safety and health legislation and no proposals at the state level. The UMWA leaders knew all along about the widespread violations of regulations and the safety requirements in the union-industry contract (tabulated by the Bureau of Mines to a substantial degree) but did nothing to correct the situation. UMWA leaders knew of the practice of state and federal inspectors tipping off in advance the mine operator that they were coming, yet these leaders did nothing. Union conspiracy with industry has become a way of life. Last year a federal jury in Kentucky decided that the UMWA has been conspiring since 1956 with the large Consolidation Coal Co. to violate the Sherman Antitrust Act against other smaller coal operators.

The UMWA leadership is also deeply involved with the coal industry in the National Coal Policy Conference—a lobbying group which opposes air pollution controls, and which is funded in part by an annual UMWA grant of $75,000. W. A. Boyle, president of the UMWA, is at present the chairman of the Conference.

Keeping the rank and file member in the dark is the function of the UMW Journal which comes out twice a month in an attempt to show miners that the leadership cares for them. The Journal is filled with extended praises of the union leaders, particularly its President, W. A. Boyle. Next come the sorrowful descriptions of mine disasters due to conditions so long ignored by these leaders. Then a few recipes for the ladies. Recently, the Journal has been filled with news about proposed safety legislation and testimony by Mr. Boyle and others associated with the Union. Before a few individuals brought the health and safety issue to public attention last year, and before the Farmington disaster, the Journal was strangely silent on the atrocious hazards in the mines and the need to correct them. In fact, prior to 1968, one reads in vain year after year of the Journal's issues to find any mention of the black lung epidemic raging through the coal regions. It is a clear fact that the Union leaders never took any initiative on the black lung matter until the issue was joined by physicians and others outside the Union beginning early last year. The Journal brooks no dissent from its members. There is no space for letters to the editors and articles disagreeing with the Union leaders' policies are not permitted. In its style and content, the Journal is the classic prototype house organ of an autocratic system. This is a most serious matter inasmuch as the Journal is the chief communication link with and between the union membership.

3. Only one state in law and reasonably consistent practice affords disabled workers workmen's compensation for black lung disease. That state is Pennsylvania and even there such compensation is less than five years in operation. Other coal mining states have yet to recognize in practice that the disease is entitled to be compensated for, although West Virginia recently passed a moderate law to that effect because of coal miner pressure, not UMWA leadership. Even worse, where workmen's compensation is required for injuries, apart from black lung, there is inadequacy and violation rampant. For example, according to little known data gathered by the Kentucky Department of Labor, about 1400 Kentucky coal mines are in clear violation of the workmen's compensation laws of that state. Until April 1966, there was not even a ban on coal corporations or operators issuing policies on their workers' lives with themselves named as beneficiaries. Again pressure for action by the Kentucky Attorney General against such violations came from outside the UMWA. Incredibly enough, the UMWA leadership consistently ignored the absence of workmen's compensation or its inadequacy or the violation of these laws by coal operators.

Other abuses of mine workers pass the UMWA's desks without attention. One UMWA District in Kentucky knows of government mine inspectors who had decided to close mines on the grounds of violation of state and federal safety laws but then declined to do so in the face of physical threats directed toward them by coal operators. The UMWA kept this information to itself.

Even in its most elementary obligation, the UMWA fails its members. The recent contract negotiated with the industry could almost have been negotiated unilaterally by the industry—so little were the benefits gained. The 40 cent per ton of coal royalty which is deposited in the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has not been increased since 1952. Between 1952 and 1969, the coal industry has vastly increased its productivity and is attaining record profits; yet the 40 cent per ton remains the same. Union leaders could not even negotiate the placement of chemical toilets in the mines so that the men could relieve themselves in a decent and sanitary manner.

Against this lack of performance, it is not surprising that Mr. Boyle has been most reluctant in visiting his miners in the field. Only after the unusual passage of a resolution by 3000 West Virginian miners requesting that he come and address them in West Virginia, has Mr. Boyle relented and begun to make some carefully planned visits. Admittedly, Mr. Boyle is in a difficult position; how can he explain the presence of two pension funds—one for the rank and file and one for the union elite which produces such results as a $50,000 a year pension for Mr. Boyle when he retires and only a $1,350 a year pension for miners, many of them disabled, if they qualify under the pension fund's shifting criteria.

4. The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund is a labyrinth of arbitrariness toward retired miners and mismanagement largely attributed to the Union which controls it in fact. First, the Union has milked the fund in order to expand the operations and profits of the National Bank of Washington which is owned by the Union. The National Bank of Washington receives the bulk of the Fund's liquid resources with around $70 million in a non-interest bearing checking account. This alone deprives the Fund of over $3 million in interest annually. Other deposits, one ranging around $50,000,000 receives interest. The UMWA is clearly in a conflict of interest position here and exploits that conflict to a substantial degree. It manipulates the funds resources, deposited at the National Bank at Washington to a grossly disproportionate degree, at the same time that the Fund has been stripping thousands of sick, disabled and aged miners of their meagre pension rights. Eligibility rules were changed unilateraly by the Fund's three trustees in 1953 which prevented older miners from counting work years toward the 20 year total needed for a pension if these work years occurred 30 or more years before pension age. Other cessation of aid programs to widows and children were terminated at the "trustees' discretion" in the Fifties. Miners applying for their pension come up against a host of technical obstacles designed to discourage any likelihood of success. One favorite "eligibility requirement" of the Fund is that the applicant cannot obtain a pension if he was working at a nonunion mine at the time he retires. Thus, if a miner works 30 years in a union mine and one year at the end in a nonunion mine (often the only employment available in the area), he is denied the pension. Just this Thursday (April 24, 1969), U.S. District Court Judge, Alexander Holtzoff called this an "arbitrary and capricious" regulation and ruled it void. This pioneering case, which will be appealed by the Fund, could open up a large area for denied coal miners to pursue their rights vis-a-vis the Fund. Basic to the Fund's operation is the denial

of due process to applicants (the trustees may grant a hearing at their discretion, for example) contained in the hitherto unrestricted "discretion" held by the trustees. Secrecy envelops the Fund's operations, other than the meagre information filed under the Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act. The trustee-Director has refused to answer any questions asked by the press or other parties. Although existing common law may well go along way in countering the mismanagement and abuse of trust by the UMWA and the Fund's managers, a more comprehensive legislative inquiry is needed. For a Fund pleading penury as an excuse, the salaries of some of its employees are unjustifiably ample.

5. The Union itself appears infected with mismanagement, padded payrolls and nepotism of the most pristine variety. Data appended raise questions. For example, the UMWA President, W. A. Boyle, has his brother and daughter on the Union payroll. R. J. Boyle, district president, Billings, Montana, and member of the Executive Board, is listed at a salary of $25,000 plus $8,975 for expenses for the year 1967. Antoinette Boyle, listed as an Attorney, receives a salary of $40,000 plus expenses in 1967 of $3,288. She also resides in Billings, Montana. This $40,000 salary equals the salary of the Vice President of the Union. Even the General Counsel of the Union does not exceed Miss Boyle's salary. While it is incumbent upon all individuals to be good to their children, it is fair to ask what Miss Boyle does to earn this salary. The same inquiry can be put to the work of R. J. Boyle. Consider the scene at Billings. The UMW office in Billings is composed of 4 small rooms with only one lady—not Miss Boyle—in attendance. From all appearances, neither Miss Boyle nor R. J. Boyle have much to do with this office. District 27, based in Billings, includes Montana, Alaska, North and South Dakota and northern Wyoming. But there is little coal mining in these areas—some 4000 laborers and 3000 pensioners. There is no organizing going on, according to Union sources. In fact, the lady in charge of the office declares there is little of anything to be done in Billings. There is only the rarest need for any legal advice or work. Miss Boyle, who is considered a capable young lawyer in Billings, has her own practice or work that occupies her and is not connected with District 27.

The afore-mentioned descriptions only sketch the malaise and irresponsibility of the UMWA leadership. Anyone who has talked with union members in the coal mining regions receives clear impressions of overwhelming dissatisfaction and resentment against Mr. Boyle and other union leaders. The mass coal miner movement in West Virginia, in clear disregard of the leadership, is evidence that the miners are at the limits of their patience. Union headquarters in Charleston were booed by the marching union miners earlier this year. No political pundit is needed to predict that if a free election were held, Mr. Boyle would be doing well to receive 25% of the vote. In West Virginia, his support would be even less. But miner resentment at the Union leadership is accompanied by a feeling of impotence to change the situation, an absence of organization and the lack of any public agency providing these miners with a voice for their grievances. The grip of the Union bureaucracy is well financed and supported by the very coal industry that is abusing the rank and file, failing to correct mine hazards and denying the employees their rights. Against a Union bureaucracy-industry interlock, what countervailing force is left? Where there is so little hope for reform, a Congressional Committee's role is crucial. I urge you to commence an inquiry into the UMWA and provide hope for the stilled voices of the coal miners. To permit the present situation to continue is to sully even further the humanitarian principles of organized labor as a key institution in a democratic system.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH NADER.

NEED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE FOR CIVILIAN PROJECTS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great interest that I note a recent speech delivered by the new Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin Laird, at St. Leo's College in Florida, in which he points out the need for the establishment of an Office for Civilian Projects in the Department of Defense.

According to Secretary Laird, it is the proposed intention of this new office to coordinate community-oriented, socially beneficial activities of the Department of Defense which can be sponsored within the scope of the Department's present activities in communities throughout the country.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to have extended dealings with the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army in the very area in which Secretary Laird promises the cooperation and services of the Department of Defense. In the summer of 1967, while the U.S. Army had jurisdiction over the facilities of Camp Perry, Ohio, I endeavored to get the Department of the Army to permit the use of Camp Perry for a summer camp facility for urban area children during such time as the camp was not being used for the National Rifle Association marksmen matches which were being subsidized at a cost of the Federal taxpayer of millions of dollars. At that time, the Department of Defense made absolutely no effort to recognize the social advantages to simply permit the use of the facilities of the camp during such times as it was not being utilized by the Department of the Army for the support of the national rifle matches.

Thereafter, I endeavored to see if some small part of the 26,000-acre Ravenna Arsenal site could be used for such a camp facility. At that time, I was advised that the storing of ammunition bunkers within a small portion of this vast domain would preclude the use of the site for this important social purpose. The Ravenna Arsenal site is fully equipped with swimming pools, buses, barrack facilities, and countless other military facilities lying vacant and dormant. It appears that the Department of the Army preferred to keep its claim to the facility by retaining certain ammunition storage within the depot instead of consolidating this storage in other areas.

Although the Ravenna Arsenal site was not available for any social purpose, it is an excellent place for hunting—provided you can get a permit. However, a special permit is available to high-ranking military officers and executives in the Government service. It seems tragic that this 26,000-acre domain used only slightly for military purposes should be preserved as a "special privilege" domain.

My experiences with the Department of Defense are not good with respect to the utilization of military facilities for any nonmilitary purpose. The Secretary's new program is encouraging but it can never be a substitute for eliminating waste and unnecessary procurement by the Department of Defense.

THE LAST GIANT TOPPLES

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, General de Gaulle has been defeated by the French people and has resigned.

No Member of this House has uttered stronger words against the general in past months. Nor will I unsay a word at this time. Nonetheless, it is true that the last of the towering giants of Europe has fallen. We shall never see his like again.

France and the French people have always been dear to my heart personally. Her heritage and message to the world have always quickened my pulse and uplifted my spirit. Her culture and bravery are second to none. All the more reason to feel bitterness when she temporarily wanders away from her true path, for there are those who hold her to a higher standard. In this case, it was the general's decision to aid the Arabs in their determination to destroy Israel and her people. Denying aid to the embattled Israelis caused me to speak out against the general. My strong words were uttered as much in grief as in indignation. So it is my fond hope that France will abandon the general's pro-Arab policy now, and return to her hallowed role of aiding liberty and those who would live in the sunlight of democracy as free men. Truly no nation reveres or emulates France's love of liberty more than does Israel.

For it has ever been known of France that whenever she has lost her way, she has inevitably found it once more. From the Terror to the time after Dreyfus, she has always embraced what is finest in man. Fondly do I hope that this will be the case now. Other nations hide their error. France atones for them.

A further word about General de Gaulle is in order. When France was laid low in the dust of defeat, it was De Gaulle who said:

> France has lost a battle, but she has not lost a war.

His words and leadership led Free France to a rebirth. An entire world thrilled to his sublime courage when he walked unarmed and unguarded into Algerian mobs screaming for his life's blood. An entire nation gathered itself together to follow him toward a higher road when he took over leadership of his nation.

In all these actions he showed he was in the tradition of those incredible men we have known as the great Europeans. His dreams swept across the ages and political boundaries. His leadership never descended into the abyss of dicta-

torship. In many ways, he epitomized all that has been finest in French history.

No one wishes France and her people well any more than I. Nor can anyone begrudge or deny the general his place in history—for certainly he will loom large.

It is only sad that a cleavage had to develop between those who loved and admired him and his country the most over an issue that symbolizes and means so much. Were any man to go into the fury of battle, he could ask no more than to be led by a De Gaulle. Fit companion for all of France's mighty heroes, surely, he ranks as one of the bravest of the brave.

A worthy member of those who fought the beast from the pit in the name of all the Western World, he is one of that tiny elite company of men who tower because of what they are and do as well as because of their physical stature. One cannot but wish him well.

Above all, one cannot help but wish his beloved country well, too. Jean Racine wrote in act II of "Andromaque" the following words:

> I loved him too much not to hate him at all!

Let those who can read into that what they will.

SECRECY AND CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of our chemical and biological warfare policies and practices is the secrecy that shrouds even the most basic public policy aspects of the program. One cannot help thinking that this secrecy is imposed more to keep the information from the American people than it is to keep any potential enemy from learning about our activities.

We know, for example, the basic policies that govern the possible use of our nuclear missile arsenal. The number of missiles that we have is public knowledge; the conditions under which they would be used is made unmistakably clear. This is the essence of a deterrent, a retaliatory capability.

In the field of chemical and biological warfare, we are told by the Department of Defense:

> It is the policy of the U.S. to develop and maintain a defensive chemical-biological capability so that our military forces could operate for some period of time in a toxic environment if necessary; to develop and maintain a limited offensive capability in order to deter all use of CB weapons by retaliation in kind.

In other words, our CBW capability is supposed to be a deterrent. Yet Congress does not discuss, nor does the public evaluate, just what constitutes a limited offensive capability. Does the potential enemy know what our capability is?

It becomes clear, after analyzing the material that is available that there are other reasons for the shroud of secrecy. U.S. Army Regulation No. 11–17, issued on May 3, 1967, prior to the Skull Valley sheep kill, was issued to insure that each Army base involved in chemical or biological warfare would exercise strict safety precautions in handling chemical and biological agents. It goes on to say:

> Certain CB agents and munition systems present problems in reconciling the requirements of safety and security with the requirements for assurance of continual operational responsiveness. These problems are further complicated by *the possible political and psychological implications of an accident/incident exposure.* (Emphasis added.)

This regulation admits by implication that the activities of the Army in chemical and biological warfare might not meet the approval of the American people. So the shroud of secrecy is apparently designed to keep the American people in ignorance. As such, I believe that it is unacceptable. A public discussion of our policies and practices in the field of chemical and biological warfare is needed.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including in the RECORD an article by Mr. Seymour Hersh, one of the individuals who has performed a public service by bringing this issue to the fore, appearing in the May issue of Progressive magazine. This article, "Silent Death," throws some additional light on this secrecy-shrouded part of our defense activities:

SILENT DEATH

(By Seymour Hersh [1])

America's heavy investment in chemical and biological warfare (CBW) traditionally is a taboo subject in Washington. CBW is not mentioned in the Secretary of Defense's annual report to Congress on the nation's military posture, and all important references to it are censored out of Congressional testimony. In the late 1950's the generals of the Army Chemical Corps decided to make a public plea for more understanding, plus more money, and turned to a public relations firm for guidance. "Operation Blue Skies" thus emerged, complete with heavily publicized promises of "war without death" and dire warnings about the Soviet Union's preeminence in all things chemical and biological.

The effort produced more money, but with it the beginnings of a protest movement against the development of CBW weapons. The Army went underground again and probably would have remained there, but the use of gases and chemicals in Vietnam and in the ghettos and campuses of America has ended the dreams of obscurity for the CBW generals. CBW has been under increasing assault from a public rapidly becoming more aware of the Frankenstein monster in its midst. Recent network television shows, at least two books, and many more magazine and newspaper stories have pointed out some of the obvious pitfalls of spending millions of dollars where it is not only not needed, but is highly dangerous.

Precisely how much is being spent each year on CBW is a military secret. Recently the Pentagon gave a group of Congressmen and Senators as classified briefing on CBW and admitted it was spending about $350 million annually, far more than the Federal Government spent last year to subsidize all forms of cancer research. But even this amount, high as it might appear to most citizens, seems inaccurate. In 1963, the last year in which the cost of CBW was provided to Congress on an unrestricted basis, the Government was spending nearly $300 million. Since then, costs have soared for the tear gases and anti-crop chemicals used in South Vietnam. Expenditures at the Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, the military's main chemical purchasing center, were more than $420 million in fiscal year 1969, according to a McGraw-Hill investment newsletter, and that base is only one of five major CBW facilities in the nation.

In the arsenals of the Pentagon (and in at least thirteen other nations) are chemical poisons—never agents such as the recently widely publicized GB—so toxic that one fiftieth of a drop, about one milligram, can be lethal in minutes; it was a nerve gas that was responsible for the death of 6,400 sheep in a Utah ranch in March, 1968, after an errant test near the Dugway Proving Grounds, a CBW research base.

Biological agents are potentially even more deadly: In 1960 the head of the Army Chemical Corps told Congress that ten aircraft, each carrying 10,000 pounds of a dry disease agent such as plague or anthrax, could kill or seriously disable as many as thirty per cent of America's population—about sixty million people.

Congress and the nation were aroused recently when it was revealed that the Army was regularly shipping 300-gallon containers of the deadly GB and similar lethal agents around the country by rail, a grave hazard in the event of an accident.

It is relatively as easy for CBW scientists to produce 10,000 pounds of a disease agent as it is for pharmaceutical houses to produce a similar amount of vaccines and antibiotics. Gas and germs can be delivered in combat situations by hand grenades, airplane spray tanks, bombs, shells, rockets, and missiles.

Since the early 1960's when CBW spending trebled within a few years, the aerospace industry has been increasingly involved in CBW research. Along with it has come a reliance on sophisticated computer techniques and equipment in meteorology, biomathematics, aerobiology, and other necessary disciplines.

The heavy use of defoliants and herbicides in Vietnam (some $100 million worth last year) has been increasingly questioned by scientists concerned about the long-run ecological dangers. There also is considerable evidence that the "riot control" gases used in Vietnam can be lethal to the weak, sick, and undernourished civilians exposed to them. One of the so-called "non-lethal" gases now in wide use in Vietnam is Adamiste, an arsenic-laden chemical that will kill upon ten minutes' exposure to concentrations of one ten-thousandth ounce per quart of air. One of the anti-crop chemicals also in wide use is Cacodylic acid, which is fifty-four per cent arsenic, enough to make systemic arsenical poisoning a lethal threat to civilians living near sprayed areas.

In the past few years criticism of the CBW program has become increasingly led by scholars. The Army's main biological research center at Fort Detrick, Maryland, which has held many pseudo-scientific academic conferences in subject areas close to its needs—such as defoliation and genetics—suddenly found itself picketed by a small group of biologists and microbiologists at its session in April, 1968. The fact that at least sixty colleges and universities are currently involved in CBW research has also spawned scores of protests, with more to come.

---

[1] Seymour M. Hersh, currently Washington correspondent for The National Catholic Reporter, is the author of "Chemical and Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal," published in hardcover by Bobbs-Merrill in 1968. It will be available in paperback in June from Doubleday Anchor Books. Mr. Hersh has covered the Pentagon for the Associated Press and has worked for United Press International. He was press secretary for Senator Eugene McCarthy in the 1968 Presidential campaign, and his articles have appeared in The New York Review of Books, The New Republic, and War/Peace Report.

But the experience of waging an unpopular war in Southeast Asia for the past nine years has taught the military's public relations representatives some lessons. Instead of ducking the blows, the Pentagon apparently has decided to counter the criticism of CBW with demonstrations of its concern with public reaction, and more openness about America's CBW efforts.

Thus, after a group of scientists complained last summer that something like 100 billion lethal doses of nerve gas were stored above ground on a CBW base near Denver, the Army announced it was going to move the gas. Most, but not all, of the gas was shipped to Utah. Enough remains stacked in steel storage tanks less than two miles from the runways of nearby Stapleton Air Field, Denver's main airport, to provide death for everyone in Denver and the vicinity, given the proper wind and weather conditions. Along with such moves, the Pentagon has embarked on a new program of carefully arranged disclosures to curb protest. "We're in the process of changing the public's mind," a Pentagon official recently told me. "We're trying to acculturate the public to deal with reality—this is the Government's responsibility."

Last fall, the Columbia Broadcasting System enjoyed the privilege of having an Air Force Captain, representing the Defense Department's Office of Public Affairs, open the doors for a CBS television unit, headed by veteran correspondent Mike Wallace, to three highly secured military installations devoted to chemical and biological warfare research and testing. Once inside, the television crew was allowed to film employes at work and interview a number of key personnel.

The network had been trying for years to film a news report on CBW: Just twelve months earlier the Pentagon had refused a similar request. CBS, however, paid a high price for the Pentagon's cooperation, a price it did not reveal to the estimated ten million persons who watched the report (shown in separate segments October 8 and October 22 on *Sixty Minutes*, a one-hour news show which the network describes as a "magazine of the air"). A few weeks before the first broadcast, more than fifty Government officials, representing twelve agencies, were given an advance screening of the completed shows in a Pentagon studio. The officials suggested some factual changes, which were made, and offered other objections to the editorial content—not all of which were entertained by the network. In return for its courtesy, the network was permitted to televise previously unavailable films.

At the outset of the two-part series, Wallace told viewers that "the Government undertook a major policy change in granting our request to show what these weapons can and cannot do . . . This change of policy indicates an effort by the Pentagon to dispel the public horror that surrounds these weapons." One civilian in the Pentagon told me why CBS was permitted to get the rare film of biological facilities: "Our goal is to bring CBW into the sphere of rational discussion—sort of delousing it, or debugging it, like kids learning there aren't any ghosts." The official said he was delighted with the fact that the public responded only feebly to the show—fewer than a dozen letters, he said, were received, most of them asking for more information.

Shown for the first time by CBS on television (or anywhere else in public, for that matter) were some films apparently made at the Army's main biological production laboratories at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, where a ten-story, $90 million laboratory was built fifteen years ago. The footage, supplied by the Pentagon, showed the facilities America has created for the massive production of diseases such as anthrax, plague, and tularemia, all top potential biological warfare agents. Large concentrations of frozen germs were shown rolling off an assembly line device—apparently a huge, sophisticated fermentation machine. Neither the base, or the equipment, was identified, although such facilities are known to exist at the Pine Bluff Arsenal.

Scenes also were shown of the research facilities at Fort Detrick. As the screen depicted scientists determined to find and produce better killers than are available in nature, television viewers were told how easy it is to produce hundreds of gallons of an infectious organism within a few hours. Yet it is what commentator Mike Wallace did not say that is truly alarming, although the average viewer could not have known how much information was not supplied him. Wallace did not report that there are at least 251 cold-storage earth-covered vaults, known as igloos, on the Pine Bluff facility, many of them used to store biological warfare agents. The CBS programs did not tell of the sophisticated weapons assembly lines at the Arsenal, capable of filling hundreds of 750-pound bombs within hours with diseases considered to be worldwide scourges, nor of the detailed military procedures and plans for the distribution of these weapons to Army and allied units around the world. CBS did not mention the more than 3,300 accidents, half of them in laboratories, in an eight-year period at Fort Detrick, involving infection of more than 500 men and three deaths—two from anthrax.

Many of the questions left unanswered by CBS were answered by the National Broadcasting Company when that network broadcast its special report on CBW February 4 on *First Tuesday*, NBC's response to CBS' *Sixty Minutes*. NBC correspondent Tom Pettit carefully told viewers that the show had not been prepared in consultation with the Pentagon, and millions of viewers were left stunned by scenes of laboratory experiments involving rabbits and mice, and views of the Utah sheep being bulldozed, dead, into huge pits.

Much emphasis was placed on NBC's finding that a Smithsonian Institute project was being used by Fort Detrick to locate a proper site for a biological warfare test; viewers were casually told that tularemia "once was routinely suggested for use in Vietnam. The suggestion was turned down." After this scary development of CBW, NBC concluded the hour-long show by saying that the "United States today does not have germ weapons ready to go at the push of a button [a patent lie]. We know how to build them; we have tested the stuff, but so far at least there has been no order to go into mass production. And until there is an order, the U.S. biological capability will remain only a paper tiger. Of course we don't know about Russia and Red China. It was a cop-out. The United States suddenly emerged from the hour of squalor as Mr. Clean, threatened by the Commies once again.

Because of the muddled direction, the show's most telling point was nearly wasted. NBC reported that the Smithsonian Institute had received more than $2.5 million over six years to investigate the migratory pattern of birds on one-mile-square Baker Island, an obscure uninhabited island belonging to the United States, 1,700 miles southwest of Honolulu. Former Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania told NBC that, as he understood it, "under the screen of the Smithsonian Institute in a bird-banding project, they were looking for a relatively safe place to conduct chemical and biological warfare testing. . . . It is my understanding that they are now on their way to do some testing there."

The NBC charge that the Smithsonian project was being used as a coverup for tests was incorrect and misleading; the Army does not need the Smithsonian to travel to an island and release germs—all it wants to know is where to go.

There is no evidence that a major large-scale test of a virulent and lethal biological agent has ever been conducted by the military, although many small laboratory and simulated tests are constantly under way. But one rare insight into the thinking of the managers of CBW was given in an unusually candid interview that Archie Penney, head of Canada's CBW efforts, gave to the *Montrealer Magazine* in September, 1967. Asked if there is a point at which a simulated test cannot give proper results and a live agent must be used, Penney replied:

"You sound like the scientists who are working on the job. This is exactly their problem. There comes a time when you say, 'Look, it's no good playing with the model railroad. We have to use the whole railroad.' You've hit on a very delicate and sensitive problem. There are very few areas in the world in which you can do it."

Congressional hearings on the CBW program are held every year, but by a sympathetic subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. The hearings are usually chaired by Representative Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida Democrat, a former Major General in the Army Chemical Corps. The hearings, which are heavily censored and attract little press coverage, never touch on these questions:

Why is there a need for the heavy security blanketing CBW efforts, security so stringent that even Congress has not been told publicly since 1963 how much money is being spent in this area? Even the recent disclosure of $350 million a year was off the record, but could be confirmed by a recent Library of Congress Study.

Why will only $175,000 be spent by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency this year to study the basic disarmament problems connected with treaty enforcement, with no immediate increase in spending anticipated by ACDA officials, while vast sums are poured into CBW?

Why has the United States not ratified the 1925 Geneva Protocol outlawing the use of lethal chemical and biological weapons? The Soviet Union, Communist China, and even Cuba have agreed to the Protocol, along with more than sixty other nations.

Is the heavy spending on CBW justified? How serious is the Soviet threat, details of which have never been made public by the military? The claim of a Soviet threat has not moved U.S. officials to take any significant steps toward civil defense against a CBW attack. There are about 20,000 gas masks stored throughout the nation for civilian use, one for every 10,000 residents.

Where are the CBW agents being stored and tested overseas? The Army is known unofficially to be field-testing its agents in Panama, Hawaii, and Greenland, and also sponsors CBW research in Japan, Malaysia, and Germany. It also supplies nerve agents in quantity to its NATO allies. Chemical defoliation agents are field-tested in Thailand before use in South Vietnam.

How the nation's CBW programs might develop under President Nixon and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird is uncertain. Laird's specific views on CBW are not known. Mr. Nixon told a Cambridge, Massachusetts, rally during his 1960 campaign against John F. Kennedy that he was all for continued research, but his current views have not been made public.

The Nixon Administration's approach to CBW could not be much worse, however, than that of his immediate predecessors. While doing research for a book on CBW in 1967, I had a score of interviews with past and present Pentagon and Kennedy and Johnson Administration officials. They produced little evidence that there had been any serious thinking about the strategic, political, or moral implications of CBW in the Defense Department or anywhere else. When asked why CBW disarmament studies were not being emphasized, one White House official

told me: "There's just a hell of a lot of more important things. CBW is far down the list of criticality."

Yet William C. Foster, then director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told a House Appropriations Subcommittee at about the same time that CBW would pose the next major threat to world peace after a full nuclear agreement was reached.

In its television series, the best justification CBS could find for the vast U.S. CBW effort came from Albert Hayward, a relatively low-level Pentagon research and development manager for CBW. "If chemical or biological weapons are used against a nation," Hayward said in an interview filmed at the Pentagon, "and its only option is to accept defeat, or to respond with nuclear weapons, then, in fact, another nation has the ability to force you into initiating nuclear war. I think this is another reason for having our chemical and biological capability so that we are not faced with a choice of fighting a chemical-equipped enemy with conventional weapons or escalating to nuclear war."

This sort of reasoning, left unchallenged and unpursued on the television shows, ignores the fact that CBW agents only increase the number of weapons systems and possibilities available for war. Any nation that now dares to attack America with a chemical or biological agent risks retaliation with nuclear weapons and instant removal to the Stone Age; the deterrence is far greater now than if America was prepared to respond to a gas attack with more gas.

Given the military's and the executive's lack of public concern for this eventuality, the burden falls to Congress. Senator Gaylord Nelson, in a recent Senate speech, raised several vital questions regarding CBW. Among them were:

"What are the official policies for the use of CB weapons in the event that they are used first by a foreign aggressor against us? Who makes the decision to deploy anthrax, the plague, or a lethal nerve gas? What are the ground rules? What have they been in the case of Vietnam? What are the deterrent factors in a program of chemical and biological preparedness? How do we militarily defend against a CB attack? If the purpose of our preparedness is to prevent surprise, what specific steps have been taken to detect a surprise?"

Staff members of Senator J. William Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee have been investigating CBW in preparation for hearings sometime this year, but as of this writing no final decision has been made, nor is the world waiting for U.S. action.

Last December the General Assembly of the United Nations approved a resolution asking Secretary General U Thant to prepare a full-scale report on the effects of possible use of CBW weapons. The resolution calls for broad international cooperation in the preparation of the report; wide public distribution of the conclusions, to be presented by July 1, 1969, if possible; and observance by all states of the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of poisonous gases and bacteriological warfare. The United States has agreed to participate in the study.

Last August the British government proposed reconvening the 1925 Geneva meeting to work out a supplementary agreement calling for a ban on the research and development of biological warfare agents. The British proposal would call upon each nation to destroy its stocks of such agents and equipment intended for their production. The proposal, on the other hand, would not deal similarly with chemical agents, because of their use in the past and the belief by some countries that they are necessary for future use.

Gas warfare already has broken out in at least two countries within the past six years—South Vietnam and Yemen. Many Administration officials, particularly in the State Department, are dubious about the legality of the U.S. use of riot control and harassing agents in Vietnam.

The chance of a serious accident involving CBW agents seems to be higher than many experts thought; the incident involving the sheep in Utah surprised many Army gas warfare experts, according to one source, because of the extreme effectiveness of the nerve agent. Ironically, an order issued May 3, 1967, nearly a year before the accident, sharply tightened the military's safety conditions for CBW handling and testing. The order noted that "the problems are further complicated by the possible political and psychological implication of an accident-incident exposure." The order was not made public.

Along with the accident problem, the chance of gas warfare among smaller nations has been increased because of the heavy World War II munitions stockpiles deposited all over Europe and Asia. The Egyptian use of mustard gas early in the Yemen War was prompted, according to English sources, by the discovery of an old World War II gas weapon depot by the Egyptians. A similar discovery was made in 1966 somewhere in India, according to sources here, when a civilian construction firm digging a highway found a cache of American mustard gas shells. After a frantic flurry of classified cables, a U.S. military team was sent to recover the shells. Details of the incident have yet to be made public.

Unilateral disarmament in CBW has few official supporters, but Congress could take a major step by urging the military to make public essential facts about CBW spending, weapons, and other information that is given out with ease about America's nuclear arsenal.

"What is the United States now doing," asked Senator Nelson in his Senate speech on CBW, "to insure that this totally destructive and little understood aspect of the arms race is reduced? . . . Congress should make it its business to look immediately into this matter. . . . We will need to review the entire scope of chemical and biological warfare. . . . What is significant is the cloak of secrecy which has surrounded our activity in CBW research. This cloak of secrecy must be removed."

Such a full-scale investigation by Congress might well be the first step toward withdrawing these terrifying agents of silent death from the world's overstocked arsenal of weapons.

SCANDAL AT SBA

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I was informed that a small businessman in San Antonio was subjected to a shakedown attempt by the special assistant to the administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The complaint was filed with the San Antonio office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on April 22; I received an affidavit containing the complaint on April 24.

In this case, the small businessman needed a loan to expand and continue his business. The special assistant to the Administrator offered his help, and even had a study made of the prospects of the company. When the loan was approved the special assistant and others asked the businessman to incorporate and to pledge 49 percent of the company to them. This is a serious allegation, and I have every reason to believe that it is true; in fact one of the participants admits its substance. I believe, and have so informed the Administrator of the SBA that this matter warrants the immediate suspension of the special assistant, Mr. Albert Fuentes.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the affidavit I received, a copy of the feasibility study aforementioned, and a copy of a telegram I sent the Administrator of the SBA:

State of Texas, County of Bexar:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared Emanuel Salaiz, who, after being by me duly sworn, upon his oath, stated the following:

"My name is Emanuel Salaiz, I am the owner and operator of E & S Sales, San Antonio, Texas. Since early 1967, I have been attempting to obtain a loan from SBA in order to improve and continue my business. I was finally approved for a loan from SBA in the amount of $10,000 in February, 1969. Many people intervened for me during these years and when I finally was approved by SBA I was of the opinion that the successful efforts in my behalf were made by Mr. Eddie Montez and Mr. Albert Fuentes. I reached this opinion because Mr. Montez and Mr. Fuentes never let me forget it. When I was approved for the $10,000 I was instructed along the following lines by Eddie Montez and Albert Fuentes, 'Let us complete the research and then we will talk to you about your business loan. Don't accept the $10,000 until we talk to you.'

"I did not accept the $10,000 and I waited until the 'research was complete.' I was called to a meeting in the office of Mr. Tom Guardia on a Sunday, one week before Easter. At this meeting, the following were present: Tom Guardia, Eddie Montez, G. J. Gonzales, myself and Albert Fuentes and a Mr. de la Rose who runs the Alameda Restaurant. At this meeting I was advised by Mr. Montez that it was a personal meeting before but now it was strictly business. At this meeting I was handed a research on survey report allegedly by one W. J. Garvin, Assistant Administrator, United States Government Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., dated March 20, 1969. The report is hereto attached and made a part of this statement for all intents and purposes. Albert Fuentes told me that this report would help in obtaining for me a larger sum of money. He told me that it would be necessary for me to incorporate and to pledge to them 49 per cent of the corporation, that Mr. Tom Guardia would set up the corporation and take care of distribution of the 49 per cent. When I asked if this was legal, Mr. Fuentes assured me that it was; Mr. Montez assured me that Mr. Guardia would set up the 49 per cent properly and that Mr. Fuentes' share would be set up in trust.

"Mr. Fuentes then told me, 'I'm not going to be here very long and when I get out I have to have something to fall back on.' They told me that if I did not incorporate there would be no loan of the type as suggested in the research on survey report. I told all of them I would send my lawyer, Tom Joseph, to talk to Mr. Guardia and I left. Mr. Joseph referred me to Mr. Rudy Esquivel, Chairman of the SBA Council. I worried for about a week and finally talked to Mr. Esquivel on Friday, April 18, 1969. When I advised Mr. Esquivel about the possible conflict of interest involved here he advised me that the investigating arm of the government was the FBI. I went to the FBI and made a statement to Agent Miller in the San Antonio, Texas office."

"I have made this statement of my own free will and every statement of fact herein contained is true and correct."

EMANUEL SALAIZ.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on the 24th day of April, 1969 to certify which witness my hand and seal of office.

JESSE B. CAMPOS,
Notary Public.

U.S. GOVERNMENT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washintgon, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Reply to Attention of:E.
Subject: E. & S. Sales Co.
To: Mr. Albert Fuentes, Special Assistant to the Administrator.

As previously reported we have continued our analysis of the market outlook for a capital needs of this company and now believe that we have pursued the matter as far as we profitably can from this distance.

The Market Outlook: Excellent prospects for the immediate and foreseeable future, both for specialized, custom type ornamental hardware and for more standardized high volume output. A well managed firm should prosper and grow in this location.

Capital Needs: We have analyzed several alternative types of manufacturing facility which might be considered. The two best choices seem to be:

a. *Moving the existing business* out of the garage into a manufacturing facility, with expanded output but no basic change in operations. That is, the company would continue to design its unique ornamental hardware, contract with an outside foundry for casting services, and perform the finishing work in its own building. This would require:

A building with about 5000 feet of floor space (costing $10,000 to $12,000 plus land unless leased space is available.

About $20,000 worth of equipment.

Working capital of up to $20,000 for an annual sales volume of $100,000 to $150,000.

Thus total investment requirements would be on the order of $40,000 for leased facilities and $50,000 to $60,000 for purchased facilities. The advantages of this choice are:

It could be set up quickly.

It would make best use of the specialized skills of the existing company.

It can expand, to keep pace with the market.

It could later be developed into a more integrated operation doing its own foundry work.

b. *Going immediately into an integrated operation:* This is basically the choice indicated by Mr. Salaiz. This would be a complete design, casting and finishing operation in a large manufacturing facility. Industry experts and our own research indicates total initial capital requirements (including working capital) to be at least $200,000. It would need to reach an annual sales volume of up to $1 million for efficient operations.

The principal advantage of this choice is that it would expand employment opportunities and contribute significantly to community development. It would need to move more towards standardized, mass produced hardware rather than the present custom type. It would also take at least a year before operation could begin.

Recommendation: I recommend alternative in (a)—the smaller, more specialized facility—as the most promising immediate source of action. Alternative in (b) would not be ruled out as an eventual solution. If the business is as successful as I believe it could be, expansion into an integrated operation could well be undertaken through a local development company or a small business investment company.

Other considerations: I have given the data on the E & S bid on the defense order for door handles to Mr. Bothmer. I have also been advised that several score volunteers could be made available at nominal costs to assist in management training and counseling. Finally, Mr. Salaiz does not have a good accounting system and—according to reports—could not be pursuaded to furnish cost and sales data needed to support a loan application. An expanded operation would require installation of an efficient accounting system.

W. J. GARVIN,
Assistant Administrator.

APRIL 24, 1969.

Mr. HILARY SANDOVAL,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.:

Affidavits in my possession and on file with the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that there is serious reason to believe Albert Fuentes has engaged or attempted to engage in shakedowns of SBA loan applicants. I believe that this warrants your immediately suspending Fuentes pending a full investigation.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

A MEANS OF HALTING ILLEGAL SEIZURES OF U.S. FISHING BOATS

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing new legislation to try to bring the Peruvians and other Latin American countries that illegally seize American fishing boats on the high seas to negotiations.

This bill would cut off imports of fish and fish products from these countries in the event of future seizures. In the case of Peru, such imports amount to a substantial dollar figure. Commerce Department figures indicate that in 1968, Peru exported $62.1 million to the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, such a cutoff would not be effective while discussions were going on. Let me emphasize that my bill is not to punish anyone, but rather to have disputes arising from seizures of our fishing vessels off their coasts taken to the negotiation table and to achieve some understanding.

We do not have to argue over their claim of 200 miles or over our claim of 12 miles. All we ask is that these countries honor our historic rights the same as Canada, Mexico, and the United States honor historic rights of other nations to fish in their fishing zones.

Meanwhile, I am fearful that our fishing dispute has been put aside during the discussions on the problem of Peru's expropriation of an oil plant, and I want to be assured that American fishermen are heard during the meetings now being held or to be held shortly between the United States and Peru.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have a greater fear, and that is that within the next few weeks there will be additional seizures off the Latin American coast, and as I informed my colleagues last Thursday, the International Longshoremen's Union has passed a resolution which could lead to their refusing to unload ships from any country illegally seizing U.S. fishing vessels. This, I would like to prevent, Mr. Speaker, and I feel that a law such as would be provided by the legislation I am introducing today would accomplish this by Government rather than by union action.

Time is important as we face the start of another fishing season off Latin America, and I urge swift consideration of this new legislation I am introducing today.

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY 100 PERCENT OF CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS COSTS

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—H.R. 10593—to require the Federal Government to pay 100 percent of health benefits costs for Federal employees.

I believe that the Government has an obligation to be in the forefront in providing fringe benefits and good working conditions for its employees rather than trailing behind private enterprise as has been the case. Today, many enlightened firms pay all of the health benefits costs of their employees. Surely, the time has come for the Federal Government to take this enlightened step.

Originally, the health benefits law provided that the Civil Service Commission would establish the Federal contribution within a specified dollar range, but not more than 50 percent of the least expensive low-option plan offered by one of two Government-wide carriers. Due to the increasing costs of the high option plans, the Government's share of the total premiums was down to less than 30 percent by 1966.

Public Law 89–504 increased the Government's contribution rate, restoring it to the 1960 level of 38 percent of the total premiums, and eliminated the tie-in of the Government contribution to the low option rates. However, due to subsequent rate increases, the Government's contribution has since fallen to about 32 percent of the total premium costs. Congress should act promptly to rectify this inequity.

There have been several proposals in past Congresses and in the current Congress to have the Government assume varying percentages of employee health benefits premiums. In fact, during the 90th Congress, the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) on whose subcommittee I am privileged to serve, held public hearings on legislation calling for the Government to pay 100 percent of employee health benefit premiums.

After considering these bills, the subcommittee noted:

> Aside from the cost, were the Government to pay the total premium, employees would naturally choose the more expensive plans and options that provide the richest benefits, so that the only competition among health plans would be in the amount and kinds of benefits provided. Ultimately, every plan might be not only covering 100 percent of all medical expenses but exploring the inclusion of other types of related expenses.

I believe that this was a valid objection to the proposals that have been

made in the past. However, my plan would meet this objection. It would set a limit on the types of coverage to which the Government would contribute, and it would retain the competition that now exists among the 36 different plans serving Federal employees.

Essentially, my plan would have the Government pay 100 percent of the cost of certain specified benefits which would be provided for all employees, annuitants and their families. In effect, this would become the low-option plan which each carrier would make available at no cost to the employee. Each carrier would then be free to offer such additional benefits as it chose, with the employee paying all of the additional cost.

The bill—H.R. 10593—which I am introducing today includes the following benefits for which the Government would pay the entire cost:

Up to 180 days' hospital coverage for each confinement;

Surgical benefits as outlined in the set schedule of fees with a maximum of $500 for any one confinement.

Medical visits to be reimbursed at $10 per hospital visit; $8 per home visit; and $6 per office visit;

Diagnostic services as provided for in a set schedule of fees;

First-aid treatment in full within 72 hours after an accident;

Maternity benefits to be treated as regular hospital benefits plus up to $200 for doctor's charges;

Nursing care up to $20 per 8-hour shift for up to 180 days a calendar year;

Alcoholism and drug addiction for up to 30 days per calendar year;

Mental and nervous disorders for up to 30 days per calendar year:

Dental and cosmetic surgery shall be covered only when necessary for prompt repair of injury caused by an accident.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear at this point that there is certainly nothing sacred about these specific benefits that I have included in my bill. Further consideration may demonstrate that these benefits should be curtailed, eliminated, or expanded to include additional benefits. However, I do believe that this legislation is a necessary starting point which can be refined later on to establish the Federal Government as a model employer and to make Government service more attractive.

I am confident that the basic idea of this approach to providing health benefit coverage for Federal employees is sound. I feel it merits the prompt attention of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and, indeed, every Member of Congress.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION SUPPLYING ARMS TO JORDAN

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed last Friday by the report that the Nixon administration has approved the sale of $30 million worth of arms and equipment to Jordan, including another squadron of F-104 jet interceptors.

It would appear that this administration intends to continue the already discredited policy of supplying arms to the so-called moderate Arab States in the hope of exercising some influence on these countries.

Has the administration forgotten that, in attacking Israel in June 1967, Jordan used arms and equipment, including tanks, provided by the United States?

The inclusion of a squadron of F-104 jet interceptors constitutes an especially grave threat to peace, for these jets will further bolster the increasing Arab military power and embolden their determination to destroy Israel.

We all know that Jordan has been a base for terroristic attacks on Israel which have continued unabated since the 6-day war. For what imaginable purpose would Jordan use these jets and other military equipment except to attack Israel?

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned by the fact that the Department of Defense is continuing to train Jordanian pilots and army personnel and other Arab pilots and army personnel in this country. The Department of Defense has advised me in a letter dated April 22 that 94 air force personnel and 74 army personnel from Jordan are being trained in U.S. service schools during fiscal year 1969. First we equip, and then we train, the Royal Jordanian Air Force.

No matter what the history of the Middle Eastern conflict demonstrates, the same stale policies continue to be implemented. The administration continues to arm Jordan in the face of every indication that these weapons will be used against Israel, to which we have a long-standing commitment. It should also be remembered that the vaunted "influence" which this policy was supposed to insure in the past was destroyed when King Hussein and other "moderate" Arab leaders placed their forces under the control of Nasser in the 6-day war. What is there to insure that these weapons will not become an addition to Nasser's developing stockpile of weapons again—to be used when the Arabs believe they have sufficient arms to finally annihilate Israel?

Has the U.S. Government learned nothing from the bloody and tragic war that took place less than 2 years ago?

I have called upon the President of the United States to rescind immediately the sale of these weapons to Jordan and to publicly disavow any intention of approving any further agreements which would subsidize the Arabs' hostile military intentions. My telegram of April 25 to the President follows:

APRIL 25, 1969.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

As one who has long opposed the United States providing any military support whatsoever to the Arab States, I strongly protest the decision of your administration to sell $30 million worth of arms and equipment to Jordan. The inclusion of a squadron of 18 F-104 jet interceptors constitutes an especially grave threat to prospects for peace in the Middle East.

The public pronouncements of Arab leaders on their continued determination to annihilate Israel make it clear that the receipt of these weapons will only encourage the Arabs to persist in their refusal to begin direct negotiations with Israel on outstanding issues, thereby prolonging the conflict in the Middle East.

I call upon you to immediately rescind the sale of these weapons to Jordan and to publically disavow any intention of approving any further agreements to subsidize the Arabs' hostile military intentions.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

CONTINUE OEO

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have in recent months heard and read much about the Office of Economic Opportunity, about the specific programs it administers, about its worth—or lack of worth, about its future. From some critics we have heard that OEO has not been adequately doing the job of fighting poverty and that therefore it should simply be undone this year and done away with the next. Others agree with that diagnosis but call for a different cure: reorganization—they want OEO to function merely as an innovating agency in charge primarily of new, experimental programs which would presumably be transferred to other agencies if they were successful and dropped if they were not. While such an idea may have a certain appeal to social scientists, we who live in the world of political reality know that when Congress is in a budget-trimming mood, an agency without a permanent set of programs—and the concomitant protection of a set of interested participants—is about as secure as a turkey in November.

I should like to know why—amidst all the recent talk about the future of OEO—no one points to its past. The OEO is not yet 5 years old—surely that is a very short time in which to eradicate an age-old evil such as poverty. The OEO has consistently been underfunded by the Congress—surely it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of a war on poverty if it is fought with limited weapons. Despite handicaps such as these, however, OEO has managed to accomplish a great deal: Community action, Headstart, Upward Bound, neighborhood health centers, legal services, foster grandparents, VISTA—these names do not stand for failures but for solid successes; they are now part of the national vocabulary. But to the poor themselves, these programs are more than just familiar names; they are reasons for activity in place of idleness, expression instead of silence, hope in place of what at best was apathy and at worst was despair. What happens to the poor themselves if the life of OEO is crippled or cut off? The OEO is their agency, their voice in official Washington; it must not be allowed suddenly to fall silent.

Amid all the recent talk about OEO, we seem to have heard little or nothing either from the poor themselves or from those who are often closest to the poor—the regional OEO workers. I should like to make known their opinions on this subject. Accordingly, I should like, Mr.

Speaker, to place into the RECORD a resolution drafted by community action officials from OEO's northeastern region.

On March 7, 1969, the Northeast Region State Economic Opportunity Office Directors, the Community Action Agency President from each State in the Region, and Community Representatives Advisory Council members from each State met in Hartford, Connecticut. After a discussion of the basic philosophies of the Federal anti-poverty program, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and its future, the following statement was unanimously adopted by all three groups present:

We do not approve at this time the dismemberment of OEO or the spinning off of programs such as Head Start, Upward Bound, Job Corps, VISTA, Foster Grandparents, or Health Centers.

We urge the Administration and Congress to support the philosophy of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, the Community Action Agencies, the Community Action process, and particularly the principle of maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and members of the groups to be served. This statement is generated in part by the position taken by Head Start Parents, Upward-Bound students, Neighborhood Youth Corps participants and other community residents throughout the country in support of these principles.

We further support the principle of extending Maximum Feasible Participation of the people served, as developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to all Federal service programs, including but not limited to programs of the Departments of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, starting with the representation of the poor on Department advisory councils.

CHICAGO TODAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the presence of something new and significant in the city of Chicago.

For many years, countless thousands of Chicagoans, middlewesterners, and others throughout America have read the Chicago's American. They have undoubtedly begun to notice a change. However, beginning today, the Chicago's American will appear in compact form and be known as Chicago Today.

This newspaper, both new in format and name, will include new features and new writers as well as its established favorites whom readers have enjoyed so long in Chicago's American.

Under this new format, Chicago Today will incorporate 200 more columns of new space each week, thus enabling it to keep its readers even better informed. With this, the writing style will be more concise thus enabling the new format to present more and better stories. As part of presenting its expanding coverage, Chicago Today will have complete stock market tables in virtually all editions as well as the closing markets in the final edition.

In line with the new format, aimed at the "now" group, the paper has a section called "now," which in effect is a directory of where to go, what to do and how to have fun in Chicago which should be of great benefit to its readers. There will be a new feature called Focus which will enable Chicago Today's talented writers to examine in depth, the most important issues of our time both nationally and in Chicago.

Chicago has a reputation nationwide as a good newspaper town. The fact that it has four daily newspapers has made it one of the most competitive news towns in the country and this helps the readers. This newspaper will contribute to the fact that this is a "good newspaper town."

A PROPOSAL FOR RELIEVING LOW-INCOME ELDERLY CITIZENS—HOMEOWNERS OR RENTERS—OF PART OF THEIR LOCAL PROPERTY TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, H.R. 10615, the Property Tax Relief Act of 1969.

H.R. 10615 is designed to ease the property tax burden on those low-income elderly persons whose local property taxes are excessively high in relation to their total income by allowing them a credit against the Federal income tax for that portion of the property tax that is determined to be excessive.

The bill is modeled after Wisconsin's highly successful Homestead Relief Act, which allows a credit against the Wisconsin State income tax.

Poor elderly homeowners often have great difficulty in paying their property taxes. Frequently the homes they live in were purchased many years before, when property taxes were low and job income was coming in regularly. But now property taxes have risen drastically, especially in urban areas, and these elderly homeowners are retired and living on small fixed incomes, depleted by inflation and supplemented inadequately if at all by social security payments. The thought of moving is not a welcome one; there is often a sentimental attachment to the old familiar home and, beyond this, the task of moving is a burdensome one for the elderly.

To meet this problem, the bill provides property tax relief to those over 65 with a total yearly income of $3,500 or less. To insure that only truly needy persons receive relief, applicants must list all forms of money income, including nontaxable income such as social security, veteran's disability benefits, public assistance payments, and railroad retirement benefits.

The credit extends to elderly renters as well as homeowners—for renters it is assumed that 25 percent of the rent payment is in effect payment for property taxes.

For those eligible persons whose income is so low that they pay no Federal tax, a direct cash refund is substituted for the credit.

The refund or credit is intended to offset only that portion of the property tax that is well in excess of what is normal. It works like this.

Property taxes are considered unusually high if they exceed a certain percentage of household income. These percentages are increased as household income increases. After determining the amount of the tax which is excessive, a percentage of this excessive part is relieved. For households with incomes over $1,000, there is a refund or a credit for 60 percent of the excessive part; for those with incomes under $1,000, the refund or credit is 75 percent of the excessive part.

In addition, H.R. 10615 limits the amount of property taxes that can be used in computing relief to $300. Thus, if a householder has property tax payments of $400 he can only use $300 of that in computing his refund or credit.

As one might expect, the upshot of all this is a rather complicated formula. For those who are curious, the formula is in section 1603 of the bill, the text of which follows. The following table lists the size of the credit or refund which is available in some representative cases:

	Total household income	Credit or refund
Property tax:		
$100	$1,000	$67.00
$200	1,000	142.00
$300	1,000	213.30
$100	2,000	9.10
$200	2,000	69.10
$300	2,000	126.10
$100	3,000	0
$200	3,000	0
$300	3,000	43.50

Because the bill is modeled so closely after Wisconsin's Homestead Relief Act, a brief look at some aspects of Wisconsin's experience with the law might be helpful.

The Wisconsin law was passed in 1964 and liberalized in 1966. In 1967, it provided tax relief of over $6.3 million to 69,400 low income elderly families owning or renting their homes, for an average payment of $90.78. The total relief granted came to only around 1 percent of total property tax collections in the State.

Very few of those eligible for the program have incomes high enough to make them subject to the State income tax, so that in some 98 percent of the cases property tax relief is in the form of a direct cash refund rather than a credit against income tax. In 1966, $5 million of the $5.1 million in relief granted came in the form of direct cash refunds. In this respect, the Wisconsin law is a kind of negative income tax, but restricted to those past their working age.

The main objective of the Wisconsin law is to relieve the low income elderly of excessive property tax burdens. But the law has also had important side effects.

A serious problem with the property tax is that, especially at low income levels, it tends to be regressive—that is, those with low incomes pay a higher percentage of their income in property taxes than those with higher incomes. The Wisconsin Homestead Relief Act has reduced this regressivity substantially.

The law has also had a beneficial effect on income distribution, since it transfers income from the general tax-

paying population to those persons who are very poor, and since the poor tend to live together, to those jurisdictions that are very poor.

The Wisconsin experiment has been so successful that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that all States follow Wisconsin's lead in giving relief to elderly low-income homeowners and renters. See ACIR, State and Local Finances: Significant Features, November 1968, page 5. But there is no need to wait for all State legislatures to act; we can make this relief available now by using the Federal income tax system.

If this bill was passed, States like Wisconsin which have such property tax relief laws might wish to continue them as a supplement to the Federal credit.

The text of H.R. 10615 follows:

H.R. 10615

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide relief to certain individuals 65 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through a system of income tax credits and refunds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 7—PROPERTY TAX RELIEF FOR THE LOW-INCOME ELDERLY

"Sec. 1601. Definitions.
"Sec. 1602. Claim allowable as credit or refund.
"Sec. 1603. Amount allowed as claim.
"Sec. 1604. Special rules.
"Sec. 1605. Administration.

"SEC. 1601. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) INCOME.—The term 'income' means the sum of adjusted gross income, support money, cash public assistance and relief (not including any amount received under this chapter), the gross amount of any pension or annuity (including railroad retirement benefits, all payments received under the Social Security Act and veterans disability pensions), nontaxable interest received from the United States, a State, or an instrumentality of either, workmen's compensation and the gross amount of 'loss of time' insurance. Such term does not include gifts from nongovernmental sources, or surplus food or other relief in kind supplied by a governmental agency.

"(2) CLAIMANT.—The term 'claimant' means a person who has filed a claim under this chapter and was both domiciled in the United States and 65 years of age or over during the entire taxable year preceding the year in which he files claim under this chapter. When two or more individuals of a household meet the qualifications for a claimant, or when a homestead is occupied by two or more individuals and more than one such individual is able to qualify as a claimant, and some or all such qualified individuals are not related as determined under paragraph (3), the person or persons entitled to make a claim under this chapter shall be determined under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) HOUSEHOLD.—The term 'household' means a claimant and the spouse of the claimant.

"(4) HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—The term 'household income' means all income received by all persons of a household in a taxable year while members of such household.

"(5) HOMESTEAD.—The term 'homestead' means a dwelling in the United States, whether owned or rented, and so much of the land surrounding it, not exceeding one acre, as is reasonably necessary for use of the dwelling as a home, and may consist of a part of a multidwelling or multipurpose building and a part of the land upon which it is built. (Such term also includes a vendee in possession under a land contract and of one or more joint tenants or tenants in common.) Such term does not include personal property such as furniture, furnishings, or appliances.

"(6) RENT CONSTITUTING PROPERTY TAXES ACCRUED.—The term 'rent constituting property taxes accrued' means an amount equal to 25 percent of the gross rent actually paid in cash or its equivalent in a taxable year by a household solely for the right of occupancy of its homestead in such taxable year.

"(7) GROSS RENT.—The term 'gross rent' means rental paid at arms-length, solely for the right of occupancy of a homestead, exclusive of charges for any utilities, services, furniture, furnishings or personal property appliances furnished by the landlord as a part of the rental agreement, whether expressly set out in the rental agreement or not.

"(8) PROPERTY TAXES ACCRUED.—

"(A) GENERAL RULE.—The term 'property taxes accrued' means State and local property taxes (exclusive of special assessments, delinquent interest and charges for service) which accrue with respect to a claimant's homestead in a taxable year.

"(B) OWNERSHIP BY MORE THAN ONE HOUSEHOLD.—When a homestead is owned by two or more persons or entities as joint tenants or tenants in common and one or more such persons or entities is not a member of claimant's household, 'property taxes accrued' is that part of property taxes accrued with respect to such homestead as reflects the ownership percentage of the claimant and his household.

"(C) OWNING AND RENTING IN SAME TAXABLE YEAR.—When a claimant and his household own their homestead part of a taxable year and rent the same or a different homestead for part of the same year 'property taxes accrued' means only taxes accrued with respect to the homestead when both owned and occupied as such by claimant and his household, multiplied by the percentage of twelve months that such property was owned and occupied by such household as its homestead in such year.

"(D) OCCUPANCY OF MORE THAN ONE HOMESTEAD.—When a household owns and occupies two or more different homesteads in the same taxable year, property taxes accrued shall relate only to that property occupied by the household as a homestead for the greatest portion of such year.

"(E) HOMESTEAD PART OF A LARGER UNIT.—Whenever a homestead is an integral part of a larger unit such as a farm, or a multipurpose or multidwelling building, property taxes accrued shall be that percentage of the total property taxes accrued as the value of the homestead is of the total value, except that the claimant may use the total property taxes accrued for the larger unit, but not exceeding forty acres of land, except as the limitations of section 1603(b)(2) apply.

"SEC. 1602. CLAIM ALLOWABLE AS CREDIT OR REFUND.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CLAIM.—Subject to the limitations provided in this chapter, a claimant may claim as a credit against taxes imposed by chapter 1 for a taxable year property taxes accrued for such taxable year, or rent constituting property taxes accrued for such taxable year, or both. If the allowable amount of claim exceeds the amount (if any) of taxes imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year (less the aggregate amount of credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 for the taxable year) the amount of such excess after audit by the Secretary or his delegate, shall be paid to the claimant. No interest shall be allowed on any payment made to a claimant pursuant to this chapter.

"(b) TIME FOR FILING.—A claim under subsection (a) for a taxable year shall be filed on or before the time prescribed by law for filing an income tax return for such taxable year (taking into account any extension of time).

"SEC. 1603. AMOUNT ALLOWED AS CLAIM.

"(a) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—The claim allowable to a claimant under this chapter for a taxable year shall be determined in accordance with the following table, on the basis of the household income of the claimant's household and of such household's eligible property taxes and rent (as defined in subsection (b)) for the taxable year:

"I		II	III	IV	V
If household income is—		Then the allowable claim is the product of—	times the amount by which eligible property taxes and rent exceed the sum of—	plus—	of household income in excess of—
At least	but not more than—				
0	$500	0.75	0	0%	-----
$500	1,000	.75	0	3%	$500
1,000	1,500	.60	$15	6%	1,000
1,500	2,000	.60	45	9%	1,500
2,000	2,500	.60	90	12%	2,000
2,500	-----	.60	150	15%	2,500

"(b) ELIGIBLE PROPERTY TAXES AND RENT.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'eligible property taxes and rent' means the lesser of—

"(1) the sum of property taxes accrued plus rent constituting property taxes accrued, or

"(2) $300.

"(c) SET OFF AGAINST OTHER TAX LIABILITY.—The amount of any claim otherwise payable under this chapter for a taxable year may be applied by the Secretary or his delegate against any liability of the claimant with respect to taxes imposed by this title, or against such liability of any other individual who was a member of his household in the taxable year.

"(d) ONE CLAIMANT PER HOUSEHOLD LIMITATION.—Only one claimant per household per taxable year shall be entitled to relief under this chapter.

"SEC. 1604. SPECIAL RULES

"(a) RENTALS NOT AT ARM'S LENGTH.—In any case in which a homestead is rented by a person from another person under circumstances deemed by the Secretary or his delegate to be not at arms-length, he may determine rent constituting property taxes accrued as at arms-length, and, for purposes of this chapter, such determination shall be final.

"(b) MOBILE HOMES.—Under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate, a mobile home shall be treated as a homestead for purposes of this chapter.

"(c) CLAIMANTS HAVING DIFFERENT TAXABLE YEARS.—In the case of a household consisting of two claimants who do not have the same taxable year, household income, rent constituting property taxes accrued, and property taxes accrued shall be determined (1) on the basis of an annual period prescribed by

regulations of the Secretary or his delegate, and (2) with such adjustments as may be required by such regulations.

"SEC. 1605. ADMINISTRATION.

"(a) FORMS AND TABLES; COMPUTATION OF CLAIM BY SECRETARY.—In administering this chapter, the Secretary or his delegate shall make available suitable forms with instructions for claimants, including a form which may be included with or a part of the individual income tax form. The Secretary or his delegate shall by regulation prescribe tables under which claims under this chapter may be computed to the nearest 10 cents. The claimant may elect not to record on his claim the amount claimed by him, in which case the Secretary or his delegate shall compute the claim and notify the claimant by mail of the amount of his claim under this chapter.

"(b) INFORMATION.—Every claimant under this chapter shall supply to the Secretary or his delegate, in support of his claim, reasonable proof of age, rent paid, property taxes accrued, changes of homestead, household membership, household income, size, and nature of property claimed as the homestead and a statement that the property taxes accrued, on the basis of which his claim is made, have been or will be paid by him and that there are no delinquent property taxes on the homestead.

"(c) RIGHT TO FILE CLAIM ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANT.—The right to file a claim under this chapter shall be personal to the claimant and shall not survive his death, but such right may be exercised on behalf of a claimant by his legal guardian or attorney-in-fact. When a claimant dies after having filed a timely claim the amount thereof shall be disbursed to another member of the household, under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate. If the claimant was the only member of his household, the claim may be paid to his executor or administrator, but if neither is appointed and qualified within two years of the filing of the claim, no amount shall be paid with respect to the claim.

"(d) REDETERMINATION OF CLAIM.—Whenever on the audit of any claim filed under this chapter the Secretary or his delegate determines the amount thereof to have been incorrectly determined, the Secretary or his delegate shall redetermine such claim and notify the claimant of such redetermination and the reasons therefor. Such redetermination shall be final unless appealed to the Tax Court within 30 days of notice thereof.

"(e) RECOVERY OF FRAUDULENT CLAIMS.—In any case in which it is determined that a claim is or was excessive and was filed with fraudulent intent, the claim shall be disallowed in full, and, if the claim has been paid or a credit has been allowed against income taxes otherwise payable, the credit shall be canceled and the amount paid may be recovered by assessment as income taxes are assessed and such assessment shall bear interest from the date of payment or credit of the claim, until refunded or paid, at the rate of 1 percent per month. The claimant in such case, and any person who assisted in the preparation or filing of such excessive claim or supplied information upon which such excessive claim was prepared, with fraudulent intent, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. In any case in which it is determined that a claim is or was excessive and was negligently prepared 10 percent of the corrected claim shall be disallowed and if the claim has been paid, or credited against income taxes otherwise payable, the credit shall be reduced or canceled, and the proper portion of any amount paid shall be similarly recovered by assessment as income taxes are assessed and such assessment shall bear interest at one percent per month from the date of payment until refunded or paid.

"(f) APPEAL TO TAX COURT.—Any person aggrieved by the denial in whole or in part of relief claimed under this chapter (except when the denial is based upon a redetermination of rent constituting property taxes accrued as at arms length) may appeal such denial to the Tax Court by filing a petition with such court within 30 days after such denial."

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 7. Property tax relief for the low-income elderly."

(b)(1) Section 40 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to cross references) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 40. CROSS REFERENCES.

"(1) For credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for overpayments of tax, see section 6401.

"(2) For credit against the tax imposed by this chapter with respect to State and local property taxes of the low-income elderly, see section 1602."

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Cross references."

(c)(1) Subchapter A of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to abatements, refunds, and credits) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6408. PAYMENTS TO LOW-INCOME ELDERLY WITH RESPECT TO STATE AND LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES.

"For authority to make payments to low-income elderly with respect to State and local property taxes, etc., see section 1602."

(2) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 6408. Payments to low-income elderly with respect to property taxes accrued."

SEC. 2. Section 164 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for taxes) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) DISALLOWANCE IN CASE OF TAXES WITH RESPECT TO WHICH CREDIT OR PAYMENT ALLOWED UNDER CHAPTER 7.—Under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate, no deduction shall be allowed for a tax with respect to which a claim is allowed under chapter 7 (relating to property tax relief for low-income elderly)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to property taxes accruing and rent paid on or after January 1, 1970.

REFORM OF MILITARY CODE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to reform the Military Code so that a repeat of the Presidio Stockade incident could not occur. My legislation would make the distinction between mutiny and the lesser charge of disobeying an order much clearer. It would also require prior approval by the Secretary of the particular armed forces before prosecution could take place for an offense carrying the death penalty.

I introduce this legislation because I do not believe the Presidio incident should be allowed to pass without remedial action being taken. This legislation deals with the two fundamental aspects of that incident—the failure of the commanding officer to employ a proper and accepted interpretation of the term mutiny, and the proper disagreement of Pentagon officials with this action. They, unfortunately, had no legal recourse. If either of these aspects had been different, the Presidio incident, as we know it, could not have occurred.

It was Gen. Stanley Larsen's failure to heed the recommendation of the pretrial hearing examiner that "the charge of mutiny does not apply to the facts of October 14, 1968," which precipitated this gross injustice. There have been other cases of sitdowns in the Army; yet, to my knowledge, only cases involving force were prosecuted for mutiny. This legislation, by making the already commonly accepted definition of mutiny clearer in the law, should deter future ill-advised judgments of this nature.

The fact that the Judge Advocate General of the Army moved in less than 24 hours of General Larsen's confirmation of the first Presidio defendant's sentence to apply a rarely used clemency power suggests that high officials of the Army also were upset by this gross injustice. This combination of events is no accident. My conversations with Pentagon officials confirm this. Yet, under military law, there was nothing they could do prior to prosecution. My bill, while serving to preserve the decentralized character of the Armed Forces, would serve to reassert a greater sense of legal authority in the field of military law, at least in capital cases.

What concerns me even more than the gross injustice perpetrated against these 27 young men in this single incident is that it may not have been an isolated incident. It may have been motivated by political considerations, and had the object of cracking down on antiwar behavior as well as to discriminate in the handling of military infractions on the basis of imputed or actual political motivations behind infractions. Whether it applies to civilian or military, this does not appear to be justice to me.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, GERALD R. FORD, that the President is sending a message to the Congress which is expected to arrive very shortly. In view of this and in a spirit of cooperation, if there is no objection——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Under the circumstances the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the distinguished Speaker be able to say how long it will be before this message may be received?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I was assured by the staff of the President that the message would be here sometime between 1 and 1:30 p.m. On the basis of that information given to me I spoke to the distinguished Speaker and he agreed to ask for a recess under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–108)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LENNON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Adair	Edmondson	Ottinger
Annunzio	Edwards, La.	Philbin
Arends	Evins, Tenn.	Poff
Ashbrook	Fallon	Pollock
Ashley	Fish	Powell
Barrett	Gallagher	Pucinski
Bates	Gettys	Quillen
Bell, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Randall
Betts	Halpern	Reifel
Biaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Bingham	Hathaway	Ronan
Blackburn	Hawkins	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Roudebush
Brasco	Helstoski	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Holifield	St. Onge
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Sandman
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Scheuer
Cahill	Jarman	Scott
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Karth	Stanton
Chappell	Kirwan	Steiger, Wis.
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Stephens
Clancy	Landrum	Symington
Clark	Lloyd	Taft
Clay	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Collins	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	McDonald, Mich.	Van Deerlin
Conte		Waggonner
Conyers	Mann	Watkins
Corbett	Mikva	Watson
Corman	Mizell	Watts
Cunningham	Monagan	Whalley
Daddario	Moorhead	Widnall
Diggs	Morton	Wolff
Donohue	Murphy, N.Y.	Wydler
Dulski	Nedzi	
Dwyer	Nix	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will continue the reading of the message.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 of our country.

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 government which they have no part in choosing—or to bear the full burdens of citizenship without the full rights of citizenship.

I therefore ask Congress to create a Commission on Self-Government for the District of Columbia, to be charged with submitting to Congress and the President a proposal for establishing meaningful self-government in the District.

In order for any government to be accountable to the people, responsibilities must be clearly pinpointed, and officials must have the powers they need to carry out their responsibilities. The Commission would recommend how best to augment and allocate the legislative and executive authorities with respect to governing the city.

The members of this Commission would be partly appointed by the President, partly designated by the Congress, and partly chosen in a city-wide election by the citizens of the District. They would be given an adequate but strictly defined time period to formulate their plan. I would hope that the Commission would be established promptly, so that its report could be submitted to Congress and the President in time for the 1970 legislative session. With adequate funding, they would be able to draw on the wisdom of consultants throughout the country—men who know firsthand the art of the possible, as well as those who study government—in addition to their own staff.

The Commission members must give thorough consideration to the many alternative plans for self-government which have been presented over the years. But they must also make use of new knowledge we have gained about the problems of existing local governments around the country—in finance, management, urban development, citizen participation and many other areas. They must seek the sentiment of the District's citizens from the earliest stages of their work.

There also is a Federal interest that must be respected. The normal functions of the Federal agencies must be guaranteed and their vital operations protected. There must be continued Federal jurisdiction over public buildings and monuments and assurance of well-being for the men and women who work in them or come to visit. The rights of the

national government must be protected, at the same time as the rights of the city's residents are secured. There must be respect for the responsibilities with regard to the District which the Constitution places in the Congress.

To establish a new government in so diverse and active a city as the District is certainly no easy task. There are dangers in setting up new governments, as well as opportunities. Congress has been rightly concerned that the plan for self-government must insure responsible elections, effective executive leadership, protection of individual liberty and safeguards for District of Columbia employees. Self-government must be extended in a timely and orderly manner.

It is especially important that the Commission go beyond the issue of self-government as such, and concern itself with the effective functioning of government in the District of Columbia. Under the existing government structure the City Council finds itself without the power to deal with many crucial problems because of the conflicting and divided authorities that now reside in independent agencies.

But there is no cause for delay: Self-government has remained an unfulfilled promise for far too long. It has been energetically supported by the past four Presidents—Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson. The Senate approved measures to provide it during the 81st, 82nd, 84th, and 86th Congresses. We owe the present lack of local elections to the Reconstruction period, when Congress rescued the District from bankruptcy but suspended the voting franchise. Congress established a Commission form of government in 1874 as a temporary "receivership," but the Commissioners' government persisted for over 90 years—and today, even after reorganization in 1967, the District remains under Federal control.

The history of failure for self-government proposals shows the need for a new plan strong enough to stand up against the old questions or criticisms. Myriad different plans have been offered—and will be offered again this year. But each will have its own doubters as well as its supporters. A Commission must examine all of them, combining old and new ideas in a proposal that will at last win the broad-based respect necessary for final acceptance, and that will carry the authority of a disinterested group of men whose vocation is government—jurists, political leaders and scholars, as well as other citizens, investing the wisdom of their life's work in a truly new government.

Recognizing both the solemn right of the District's citizens to self-government and the Federal interest, I ask Congress to act promptly on proposed legislation to establish a *Commission on Self Government for the District of Columbia*, which will be transmitted shortly.

CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

I also urge Congress to grant voting representation in Congress to the District of Columbia. It should offend the democratic senses of this nation that the 850,000 citizens of its Capital, comprising a population larger than 11 of its States, have no voice in the Congress.

I urge that Congress approve, and the States ratify, an amendment to the Constitution granting to the District at least one represenative in the House of Represenatives, and such additional representatives in the House as the Congress shall approve, and to provide for the possibility of two Senators.

Until such an amendment is approved by Congress and ratified by the States, *I recommend that Congress enact legislation to provide for a non-voting House delegate from the District.*

STRENGTHENING THE CITY COUNCIL AND MAYOR

While working for self government and Congressional Representation for the future, I recommend that Congress take certain measures this session to strengthen the present District Government, in both authority and efficiency.

The Reorganization Plan which established the present government left to Congress many mundane municipal functions which are burdensome chores to it but important functions for good local government. At present, Congress must allot a portion of its legislative calendar to setting ordinances for the District of Columbia, in effect performing the duties of a local City Council for the Capital. It thus deals with matters which are of little or no importance to the nation as a whole—the setting of a fee, for example, to redeem a dog from the city pound. The concerns of the District are frequently shunted aside to allow for higher-priority legislative business. "No policy can be worse than to mingle great and small concerns," argued Augustus Woodward, one of the founders of our city, when Congress considered establishing a territorial form of government in 1800. "The latter become absorbed in the former; are neglected and forgotten."

Legislation will be proposed to transfer a number of specific authorities to the District Government—including authority to change various fees for user charges now fixed by statute, waive license fees for new businesses, for persons whose businesses have been burnt out in a civil disturbance, and modernize the licensing of various businesses, occupations and professions.

In addition, I recommend that the Mayor be given certain local responsibilities now exercised by Federal departments or agencies. Reorganization plans will be submitted in the coming weeks to transfer local functions now operated by the Federal Government—and frequently paid for by the District—to the Executive Branch of the District Government. Local services should be operated by local government. Such responsibilities are only an extra burden for the Federal departments, which should rightly devote their energies to the welfare of the entire nation.

I will also submit other reorganization plans to transfer certain independent or quasi-independent District agencies to the Mayor's jurisdiction. These actions will strengthen the executive direction of the City's administration and complement the continuing reorganization and strengthening of the District's administrative structure.

Granting new authority to the Mayor and City Council would in no way prejudice the ultimate form or degree of Self Government. It would provide them with powers which any good local government, however chosen, should exercise. By initiating this process now, we thus build the strength of local institutions even as we make them more responsible, formally, to their citizens.

MORE HIGH LEVEL CIVIL SERVANTS

Good government is the product of able and dedicated people working together. The District Government needs the very best urban managers and experts this nation has to direct the Capital's growth and apply its resources, and it must be able to attract such public servants at realistic salary rates.

Adding to the number of top management positions is vital to the effective carrying out of District Government reorganization—the creation of new departments recently announced by the Mayor, and other steps planned for the future. Such reorganization, streamlining the chain of command, is one of the most promising achievements of the Mayor's first years.

Accordingly, I urge Congress to enact legislation to increase the number of supergrade positions available to the District Government.

THE FEDERAL PAYMENT

The District of Columbia cannot achieve strong and efficient government unless it has ample and dependable sources of financing. Sound financing can be achieved only if the Federal Government pays its appropriate share.

I therefore recommend that the Congress authorize a Federal payment formula, fixing the Federal contribution at 30 percent of local tax and other general fund revenues.

This formula would equitably reflect the Federal interest in the District of Columbia at this time with respect to:

—the 217,000 Federal employees who work in the District, about one-third of the local work force.

—the more than 10 million Americans who visit their Nation's Capital each year.

—the embassies and nationals of the foreign governments.

—the land and buildings owned by the Federal Government which cannot be taxed but comprise more than 40 percent of the District's land value.

Enactment of a formula approach would be a significant step toward effective government in the District. It would tie the level of Federal aid to the burden of local taxes on the District's citizens. It would also provide the District with a predictable estimate for use in the annual budget process, thus allowing it to plan its expenditures more accurately and imaginatively for the growing needs of its population. A similar formula, dealing with District borrowing authorization, was enacted by the Congress more than a year ago—and has already proven its worth in improved budgetary planning.

The proposed Federal payment formula would not involve an automatic ex-

penditure of Federal funds. The Federal payment would still have to be appropriated by Congress.

By authorizing the Federal payment at 30 percent of all District general fund revenues, the Congress would allow a payment of $120 million in fiscal 1970, an increase of $30 million above the present fixed authorization. This payment is incorporated in the District's 1970 budget request.

BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The National Capital needs and deserves a mass transit system that is truly metropolitan, unifying the central city with the surrounding suburbs. As a part of its responsibility for the National Capital Region, the Federal Government should support deliberate action, based upon effective planning, to meet the future transportation needs of the Region. The surrounding areas in Maryland and Virginia, as Congress rightly recognized, include the most rapidly growing areas of population and job opportunities, potentially of rich benefit to the inner city.

Mass transit must be part of a balanced transportation network. A subway will not relieve local governments of the duty to modernize and improve their highway systems and other forms of transportation, so that all citizens have an adequate choice as to how they travel. Clearly, the impasse that has arisen between proponents of road and rail transportation in the Washington metropolitan area has contributed little to the progress of either. There are, however, hopeful signs that a fair and effective settlement of these issues will be reached in the near future. It is in the interest of all those involved—central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees, and visitors alike—that this be done.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, in consultation with the District Government and other local jurisdictions, has prepared legislation which would extend the presently authorized 25-mile rapid rail transit system to a 97-mile regional system. The expanded system would provide rapid transit between the downtown and outlying areas. It would facilitate the free flow of resources and labor, and would benefit all eight jurisdictions involved in its planning and approval.

The proposed legislation fulfills the Congressional mandate in a 1966 Act, which directed the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority to plan, develop, finance and provide for the operation of a full regional rapid rail system for the National Capital area.

The 97-mile system would relieve downtown congestion; increase employment; make educational, cultural and recreational facilities more accessible; reduce air pollution; stimulate business, industry, and tourism; broaden tax bases; and promote orderly urban development of the Nation's Capital.

The cost of the expanded system is estimated to be some $2.5 billion. Fare box receipts would pay for $835 million. The remaining cost of $1.7 billion (the net project cost) would be divided equitably among all the governments concerned on a ⅔-⅓ sharing basis between Federal and local governments.

The local governments concerned have already passed bond referenda or taken other appropriate action to finance their contributions of $347 million. But action by Congress is needed to authorize grants sufficient to cover the $1.1 billion Federal (⅔) share of the net project cost and capital contributions of $216 million for the District's portion of the local (⅓) share.

I urge that Congress promptly appropriate the necessary authorizing legislation for the 97-mile system.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

Finally, we come to the Washington that so many millions flock to visit; the Washington that stands as a proud physical symbol of our Nation's liberties and its hopes.

Pennsylvania Avenue should be one of the great Avenues of our Republic—as in the original version of our Capital City—and will be so if the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission presses forward with its present plans. Already, in accordance with the Commission's plans, construction of the Presidential Building at 13th Street has been completed; construction is continuing on the new Capital Reflecting Pool, as well as buildings for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Labor Department. Planning is going forward for the Federal Triangle, a new Municipal Center at Judiciary Square, and an extension of the National Gallery. Our ultimate goal must be the Avenue of L'Enfant's Plan, a grand route connecting the Congress and the President's House, the vital center of the City, monumental in importance but designed for the Citizens of this Nation to enjoy at all hours for work or pleasure. I will encourage the development of this plan and submit legislation at the appropriate time.

One of the most significant additions to Pennsylvania Avenue will be an international center for scholars, to be established as a living memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the area just north of the National Archives. There could hardly be a more appropriate memorial to a President who combined a devotion to scholarship with a passion for peace. The District has long sought, and long needed, a center for both men of letters and men of affairs. This should be, as it was first proposed, "an institution of learning that the 22nd Century will regard as having influenced the 21st."

The renewal of Pennsylvania Avenue is an enterprise which two Presidents have supported. Their vision was the great vision of Pierre L'Enfant, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, whose plans embodied the ageless ideal of a Capital City. It is a vision which links Presidents, as it links the citizens of the District, in the love of this city. And I am proud to join them.

A GREAT ENTERPRISE

It is a noble aim—this planning of a Capital City. It encompasses a drive which must apply to areas of rebuilding beyond a single Avenue, and to areas of need beyond physical renovation. It infuses our knowledge of human want with a new urgency. It tests our vision of man, and of the future of his cities.

I ask the Congress, and the American people, to join in this great enterprise, knowing that if we govern with wisdom in this Capital City, it will be a proud symbol of the quality of American life and the reach of America's aspirations.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 1969.*

The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY R. SHEPPARD

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add some further information. I know there has been an announcement on the floor today of the death of the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard, this morning at 5 o'clock.

I have just received this further information: that the funeral services will be held Thursday morning, at 10 a.m., at the Robert Pumphrey Home at 7557 Wisconsin Avenue in Bethesda. The interment of the body will be at the National Memorial Park, on Lee Highway, 1 mile west of Falls Church.

OUTSTANDING TEACHER AWARD TO MISS BARBARA GOLEMAN, OF FLORIDA

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleague from Florida in paying tribute to Miss Goleman, who received, as indicated, the outstanding teacher of the year award for the entire United States. I wish to say how proud we are throughout the State of Florida, and as I am sure is true throughout the Nation, of the great contributions being made by dedicated schoolteachers such as Miss Goleman.

In this instance this particular lady has shown outstanding ability in the best tradition of a great profession.

I was proud to join with the contingency at the White House today in paying tribute to her, and I thought it was particularly fitting that the three students who were in attendance with her are such outstanding students and represent such a diversified group of the fine individuals who are being instructed in the schools of the United States of America.

I am proud to join with my colleague in paying this tribute to Miss Goleman and to those students.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE—KEY TO POSTAL REFORM

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has advocated taking politics out of the Post Office Department and reforming this great Department so it can be run on a business-like basis, I am troubled by this cycle of higher and higher postal deficits and the ever more frequent requests for new postal revenue.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if our postal service were efficiently organized we could achieve savings of about $1 billion a year. But, turning this Department—with its 730,000 employees—around will take years.

This is why I am disturbed by those holding out the hope that postal reform will solve our rate problems in this session of the Congress.

I believe that if we fail to increase postal rates—if we let the postal deficit grow—it will become even more difficult to transform the existing Post Office Department into a business-like agency of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those favoring postal reform should support President Nixon's proposal on postal rates. If we cannot keep this big Department on a sound fiscal basis today, it will be even harder in future years for mail users to stand on their own feet.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot let the Department slip into an even greater deficit if we are to bring fundamental reform to the postal service, and reduce this drain upon the Federal budget. We must create the kind of organizational structure that will retain dedicated, efficient, and experienced postal employees and enhance their opportunities for job security and advancement with proportionate reward for initiative, production, and efficiency.

EXPLAINING THE PROCEDURES OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the tourist season is now in full swing and from now until the end of August the American public will be traveling and many will be coming here to Washington among other things to observe the sessions of the House of Representatives in this building.

I am concerned about the manner in which we treat the traveling public here. This building belongs to the people of America. When it was built it was not built to accommodate the large numbers of visitors the motorcar has made possible. For this reason and for reasons relating to the image of Congress as a body, I would like to make some suggestions today as to how we can improve in the eyes of the traveling public the opportunities for learning about representative government during visit to the chamber of the House.

It seems to me that most of us in this body have had the experience of sitting in the galleries with constituents who are visiting Washington and explaining what is proceeding on the floor of the House, pointing out the various figures of public interest as they struggle with the legislative process here in our regular meetings. It is my impression that anyone who does receive some advice from a Member of the House as events transpire on the floor gets a great deal more out of a visit to the Chamber than someone who simply wanders in, listens, and leaves, sometimes dismayed at the apparent chaos on the floor. We all know that we have here a procedure that has developed through the years which has served the Nation well.

We all know that sometimes, superficially, we create the appearance of disorder and of inattention and that our procedures are not immediately comprehensible to people who are not instructed in them.

For this reason, it seems to me that we should do something to make a visit to the gallery a more instructive process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ways in which this can be done. I do not pretend that I have the ultimate answer. I suggested about 2 years ago that it might be desirable to glass in the galleries—those galleries to which visitors come. I did not include the Press Gallery in this suggestion, but by glassing in the galleries we could very much improve the acoustics in this room, and I suspect that it would provide many opportunities for improvement of a visitation to the galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are objections to such a suggestion. One is the esthetics. There is no question that by glassing in the galleries we would damage the appearance of this Chamber. Also there is some objection to a barrier or a fixed shield of glass between the people in the galleries and the Representatives on the floor of the House. The argument runs that this is a representative place and there should be no barriers between the people and their Representatives.

But I think the benefits far outweigh the problems which would be encountered by glassing in the galleries.

For instance, if we do it, it would be possible for us to install earphones and have a concurrent commentary for those who wish to listen to it whereby someone knowledgeable in the procedures of the House could say, for instance, "The gentleman has just risen to make a point of order that a quorum is not present; bells will ring throughout Capitol Hill and the Members who wish to be recorded as present will enter the Chamber."

For that sort of concurrent commentary, earphones, I think, would add inestimably to the appreciation of what is transpiring on the floor of the House. It would also permit the identification of the speaker who is talking who is now only identified by the State from which he comes. It would present an opportunity for an occasional elucidating comment about the type of bill that is being considered. Such a concurrent commentary, of course, would be only brief. It would interrupt the speaker, perhaps, and to that extent it would be undesirable. But I think it would make the entire process much more comprehensible. Earphones could be made even more beneficial by using a two-course circuit, permitting some selection by those who are in the galleries to make it possible to hear also a descriptive or historical statement, recorded or oral, about the Chamber itself. After glassing in the galleries, these earphones would be necessary also for a good hearing of what is going on on the floor of the House. Even now, we do not speak, except over microphones, and it would be easy then to pick up our voices and carry them to the galleries. The acoustics in the galleries are now very bad; people would be able to hear better with earphones. This method would have the added premium of cutting off occasional floor noises or additional gallery noises and, in my opinion, would improve the audibility of what is transpiring here for everyone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many variations of such a plan, of course. One would be to eliminate the historical lecture about the Chamber from the earphones and to simply pass out, as I understand the Senate does, a small four-page pamphlet describing the House Chamber and giving something of its history—including, for instance, the fact that the center aisle divides the parties and that the tables are for committee use, and so forth.

In other words, I am here suggesting with respect to glassing in the galleries and their separation by a glass pane from the rest of the Chamber, that it would provide an opportunity to make a visit to the galleries a great deal more educational than it is at the present time for those who do not have the good fortune to have a Congressman sit with them and explain what is happening on the floor, and why we are doing what we are doing.

It seems to me also, Mr. Speaker, that we could improve the use of the galleries if we did not limit the galleries in their usage. I find it very difficult to justify, for instance, having one gallery reserved entirely for men. I realize that some galleries are reserved for women, and that men may accompany women into the women's gallery. I realize there is a diplomatic gallery, and that some galleries are also reserved for touring groups who come in.

It seems to me, though, a great shame at times when there are a large number of tourists here, that we have some sections of the gallery completely empty, while some people are waiting in line outside. This is hard to justify, and I believe it could be corrected. I realize there may be some reasons for some people to have preference in their attendance in the galleries, but I believe we could give them a preference card, and make available the galleries with the understanding that if people are waiting outside they may be required to leave after a certain time, unless they have a preference card entitling them to stay. It would certainly improve the use of the galleries if we did not earmark them, and I wish this could be considered.

A third point that I would like to make about the galleries—and I believe this also is an unfortunate limitation on their use—has to do with the restrictions on the taking of notes in the galleries. We know that many students come here. We know that many people like to record their impressions of what is going on. I

cannot see any real justification for the prohibition of the taking of notes. Presumably this was intended originally to preserve the rights of the Members to revise and extend. Of course, this right is a limited one anyway. The press is always present. And if we hope to protect our right to revise and extend, we certainly have a great deal more to fear from the press than we do from the visiting public.

I believe that students, particularly, would be grateful for the opportunity to take notes. I fail to see why such a limitation makes sense in terms of our modern day. Therefore I would urge that this particular rule be changed as well.

Before I leave the subject of the galleries, I would like to add that glassing them in and separating the galleries in that way from the rest of the Chamber would also provide added security for the House. I must say that this is not a serious problem in my view. We have had very few interruptions from the galleries in the 4 years that I have been here. However, security could become a problem, and certainly to have some sort of glass partition would increase the security of the House for those Members who might feel this was necessary.

I do not wish to make a great point of that, because my concern is not so much that of security as it is the making of a visit to the House a more educational matter.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONABLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

That very suggestion on security is the very reason that I want to endorse what the gentleman has said about glassing in the galleries. I would remind the gentleman in the well that it was through that door that a number of years ago these Puerto Ricans, who were in the category of radicals, actually came in the gallery and fired into the Chamber.

An example of their action is right here at the minority leader's station where there is still a bullet hole in existence which reminds us of the fact that each one of us sitting here in the Chamber is in fact a sitting duck for that radical type of person who does not appreciate the freedom of our society for what it is intended to be.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

I am sure there is a point to be made there—I would not deny it. But this was not the purpose in my urging the closing in of the galleries. In passing, I agree that added security is another advantage of enclosing the galleries.

I would like to move on to another subject and that is the use of electronic aids to reduce the possibility of error in recording the votes here in the House.

I am not one of those who favor the so-called instantaneous voting systems. I do not see how it could work for us, particularly in view of our other responsibilities which we have to our constituencies and in our committee assignments.

I think it is almost essential that when we have a quorum call or vote on the floor of the House that we use a system which will provide ample time for a Congressman to get to the floor to be recorded.

If we go to the instantaneous electronic system of voting, it is inevitable that we are going to have to spend a great deal of our time on the floor of the House, regardless of how germane we may consider a particular discussion, simply to avoid being marked absent.

I do think ours is a complex job requiring other responsibilities than simple attendance and listening sometimes to a rather long debate. Certainly I personally find I have a great deal of time to spend as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I consider it more important in some instances than listening to every word of debate on the floor of the House. So I am in favor of taking some steps in the way of electronic checking relative to a vote—such things as a tote board, for instance, if that can be done without damaging the appearance of the Chamber too much and creating more problems than we would solve. Such a thing would reduce the requirement for checking constantly on how we voted or how other people voted and how the vote is going.

I think this could be done and I think also it would be of assistance to the visiting public if they were able to keep track of such things through the use of electronic devices as well as at the same time assisting the Congressmen themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the impasse which is continuing as to the rebuilding or extension of the west front of the Capitol. I do not wish to intrude into that debate at this point because I do not know its exact status. But I am concerned about the west front of the Capitol not being rebuilt, repaired or extended.

If it is necessary to decide this by a vote of the House, we should do it. I have no opinion which I wish to express at this time about whether the west front should be repaired in its present location or extended, but we had better get at it and we had better get at it pretty soon.

I do not believe it reflects well on our body to have the west front of the Capitol braced up with temporary wooden braces. It seems to me it should be within our power to resolve this impasse.

If the decision is made to extend the west front of the Capitol, I would hope that the extra space made available would be made available primarily to the public. We have adequate facilities for the Congressmen themselves. I acknowledge that a building as old as this is has its imperfections. But I am concerned primarily that we should furnish for the public better restaurant space, better restroom space and perhaps better information services than they now have available to them.

I realize that we have taken a step in the direction of helping the traveling public by the creation of a visitors' center. There is a problem about the visitors' center, as I understand, although I do not have the details of it, relating to the ability of the railroads to borrow the $17 million that is needed for the improvement of the Union Station as a Visitors' Center.

I hope whatever that difficulty is we are keeping track of it and we are assuring ourselves that the Visitors Center will proceed. As I recall, when we authorized the Visitors Center, we authorized a substantial amount of parking space. Certainly parking space is a great problem for those who come to Capitol Hill without reserved parking, and frequently drive around for hours trying to find a place to park.

The Visitors Center is a step in the right direction. I am told that it is not likely to be finished for at least 3 years, and I am afraid it may be longer unless the financing problems attendant on the lease are resolved.

I do not think the Visitors Center is a full solution to the entire problem. For that reason, if the decision is made that we can, with architectural soundness, extend the west front of the Capitol. I hope the added space available will be dedicated to the use of the visiting public. This is their building, after all.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that there is likely to be resistance to any effort to do over any part of the Capitol, and particularly the Chamber of the House where the business of the House is transacted. There may be some concern about the cost of improvements I have suggested. I do not know what it would cost: someone more expert than I in estimating such things would have to make an analysis of that. I suspect, however, that the cost of glassing-in the galleries and installing an earphone system for the purpose of a current commentary, for purposes perhaps of the recorded history of the Chamber, or for whatever other purposes, would make a visit to the Chamber more instructive—I suspect that the total cost would be considerably less than is spent by the agencies of the executive department in 1 day to explain their programs, to advocate them and to advance them. We have very little interest in public relations as an institution here in this bastion of representative government, the House of Representatives. We have an interest in public relations with respect to ourselves and our relations with our constituency. Many of us are concerned about improving our communication with our constituency as individual Representatives, but I do not believe that we translate that concern into a concern about Congress as an institution. Representative government exists in the sprawling Federal establishment only here, and we have done very little to get our best foot forward.

I think the way to get our best foot forward is to help people to understand our process. What I have suggested constitutes only a minor step in that direction, but I hope my colleagues will agree that since representative government is worthy of support we must be willing to concern ourselves with small details as well as great principles.

RACISM IN SOUTHWEST TEXAS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on at least two previous occasions I have taken this floor to acquaint this House, and through this forum the constituencies throughout the United States, of an ominous development in our section of the country in southwest Texas. It has to do with what I call the new racism, though actually it is just a new form of an old and potent poison.

It has to do with the development in a most disturbing section of our people—the young, those who have benefited from the programs, from the freedom, from the opportunities that this Nation has made possible because of the sacrifice of the men who fought through two world wars, men who survived the depression in between, and men who after the world wars continued to fight in behalf of freedom in those sequelae known as Korea and Vietnam. Even now men are dying so these very same people can be preaching a doctrine of divisiveness and a poisonous view of dissension based on racial hatred—that is new because of its new advocacy.

To be specific, there has emerged in our midst a group that calls itself the Mexican-American Youth Organization. It has a self-styled leader and some members who affect the Castro manner—berets, beards, fatigues, and so on.

Through the spokesmanship of their self-styled leader, who is approximately 25 years of age—and this man is a good example of the benefits that our country has to offer, being a graduate with a degree from a State-supported college in Texas and presently working on his master's degree at a private university in San Antonio, and helped and funded by the efforts of poverty programs and some related programs—this organization says that the low position of what he calls the Mexican-American is entirely and completely due to what he calls the gringo establishment—the gringos.

He says the gringo must be killed. Repeatedly he has inflamed and whipped up passions by saying:

> We have got to eliminate the gringo, and what I mean by that is if the worst comes to the worst we have got to kill him.

These are strange words in this day and time. Some people have reacted after they were informed of this. They were people who at first were skeptical that such things were going on. In fact, one State senator said, "I see no evidence of hate literature." So within a day we presented to him a full half-page newspaper account of systematic dissemination of hate literature that had been spread in my area and surrounding areas for 1 year. Most of it had been done through moneys coming from the Ford Foundation, of which I will speak later and at length.

Naturally, somebody speaking this way is going to be challenged. I was among others, but principally in the initial stages I took him on and challenged his group. Most people were skeptical until the proof through the newspapers was presented. Even then there was skepticism until this youth himself called a news conference, at which time all elements of the media were there, including radio and TV and newspapers in San Antonio. This was in the week of April 11. Then, to the shock of all present, the young man repeated his statements and advocated violence and advocated killing and had no compunction about it and enlarged upon it at great length. It was covered profusely in the local press of San Antonio.

This engendered a public reaction that finally, last week, caused this young man to crawfish somewhat and attempt to backtrack a little bit, principally in order to save the face of some politicians who found themselves alined with him.

Last Tuesday, at Kingsville, he was saying:

> Kill the gringo. What I mean is we must kill the gringo economically and politically but not necessarily physically unless, of course, the worst comes to the worst.

He still left that escape hatch.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, since my colleague has referred to the so-called MAYO organization, which is the Mexican-American Youth Organization, and since that same outfit has operated in the district I represent, up the border from San Antonio, I believe it appropriate that I call attention to some of their activities at Del Rio, which got into the news rather prominently a few weeks ago.

Mr. GONZALEZ. It certainly did.

Mr. FISHER. For the information of the House, I have in my hand here a copy of a release put out by the people the gentleman is now speaking of, those who created, originated and are now sponsoring this MAYO organization. This release was passed around promiscuously and freely among the high school students in Del Rio a few weeks ago.

Without taking too much of the gentleman's time on the point he was making, which is so vital, let me read just a sentence or two from this release, from the people who had the news conference. Indeed, many of the statements contained in this are word for word identical with other expressions by the same source. This release says:

> It is the Gringo who we need to fight. He is the real enemy and cause of our miserable plight.

Now, this includes the announced purposes of the MAYO organization, At another point it says:

> We have to be revolutionary in our demands and make every sacrifice necessary, even if it means death, to achieve our goals. The name of the game is miletancy [sic] in our actions.
>
> There you have it fellow brothers [sic]. If it turned you on, we of MAYO think its great. If it didn't, ay se va, but here it is again: MAYO is 110% for La Raza. We will fight the gringo and his superiority complex in a militant way with no holds barred [sic]—

They did not say "economic way." They said:

> in a militant way with no holds barred. He has put it to us for over 100 years, so now we are prepared to put it to him through una Raza Nueva, through una Raza unida. We are prepared to eliminate the problem.

I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I believe he will agree with me, because he is quite familiar with the area I refer to, Del Rio, that for years and years and years we have felt, both Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans, that that community was more of a model of good race relations.

The mayor of the city, who has the support of many of the Anglos, is a distinguished Mexican-American. One of the important members and highly respected members of the county commissioner's court is a Mexican-American, who represents most of the city of Del Rio itself. Members of the city commission are likewise identified with the same race.

When the Palm Sunday demonstration occurred, attended by these radical MAYO leaders and sponsored by them, and they invaded Del Rio, I have been told on good authority there were a total of 25 local people who participated in that parade, including 10 members of one family.

I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me for this comment.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Texas from the 21st District, because he also has been outspoken, though it has not been easy to do so, politically speaking. He does represent a good segment of this geographical area which is registering this type of disturbing activity, which makes it far more ominous. When we go into the matter thoroughly we find this is not the action of a flamboyant, spontaneous sort of unplanned type of individual.

This is the work of a well-trained and highly educated cadre of young men who have patterned their speech, behavior, and intentions on the well-established procedures and tactics of the militant revolutionary in other sections of the country and of the world. Some of them openly say that their symbol is Che Guevara and Castro. They openly say even in their manifesto which they issued at Del Rio, which was referred to by my distinguished colleague, that they blame the establishment for everything that is wrong. However, there is method to their madness. None of this was done in this fashion until the Ford Foundation money came into their hands. Some money even indirectly came from Castro himself. Even the State Department of this country had to suspend the visas of several of the Cuban delegates to the United Nations recently because of their sponsoring and financing of militant revolutionaries and students of this country into making trips to Cuba which were 100 percent subsidized by the Cuban Government and resulted in propaganda and other activity of that sort.

Some of them consisted of a number of what are described as young Mexican-American students who have been making regular trips to Cuba and coming back with a lot of propaganda and in some instances money, and some of them have found their way to Texas directly and indirectly. The tactics are the same. So is the approach. The thing which is basically wrong with them is that they are so wholly and completely unrealistic that they think they can transfer from the controlled atmosphere of the campus to the general population the kinds of leanings that they think are equivalent to that found in other countries such

as Cuba. This is a sad mistake. I can assure my colleagues in this House and the country that at this time—and I may say parenthetically I believe the best time to kill a snake is before it begins to rattle—at this time they represent only a minute minority within a minority. The overwhelming number of people, such as those I see day in and day out in my own district, are ashamed that these men have arrogated to themselves a right, so they say, to be the spokesmen for a conglomeration of people for whom they really do not speak. They are even rejected in the areas where they say they are going in to work in an attempt to help them. This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that should not be minimized. That is the reason why I have spoken out. I have seen what has happened in other parts of our Nation, and I do not want to see it repeated in our section of the country.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from the 23d district.

Mr. KAZEN. The thing that gets me in all of this conversation we have heard and all of these arguments that have been made and some of the statements that have been read is that there are people who profess to speak for and to be the spokesmen for the Latin Americans. Do you know of any particular person or group that has the credentials to speak for all of the Latin Americans in the southwestern part of the United States?

Mr. GONZALEZ. My illustrious colleague served with me in the State Senate of Texas. There was many a day when we dwelt on that point. We have many times disassociated ourselves from the descriptive phrase of being a Latin American spokesman or a Latin American leader, because this is a pluralistic group. We cannot be the spokesmen for such a large group.

Mr. KAZEN. The gentleman is correct. In this country there should be nothing but first-class Americans. Those who do not agree with this are the ones who are causing the harm. Hate and prejudice should have no place in American life. The American system is based on law and order. Our system is the finest that the mind of man has yet devised. The very laws which guarantee our freedoms and upon which every American can rely were drawn up within our American system and they are guaranteed by that system.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us not make any mistake about it. I tell these people who act in this manner that this country is the finest country on the face of the earth and if this were not so, thousands of people all over the world would not be waiting in line every day to enter our borders, and many more would not risk the loss of their lives every day getting out of countries where the rule of law is violence. I believe that this is what these people fail to recognize.

I want to take this opportunity to commend my colleague in the well for the position he has taken in denouncing the purveyors of hate and prejudice whoever they may be. I have worked with the gentleman over a period of many years and I know that he has always championed causes which have been beneficial to the Mexican-American population of Texas and I want him to know that I have no patience with those who now accuse him of betraying the best interest of that segment of our population. He has been a true leader of his people and I commend him for the position which he has taken against violence and for law and order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GONZALEZ was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield further?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield further to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KAZEN. I do not wish to take further time of the gentleman and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman and my colleague who served many, many years in behalf of the areas involved and knows those areas intimately and the people thereof and know whereof he speaks.

I want to say that I do not think we should wait until we have a situation which some of these young, irresponsible revolutionaries, self-styled, do what they say they are intending to do.

Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1968 at the time of the threatened sabotage of the Air Force base in which one of these revolutionaries advocated the destruction of certain computers and thereby disrupting the operations, this shows clearly what they have in mind and intend to do. Well, if this is La Raza, if it is symbolic of what they propose to do, in my opinion, as once a Senator said, I think we cannot wait here to see a symbolic bullet put into a symbolic citizen because a man wanted to carry out his wishes against the people of a symbolic citizenry.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the danger which existed in my district has been very great. Less than 3 weeks ago plans were afoot, which I fully exposed through the local press in San Antonio, and which appeared to tone down the threats of this young man, the law-enforcement officials prevented a serious happening, because the group had planned systematically to disrupt, through the use of tough tactics, the annual fiesta. I warned the local police, whom I fully advised as to all the facts I had at hand and all of the law enforcement authorities who took extra careful precautionary measures and as a result thereof the violence which did occur a week ago last Monday was minimal and controllable.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an issue that we must not minimize and not try to treat as something insignificant, as just a rumbling or an idle threat or something of that nature. This is more insidious. Once we allow the first violent act to be registered in our part of the country, it will take generations to heal and repair the wounds.

Mr. Speaker, we have been witnessing in other areas of this country exactly what can happen and what would happen even though the warning signals were clear and even though the acts of these individuals were irresponsible and misguided. But the signals of this activity were clearly evident long before the actual violence.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from south Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman bringing this matter of such importance to our Nation and especially to our area of south Texas.

I speak, perhaps, a little selfishly, because my family has been in that area of what is now south Texas before there was even a United States. I love this area and eventually hope to go back there sometime. When I die I hope to be buried there.

I believe that I would like to have my children continue to grow up there. All that the gentleman in the well is bringing to our attention indicates the dire consequences to the kind of life that I wish for my family, for my friends and my relatives in this area of south Texas.

The hate and racism which we are experiencing is probably an idiotic and insane type of hate, because as the gentleman in the well has brought out, these people shout about the gringos and the gringo establishment. However, in the last few days in my district in Kingsville, Tex., it was not the lives of the gringos that were threatened, but their own people with Spanish surnames who happened to disagree with these zealots, as they speak out of one side of their mouths with their wrath and hatred, and this is now to be vented upon their own kind. And if you read and study the countries which have succumbed to communism such as Czechoslovakia, Cuba, and Red China, you will find that the Communists come to the young people, and the very youngest in the group in Kingsville were from a junior high school, and they are instilling in them the insidious hate against anything and anyone they do not understand, or whom they consider different from themselves. They are driving them away from their church, from their religion—although in the Communist countries now this has been changed and maneuvered around, and we can see a similar semblance of that type of thing where, as they attempt to instill in their people the thought that there is no God they have found out that man, the human, rebels against this ideology and now they cloak some of their actions through the use of misguided or renegade members of the cloth, thus trying to give sanctity to the hatred they preach.

Unfortunately, members of the cloth participate and join in this activity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring out another facet in this dissertation, and the gentleman has also brought this out, and that is that responsible people within our Government—and on this I would like to warn all of our colleagues here that these militants come with hatred in their eyes and with hatred in their hearts, but so long as they say "I am a member of a minority," then we have even included among our own colleagues those who immediately open their hands

and embrace what they have been doing, and who will introduce any bill or any resolution these individuals might bring around, simply because they say "I am for a minority."

So these individuals are taking great advantage of the situation, even among our colleagues in the Congress, and also among public officials throughout the area.

Mr. Speaker, this is really illustrated by the example of the demands which they bring to those schools. And one who should have known better, and who is a member of the Texas Legislature, came into my district chastising the school board over something that the school board had no control or jurisdiction over, as to what is put in the textbooks. The local school board has no jurisdiction over this whatsoever. As I say, it was gross ignorance on the part of the member of the State legislature, to say the least, to do this. Yet the young ones who know no better will follow that because they say, "Well, he is a respected member—supposedly—of the State legislature".

I would like to stress the point also that because one is a public official does not necessarily mean that he is advocating that which is right.

I would also like to bring out the fact that people are succumbing to this pressure for no other reason except that it is the easiest thing to do. So I would commend the gentleman in the well, because he is the first one to raise his voice against this insidious kind of hate which these people are trying to instill in our people, especially those who are very young.

I would like to quote from a wire service report with reference to Bayard Rustin who is a well known Negro civil rights leader. I quote the New York AP as follows:

> NEW YORK.—Bayard Rustin, a Negro civil rights leader, says educators should "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students" and "see that they get the remedial training they need."
>
> "What the hell are soul courses worth in the real world?" asked Rustin, who organized the civil rights march on Washington in 1963. "In the real world, no one gives a damn if you've taken soul courses. They want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence."

I think that is exactly what is happening in our area by bringing demands upon school boards on things which they have no control of.

Then I would like to make one last point as to civil rights legislation and equal employment legislation and all of the other legislation that we have enacted here trying to correct injustices of the past and one does not deny that there were such injustices.

But now these people are turning it around to the point where they do not want justice, but they want to bring about injustice upon those who they feel brought it to them in the past.

Mr. Speaker, this is just racism in reverse and it is something that we cannot condone.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. Let us all join with the gentleman in condemning this sort of thing wherever it happens and by whoever this kind of action is done. And remembering the words:

> Whatsoever you do for the least of my brothers, you do unto me.
>
> We cannot cure injustice by hate, we cannot undo evil with evil. We cannot, we must not allow this type of action to continue, for it is against the laws of God and the laws of man to take your brothers life, and this is what these misguided individuals preach.

Mr. GONZALEZ. The gentleman is quite right and I thank the gentleman.

In fact, with reference to one of the last points he mentioned, it is very true that these people do not want justice. They do not want equality—they want to get even—not to get equal—and this is a different matter.

With reference to the demonstration in Del Rio, the man who organized it is a distinguished physician in Del Rio and he now complains bitterly and says, "My Gosh—those radicals took over. We did not invite them. I did not ask them to take part in handling this. They took over. They took the whole show over."

This, of course, is a lesson of the 20th century. I think at this time it is absolutely binding upon us and it is our manifested duty and our obligation is a clear one that we at least speak out.

Let the people judge. If we are in error, then everyone of us serving in this House have to stand up for reelection every 2 years and the people in that way have a chance to judge. But the people cannot possibly review the unlimited Ford Foundation funds where they come in and disrupt and divide and destroy a community and then they can pull out—and they have no continuing responsibility to that community.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. Since the Ford Foundation has been mentioned, I think the gentleman would be interested in this quotation from a newspaper dated April 24 from our hometown paper of San Angelo which quotes a Del Rio leader of this radical group whose name I do not need to incorporate in the RECORD. He said here:

> Foundation money has become "tight" because of recent criticisms from United States Representative Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio.

All of a sudden they have become very tight. They often in the past gave out money for things other than chicano needs.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman. I hope they do succeed not only in tackling it but also in completely stopping it because this is very irresponsible and most dangerous.

I never heard of anybody in or out of a foundation providing an amount exceeding over $110,000 to a 25-year-old person who never had the experience of even holding a regular job.

This has led to murder. It has led to homicide. People were shocked when I say this, but I have the facts and I have the pictures here.

Because it would be one of these half-baked projects in San Antonio funded through this organization and from the Ford Foundation that established what they called the Universidad de los Barrios, that is the university of the neighborhoods and the collegio de los batos, that is the college of the punks.

It was in that place, right inside the threshold of that place, that a 17-year-old was stabbed to death and another was seriously stabbed. Of course, it is all this irresponsible activity that has led to this as well as to this other manifestation that has enabled a zealot, misguided and as wrong as sin, to have this tremendous amount of money in an attempt to disturb the public peace and order of this community and other communities.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and again I wish to commend the gentleman for the leadership he is giving in bringing this discussion before the House. It is obvious that the new militancy is groping for leadership and direction. Perhaps in some instances their cause is just or their intent is real, but the methods of achieving those goals are misdirected, particularly when they criticize my colleague, HENRY GONZALEZ, I think that direction is wrong, because the gentleman in the well, as much as any other man in Texas, has led the fight for decent wages and decent housing, not only for Americans with surnames similar to his, but for all impoverished people. There is a strange irony in the attacks on the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

By the leftwing militant he is branded a conservative. The conservative fears him as being left of the militant. He has been attacked from both sides or both ends. Both of those theories are erroneous. These claims and counterclaims are emotional overreactions and harsh criticism of a man who fairly represents his district.

More than a million and a half people living in Texas have Spanish surnames. They have blessed our culture with a rich flavor inherited from Mexico. Traditionally they have joined all other Texans in contributions to our welfare and not destruction. These militants would have us believe that another blood bath is in the making. Well, I think not, and I sincerely hope not. But if lines are to be drawn, which is a form of discrimination which these militants themselves protest, I predict the lines my colleague in the well has drawn will prevail.

All of this points out, more than in any other way, the misdirection sometimes of foundation money, though well intended, if put in the hands of the wrong people.

The militants would have us believe another bloodbath is in the making. I think not and I sincerely hope not. If lines must be drawn, which is a form of discrimination the militants themselves protest, then I predict Mr. GONZALEZ will prevail.

Congressman GONZALEZ has criticized the influx of foundation money into militant causes and I find it hard to disagree

with him. Time after time, he has apprised this body of misused foundation money in San Antonio, the core of his district.

The theories behind foundation participation are sound; the management of their money down in the barrios is not. To me, this proves, Congress must take another look at some sort of control over these foundations.

The House Ways and Means Committee is investigating the tax-exempt status of foundations, which represent an estimated $20 billion in assets. I am not advocating wholesale curtailment of the theory behind foundation work, many have made valuable contributions to society which, if left untended, would fall the Government's responsibility. However, the truth is that one man's or one organization's tax exemption is usually another man's tax burden. I am concerned with the abuses of the 1917 congressional enactment which gage major tax exemptions to foundations. It is disturbing that the present law is faulty enough to be tempting.

On a broad scale, opponents to the foundation exemptions point out that many represent concentrations of vast wealth that exercise considerable impact on the overall economy. Treasury records indicate that 200 of the more than 30,000 foundations have two-thirds of the $20 billion in assets.

Tighter revision of existing laws dealing with tax-exempt foundations is in order. It is overdue.

In the case of the troubled and excited Mexican-Americans, the foundation money that should have gone toward eliminating the barrios has gone instead to inciting the passions of yet another group of hard-core militants.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members who participated in this discussion be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I conclude by incorporating as a part of the RECORD my press conference statement of today, April 28:

REVERSE RACISM

It is virtually impossible for any man of reason, intelligence and sensitivity not to see every day the destructive and corrosive effects of racism. It is virtually impossible for any man who has seen and acknowledges the existence of racism and its terrible results not to fight against it.

Racism is based on feelings that are beyond my power to fathom; it is fear, hatred and prejudice combined into a poison that divides men who under their skin are identical; it causes some to believe that they are superior to others, simply because they are one thing and others are not; and racism has given us all a burden of dishonor, guilt and grief.

The passions of racial hatred have been fanned high by fanatics and demagogues long since gone, but the poisons they disseminated remain with us still. Who can forget the contorted, hateful faces of people attacking innocent children who sought nothing more than to obtain equal educational opportunity, to enter schools freely without regard to the color of their skin? And who can forget the shameful defiance of law by George Wallace's stand in the doors of a great university, or the deadly riots at the University of Mississippi? And who can forget the fire hoses of Birmingham? Who among us did not feel shame on the day of the incident at Selma bridge? The passions that fueled those incidents, and that have bombed schools and churches, and that have created night riders and slick demagogues are with us still. The fears that created Jim Crow are still around, and we are burdened yet with the disaster that frightened *Plessy versus Ferguson;* dozens of court decisions and hundreds of judicial orders have yet to erase the stain that decision placed on our legal system.

There is in physics a series of laws having to do with motion. There is a law of inertia, which states that a mass that is headed in a given direction is inclined to continue in that direction until its force is spent or some superior force deflects or overcomes it. There is another law that states that for a given force there is an equal and opposite force; for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. In the laws of civilizations gone by we can observe these same kinds of phenomena; and injustice will continue until its force is spent or until society rectifies it; and an injustice on one side may lead to another injustice on the other. Even as the poisons of racism are with us still, though its legal foundations be destroyed and gone for all time to come, so too can racism produce an equally deadly, opposite poison that can only be called reverse racism. I say it can produce that opposite effect, for the laws of politics are not so precise as the laws of physics; in social interaction there are no immutable laws. It is true that inertia exists in political and social systems, much as it does in physics, but an opposite action, a reaction, will occur only when the force of inertia is so great that on legitimate force can change it.

I believe that we are attacking the forces of hate and bigotry, and I believe that however slowly and painfully we may be doing it, our country is overcoming the forces of racism. I believe that the impetus of racism is spent, or very nearly so, and that it is possible that justice in this land can be achieved within legitimate means.

VIOLENCE NOT ANSWER

I do not believe that violence is necessary to obtain justice, and I do not believe that hatred is necessary either; I do not believe that there is any reason why despair should be so great that reverse racism can be justified. Yet reverse racism, and reverse racists exist and their voices are loud, if largely unheard.

No man ought to either practice or condone racism; every man ought to condemn it. Neither should any man practice or condone reverse racism.

Those who would divide our country along racial lines because they are fearful and filled with hatred are wrong, but those who would divide the races out of desire for revenge, or out of some hidden fear, are equally wrong. Any man, regardless of his ambitions, regardless of his aims, is committing an error and a crime against humanity if he resorts to the tactics of racism. If Bilbo's racism was wrong—and I believe that it was—then so are the brown Bilbos of today.

Fifteen years ago as a member of the City Council of the city of San Antonio, Texas, I asked my fellow Council members to strike down ordinances and regulations that segregated the public facilities of the city, so as to end an evil that ought never to have existed to begin with. That Council complied, because it agreed with me that it was time for reason to at long last have its day. Eleven years ago I stood almost alone in the Senate of the State of Texas to ask my colleagues to vote against a series of bills that were designed to perpetuate segregation, contrary to the law of the land. I saw the beginnings then of a powerful reaction to racist politics, and I begged my colleagues to remember: "If we fear long enough, we hate. And if we hate long enough, we fight." I still believe this to be true. Since then there has been vast progress in Texas. I do not know how to describe to you the oppression that I felt then; but I can tell you that the atmosphere today is like a different world. Injustices we still have aplenty, but no longer is there a spirit of blatant resistance to just redress of just grievance. Yet despite this change in the general atmosphere, despite the far healthier tenor of public debate and public action today, I felt compelled almost exactly a year ago to address the United States House of Representatives on the continuing and alarming practice of race politics, and what I chose to call the politics of desperation.

TACTICS OF CONFRONTATION

There are those in Texas today—and I suppose elsewhere as well—who believe that the only way that the problems of the poor, and the problems of the ethnic minorities, will be solved, is by forcing some kind of confrontation. This confrontation can be economic, or it can be direct and personal, but whatever form it may take, the object is to state in the most forceful possible terms what is wrong, and to demand immediate and complete corrective action. This tactic leaves no room for debate and often no room for negotiation, however, reasonable that might be. It is the tactic of drawing a line and saying that it is the point where one system ends and another begins. This may not sound unreasonable in itself, and in fact the tactics of confrontation may be a place in political life. But the problem is that this deliberate and very often sudden confrontation might or might not be reasonable, and the demands presented might or might not be legitimate. The fact is that the tactic deliberately attempts to eliminate alternatives to violence, and it is therefore risky at best and at worst it can lead to disaster. This sort of politics is only one step removed from rebellion.

When the politics of race are added to the politics of confrontation, the makings of tragedy are abundantly clear. Race politics is itself highly unstable, and the same is true of the politics of confrontation. When the potent mixtures of long held passions are met on a hard line, but with justice obscured or perhaps lost in the mists of empty slogans, then great and perhaps irreparable damage can result.

There are those in Texas who believe that reverse racism can be mixed with the politics of confrontation, and that the result will be justice—or if not justice at least revenge. One cannot be certain whether the new racists want justice or revenge; only one thing is certain and that is that you cannot have both.

THE NEW RACISM

Probably the leading exponent of the new racism in Texas is the current president of the Mexican-American Youth Organization. This young man is filled with passions that may be obscure even to himself; he is ready to accuse anyone who does not help him of being a "turncoat" and anyone who opposes him of having "gringo tendencies" and concludes that most of the citizens of Texas are racists. Indeed, if he is opposed, he says, ". . . within a few years I will no longer try to work with anybody." He is not certain of what he wants, except that he does not want to "assimilate into this gringo society in Texas." He wants to be "Mexicano" but not "Mexican." He wants to expose and eliminate "gringos," and by that he means killing if "it doesn't work." Of course, I am told that this young man never meant to make such threats, though he clearly uttered them. But those who utter threats and who clearly mean them, must be prepared to be challenged. And I do not believe that anyone who claims any position of responsibility, or

anyone who pretends to leadership can make threats of killing and still be expected to be called responsible.

This young man and his followers have attempted to find settings in Texas to practice their militance, and in particular to test out their theory of confrontation.

They distribute literature that is replete with hatred, and which builds on the supposed romance of revolution; too often one finds a photo of Juarez running alongside a photo of Che Guevara in MAYO literature. It would be hard to find a broader appeal than that to build a myth based on Guevara. They print such patent nonsense as "there is no bad luck, just bad gringos." They like to label enemies; "if you label yourself a gringo then you're one of the enemy." They give the overall impression that anyone the MAYO leadership disapproves of is either a gringo or has "gringo tendencies" or is a "turncoat." Only one thing counts to them: loyalty to *la raza* above all else, and MAYO next. Of course they reserve the right to judge who is loyal and who is not.

Filling people with the bright phrases of revolution and the ugly phrases of race hate, MAYO seeks to find a confrontation. They sought it at Del Rio, Texas on Palm Sunday, but did not find it. Some of them sought it at Denver that same weekend, but did not find it. When they do, they have every likelihood of doing great harm to themselves and the cause they supposedly are trying to advance. The fuel of tension and the flame of passion make a dangerous mix.

I do not favor repression, because I do not believe that order is something that can be forced, at least not in an open and free society. I believe that there is enough good will and enough determination in this country that justice will prevail, and without resort to violence on one side or the other.

The young racists want to promote and exacerbate fears that already exist; they want to destroy what they perceive as an equilibrium, or a stalemate, that militates against their perception of justice. I do not think that they will succeed. I believe that most Americans believe, as I do, and as Sandburg did, that:

"Across the bitter years and howling winters
The deathless dream will be the stronger
The dream of equity will win."

This is no land of cynics, and it is no land of demagogues; it is a land wherein I believe reason can prevail; if it cannot succeed here it can succeed nowhere.

I oppose this new racism because it is wrong, and because it threatens to destroy that good will, that sense of justice that alone can bring ultimate and lasting justice for all of us. This new racism threatens divisions that cannot soon be healed, and threatens to end whatever hope there may be—and I think that hope is considerable—of peaceful progress toward one country, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I do not want to see in Texas riots and burned buildings; and I do not want to see men beaten, men killed, and fear rampant. I have seen it happen in other cities; I have seen fear and hate and violence destroy that essential impetus toward full justice. I have seen the ugliness of division and violence, I do not want to see it again, and I do not want again to have to fight against blind, unreasoning intolerance. It is not necessary, and it is not inevitable.

RETROGRESSION, DESTRUCTION

But the fruit of racism is not prejudice, fear and distrust. There can be no benefit from it, no matter how you color it with romance or the new techniques of confrontation. There can only be tragedy from it. If MAYO gets its confrontation, it will not "crush any gringo who gets in (the) way" "squashing him like a beetle" and it will not "kick the door down." It will only find itself beaten in the end, and with it, the hopes of many innocent people who follow their false banner.

The new racists, if they succeed in their divisive efforts, will in the end only unloose destructive forces that may take generations to control, for those who plumb the wellsprings of hate and break the dams of passion always learn too late that passions and hatreds are far easier to open than they are to close. It is not possible to pursue a just cause with unjust tactics, and it is not possible to justify cruel and deceitful actions by the end hoped for. It is not possible to expect sympathy or justice from those whom you threaten with hatred and destruction, and it is self-deluding to think that there is no alternative to inviting violence.

I stand for justice, and I stand for classless, raceless politics. I stand for action, and I stand for freedom. I stand against violence, racism, and anyone or anything that threatens our ability in this land to govern ourselves as a free people.

RESTRUCTURING OF JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly clear over the past 5 years that the Job Corps, as presently set up, is not providing the best possible service to disadvantaged American youth.

If we are to achieve our longstanding goal of equal opportunity for all, it is most essential that we expand and retool the Nation's manpower program.

I, therefore, am extremely heartened by the sound and effective plan that Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has devised for integrating the Job Corps into a comprehensive manpower effort.

As Secretary Shultz said in House testimony:

We do not anticipate the demise of the Job Corps, rather we seek to improve its quality and relevance to the realities of the labor market.

The need for the restructuring of the Job Corps, for shifting the program's emphasis from conservation training to training for the large number of industrial jobs, is quite evident.

By keeping the very best conservation centers and by opening inner-city and near-city centers, we will take a major step toward helping reduce today's alarmingly high youth jobless rate.

I urge every Member of the 91st Congress to support this wise decision to integrate the Job Corps into the total manpower effort and to provide better services to those youths most in need.

OTEPKA-STATE MYSTERY UNFOLDS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans continue to ponder over the Otepka-State Department affair.

Now that Mr. Otepka has left State, more of the mystery of executive privilege unfolds.

As if a mysterious manipulator pushed a button, the American people are being told that recognition of Red China is suddenly vital to the peace interests of the world community.

The usual groups of public opinion conditioners points up organization and a well-financed program to attain their goal of a "new China policy." Reappearing with the new policy is an old identity of the Joe McCarthy era—none other than John Patton Davies—a man whose former role at State is linked to the present situation of two Chinas with 800 million individuals enslaved under a mainland Communist dictatorship.

Why the sudden reinterest in John Patton Davies? Who wants John Patton Davies rehabilitated? For what purpose? Was this why Otto Otepka had to be removed from the State Department?

Mr. Speaker, I include a most informative report on the Otepka removal from the Government Employees Exchange, April 6, 1969; a report on John Patton Davies from the Washington Post, April 27, and related clippings from the local Washington papers:

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Apr. 16, 1969]

OTEPKA WAS MAJOR ROADBLOCK IN TAKEOVER BY A "NEW TEAM": NEW YORK TIMES LINKED TO CIA PLOT ON OFFL.

The Central Intelligence Agency's "New Team," including such "outsiders" as Harding A. Bancroft, now the Executive Vice President of *The New York Times*, played a critical role in the final decision of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to press Secretary of State Dean Rusk to proceed with the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka as the State Department's top Security Evaluator, a former Ambassador associated with CIA Director Richard Helms informed this newspaper on April 11.

According to the source, Mr. Bancroft played a role because of his liaison and coordinating work involving the use of the organization and facilities of *The New York Times* on behalf of the CIA and the "New Team."

Other persons who had a role included William H. Brubeck who had been the recipient of the 1960 "leak" of Top Secret information from the State Department to the campaign headquarters of John Kennedy which contributed significantly to Mr. Kennedy's narrow victory at the election polls. After Mr. Kennedy's victory, Mr. Brubeck received complete information about Mr. Otepka's role in tracing this "leak", the former Ambassador revealed.

Other members of the "New Team" were McGeorge Bundy and his brother William Bundy, who had moved from the Central Intelligence Agency to become the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, including Vietnam.

"THE NEW TEAM"

The "New Team" at the Central Intelligence Agency was being planned by Attorney General Robert Kennedy even before the Bay of Pigs "fiasco" in 1961. In fact, the former Ambassador said, the Attorney General had a special group of his own "monitoring" the Bay of Pigs operation to determine which persons, not yet projected for the "New Team", would "pass the test".

Although the "Bay of Pigs" was a national disaster, the source said, Robert Kennedy exploited it within the Government to accelerate building the "New Team."

NEW TEAM GOALS

The "New Team" goals were set by the "personality" of Robert Kennedy and the "philosophy" of President John Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the source revealed. The main exponent of this "philosophy" was Major General Maxwell Taylor, assisted by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Whitman Rostow, the former Ambassador said.

The mission of the "New Team" was to contest the Soviet penetration of the "Third World," the so-called nonaligned countries through "paramilitary, parapolitical and paradiplomatic" means. To do this, the "New Team" was to be a "paragovernment", performing for the United States "the same kind of functions" which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union performed for the Soviet Union, the former Ambassador revealed.

This required the "New Team" to penetrate every department and agency of the Executive Branch dealing with foreign policy by inserting "trusted members" of the "New Team" into key positions. Among these were the Offices of Security of the State Department, the military services departments, the United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development, the source added.

"NEW TEAM" MEMBERS

Besides Robert Kennedy and Maxwell Taylor, other members of the "New Team" were General Marshall S. Carter, who replaced General Charles B. Cabell as Deputy Director of the CIA. Very early "recruits" to the "New Team" were Richard Helms, today the Director of the CIA, and Cartha "Deke" Deloach, the second man in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Together with Robert McNamara and Dean Rusk, the "New Team" acting under the control of Robert Kennedy began the "infiltration" of the State Department and the Defense Departments with Central Intelligence Agency personnel. "Counter-insurgency" projects sprung up in every agency dealing with foreign affairs.

OUTSIDE "INSIDERS"

Besides key persons officially already in the Government, the "New Team" selected persons in leading banks, law firms and foundations for the penetration of the "non-governmental" apparatus of the United States, the former Ambassador revealed. Because of the paramount role of *The New York Times* in Amercian life and because of the "black" assignments which it might be asked to perform for the CIA, great care was taken to select a person who had full access to every office in *The New York Times* and yet could conceal his own operations. This was especially important because "gray" operations, involving special background briefings for such top *New York Times* representatives as James Reston and Tom Wicker were already going on, and top *New York Times* reporters were in an especially good position to "uncover" the "black" operations.

BANCROFT'S PAST

Harding Bancroft had been originally introduced into the State Department by Alger Hiss, and, after Mr. Hiss became the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Mr. Bancroft served under Dean Rusk as a member of the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, renamed the Office of United Nations Affairs. Subsequently, he took the post of General Counsel to the International Labor Organization in Geneva and then went to *The New York Times*, eventually to be named Executive Vice President.

During the Eisenhower administration, Harding Bancroft worked closely with Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, maintaining close liaison with John Foster Dulles and with Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

BANCROFT'S COVER

Because Mr. Bancroft's liaison role at *The New York Times* required meeting with top CIA and State Department officials, especially on matters of "Personnel", it was decided to provide him with "cover" by designating him a "member" of the newly created State Department Advisory Committee on International Organization Affairs, whose task was to recommend the "best qualified Americans" for those international organization positions in which they could make important contributions.

Although the Advisory Committee eventually prepared a "Report", which was itself controversial in its original draft form, the basic role of the Committee was to provide a "cover" for the "New Team," the source revealed.

"ROADBLOCK" OTEPKA

One of the major "roadblocks" to the "infiltration" of the State Department by the Central Intelligence Agency New Team was Otto F. Otepka, its top Security Evaluator. Mr. Otepka had already "annoyed" the Central Intelligence Agency by his "uncovering" the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in using "double agents" in the Warsaw "sex and spy" scandals. Subsequently, Mr. Otepka "annoyed" Robert Kennedy and Dean Rusk by insisting, in December 1960, that Walt Whitman Rostow would need a "full field FBI investigation" before he could be "cleared" for employment in the State Department. Mr. Rostow had just completed in December a "secret" mission in Moscow for President-elect John Kennedy. The mission was "cleared" by CIA Director Allen Dulles. Previously, Mr. Rostow had established the CIA channels at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University professors maintained their own CIA "black" ties with Washington through the Institute, the former Ambassador asserted.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 27, 1969]

JOHN PATON DAVIES: THE LONG STRUGGLE BACK

(By Michael Kernan)

If Tolstoy could have seen the John Paton Davies family getting its picture taken, complete with dog, he would have nodded sagely and repeated himself (in the way of novelists) with the comment that all happy families are alike, and he would have been wrong, wrong, wrong.

While five of the seven children, churned around the living room of the comfortable red brick house on Cumberland street, Davies and his wife and her mother cheerfully arranged themselves where the photographer wanted them.

"Tiki just got word that she's been accepted by the Smithsonian children's theatre festival for the summer," said Mrs. Davies. Tiki, or Patricia, a University of Maryland student, beamed and corralled a speeding small girl.

Eventually the girls simmered down, even 10-year-old Jenny, who is the violin-playing "captain" of what her father calls the junior varsity. Davies and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Henry Grady, visiting from San Francisco, chatted quietly. Mrs. Davies told about the time Debby was arrested at the ago of 7 at the zoo for passing out McCarthy buttons (one would like to know more about the arresting officer) and discussed the health of Weinie, the longhair daschund.

"She has to have aspirin all winter because she gets rheumatism in her paws," she said, and the children laughed gaily, and Davies smiled with hooded eyes, looking—despite the corduroy jacket and the pipe—vaguely like a mandarin.

This is not surprising for Davies was born in Szechwan, western China, in 1908, and as a veteran of the U.S. Foreign Service from 1931, the year he graduated from Columbia, he qualifies as an "old China hand."

It was his expertise on China and Asia that brought him in the early 1950s, into the sights of the late Joseph R. McCarthy, the Senator who made a career out of innuendo and rode to power on his claim of "Communists in Government."

In a State Department memorandum, Davies had challenged the prevailing notion that world Communism was an all-powerful monolith: The "devil theory" in which the noted psychiatrist Dr. Jerome Frank was later to detect a national case of paranoia. The possibility that Russia and China might be considered separately, that Chiang Kai-shek might not be able to clear the Communists out of the Chinese mainland, was so disturbing to McCarthy and others that Davies became a target.

Summoned from Lima, Peru, where he had become counselor and charge d'affaires in 1953, he went through nine security investigations. None produced any evidence of disloyalty, perjury or Communism. The first eight security boards cleared him of all charges.

The ninth, late in 1954, discovered something new, a "lack of judgment, discretion and reliability," enabling Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to dismiss him.

Thus he became one of the victims of the McCarthy era, of whom there were many. Some are still picking up the pieces of their lives. Some have long since quit trying. A few not only have survived but have returned. This takes time, for governments do not admit to mistakes. It also takes character. John Paton Davies Jr. won his vindication three months ago.

Walter Sterling Surrey, an attorney whose firm has handled many Government loyalty cases, cleared Davies' name by having him apply for a consultant post (with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency) requiring security checks. He got it just days before the Johnson Administration broke up.

"Anyone who goes through one of these cases, even if they win it," said Surrey—"you have no idea what happens. Any little thing becomes monstrous, something you did when you were a kid. You stay awake thinking . . ."

The first thing Surrey has such a client do is write out a personal dossier recounting everything he can possibly remember that makes him feel guilty or that might be construed in some detrimental way.

"We have them get it all out," he said, "to clear the air. You'd be amazed at the stuff."

Surrey noted with some irony the ingenuity of an accusation that covered the very years during which the State Department gave Davies increasingly responsible posts in China, Russia and Germany, culminating in FSO-1, the top rank outside career ambassador and career minister.

"He was due to become an ambassador on his next assignment," said the lawyer. "He was supposed to lack judgment all that time?

"Certainly he was hurt, and not only in his career. But I never heard a word of bitterness or anything but his usual humor and pleasant sarcasm. And his wife—I never heard her question his judgment. Before he went in to Dulles he was urged to resign, so he could have had all his retirement benefits and everything, but he said they would have to fire him or retain him. She never questioned that decision, though it must have meant a lot, with her father an ambassador. I think it meant a great deal to her."

Both of them, said Surrey, "had the attitude that it was the other people who had the problems, and if someone wanted to snub them, they would keep away, and if someone wanted to talk about the case but was hesitant, they would bring it up themselves. They would help him.

"A few people called me to ask if it was okay to see him. You know. If it was safe. I told them no. I figured he didn't need them."

It is easy to get Davies to talk about "those days," for as he says, "I'm a very open person." But the story that comes out is not, perhaps, what one might expect:

"When I was called up from Lima, I had an idea what it might be. I wasn't the only one, after all. My friends were falling away like autumn leaves. In fact, the statement I read I had prepared beforehand in Lima."

Returning to his wife, Patricia, and their

four small children in Lima, he took stock for a month or two, living on savings. The son of a Baptist missionary, he had no business background. He decided, finally, on the advice of a friend at Sears Roebuck, to manufacture furniture.

Starting with mass-market items, he gradually shifted to high-quality work in hard tropical wood. With the help of his wife, who is an interior-design consultant, he produced furniture that won awards from the American Institute of Interior Designers.

"We made every mistake known to man," said Mrs. Davies, "plus a whole lot we invented ourselves."

Eventually, State began sending him a fraction of his pension, and life in Lima, surrounded by cultured Americans and the pre-Columbian art in which he took a passionate interest, was comfortable.

"Remember, I didn't feel ostracized," he added. "We got all kinds of letters of support. And we have always taken a positive attitude about things. Of course, it was most unpleasant, disagreeable, no doubt about that, but we never sat around holding our heads."

(What Surrey described as "a terrible automobile accident that Patricia was in" became in her telling the casual remark that "I went through a windshield when I hadn't planned to." Her husband calls that being stoical; some would call it gallant.)

A few years ago the quality furniture market dried up, so Davies brought his family back to Washington to seek his vindication and with it some $17,000 in back pay and pension, withheld because he had refused to sign a release form.

John Davies sat in the living room letting the interview happen at its own pace. On the walls were rubbings of steles from the Han period. A spray of magnolia blossoms burst from a superb early Chinese apple-green vase. Two ancient Wei figurines graced the mantle. Flanking the fireplace were a pair of tall ladderback chairs that somehow combined purity and delicacy of line with an impression of wiry strength.

"We used black palmwood," he said, loading his pipe with latakia tobacco and lounging in a comfortable but light armchair. "It's fantastically strong."

"These arms"—he stroked the smooth curve of his chair's arm, less than half an inch thick—"are made with four laminates. You put it in a mold for a week, and the glue holds it to the shape. It could have been even thinner, but you have the problem of fitting the legs into it."

To cover the place where the dowel penetrated the arm, he used a silver medallion with a pre-Columbian Chimu design. The effect was stunning. Across the room stood a large coffee table with black leather jacketing on the ends and a lyrical Peruvian design inlaid on the top.

"There's enormous variations in tropical woods," he observed. "The Indians use this for arrowheads and for bows, too."

Since his return to Washington he has been working daily on a new book, about China, Russia and America. "I'm only about a year over the deadline," he said drily. He works in an office (smelling of old books and wood-smoke) off the living room, surrounded by shelves of volumes on everything from archaeology to politics. There are also paintings, rubbings and some of his own large, curiously embossed woodcuts, made by a process that Davies playfully refuses to divulge.

The conversation veered around to Walter Surrey's work in arranging his vindication. "I won't say reversal because governments don't reverse themselves—except in the case of Mr. Otepka," he smiled ironically. "State began to study it a year ago, and I thought nothing in the world would happen."

Suddenly he was out of his seat, pacing restlessly before the fireplace. "But dear Walter kept after them—he was the conscience of the Government—until State finally came up with the all clear . . . largely through Katzenbach . . . I've been very lucky, had an extremely able lawyer, and one with some influence in the Government. You have to, to get justice."

The people close to John Davies add to the picture of what he calls his stoicism. His father, John Davies Sr., of Alexandria, is not only alive, at 91, but keeps so busy he is a hard man to catch. His grandchildren think he is cool.

"It puts iron in your blood, an experience like that," he said. "John grew up with Chinese children and servants. Even much later, he used to send back money to his old Chinese amah [nurse]. In the early days we had oil lamps and traveled by ricksha, had a little garden, and if you wanted milk the cow would be brought to your door and milked in your presence. We were comfortable.

"John was the oldest (a brother, Donald, lives in Washington), a studious boy, very thoughtful. Self-contained, but he always attracted friends. We never used physical force on him—it was a Christian home, a well-regulated life, and he was not easily upset."

The frontier life gave young Davies an appetite for adventure, and the first time he crossed Asia on the Trans-Siberian railway, in 1930, he went hard class, surviving on black bread and candy bars.

He picked up languages easily in his travels through Mukden and other volatile spots in the era of the Sino-Japanese war and in Moscow, where he came to know George Kennan. "I studied Russian," he said, "and I speak a passable coolie Spanish, but Chinese is my language."

Even Mandarin, however, was no help in 1944, when he had to bail out of a C-46 going over the Hump and landed in the jungle among Naga headhunters.

"We came by such a miraculous way that it was okay. If we had come in by foot they would have taken our heads. There were five or six of us in our group. We finally hiked to a village and got out."

Commentator Eric Sevareid was in the group, too. He broadcast a piece about it. ". . . In such circumstances men learn truly to know one another—who is weak, who is afraid, who is impetuous and who is strong and calm and prudent. As the time passed the GIs and I began to recognize the civilian with the carefully guarded dispatch case as one among us with a calm and natural courage, as one who would never panic, who never complained. He was the one we chose, for common sense and discretion, to deal with the touchy and dangerous Naga. . . . I have known a great number of men . . . none who seemed more the whole man . . . in all that a man should be—in modesty and thoughtfulness, in resourcefulness and steady strength of character. . . ."

Davies won the Medal of Freedom for that incident.

It was his wife who had the most to say about the firing and the long struggle back. She said they never discussed it between themselves. As she talked he watched her steadily from across the room.

"It's like standing in Rotterdam being bombed," she said. "When you are the target, your problems are tremendously simple. Like the Jews under the Nazis, the problem was to survive. It's harder for the people near you; they have the moral dilemmas about whether they should resign, should they have done more, things like that, all kinds of trauma. It was very different for us. Maybe they should have resigned, but for us the only way we could fight was by not resigning.

"But we don't dwell on all that. Our lives are full. We live very much in the present."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1969]

MRS. OTEPKA RECALLS ORDEAL

(By Vera Glaser)

Mrs. Otto F. Otepka is a quiet-spoken school teacher who is married to one of the most controversial figures in public life today.

Her dark hair is turning gray, but her steely resolve has helped her husband weather a five-and-a-half year, headline-studded battle to keep his job as a State Department security officer.

In an exclusive interview, her voice trembling with emotion, Mrs. Otepka compared their ordeal to "something that might have happened in Russia or Nazi Germany. My husband only told the truth, but we were forced to act like criminals."

VINDICATION

When President Nixon recently named Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board, some hailed it as complete vindication. The nomination may run into trouble in the Senate because, among other things of a recent news story linking Otepka to the ultra-right John Birch Society.

Otepka's tough security evaluations of State employes in the early '60s ran afoul of the late Robert Kennedy, then Attorney General, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Otepka was charged with passing confidential documents to a Senate subcommittee.

During that period, Mrs. Otepka recalled, "We were harassed. Men watched our house with binoculars. Otto was locked out of his office. They tapped his phone and we were afraid to use our home phone for fear that was bugged, too. I had to go down to the shopping center when I wanted to talk to Otto."

Sitting in the living room of their neat-as-a-pin home in suburban Silver Spring, Mrs. Otepka stroked her two enormous cats, Inky and Barney, recalling the highlights of a case that has made her husband the symbol of the clash between "liberals" and "conservatives" on how the national security should be protected within the government.

For her, "the Otepka case" began on a summer evening in 1963 when her husband came home and said his superiors had lied to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, then probing State's security practices.

"Otto couldn't have lived with himself if he hadn't given those documents to the committee," she said, describing his action as necessary to verify his own testimony and refute that of his superiors.

She learned how very serious her husband's situation was the following September when she switched on a radio news report to hear, "State Department security officer charged with passing documents to the Senate!"

"You expected them to say, 'to Russia,'" she said, noting that 13 charges were leveled at Otepka at the time. Ten were dropped after his superiors confessed to tapping Otepka's phone, scrutinizing his office trash, and committing perjury before the committee.

"Otto has never been accused of lying or being unfair," his wife said.

The former Edith Simon, Mrs. Otepka was born on a Maryland farm and reared as a Christian Scientist, but now belongs to Grace Episcopal Church. She met Otepka, a Chicagoan of Czech extraction, shortly after she began teaching in the District of Columbia schools. He held a minor government job while studying law at night.

THE 91ST PSALM

After their marriage, they lived modestly, stayed out of debt, and planned for the college education of their one daughter Joanne, now 23, in 1957 Mrs. Otepka quit teaching. In 1965, as her husband's troubles with the State Department dragged on, she went back to work and they mortgaged their home.

The couple decided early that keeping busy would help them weather the storm. He bought a boat and took up fishing. She studied art and did church work.

"I kept reading the 91st Psalm," Mrs. Otepka recalled, "especially the part about 'His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.' Last summer I painted the bedrooms and bathroom. It's healthy to be busy. I can't stand self-pity."

Otepka spent long hours in his basement office organizing material on his case which fills several file cabinets. The walls are hung with mementos and State Department citations for outstanding work, one signed by former Secretary of State Dulles.

Mrs. Otepka maintains her husband's resolve never wavered but friends say they both showed signs of strain. At times the Otepkas seemed to wonder if it was worth-while to give up years of potentially productive activity to pursue the fight. Once Mrs. Otepka wrote her husband a "chin up" note which he has saved.

Occasionally they laughed about their troubles. "We'd say 'why watch television? We've got our own show'," Mrs. Otepka reminisced.

In February 1966, three years after he had been charged, Otepka crossed the path of Richard Nixon, who had not yet decided to run for the Presidency. "Stay in there," he told Otepka, "and some day the worm will turn."

"It's true Otto was blocking some Kennedy Administration appointments," Mrs. Otepka said. His job was to follow the security rules laid down by the intelligence agencies. When word came back to us that Bobby had inquired about the possibility of having Otto charged with violation of the espionage act, that did it. We knew then we'd fight it out."

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Apr. 24, 1969]

NEW YORK TIMES "DISCLOSURES" ARE AMUSING: LEGAL DEFENSE DIALOG

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—That was quite an editorial in the N.Y. Times, April 8, titled "Otepka and the Birchites," and it deserves some dialogue.

N.Y. Times: "The disclosure that Otto Otepka received $22,000 from a fund with extreme right-wing associations should be enough to kill his nomination to the Subversive Activities Control Board."

Answer: But Otepka tells me he received not a penny. Rather it was his attorney, Roger Robb, now a nominee for the U.S. Court of Appeals, who got the bundle. Even when he made personal appearances before libertarian groups (composed of both political conservatives and political liberals), Otepka refused all except his expenses.

N.Y. Times: ". . . Senators of conscience cannot vote to confirm Mr. Otepka in a $36,000 job where his work, if any, will be to judge the loyalty of American citizens and organizations."

A: Oh, come on. Otepka will be one of a five-member board which examines only those cases sent by the Attorney General of the United States. The "Birchites" aren't named in the editorial, but the head of the Defense Fund which paid Mr. Robb is James Stewart of Ohio. Otepka never asked Stewart about a possible membership to the John Birch Society, but in all the official lists of subversive organizations which Otepka has seen in his line of work, the JBS never appeared.

N.Y. Times: ". . . Mr. Otepka's link to the Birchites is no youthful indiscretion."

A: That's right. Otepka tells me, "I don't belong to anything except the American Legion and the Catholic Church."

N.Y. Times: ". . . Evidently he violated no law in accepting money from Birchite sources to meet the legal costs of his unsuccessful fight as the State Department's chief security evaluator."

A: What do you mean "evidently"? I say "evidently" the N.Y. Times is not in the pay of a foreign government, and "evidently some of its editors are not bigamists. It's public policy that poor people in the clutches of the law are supplied with legal counsel, and I don't suppose that the murderers of Martin Luther King and Bob Kennedy are paying legal fees from their own pockets.

SEGREGATE PLASMA?

If "Birchite sources" are tainted, then we ought to segregate Birchite blood-plasma to make sure it doesn't get into the Red Cross blood banks. If that sort of dollars is bad, that sort of corpuscles must be worse. Not only the Birch Society, allegedly, came to Otepka's aid, but so did the American Civil Liberties Union which spent its members' money investigating and deploring the wiretap used by the State Department against Otepka. And a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate expended money and man-hours in exposing the violation of Otepka's civil rights. Are they all tainted?

N.Y. Times: "But his warped concept of Americanism disqualifies Mr. Otepka from sitting in judgment on subversion."

A: Well, the "warped concept" isn't described, but there were two State Department officials caught in lies during the Internal Security subcommittee's investigation, and neither of them was named Otepka. He did not, as insinuated, "spy" on his colleagues, but they spied on him. In obedience to the Senate subcommittee's counsel's request, Otepka turned over objective documents which showed that some of his superiors were not complying with the laws.

MISSPENT DECADES?

If Otepka isn't "qualified for sitting in judgment on subversion," then he must have misspent two decades of work as a Civil Service investigator. He must have fooled those superiors who gave him citations for meritorious achievement. He must have fooled President Nixon who nominated him for an important post.

N.Y. Times: "The evidence is overwhelming that the Senate should reject this nomination."

A: This statement is the exact opposite of the truth, but let's defend with our lives the right to make it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 27, 1969]

RECOGNIZE RED CHINA, VOTERS LEAGUE PROPOSES

The League of Women Voters of the United States today called on the U.S. government to "initiate" policy changes which will lead to recognition of the Communist Chinese government and cease opposition to its seating in the United Nations.

The league's policy position on U.S.-China relations climaxes a three-year study by the 157,000 member organization.

In announcing the position, Mrs. Bruce B. Benson of Amherst, Mass., national league president, emphasized that reports from local leagues in every part of the country "overwhelmingly" indicated agreement that "present U.S. policies of isolation and containment of China are invalid."

"You can't ignore a country with 800 million people," Mrs. Benson told a press briefing earlier this week. At the same time, Mrs. Benson said she saw no conflict between present U.S. support of the Taiwan government and the league's proposal it recognizes the mainland China government.

"We have not said what we think ought to be, or is, or should be the government of the island of Taiwan," she said in answer to a question challenging the league's exclusion from its policy statement of its position on Taiwan. "Regardless of what the solution to the Taiwan issue is, we are saying that it is quite clear that the People's Republic of China is the government of continental China."

TUESDAY SESSION

The league's policy statement, which will be discussed at the Tuesday afternoon session of its week-long National Council meeting opening tomorrow at the Mayflower Hotel, reads in full:

"The League of Women Voters advocates U.S. initiatives which would facilitate participation by the People's Republic of China in the world community and relax tensions between the United States and Mainland China.

"Policies should be established which would encourage normalization of U.S. relations with the Chinese mainland, including travel, cultural exchange, and unrestricted trade in non-strategic goods.

"The United States should withdraw its opposition to representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations. The United States should move toward establishing diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China."

The league adopted U.S.-China relations as a major part of its foreign policy program at its 1966 convention. Since then, members of the 1,200 local leagues throughout the country have been involved in extensive study and discussion as well as conferences with China experts from universities, government and the press.

Both non-league and league material was used as background material. More than 100,000 copies of the league's 30-page booklet, "The China Puzzle," have been sold.

IN DEPTH STUDY

The book, which is an in-depth study of China's historical and political development with emphasis on U.S.-China relations from their inception with the New England clipper trade in the 18th century, concludes:

"Reexamining attitudes or positions inherited from the past is never easy; reevaluation of a foreign policy issue as complex and controversial as China promises to be no exception.

"A current complicating factor is the spillover of strong feelings aroused by the Vietnam war. Communist China's vehement attacks on the United States continue to add to the already overcharged atmosphere in this country. Yet for any constructive consideration of the China problem, emotionalism is out of order."

Mrs. David G. Bradley, of Durham, N.C., chairman of the league's Foreign Policy Committee, commenting on the China position, declared:

"The league is now in a position to urge changes in basic U.S. policies which have cut this nation off from communication or cooperation with the People's Republic. We want a U.S. policy designed to invite a peaceful response from the People's Republic, welcoming her participation in the family of nations."

At the Tuesday meeting, league leaders from 50 states will discuss ways to bring about changes in U.S. policy on the basis of the league's China position.

MURDER AT NEW BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic murder of a peace officer at the Bethel Church in Detroit provokes serious inquiry.

What were the armed secessionists try-

ing to conceal or who were they shielding the officers from observing?

The religious news edition of the Herald of Freedom, April 18, 1969, and clippings from the New York Times for April 21 and the Washington Post of April 26 point out some very interesting information and raises the question, When are the American people going to cease financing violence in our country?

The material referred to follows:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Apr. 18, 1969]

CLERGY AND COURT HELP BLACK REVOLUTION

The role of clergymen in the ever-increasing tempo of the Black Revolution was never more evident than in the aftermath of a gun battle Saturday, March 29, 1969 between Detroit police and armed black militants. Police were forced to storm the New Bethel Baptist Church into which black ambushers fled after killing one policeman and wounding another when they stopped to question a dozen Negroes carrying rifles and carbines outside the church. The church, it developed, had been used by a black nationalist group, the Republic of New Africa, which was winding up a four-day national convention. This is the group which is plotting to take over five southern states in a series of well-planned steps, the first of which is to arm the black communities of the North and West. They plan to start their take-over with Mississippi, shipping in about a million well-armed blacks to seize the local government by ballot. They will then move on to Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia and South Carolina and repeat the process.

The incident was described as follows by the N.Y. Times:

"Reviewing the Saturday incident, Commissioner Spreen said that as the black nationalist meeting was breaking up in the church, the slain policeman and his partner saw men with rifles next to the church and stopped their scout car.

"They had not drawn their guns and were immediately fired upon as they left their scout car on Linwood Avenue, he said. Patrolman Czapski was hit five times, staggered to the sidewalk next to the church and collapsed.

"His partner, struck once in the leg and twice in the back by rifle fire, Commissioner Spreen said, managed to clamber back into the scout car and radio for help."

The police reinforcements, who arrived in response to the call for help, fired "at least 84 rounds into the pews, walls, pulpit and doors of the church" and arrested 147 persons. The shooting up of the church has become a central issue in the affair with Rev. Ralph Abernathy, successor to M. L. King as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, being quoted as stating sanctimoneously: "There should be no obscuring of the fact that police powers were misused in trampling, shooting and wreaking havoc in God's holy temple." It might be suggested that the pastor responsible for the church should have been a bit more careful of the type persons allowed to make use of it.

The pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church used by the Negro militants is Rev. C. L. Franklin, associated with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. A two-hour conference was held between Rev. Abernathy and other clergymen, police officials and the mayor of Detroit, Jerome P. Cavanagh. The mayor stated that the police "conclusively believe and know" that members of the black nationalists' armed "Black Legion" had fired from inside the building at entering police officers. Rev. C. L. Franklin, however, "defied" the police commissioner to show any evidence that bullets had been fired from within the church. City Councilman Nicholas Hood, Jr. toured the church and came to the conclusion that the police had "overreacted." The fact remains that a policeman is dead and a shot from somewhere killed him.

The most amazing result of the shooting was the treatment of those arrested by what passed for a "court." All but two of the 147 arrested were freed promptly by a Negro judge who obviously got up in the middle of the night to do so, setting up an impromptu "court" in a sideroom of the police station. When the county prosecutor attempted to hang on to one of his prisoners, the judge ordered him held in contempt of court.

The judge is an expert on "contempt of court" from the contempt side, that is—as he himself was sent to Federal prison after having been found guilty of contempt of court when he represented the Communist side in the trial of the top Communists in the United States before Judge Harold Medina who suffered almost unbelievable harassment from the Communists and their lawyers.

The judge in question is George William Crockett, Jr., judge of Detroit's Recorders (Criminal) Court. The N.Y. Times, calling him a "Controversial Judge," stated: "At 5:30 Sunday morning the judge marched into police headquarters in downtown Detroit and asked for a list of the 147 Negroes arrested hours earlier after a gun battle with black separatists in which one patrolman was killed. He could not get it, and within an hour . . . Crockett . . . had turned a stationhouse room into an impromptu court and he began releasing prisoners. When the county prosecutor ordered one man held anyway the judge charged the prosecutor with contempt of court.

"A few hours later he rejected the prosecutor's request to keep eight men jailed for another 24 hours despite indications that some might have fired weapons during the battle."

Crockett was born in Jacksonville, Fla., fifty-nine years ago and graduated from the University of Michigan Law school. He worked for the U.S. Department of Labor in an executive position and then went to work for the United Automobile Workers in Detroit. He left the union to set up private practice and is a partner in the law firm of Goodman, Crockett, Robb & Philo of Detroit. He has been married for thirty-five years to Dr. Ethelene Jones Crockett, who received her medical degree after the birth of their three children: Mrs. Richard Hicks, a Los Angeles school-teacher; George W. Crockett 3rd, a lawyer, and Mrs. John Jones, a doctor . . . no underprivileged people in this Negro family.

The Congressional Record has contained much information on George W. Crockett, Jr. In the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 13, page 16595, we read:

"Recently the National Lawyers Guild (a cited Communist-front—Ed.) sent representatives into Mississippi to open offices there, quite openly for the purpose of meddling into the problems of the State of Mississippi.

"One of those involved in this effort is George Crockett.

"Those people are directing the agitators in the State. Many of the people involved are young people, but most of them are old hands, with long Communist affiliations.

"And who is George Crockett? He is a Nergo lawyer from Detroit, a member of the National Lawyers Guild, and the attorney who represented the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party in the New York City Smith Act trial. He was one of those placed in contempt of court by Judge Medina at the conclusion of that famous trial of Communist leaders, for his arrogant, provocative, and flagrantly contumacious conduct during the course of the trial.

"Crockett was accompanied, in setting up his Mississippi headquarters for the legal defense of the invaders, by Mr. Benjamin Smith of New Orleans. This Benjamin Smith has long been associated with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, with Mr. James Dombrowski and with Carl and Anne Braden, whose associations and activities are well known. (The Bradens and Dombrowski are identified Communists—Ed.) This Benjamin Smith, like Victor Rabinowitz, is registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of Fidel Castro."

Also in the Congressional Record, we find the following from a statement by Sen. James Eastland concerning "Communist Forces Behind Negro Revolution in This Country:"

"Let me name some of the other well-known nonresidents of the State of Mississippi who have been publicly identified with the organization of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, and tell something about them.

"One of these individuals is George William Crockett, Jr., a Negro, long active in the Detroit chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and who has been on its advisory board. Crocket was designated as co-chairman of a committee of lawyers who would spend a period of 12 weeks in Mississippi, after the Guild in 1964 inaugurated a lawyers peace call program involving the recruiting of attorneys to devote their time for defense of individuals involved in Mississippi civil rights cases.

"George William Crockett, Jr., is a partner in the law firm of Goodman, Crockett, Robb & Philo, of Detroit, Mich. He has defended Communists in various Smith Act cases. . . . Judge Medina held in contempt of court and sentenced him to 4 months' imprisonment on each of nine specific contempt charges. Crockett sought relief from a higher court, but the U.S. Supreme Court denied his petition for certiorari, and Crockett and other attorneys similarly sentenced in the same proceeding served their sentences in 1952.

"In 1962 Crockett went to Mexico, where he associated with individuals known as among the more active members of the American Communist group there. In 1964 Crockett was registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of the Cuban Communist Government of Fidel Castro."

In U.S. Hearings on "Communist Political Subversion," an identified Communist took the Fifth Amendment concerning his association with George W. Crockett, Jr. On Page 6530 we read the testimony of Stanley Nowak (accompanied by counsel, George W. Crockett, Jr.) who had been identified as a member of the Communist conspiracy by Stephen J. Schemanske:

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Nowak, do you know your counsel in any capacity other than the capacity of attorney and client?

"Mr. NOWAK. Yes. . . .

"Mr. ARENS. Did you ever serve in the Communist Party with him? (The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. NOWAK. First of all, this is an improper question.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

"Mr. FRAZIER. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Chairman, may I again say this is an improper question and that is why I refuse to answer improper questions on the grounds of the fifth amendment."

In the index of the appendix to these hearings, which is practically a "Who's Who" of members of the American Communist Party, George W. Crockett, Jr. is listed as appearing on thirteen separate pages. On page 7102 is an article concerning Crockett appearing in the Lamp (publication of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born—a cited Communist-front): "Crockett Joins Legal Defense in the Case of Claudia Jones":

"George W. Crockett, Jr., noted Negro attorney of Detroit, has joined Carol King (identified Communist—Ed.), general counsel of the ACPFB, in serving as co-counsel in

the case of Claudia Jones. Crockett, one of the defense attorneys in the trial of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party, is a graduate of the University of Michigan. In 1939, he served in Washington with the Department of Labor and later with the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. In 1944 he founded the CIO Auto Workers Fair Employment Practices Committee and served as its executive director for two years. Since 1948, he has served as local counsel for the ACPFB in Detroit. Claudia Jones, 35, a native of the British West Indies, is secretary of the Women's Committee of the Communist Party."

On page 7117 of the Hearings on Communist Political Subversion is another item concerning Crockett appearing in the Lamp (under "Organizational Activities"):

"The Hungarian American Defense Committee has translated and published in pamphlet form the ACPFB folder, 'The Rights of Foreign Born Americans,' by George W. Crockett, Jr., of Detroit."

On page 7119 was another mention of Crockett in the Lamp; on page 7157 was a summary of proceedings of a conference held October 27, 1951, at Ford Local 600 Auditorium, under auspices of Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and Detroit Chapter, National Women's Appeal for the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, in which we read:

"George W. Crockett, Jr., noted Detroit attorney, reviewed the history of the fight for bail and pointed to the victory won locally when the Federal Courts agreed to accept bail money from the Civil Rights Bail Fund when the Immigration Dept. tried to cancel bail. He called for a struggle by all to defend the rights of the American people."

On page 7222 is a summary of the proceedings of the Michigan Conference To Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend the Rights of Foreign-Born Americans, held in the Hotel Tuller, (Detroit), Sunday, November 22, 1953, which read in part:

"The morning session, chaired by Mrs. Margarett Nowalk, heard a report on the work and accomplishments of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born by the Executive Secretary, Mr. Saul Grossman. Attorney George Crockett gave a comprehensive analysis of some of the current legal problems facing those under attack by the Walter-McCarran Law."

On page 7640 was Exhibit No. 312A, a press release of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 920 Charlevoix Building, Detroit 26, Michigan, Saul Grossman, Executive Secretary, concerning the above conference. Referring to Crockett:

"Speakers at the Conference included George W. Crockett, Jr., who is defending many of the 68 local victims of the Walter-McCarran Law; Saul Grossman, Executive Secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, sponsors of the Conference; and Carl Marzani, author and film producer, who received a standing ovation at the end of his fighting speech which hailed the tremendous scope of the anti-McCarthy movement."

On page 7672 was a Special Bulletin of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 142 Griswold Street, Detroit 26, Michigan, announcing, among other things, "New Folders: We have just received 5,000 copies of George Crockett's excellent new booklet: 'Rights of Foreign Born Americans.'" Page 7691 contains Exhibit No. 331A, an invitation to a "Gala Banquet Saturday" from the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, stating:

"Honor the 21 who refused to sign the fascist-like bail conditions demanded by the Justice Department! Valiant fighter for the rights of the people, Stanley Nowak, facing loss of his citizenship!

"Hear noted speakers: Prof. John F. Shepard, nationally-known educator and psychologist; and George W. Crockett, Jr., leading civil rights attorney....

"Bring your families and friends! Saturday, April 25, 7:00 p.m., Jewish Cultural Center, 2705 Joy Road...."

On page 7692 was a letter concerning the banquet, mentioning the fact that Crockett was to be a speaker and stating that at the banquet a drive was being launched to raise the necessary funds to continue with the fight against the Walter-McCarran Law; "Obviously, this fight against the Walter-McCarran Law is the responsibility of every American and needs the support of all. Thousands of dollars are needed every month, just for defense activities."

Page 7709 lists a "Partial List of Conference Sponsors" of the Michigan Conference to Repeal the Walter-McCarran Law and Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans. In the list is the name of George W. Crockett, Jr. along with the usual quota of clergy; Rev. Paul J. Allured, Rev. Charles A. Hill, Rev. Henry Lewis, Rev. C. M. Metcalf, Rev. Henry Powers, Rabbi Joshua S. Sperka, Rev. Carlyle F. Stewart.

Page 7726 contains Exhibit No. 357, an article from the official Communist newspaper, The Daily Worker, of November 8, 1949, bragging about a Communist victory: "Victory Hailed Through Nation." Following are statements from notables here (Detroit) on the granting of bail to the 11 Communist leaders...

"Lawyers Harry S. Anbender, Morton Eden, Ernest Goodman, Jack Tucker, N. L. Smokler, Benjamin J. Safir, associates of George Crockett, Jr.:

" 'Every supporter of democracy will welcome this reversal of Judge Medina's refusal to respect the constitutional rights of the defendants, as a much-needed vindication of the Bill of Rights.

" 'The same type of vindication must now be extended to our associate George Crockett and his colleagues, Isserman, McCabe, Sacher, and Gladstein, whose fearless championship of the rights of their clients will in due time inspire the admiration of the great body of fair and conscientious attorneys throughout the country.' "

On page 7812 George W. Crockett, Jr. is listed among the sponsors of the 6th Annual Conference of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Sunday, May 16th, 1954 at the Midwest Hotel, 6 N. Hamlin Ave., Chicago, Ill. Finally on page 8217 Crockett is listed among those interested in the campaign to stop the deportation of Hazel Wolf. Others interested, according to the Northern Light, publication of the Washington Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, were California attorneys, Robert W. Kenny and A. L. Wirin; N.Y. attorney Royal W. France and Harriet Bouslog of Hawaii, among others. The support of "many Methodist ministers" was also being drummed up by Rev. John W. Caughlan.

Its friendly interest in (now Judge) Crockett continuing to the present time, the Communist paper Daily World (successor to the Worker) headlined the gun-battle incident: "Did Detroit Cops Plan Assault? Stormtroop tactics used; cops harass Judge Crockett." On February 20, 1965 Crockett chaired a meeting in the Central Methodist Church and introduced as guest speaker Herbert Aptheker of the National Committee of the Communist Party. On December 9, 1960 Crockett was a guest speaker for Global Books Forum, a Red propaganda outfit headed by avowed Communist Helen Winter. He spoke in glowing terms about his visit to the Soviet Union and the Soviet system of "justice."

Judge Crockett, who was able to win election to his important position in spite of his left-wing background, was criticized for his handling of the arrested militants by the Detroit Police Officers Association which stated that Judge Crockett either "abused his discretion and went far beyond the limits of the law" or that the state laws "which allow a judge the unquestioned power to interfere with and disrupt accepted arrest procedures in cases of armed uniformed insurrectionists must be changed immediately." The president of the association reportedly said the judge's action "had given people a free license to shoot policemen . . . without fear of punishment."

The black revolution marches on—with the help of the clergy and the courts.

An informed insider's view or the clergy: From the article "Reds and Our Churches," by J. B. Matthews:

"The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen.

"Since the beginning of the First Cold War in April, 1948, the Communist Party of this country has placed more and more reliance upon the ranks of the Protestant clergy to provide the party's subversive apparatus with its agents, stooges, dupes, front men . . ."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1969]

POVERTY FUNDS LINKED TO FOUR CHARGED IN CLEVELAND POLICE SLAYINGS

CLEVELAND, April 20.—Four men charged with the killing of three Cleveland policemen and one civilian last summer received $7,000 from Cleveland: Now!—a program to aid the disadvantaged—according to a witness at the trial of one of them.

The Rev. De Forest Brown, a witness at the trial of Fred (Ahmed) Evans, one of the four men, testified last week that Mr. Evans and his African Cultural Shop received the money early in July. Mr. Evans received $150 a week as a director of the summer youth program, according to Mr. Brown, who is the director of the Hough Area Development Corporation.

Program money also was given to Lathan Donald, Leslie Jackson and John Hardrick, who also are facing first-degree murder charges arising out of the killings on July 23, and to Sidney Taylor, Leroy Mansfield Williams and Bernard Donald, who were slain during the gun battle with the police. Mr. Brown, a Baptist minister, testified. These six men also were connected with the shop.

Cleveland: Now! payments to Mr. Evans and the rest were reported to have stopped after the July shootings in the city's Glenville section.

Testimony so far showing the distribution of the money has covered part of it as follows:

Six hundred dollars to Mr. Evans to buy a used station wagon; $300 to refurnish the African Cultural Shop, and the rest in salaries for the first week of the program. Mr. Evans received $150, Lathan Donald $125, Mr. Jackson $100 and Mr. Hardrick $100. Mr. Taylor, Mr. Williams and Mr. Donald each received $100.

In addition, Linda Hardrick, Sandra Hardrick, Anita Scott, Sharon Moore, Jean Saunders and Sandra Hart, who have not figured in the trial, each received $75, apparently for working in the store. James Taylor, indicted for setting off explosives, also received $75.

AVOWED BLACK NATIONALIST

Mr. Evans, 37-years-old, a self-proclaimed black nationalist, is the first of those charged in the slayings to stand trial. He is charged with seven counts of first-degree murder, and has pleaded not guilty to all of them.

The trial began March 24, but the selection of a jury of five men and seven women, as well as three alternates—two women and one man—was not completed until April 10. All members of the jury and alternates are white. Testimony began the following day.

The trial, at the Cuyahoga County Criminal Courts Building, is being conducted under strict security procedures. Common Pleas Judge George J. McMonagle, who is

hearing the case, has barred all cameras and recording apparatus and has ordered all persons searched each time they enter the court.

On Friday, Judge McMonagle dismissed a motion by the defense attorneys, Stanley E. Tolliver and Charles W. Fleming, to eliminate all discussion of Cleveland: Now! funds. The lawyers said the discussion was irrelevant.

County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan said the testimony was relevant, and the judge agreed.

The Cleveland: Now! effort—a $1.5-billion project based on recommendations made in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and designed to run 10 years—was started by Mayor Carl B. Stokes last year to provide programs in jobs, housing and health. Local business groups and private citizens put more than $11-million into it as seed money.

Earlier last week, testimony by representatives of the county coroner's office showed that two of the three slain policemen had been drinking the night of the disturbance.

Dr. Lester Adelson, chief deputy county coroner, said he had evaluated the autopsy reports on Patrolman Willard Wolff and Patrolman Louis Golonka and said they were "far from 100 per cent of being capable of their normal duties." It would be "more dangerous than if they were sober" for either of them to carry or fire guns, he said. The third policeman, Lieut. Leroy Jones, had not been drinking, witnesses testified.

The prosecutors have introduced as evidence a collection of high-powered rifles and more than 2,000 rounds of ammunition, which they said Mr. Evans and several other men had purchased shortly before July 23.

Walter Beach, a former defensive back for the Cleveland Browns, who is now an aide to Mayor Stokes, told the court that City Hall had been aware of impending trouble hours before the shootings broke out.

Mr. Beach, now coordinator of the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity, said he and a city councilman, George Forbes, visited Mr. Evans at his apartment on July 23 and saw Mr. Evans and an unidentified man wearing ammunition bandoliers and brandishing rifles.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 26, 1969]

FIGHT IN ROCHESTER: BLACK OWNERS OF FACTORY PLAN TO PUT PROFITS INTO HOUSING, EDUCATION, JOBS, DAY CARE

(By William D. Tammeus)

ROCHESTER, N.Y.—Just a few blocks from the site of Rochester's 1964 riots, a factory described as "more militant and more radical than all the riots put together" has begun operations in an abandoned clothing plant.

It's called Fighton, Inc., and it is black-owned and operated. Fighton, which turned out its first product early this year (an industrial vacuum cleaner for the Xerox Corp., assembled from pre-made parts) is a child of the FIGHT organization, a broad-based community group which has been getting under white Rochester's skin since Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation helped organize it after the 1964 riots. FIGHT stands for "Freedom, Independence, God, Honor, Today."

HELPED BY XEROX

Fighton was the product of months of discussion between FIGHT and the Xerox Corp., which agreed to purchase $500,000 worth of products from the plant over its first two years, as well as lend its technical assistance. In addition, Fighton received a $444,677 U.S. Department of Labor training grant.

A new local group of businessmen known as the Rochester Business Opportunities Corp. (RBOC) bought the 32,000-square-foot plant, which formerly housed Timely Clothes Inc., for $35,000, remodeled it for $240,000 and leased it to Fighton. FIGHT owns Fighton.

One of the sidelights to the founding of Fighton is that RBOC grew out of a lengthy dispute between FIGHT and the Rochester-based Eastman Kodak Co.

Besides talking about hiring Negroes, Kodak and FIGHT had discussed the establishment of an inner-city business. But they reached no agreement. However, in January 1968, Kodak announced a plan by which major Rochester industry could provide markets, financing and technical help to foster inner-city business run by minority-group members.

That proposal led to the formation of RBOC, which has helped provide seed money and negotiate bank and Small Business Administration loans for some 40 businesses, of which Fighton is by far the largest.

Fighton employs 32 persons and plans to have at least 100 on the payroll by this time next year. Fighton general manager DeLeon McEwen, former president of FIGHT and a one-time barber, says most of those working for the firm did not have jobs when hired and would not have been employable by traditional industrial standards.

McEwen says his workers make between $80 and $100 a week, with an hourly minimum of $2.05. He'd like to raise that to be more competitive, but thinks that will come in time.

PROBLEMS, SUCCESSES

He's working with "ex-convicts and reform-schoolers," he says, and admits to both problems and successes in getting people to work on time and conforming to the routine of a regular job.

Fighton, in addition to assembling the vacuum cleaners, will produce electrical transformers and metal stampings as its first products. It also will have the capacity to do some welding and light assembly work.

For the Rev. Franklin D. R. Florence, president of both FIGHT and Fighton, the new factory means that "we're nearing our goal of community control" a drum FIGHT has been beating hard this year.

Florence says Fighton profits will be turned over to FIGHT and the "black community for housing programs, education, rehabilitation, jobs, day care, and all the things the black community needs."

It will mean, the black-power advocate says, that FIGHT will help provide "economic strength and stability in the black community."

The agreement between Xerox and FIGHT did not come suddenly. "Nobody approached us with open arms" a FIGHT officer says. But both Xerox and FIGHT acknowledge a willingness to deal and learn and work together.

A Xerox spokesman puts it this way: "The proposal from FIGHT to establish a black business was something that immediately made sense." But FIGHT was talking about a business which would employ 400 to 500 people, the same figure it had discussed with Kodak. Xerox says it pointed out that businesses do not grow that way, and so negotiations got under way. Some day, Fighton does hope to have as many as 500 on the payroll.

Eventually FIGHT and Xerox decided they needed a factory that would produce something Xerox could purchase; a product which required a minimum of capital to start and which could provide plenty of jobs to persons without many skills.

Now FIGHT is branching out. It recently proposed that it develop $15.8 million worth of housing, commercial and recreation centers in the city's predominantly black Third Ward Urban Renewal project. The plan, with full architectural models, was a "complete bombshell" to the city's Urban Renewal director, but neither he nor anyone else ruled out the possibility that FIGHT actually could be named developer.

So, despite the achievement of the new factory, FIGHT is not about to let this city of 300,000 (about 45,000 of whom are Negroes) rest easily.

YOUTH NEEDS A SPOKESMAN IN THE CABINET

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday, April 20, issue of Parade magazine, there appeared an article written by my good friend and distinguished colleague, CLAUDE PEPPER, concerning the need for making Government more responsive to the ideas and ideals of the Nation's young people.

In the article, entitled "Youth Needs a Spokesman in the Cabinet," Mr. PEPPER wrote of his proposal and that of 15 cosponsors to create a Cabinet Department of Youth Affairs so that the Nation's youth might have a spokesman to present directly to the President and to Congress the concerns, problems, aspirations, thoughts, and suggestions of its younger Americans.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I submit the text of this interesting and informative article for publication in the RECORD.

YOUTH NEEDS A SPOKESMAN IN THE CABINET

(By Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida)

The evidence is all around us that young Americans are growing disillusioned and disaffected. An angry minority no longer believes in peaceful protest. Rather than discuss grievances, they lay siege to campuses. They can attract more attention, they have found, by throwing rocks than by writing letters. In five hectic days, as I was preparing this article, 14 campuses erupted in violence. Virtually no area of the country went untouched.

All this has produced a stern reaction against student disorders and in favor of harsh repression. Government authorities, goaded by outraged public opinion, have threatend to take away from students and educators the right to control our college campuses. When Congress voted to require universities to cut off federal aid to students convicted of campus disturbances, four out of five persons polled by Gallup approved. Now President Nixon has thrown the weight of the federal government against disruption on the campus.

Apologists hasten to point out that only the hard-core militants, a small fraction of the student population, capture the classrooms and headlines. However, we should not confuse the responsible refusal of the vast majority to rush to the barricades as tacit complacency. For this new generation is bringing with it the winds of change.

Distressed as I am over the violent confrontations between students and authorities, I am heartened that we have a literate, articulate, vocal younger generation to challenge us to sit up and pay heed. It may be time for a sweeping reappraisal, for example, of the way our young adults are educated beyond high school.

Our academic communities today have become small cities. More than 28,000 are registered at the University of California at Los Angeles. Yet the attitudes and relationships are still patterned after the cloistered, ivy-grown campuses of an earlier era.

We know the quality of our students has been improving, but I am not so sure this holds true of the instruction they receive. Many classroom professors, if student complaints are to be believed, would do better

in the research laboratory. Student demands aren't necessarily unreasonable just because their elders may have been more complacent and conforming back in the "good old days."

Should students be allowed to grade their instructors? Are student grievances getting attention in the front offices? What recourse do students have who are confronted with administrative callousness and stubbornness? Certainly violence should not be necessary to get a legitimate hearing, and violence by militant groups simply bent upon disruption cannot be tolerated. Yet if there are no other effective ways of getting action on just grievances, we cannot rule out violence.

There is a need to study the student avenues for redress at our major colleges and universities. Let us find out which doors are barred to legitimate complaints. Going beyond the campuses, our young people are also entitled to a voice in the national decisions that will shape their future.

Half of the U.S. population next year will be under 25. Every day decisions are made at all levels of government which determine the rules that young people are expected to follow. Yet their voices are but distant shouts, ignored or unheard at the policy-making level.

Our government has established the Labor Department to speak for the workers. The farmers can take their problems to the Agriculture Department, and businessmen can get a hearing for their views at the Commerce Department. Small businessmen have another special advocate in the Small Business Administration.

Yet none of these favored groups is as populous or as problem-plagued as the under-25 generation. Certainly the youth of the nation deserve a voice at the Cabinet level, a department which would concern itself solely with their problems, aspirations, thoughts and ideas. This compelling conclusion grew out of a discussion I had in Florida many weeks ago with Mrs. Malvin Englander of Miami Beach, a concerned state Democratic committeewoman. She and I agreed that the young people needed a spokesman to present directly to the President and to the Congress the concerns of young America.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6259, which would authorize a Department of Youth Affairs, a person at the uppermost level of government—who would represent the young in the nation's policy-making councils. He would serve not only as a spokesman but an ombudsman for the 50 percent of our population under 25.

YOUTH CAN SERVE

The Department of Youth Affairs would also coordinate and expand government programs which draw principally upon the talent and energy of the nation's youth. The Peace Corps, VISTA and National Teacher Corps, for example, would be transferred to the new department. These three agencies rely heavily upon the active, selfless participation of young people.

That each is almost universally regarded as a solid success is dramatic proof of what the youth of America can accomplish. It is little short of astounding what changes in attitude, opportunity and environment a relatively small number of young men and women (some 12,000 in all) are achieving in these three volunteer programs. I fiercely believe there are many more thousands of young adults in this country who are eager to join in the attack against poverty and other social ills.

The Department of Youth Affairs would be primarily concerned with the young person as a citizen and individual, rather than as a charge of his parents, his doctor and his teacher. As I envision it, the heart of the department would be an office of youth participation, which would open the way for young men and women to exercise substantial influence on programs at the policy-making level.

This office would actively attempt to recruit persons under 24 for appointment to responsible positions in the higher pay grades. Young people would be sought from a broad range of background, experience, educational attainment and geographical distribution.

The office of youth participation would be empowered to establish and administer a program of grants-in-aid to public agencies and non-profit organizations which, on the local level, would recruit, select, train and employ youths up to age 24. They would serve as paid and volunteer workers in social and economic programs benefiting their communities.

I believe most young adults—given their expanding levels of education, their willingness and eagerness to work hard, long hours—are ready for such a challenge. I may not be able to verify this to the satisfaction of every doubter. But the preponderance of evidence (I refer to exhaustive studies by doctors and educators) suggests that young adults today possess a sophistication and intelligence superior to that possessed by their parents and grandparents at the same age.

The Secretary of Youth Affairs, who would be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, need not necessarily be a young man—although young men have shouldered great responsibilities in the past. Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence at age 33. John Rutledge was a leader of the Southern delegates at the Second Continental Congress, which declared our independence, at age 26. And every Frenchman knows that Napoleon Bonaparte was commander of the entire French Army in Italy at age 27.

What is important for a Secretary of Youth Affairs is that he be tuned in on young thoughts. He might be someone like John Gardner, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who understands and identifies with the aspirations and concerns of young people.

INVITE THEM IN

Those of us who have occupied this planet a little while longer should be careful not to spurn the thoughts of youth. Rather we should welcome and encourage them. We should concern ourselves with the varied and peculiar problems encountered by young adults growing to maturity in an age of automation and impersonalization. We should provide a place where they can become involved, influentially and constructively, in the affairs and responsibilities of government.

Would it not increase the morale and the confidence of youth in our system to know that their national government is sufficiently concerned to create a department at the highest level to hear their grievances and to give them a meaningful place? Would this not discourage violence and encourage the overwhelming majority of our young citizens who are interested in constructive change and correction of abuses rather than in blind disruption?

The need is urgent to bridge the gap between the generations. Personally, I don't believe we will find any chasm too wide to bridge. I am reminded of an eloquent phrase spoken during the recent campaign by one of the presidential contenders:

"We are as old as our despairs, as young as our hopes; as old as our fears, as young as our faith; as old as the doubts we harbor, and as young as the ideals we sustain."

IF YOU SUPPORT TAX REFORM, NIXON'S PACKAGE IS WEAK

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee begins marking up a tax reform bill this week. I am sure many Members will find of interest an article in the Washington Post of April 27 entitled "If You Support Tax Reform, Nixon's Package Is Weak," by Joseph A. Pechman. Dr. Pechman is director of economic studies of the Brookings Institution and is author of the book "Federal Tax Policy."

The article follows:

IF YOU SUPPORT TAX REFORM, NIXON'S PACKAGE IS WEAK

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

The Nixon tax reform package was unveiled last week with the fanfare that usually accompanies a major presidential tax recommendation. First, a presidential message proclaimed that "reform . . . is long overdue" and outlined in general terms a series of ten proposals. The next day, Treasury officials read to the Ways and Means Committee an inch of technical papers describing in great detail 16 proposals which, they emphasized, are only a "first step in reshaping the Federal tax system to make it fair and efficient."

Chairman Mills and his colleagues listened carefully to the testimony, complimented the Treasury for its diligence, suggested that the package is a bit timid even for a first step, but cautiously avoided committing themselves.

All this was in response to pressures for tax reform which had been building up since it became evident that President Nixon would be forced to propose extension of the surtax to fight inflation. Congress accepted the surtax last year only after attaching to it a requirement that the President submit a tax reform plan by the end of the year. President Johnson balked, partly because he regarded this as an infringement of presidential prerogatives and partly because he isn't a tax reformer at heart anyway.

But Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley S. Surrey took the Congressional mandate seriously. As his last official will and testament, he left behind a tax reform plan which was later transmitted to Congress by the new Treasury.

Armed with this ammunition, Congressional tax reformers served notice that the surtax would not be extended unless it was accompanied by a "real" reform. This movement has a lot of steam behind it because there is simply no way to answer the argument that the surtax penalizes those who already pay taxes, while those who escape paying in one way or another go scot-free.

The Surrey package is a skillful blend of a large number of tax changes which would distribute $1.7-billion of individual income tax revenue—out of a $75-billion total—from those with incomes of more than $15,000 to those below this level. The showpieces of the package are an increase in the minimum standard deduction which would remove 1.25 million families from the income tax rolls; taxation at capital gains rates of capital gains transferred through bequests and gifts (which are not now subject to income tax) before calculating the amount of property subject to estate or gift tax; a device to disallow personal deductions in proportion to the percentage of tax-exempt income received by taxpayers; and a minimum income tax levied at half the regular income tax levied at half the regular rates on a comprehensive income tax base which would include most, but not all, of nontaxable income.

In the light of the grave deficiencies in the tax law, the Surrey package is really quite modest. In fact, it fails to do anything about the most important and expensive "special provisions" in today's tax structure—most notably, percentage depletion, tax-exempt interest, the defintion and rates of capital

gains tax, and the favored treatment of married couples through income splitting.

All told, these provisions cost the Treasury at least $20-billion annually at present tax rates. Surrey would recover less than a billion of this amount by the minimum tax and the allocation of deductions between taxable and nontaxable income sources.

Edwin S. Cohen, Surrey's successor in the Treasury, is also well versed in the intricacies of the Internal Revenue Code. His problem was to satisfy the demand for tax reform and, at the same time, differentiate his product. The package he puts together for President Nixon is a work of art, even if it is not the Mona Lisa of tax reform.

Cohen carried over a few of Surrey's proposals with little or no change (example: elimination of multiple surtax exemptions for large corporations that break up into hundreds of small corporations each of which is worth $6,500 in reduced taxes); went further than Surrey in some respects (example: tighter rules for foundations and other tax-exempt organizations); and discarded several of the proposals most likely to meet political resistance (example: imposition of a capital gains tax on gains transferred at gift or death).

The eye-catching change made by Cohen concerns the taxation of the poor. Surrey's hike in the minimum standard deduction would have left three-quarters of a million poor families on the income tax rolls. As a substitute, Cohen devised a new "low income allowance" which raises the minimum taxable income level by a flat $1,100 above the per capita exemptions and happens to duplicate almost to the dollar the official "poverty lines" at this year's prices. To limit the revenue loss, the low income allowance is tapered off by 50 cents for each dollar of income tax above the present minimum taxable levels so that the allowance disappears rapidly (at $3,300 for a single person, $3,700 for a married couple, and $4,500 for a family of four).

This device permits Cohen to claim, correctly, that he has eliminated virtually all the poor from the income tax rolls at far less cost than the corresponding minimum standard deduction. (Of course, the heaviest federal tax on the poor is the payroll tax—not the income tax—but the burdensomeness of the payroll tax is ignored because it is legally earmarked for social security.)

The most controversial feature of the Cohen package is the new limit on tax preferences (LTP), a substitute for the minimum tax. The theory of LTP is that no one should be permitted to exclude more than 50 per cent of his income from the tax base. For example, an individual with a $100,000 salary and $300,000 of tax preferences would be taxed on half of the $400,000 total, or $200,000, instead of on $100,000 as he is now.

But the effectiveness of LTP depends on the definition of the term "tax preference." Cohen omitted two items in Surrey's list which are crucial to any attempt to limit tax preferences—tax-exempt interest and long-term capital gains. As a result, Cohen would pick up only $8-million from his LTP, a far cry from the $420-million yield of Surrey's minimum income tax which is also a pittance when compared with the huge benefits that present tax preferences provide.

Many tax experts do not regard the Surrey plan as earth-shaking, and the Cohen plan is even weaker. In the past, the high water mark of tax reform has been the Administration's bill, but things are different this year. Congress may surprise everybody by passing a tougher bill than either the Surrey plan or the Cohen plan. It all depends on the flak congressmen will get from their constituents. If you believe in tax reform, write your congressman and senators!

FIRST AID AWARDS, JOHNSTOWN, PA.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 19, I had the distinct honor of presenting awards to the winning teams competing in the 50th annual first aid meet of Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s Johnstown plant. The demonstrations by plant teams, and Girl Scout and Boy Scout teams in first aid skills was an impressive event. The meeting was naturally dedicated first of all to safety, but in the words of the plant's acting general manager, Mr. J. W. Colbert:

> We want you . . . to share with us our pride in these teams and the conviction that safety is for the whole community; for everyone—all the time.

I think Mr. Colbert put his finger on the heart of the matter when he said that safety is for the whole community. Safety awareness is what first aid meets are designed to stimulate, and this one certainly did. Again, in Mr. Colbert's words:

> We, individually and collectively, must be more concerned about safety—we must mount an attack and work at it—at work, at home, at play, and on the highway. We must be doers, not disinterested observers; and each of us must set an example.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the 19 plant teams that took part in the demonstrations were setting an example for all of us. The problems presented to them were involved and tough, and there was a minimum amount of time for them to accomplish their tasks. To give you an idea, I include the statement of the problems that each team had to face:

PROBLEM NO. 1

An Electrician was in a hurry to get a job done before quitting time, and violated three (3) safety rules in the performance of the job by working from a metal ladder, not securing the ladder against movement, and not properly cutting the current and flagging the switch. The top end of the ladder accidentally slid sideways and contacted a hot electrical line, resulting in the workman falling about 15 feet to the floor.

He is immediately found by his co-workers, laying face down, unconscious and not breathing.

He also received the following injuries:

A compound fracture of the left kneecap with blood oozing from a three-inch wound on the kneecap.

A three-inch wound on the outer side of the left leg, midway between the ankle and knee.

A two-inch wound on the outer side of the left ankle.

A three-inch wound in the left groin.

A burn two inches wide and six inches long on the right hip.

A compound fracture of the right foot with blood seeping very slowly from a two-inch wound on top of the righ foot.

Revive the workman by three (3) members of the team giving artificial respiration, back press arm lift, for one (1) consecutive minute each. The change of operators is to be made without breaking rhythm. The workman regains consciousness at the end of artificial respiration, but suffers from physical shock throughout the problem.

Reading Time: 3 Minutes.

Treat and Prepare for Transportation.

Working Time: 10 minutes.

PROBLEM NO. 2

A Mill Crew finished rolling large rounds and was making preparations for rolling another type of section. In order to make final adjustments, the mill rolls were running at idle speed. One of the men completed a change on the delivery side of the stand and started to walk to another area. For some reason, the man decided to make a final check on the adjustment to the guides. He lost his balance and fell forward toward the rolls. When found by his co-workers, one forearm was in the revolving roll and his face was pressed against the rotating top roll. Pressure on mill stand released and man removed. (Demonstrate rescue).

He was suffering from the following injuries:

Arterial bleeding from a two-inch wound on the palm of the right hand.

A dislocated left ankle.

A two-inch wound on the forehead.

A two-inch wound on the chin.

A compound fracture of the left forearm, midway between the wrist and elbow, with the ends of the bones protruding through the outside of the forearm, and blood spurting from a three-inch wound on the forearm.

He is conscious, and suffers from physical shock throughout the problem.

Reading Time: 3 Minutes.

Treat and Prepare for Transportation.

Working Time: 10 Mins.

PROBLEM NO. 3

A six-man crew was stocking 115-pound rails in an area in the Franklin Division. The rails were transported to the site on a utility handtruck. Two bars were used to form skids for the rails to slide from the truck to the ground. Suddenly, the handtruck upset, causing a rail to whip outward and strike one of the men, knocking him backward against a column.

He is found unconscious, and laying on his back, with the following injuries:

A fracture of the pelvis.

A simple fracture of the right collarbone.

A compound fracture of the skull with slight bleeding from a two-inch wound on the center of the forehead, which is also the location of the compound fracture.

Two (2) fractured ribs on the right side; and blood oozing from a three-inch wound at the same location where the ribs are fractured.

A compound fracture of the right foot with slight bleeding from a two-inch wound on the bottom of the foot, and the bones are protruding through the bottom of the right foot.

A two-inch wound on the back of the left hand, and a three-inch wound on the outer side of the left thigh.

The workmen is suffering from physical shock, and remains unconscious until arrival at the hospital.

Reading Time: 3 Minutes.

Prepare for Transportation.

Working Time: 10 Minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after reading those problems, it is hard to believe that there were three teams that achieved a perfect score of 300, and the next two teams scored 298 points each. In order to determine the winners of the first three teams, the time for completion of the problem was included. There was a time-spread of less than 1 minute between the three top teams. There was only a time spread of 3.96 minutes between the first and fifth teams. You can understand, Mr. Speaker, why I feel I was honored to present the awards to the winners of the competition.

The first place award went to the electrical department for a score of 300, in 22.88 minutes. Members of that team included. R. J. Farrell, captain; K. D. Donaldson; O. E. Gates; J. A. Panek; G. C. Amigh; and R. P. Sanders. The team was under the supervision of G. F. Shumaker.

The second-place award went to plant protection with a score of 300, in 23.29 minutes. Members of that team included: R. W. Cale, captain; F. L. Stevens; J. B. Simons; H. F. Thomas; R. M. Vargo; and G. T. Mandrick. The team was under the supervision of D. E. Suppes.

The third-place award went to steelmaking for a score of 300, in 23.64 minutes. Members of that team included: L. J. Sebastian, captain; G. Zelinsky; W. C. Hoffman; G. G. Spaid; P. Prozialeck; and G. W. Heming. The team was under the supervivsion of J. T. Sefcheck.

Winners of the fourth-place award was the wheel plant team with a score of 298, in 25.82 minutes. Members of that team included: L. E. Wissinger, captain; D. L. Snyder; R. Galayda; C. A. Kist, L. E. Flickinger, Jr.; and J. E. Lepus. The team was under the supervision of T. N. Crowley.

Winner of the fifth-place award was the car department with 298 points, in 26.84 minutes. Members of that team included: J. W. Gaydos, captain; J. Pileski; W. M. Brown; J. E. Jedrzejek; F. R. Mikesic; and R. R. Todero. The team was under the supervision of W. B. Bickley.

The entire, successful program of the 50th annual meet was under the direction of Mr. R. E. Taylor, management's representative, of the industrial relations department of the Johnstown plant.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all the winners, contestants, judges, and especially, the members of the safety division of the Bethlehem's Johnstown plant, are to be commended for this outstanding meeting, but more important, all deserve our accolades for helping us to remember that safety should be everyone's everyday job.

INTEREST RATES FORCE CONSUMER PRICES UP AGAIN

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living continues to rise at near astronomical rates.

The Consumer Price Index released by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics last Thursday showed that the Consumer Price Index rose 0.8 percent in March—the largest monthly increase since February 1951.

Mr. Speaker, the two items showing the largest increase were housing and used cars. These are the two items where interest charges have the greatest effect. The increases in these items are the direct result of high interest rates.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, much of the recent inflation and the increase in consumer prices can be traced back to high interest rates. High interest rates are reflected in the price of every item on the shelf. High interest rates are inflationary.

For example, the release by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that homeownership costs were up 1.6 percent in the month of March, or double the average consumer price increase for that month. And the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is usually hesitant to talk about interest rates, conceded that more than half of the increase could be attributed to the boost in mortgage interest charges on VA and conventional loans.

Likewise, the price of used cars jumped almost 6½ percent during the month of March and, again, this is an item where high-interest rates are immediately felt.

Mr. Speaker, I think the figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics again refute the theory that high-interest rates fight inflation. High-interest rates themselves are obviously inflationary. And again, I say that raising interest rates to fight inflation is just like pouring gasoline on a fire.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Bureau of Labor Statistics' consumer price index does not do a more adequate job of breaking down the interest charges which contribute to the increases in prices of consumer items. These interest charges should be calculated and reported fully in each months' price index.

This would do much to dramatize how destructive these high-interest rates are for the average American consumer.

JERRY VOORHIS DESCRIBES HIGH INTEREST RATES AS THE WORST KIND OF INFLATION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Jerry Voorhis is continuing to serve the public interest.

Mr. Voorhis was a great Congressman from the State of California and after leaving the House he distinguished himself as the executive director of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. and as one of the Nation's foremost champions of the consumer.

Jerry Voorhis is continuing his great work. I have just read a newspaper column entitled, "The Human Side of the Market Place," in which Mr. Voorhis discusses the injustices of our monetary and tax policies. He points out that high interest rates are the Nation's worst kind of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Voorhis' words should be heeded by all Members of this House. I place a copy of this column in the RECORD:

TODAY'S INTEREST RATES: THE WORST KIND OF INFLATION

(By Jerry Voorhis)

Everybody is worried about "inflation"—many of us without knowing exactly what the word means.

Except that *price* inflation makes everything we buy more costly. And while inflation does hurt people who depend on fixed incomes, it also keeps the economy humming and tends to increase employment.

The worst—and most inexcusable—feature of our present inflation is the usurious interest rates that are now being charged. They affect every other price in the entire market place, and until those interest rates are brought down inflation will get worse and worse. Already the exorbitant interest rates have caused over half the American people to be priced clear out of the market for homes. And good homes at costs they can afford are, today, the greatest unmet need of the American people.

At 7½% interest on a 30-year mortgage a home-buyer must pay twice as much in interest as he pays for the land, bricks, woodwork, plumbing, finishing, labor, contractor's profit—everything else that goes into that home.

The financial "wizards" are taking a toll from the people's pockets that is unprecedented in modern times.

Another and equally evil reason for our present inflation is the military budget which takes about two-thirds of all government revenues. It's high time those expenditures were drastically reduced.

It is frequently—and truly—pointed out that taxes are a way of curbing inflation.

This is true because, *properly* and *fairly* and *wisely* levied, taxes can put a damper on demand and thus cause prices to stop rising.

The trouble is that our taxes at present are *not* being levied either properly, fairly or wisely.

The newspapers and the hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee have recently been full of stories about the number of super-millionaires who do not pay any taxes at all. The 27½% oil-depletion allowance has been a scandal for many decades. But nothing is done about it.

But let's look at a little tax history.

Taxes were reduced in 1963. But they were reduced in a very unjust way. Income taxes in the lowest brackets were reduced only 4½% while people with incomes of $200,000 and more got a 21% reduction. Families with $2,000 income got $90 added to their expendable incomes, while people with incomes of $1 million got about $200,000 freed from taxes.

The 10% surtax is equally unjust. While the rich taxpayer pays more in actual dollars, he gives up far, far less of what he needs than does the poor taxpayer. A single man with an income of $4,000 has to pay $551 in taxes instead of $503. That hurts. But if a single man has an income of $100,000, the addition of 10% surtax does not really hurt him at all.

The 10% across-the-board increase in taxes favors the rich and hurts the poor. It is a tax levied not in accordance with ability to pay at all.

If that tax is continued after June 30, nothing else is likely to be done to reform our tax system.

And it needs it. Some companies are making extortionate profits out of the Viet Nam war. Others are making equally unjustified profits out of other military and space contracts.

Have we forgotten all about the excess profits taxes that have been levied in time of war and national need?

Corporation profits in 1951 were $44 billion. In 1968 they were $90 billion. In 1951 we had an excess-profits tax. If we had that same tax today it would raise $8 billion of revenue—the same amount as the 10% surtax on individuals and families is calculated to raise.

Why not take some of the profit out of war contracts and make our tax system, which *is* a cure for inflation, a just and humane one?

ADDRESS BY HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE ST. LEO COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT, ST. LEO, FLA.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by Secretary of Defense Laird at the commencement exercises of St. Leo College, St. Leo, Fla., on April 26.

I believe the Congress will find the Secretary's address of very real interest in that it contains an outline of the areas in which the Defense Department plans to move toward assisting in resolving some of this Nation's pressing domestic problems.

I heartily recommend a careful reading of this outstanding and innovative speech:

ADDRESS BY HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE ST. LEO COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT, ST. LEO, FLA., APRIL 26, 1969

I am honored to be among the distinguished company participating in your commencement exercises today. I congratulate the graduates on their achievement. Having children of college age myself, I feel a special word is due the parents of the graduates whose emotions on a day like this can be appreciated only by another parent—a mixture of pride and bewilderment from the realization that his son or daughter has accomplished so much, that the years have gone by so quickly, and that the relationship between you and this child suddenly become man or woman can never be quite the same again because he no longer needs you as he once did.

Let me also express my heartfelt appreciation to the whole college community of St. Leo's—faculty, administration, and students for inviting me to deliver the commencement address and for conferring on me an honorary degree. It is a privilege to become an honorary alumnus of this young college with a name and a sponsorship that dedicate it to the defense of the highest values of our civilization. The order of St. Benedict was the defender of learning which kept the light of civilization burning through Europe's dark ages. The holy man after whom your school is named, Pope Leo the Great, was the defender of peace who spared Rome from the attacks of Attila's barbarians.

I have always felt considerable dissatisfaction with commencement addresses. For one thing, it seems to me to amount to cruel and unusual punishment to inflict one more lecture on those who have just sat through four years of lectures. Further, the commencement speaker is very likely to devote his remarks either to things the graduates already know such as that the world they now enter is beset by problems or to things they are not interested in hearing such as how the speaker overcame great obstacles to get where he is today.

Despite my qualms, there are things about education, youth, and the role of the Defense Department today that I want to say.

My credentials, when I talk about youth, might be challenged. Obviously I do not belong to the long-haired generation. But I do have some credentials to talk about education.

During the course of 16 years of service in Congress, I was intimately involved in the problems of education. In my present position as Secretary of Defense, my interest in education continues, and my involvement in educational matters has become more direct.

Of the 10 Cabinet departments and 15 other Federal agencies which support or conduct education, training, and related programs, the Department of Defense ranks as the second largest agency. Last year $2.2 billion of the Defense budget was devoted to education, not including specialized military instruction such as recruit and pilot training. This $2.2 billion, incidentally, amounted to 20 per cent of the total Federal expenditure in the field of education.

This year 800,000 servicemen will receive formal schooling in some kind of school conducted by the Department of Defense and another 160,000 will attend military dependent schools overseas. That makes me the Superintendent of one of the largest school systems in the United States. Each year 90,000 servicemen also earn the equivalent of a high school diploma through courses conducted by the United States Armed Forces Institute.

These facts suggest something of the dimensions of the activities of the Department of Defense that bear directly on the solution of the urgent domestic problems vexing the nation. I need not go through the catalogue of these problems for this audience—problems that include poverty, discrimination, hunger, lack of opportunity.

If there is any single key that will open the door of opportunity to those who now find it locked, that key is education. So I speak with pride about what our armed forces are doing in this field. Millions of young Americans have secured through service in the armed forces the chance to learn that was denied them in civilian life. Millions, who entered the armed forces without skills or adequate schooling, leave them equipped to pursue successfully a civilian occupation or with the basic education required for continuation of their education in civilian institutions. In short, for millions of young Americans, the promise of equal opportunity has been made real as a result of their military service.

In addition to the area of education, I also feel that the Defense Department can play a significant role in solving problems that affect our urban areas. Neither President Nixon nor I feel that enough is now being done. Therefore, I have created a new Domestic Action Council composed of high level officials from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Military Services to insure a widespread, coordinated approach to the Department's domestic action programs. This Council will have a small permanent staff which will assist in planning and implementing proposals, monitor progress, and insure communication with the President's Urban Affairs Council and the civilian community. This Council will report directly to me, thereby permitting me to appraise constantly the Department's contribution to domestic action.

As a starter, permit me to outline six general areas in which I believe the Department of Defense can do more toward resolving our domestic problems.

Procurement—I believe that the Department of Defense's annual purchases of approximately 40 billion dollars can be effectively directed to produce auxiliary social and economic benefits. We are already setting aside portions of contracts to assist areas of concentrated unemployment.

Manpower—Currently the Armed Services are composed of 3½ million men and women. We must insure that any person who enters military service is better prepared to serve society and has the essential skills to attain personal accomplishment when he leaves service than when he enters the military. We have several programs in this area now. One is Project Transition which this year will provide 60,000 departing servicemen with needed civilian skills. We are also starting Project Value which is aimed at providing gainful employment for 5,600 disadvantaged youth. This summer, we plan to hire 50,000 youngsters with 75% in the disadvantaged category. Our aim here is to provide meaningful employment so that these young people can spend the summer gainfully and then return to school and finish their education.

Transfer of Knowledge—The Department of Defense has a remarkable history of developing technological advances and transferring knowledge to the civilian sector. We plan to find better methods to insure that Defense advances rapidly find use in the civilian economy.

Assets—The Department of Defense has vast resources in plants, facilities and equipment. We need to insure that when bases are closed or relocated and when equipment is declared surplus, that the economic benefits of such actions are fully realized.

Community Relations—The effective participation of the Department in problem areas cannot be totally initiated from the Pentagon. It is essential that the personnel at every military facility become actively involved in contributing to a better society. I have asked our military commanders to assist Mayors' Youth Councils and similar groups in providing facilities and assistance in support of their youth programs—again insuring that these actions do not interfere with our primary military missions.

Discrimination—Although the Department of Defense has pioneered in insuring equal rights and opportunities for our servicemen, we cannot rest on our laurels. We must continue to make every effort to insure that all Defense personnel receive the full benefits which our society promises.

All that the Defense Department does will be done with deepest concern for the taxpayers of the nation. I assure you that I will not permit Defense to make any greater demand on them than is required by the Department's primary responsibility—providing for the security of the nation. When I envisage a more active role for the Defense Department in meeting the problems of our society, I am not proposing a bigger Defense budget. On the contrary, I plan to get double duty from the dollars allocated for defense.

I promised earlier to speak about youth. What I have to say will be brief. In these remarks I am speaking not to the students in the audience but to the older generation of parents and grandparents, aunts and uncles. And I am speaking not about the disruptive minority that captures headlines, but about the responsible majority who are genuinely concerned about the shortcomings of our society and eager to make our beloved country a better land for all its people.

Admittedly, young people are not always easy to get along with. They are questioning the dogmas and the values, the institutions and the customs of their elders. They are asking particularly why there is a gap between what we practice and what we preach. They have, I think, better developed minds and better developed consciences than we did at a comparable age. They have a lively awareness of injustice and a deeper concern for others than we did when we were their age. They are more inclined to seek the reason for things, less ready to accept answers that rest on faith or authority.

Uncomfortable as they make the older generation feel, these attitudes are good. They reflect in many ways nobility of spirit. They prompt service to others to dispel ignorance and to eliminate harsh conditions under which many live.

To those who ask the perennial question of an older generation, "What are these youngsters coming to?" I answer they are coming to grips with problems too long ignored, injustice too long tolerated, suffering too long overlooked.

And I suggest that you and I of that older generation should make common cause with them in their effort to make good on the promise of America, eloquently stated by Thomas Wolfe in these words:

"So, then, to every man his chance—
To every man, regardless of his birth
His shining, golden opportunity—
To every man the right to live,
To work, to be himself, and to become
Whatever thing his manhood and his vision
can combine to make him—
This . . . is the promise of America."

REVOLUTIONARY AIMS OF SDS

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the following document entitled "New Left Notes" was distributed by what I call the Students for the Destruction of a Democratic Society at a basketball game at East High School in Denver, Colo., during the last week of February 1969.

This document clearly sets forth the revolutionary aims of this group. It also attempts to pollute the minds of our young people by including a sexual relationship inventory.

It further includes detailed instructions with diagrams that cannot be placed in the RECORD—on how to prepare and use explosive and incendiary devices.

I was pleased to note that our colleague, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, plans to call some of these revolutionary leaders before her subcommittee. This organization and its aims must be exposed.

I have written the Attorney General requesting that he use whatever legal power he has available to curb this group's activities.

I have also suggested to the chairman of the House Internal Security Committee, Mr. ICHORD, that this group should be the subject of an investigation.

The document follows:

[Passed out at basketball game at East High School in Denver during the last week of February 1969]

NEW LEFT NOTES

New Left Notes is published weekly (except June and July, when publication is biweekly) by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60612 (312–666–3374). Second-class postage is paid at Chicago. Subscriptions are $1 per year for SDS members and $10 per year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writers. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of editor David Millstone. New Left Notes is affiliated with UPS and Liberation News Service.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Mike Klonsky, National Secretary; Fred Gordon, Internal Education Secretary; Bernardine Dohrn, Inter-Organizational Secretary.

National Office: 1608 West Madison, Chicago, Illinois 60612 (312–666–3874).

Chicago: 162 North Clinton, Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312–841–0138).

Michigan: Post Office Box 625, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107 (no telephone).

New England: 126 Green, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 (617–864–3126).

New Jersey: Box 376–C, Newark, New Jersey 07101 (no telephone).

New York City: 131 Prince, New York, New York 10003 (212–674–8310).

Niagara: 308 Stewart Avenue, Ithaca, New York 14660 (607–273–0535).

Philadelphia: 262 South 45th, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 (215–382–8084).

Southern California: Box 85306, Los Angeles, California 90072 (213–667–2345).

Texas-Oklahoma: Box 1941, Dallas, Texas 75221 (214–824–1837).

Washington, D.C.: 3 Thomas Circle NW, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202–332–1387).

MINIMUM DEFINITION OF REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION

Since the only purpose of a revolutionary organization is the abolition of all existing classes in a way that does not bring about a new division of society, we consider any organization as revolutionary which purposefully, meaningfully, pursues the international realization of the absolute power of the Workers' Councils. That power has been outlined in the experience of the proletarian revolutions of this century—Russia 1905, Kronstadt 1921, Asturias 1934, Spanish revolution 1936. It is power without mediators.

Such an organization makes a unitary critique of the world, or is nothing. By unitary critique is understood a global, a total critique of all geographic areas where various forms of separate socio-economic powers exist, as well as a critique of all aspects of life.

Such an organization sees the beginning and end of its own program in the complete decolonization, the complete liberation of daily life. It aims not at the self-management, the autogestion by the masses of the existing world, but at the uninterrupted transformation of this world.

Such an organization embodies the radical critique of political economy, the transcendance of commodity and wage-labor. It refuses to reproduce within itself any of the hierarchical conditions prevailing in the world that dominates us. The only limit to participating in its total democracy is that each member recognize and appropriate for himself the *coherence of its critique*. The coherence has to be both in the critical theory and in the relationship between the theory and practical activity. The aim is theoretico-practice. A revolutionary organization radically criticizes every ideology as *separate power* of ideas and as *ideas of separate power*. It is at the same time the negation of any remains of religion and of the prevailing social spectacle which, from newsmedia to mass culture, monopolizes all communication between men around a unilateral reception by men of the images of their alienated activity. The organization dissolves any "revolutionary ideology" by revealing it to be the sign of the failure of the revolutionary project, as the private property of new specialists of power, as the imposture of a new *representation* which erects itself above the real proletarianized life.

The category of totality, of the global critique, is one last judgment of the revolutionary organization, so the organization is, in the end, a critique of politics: it must aim explicitly through its victory at the dissolution of itself as a separate organization.

SEX RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY—PLACE A CHECK IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN(S)

	Yes	No	Don't understand
1. Have you ever had a date?			
2. Have you ever gone steady?			
3. Have you ever French kissed?			
4. Has petting involved sexually touching upper body areas?			
5. Has petting involved sexually touching lower body areas?			
6. Has petting involved touching the genitals of other sex?			
7. Have you experienced heavy petting to a degree of high stimulation?			
8. Have you experienced complete sexual intercourse?			
9. Have you used a contraceptive?			
10. Do you consider yourself a virgin?			
11. How many persons have you been involved with sexually this year?			
12. How many persons have you had sexual intercourse with?			

UNDERSTANDING IDEAS INVOLVED WITH SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS—TRUE OR FALSE—T OR F

---------- 1. Pregnancy will not occur if you use a contraceptive.
---------- 2. Pregnancy will not occur if penis only touches vagina.
---------- 3. Pregnancy will not occur if penis is removed before climax.
---------- 4. Pregnancy will not occur if you take a thorough bath when you go home.
---------- 5. Pregnancy will not occur if you use Saran wrap.
---------- 6. Pregnancy will not occur if you take a birth control pill.
---------- 7. Pregnancy will not occur if you douche or wash vagina with 7-Up.
---------- 8. You are most likely to get pregnant during the time just before menstruation.

RATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FOLLOWING CONTRACEPTIVES AND CHECK KNOWLEDGE OF SAME

	Good fair poor	Have used or participated in use	Have seen	Have heard of	Don't understand
1. Condom or rubber					
2. Birth control pill					
3. Diaphragm					
4. Rhythm method					
5. Douche or wash					

In a revolutionary situation some materials are available and some must be made. The following is a series of formulas and techniques for explosive and incendiary devices.

Thermite: creates an extremely hot flame, can melt through steel such as railroads, gas tanks and oil storage tanks. Mix 50% iron oxide and 50% powdered aluminium. Requires high temperature for ignition. For this gun powder or magnesium ribbon may be used. Iron oxide is simply rust and may be filed from rusty iron or steel. Aluminium may be filed or ground into a powder, or is sometimes available in art supply stores.

Spontaneous combustion: Moisten rags with a mixture of 30% turpentine and 70% linseed oil. To ignite pour on any commercial paint dryer. Fire starts as dryer evaporates.

Fulminate of mercury: A high explosive may be packed into a cartridge case to make a blasting cap, 25% ethyl alcohol, 25% nitric acid, 50% mercury. First mix alcohol & nitric acid, then pour on mercury. Use *very* small volumes, no mixing with mercury is necessary. What is left, a powder is the explosive. Powdered copper or lead may be used but will produce a weaker explosive.

Dynamite: Mix sodium nitrate or ammonium nitrate 80% with 20% nitro glycerin. Ammonium nitrate is a commercial fertilizer.

Plastic explosive: 60–70% ground dynamite mixed with 30–40% putty. Use blasting cap.

Nitro glycerin: Use 100% nitric acid, if necessary distill to reach 100% level. To make nitric acid mix 50% sodium nitrate and 50% sulfuric acid and distill. Sulfuric acid is available in auto supply shops for filling new batteries. Buy glycerin in drug stores. Mix nitric acid and sulfuric acid and glycerin. Filter through caustic soda to neutralize. Put caustic soda on a screen and pour nitro gently through into beaker.

Ammonium nitrate fuel oil explosive: Ammonium nitrate of 8/20 mesh can be detonated in holes 3 inches or larger in diameter

when mixed with No. 2 fuel oil. Use blasting cap.

Gun cotton: Cut cellophane, as from cigarette packs, into bits. Mix with nitric acid then add sulphuric acid and pour through caustic soda or starch on screen to neutralize. For less strength use more cellophane. Use blasting cap.

Potassium chlorate: For use in incendiary time bomb. Potassium chlorate ($KClO_3$) is available in chemical supply houses, but not drug stores. It would not be advisable to buy this chemical in a revolutionary situation. However the process for making it as described below requires the use of other chemicals which would not be of a suspicious nature and are readily available. Also described is the procedure for preparing the primary ingredient for $KClO_3$ (which is Potassium Chloride, KCl).

Required equipment for preparation of $KClO_3$: 1 automobile battery, 6 or 12 volts, 2 carbon rods (from dry cell batteries), 1 set of battery cables and clamps, 1 nonmetal (glass or enamel lined) pot, 1 pound table salt (non-iodized), 1 pound KCl (Potassium Chloride). If not available, see preparation instructions, 1 hot plate or gas or electric stove, 1 wooden spoon or paint paddle for stirring.

Fill pot with water and dissolve as much table salt as possible in the water until a nearly saturated solution is obtained. Heat the solution but do not boil. Add as much salt as will dissolve but no more. Connect the battery to the carbon electrodes and insert both electrodes into the hot salt solution. Do not immerse the cables and do not boil the solution. Do not breathe the gases being given off by one or both electrodes, but rather stir the solution vigorously. As the reaction proceeds add small amounts of KCl crystals or KCl solution to the hot salt solution. You should see a finely divided solid come out of solution and settle to the bottom. Turn off heat and allow the solution to cool. As the solution cools, more and more solid $KClO_3$ should settle out of solution. The solid $KClO_3$ may be filtered out through a very fine cloth or better yet coffee filter paper. Work with plenty of ventilation as one of the gases given off is poisonous and the other explosive, but both are not in heavy concentrations and this a very safe reaction with a minimum of care. If KCl is not available a KCl solution may be prepared by treating KOH (Potassium Hydroxide or Potash or sometimes called Caustic Potash) with HCl (Hydrochloric acid). This leaves KCl in solution with water and this solution may be added as KCl in place of commercially available crystals. There would be no questions asked if a person wanted to buy KOH, HCl or KCl. All the other ingredients are available at home. As is probably apparent, this procedure is a bit troublesome for a non-chemist and since it would be much easier to buy prepared $KClO_3$ from a chemical supply house the above procedure should be used only when it is felt that direct purchase would be unadvisable or when it is found that it may not be purchased through normal channels. Explosives may always be purchased through underground or illicit sources or on the black market. $KClO_3$ is not an explosive of itself and is easily stored. It is an ingredient in some explosives and reacts with other elements in violent reactions.

Gun Powder may be purchased in sporting goods stores. Military powder is the most powerful.

SABOTAGE

Molotov cocktail—A bottle is filled with ⅔ gas and ⅓ oil. A fuze is inserted and the bottle corked. The fuse is lighted and the bottle hurled at objective. On breaking the contents will ignite. The enemy will be unable to extinguish it with water.

(There appears at this point an illustration of a molotov cocktail indicating the various parts.)

A lighted cigarette is placed in a book of matches and left on combustible material.

(There appears at this point a match book illustrated with a lighted cigarette showing the method used.)

Hand grenades: A fuze of 5 or 6 seconds length is inserted into a can filled with dynamite and scraps of iron, nails, screws, etc.

(There appears at this point an illustration of a grenade indicating the construction of the various parts.)

Bangalore torpedo: Consists of lengths of pipe filled with sticks of dynamite. Sealed at the ends, and joined in the middle by couplings thus permitting the torpedo to be of varying lengths. The cap on one end has a hole which permits insertion of fuse and detonator.

(There appears at this point the illustration of a pipe showing the various parts of a bangalore torpedo.)

These torpedoes are very effectively used in destroying concrete columns, culverts, etc.

(There appears at this point an illustration showing the method to be utilized in destroying walls and columns with the bangalore torpedo.)

This torpedo is used to destroy walls, ramparts, large wooden or iron doors.

To sabotage automobiles: Nails, tacks, clamps, etc., are spread on the streets and road at night to impede traffic. They should be black in color so as not to reflect light.

(There appears at this point an illustration of nails placed so as to damage automobile tires.)

Booby traps: How to prepare a book to explode when moved. An opening cut in pages of book so wood chip between contacts is concealed.

(There appears at this point an illustration of a book prepared as a booby trap showing the various parts including the electrical mechanism.)

(There appears at this point an illustration of a door prepared as a booby trap including all of the various electrical and explosive mechanisms.)

(There appears at this point an illustration of a land mine prepared to discharge when it is run over by an automobile.)

(There appears at this point an illustration of a bottle prepared to blow a precisely determined hole in roadways over culverts and viaducts.)

Bombs used to sabotage motors, dynamos, electric installations, generators, machinery, etc.: A piece of cord, soaked in gasoline or alcohol, is tied around the bottle and ignited which will cut the bottle in two. The bottom part of the bottle is then filled with dynamite, a fused detonator is inserted into the dynamite and the bottle sealed. It is placed on whatever is to be damaged and secured in any appropriate manner. When it explodes there will be a perforation up to six inches with the diameter of the hole dependent on the cone of the bottle.

Destruction of iron and steel beams:

(There appears at this point an illustration of the method to be used in the destruction of an iron or steel beam through the use of an explosive charge including methods of securing the charge to the beam.)

The setting of explosive charges to blow up columns or steel beams is clearly explained in these diagrams.

(There follows illustrations of various methods for the destruction of beams and pillars designed to support bridges and road ways.)

Above drawing indicates how to place charges to demolish the pillars which support the bridge. The dynamite can be placed under the water in the same manner and exploded electrically.

Action against tanks, light tanks, armored cars, etc., on roads and in cities:

(There follows at this point the illustration of the various traps described in the accompanying statements:)

Tree trunks, pieces of railway track and iron beams sunk in the roadway detain light tanks, assault cars and jeeps. Occasionally large tanks may be stopped. In any event they are slowed to the point of making them good targets for hand grenades, bazookas, molotov cocktails, etc.

Tank trap: a hole 3 yds deep, 9 yds long and 7 yds. wide is covered with weak planks and disguised with dirt and rubble.

Trucks, over turned in the streets with wheels removed and loaded with stones are effective against light tanks, assaultors.

Train mines (electric): The mine is buried two ft. below and between railroad tracks. It explodes when the train passes over the contacts which close the electric circuit.

(There appears at this point a series of illustrations showing the precise placement of train mines including the various electrical connections.)

You should use between 25 and 50 sticks of dynamite for each mine. The positive pole is fixed to the track the negative contact remains 2 inches above the rail without touching it!

A mine is placed at point "A." Several miles from "A" two others are placed without attaching the negative pole to the track, when "A" explodes, the other mines are armed so as to destroy repair trains.

SABOTAGE OF HIGHWAYS

(There appears at this point an illustration which portrays the following description.)

An obstruction is placed in the road at point "A." When traffic is backed up to points "B" and "C," these points are blown up so as to bottle up traffic on both sides of point "A."

(There appears at this point an illustration of a gunpowder charge prepared for use according to the following description.)

A compact gunpowder charge is placed in can or paper box. Magnifying glass in lid uses sun's rays to detonate charge.

Pocket incendiary bombs: Place these incendiary bombs in movies, cars, files, mail boxes, next to inflammables, once acid begins action, one leaves quickly.

(There appears at this point an illustration of small incendiary bombs showing the various parts and methods of placement.)

Incendiary mix: A glass or cellulose tube is filled with potassium chlorate ($KClO_3$) sugar mix. The fuze is a small tube of conc. sulfuric acid, plugged with Cork or paper inserted in large tube, plug up, invert bomb to activate.

Incendiary time bomb: Bomb to be used against cars, trucks, etc.

(There appears at this point illustrations of various bombs to be used according to the accompanying descriptions.)

To destroy railways: destruction of railways in various locations paralyzes traffic and forces the enemy to divert men and material for repairs and guard duty.

A cardboard or iron tube is filled with a mixture consisting of ¾ potassium chlorate and ¼ sugar and is sealed. A glass vial is filled with sulphuric acid and stoppered with paper. To arm the bomb, you insert the vial, stoppered end down, into the tube, the acid will eat thru the paper and ignite the potassium chlorate-sugar mixture.

During the night, a greased steel cable which does not reflect light is strung diagonally across the road—about a foot and a half high. When a vehicle hits the cable, it will slide off the road.

(There appears at this point an illustration showing the precise placement of the cable described in the above commentary.)

(There appears at this point an illustration of a road way booby trap designed to be triggered by contact with a moving automobile.)

Movement of wire will pull out chip of wood. Electric circuit will be complete—explosion will follow.

The "nipple": The nipple is made by filling a piece of pipe or tube with dynamite TNT, or gunpowder and capping both ends, insert fuse through hole in cap dimentions, vary "nipple" time bomb.

(There appears at this point an illustration of the "nipple" bomb showing each of the various parts and indicating the different explosives to be used.)

The nipple time bomb is activated and detonated in the same manner as the incendiary bomb.

Mines used to blow up autos, trucks, and light tanks:

(There appears at this point an illustration of various mines including their placement so as to effect the greatest damage.)

(There appears at this point five pages of illustrations showing various types of mines, their placement, and the different methods of discharge including all of the electrical connections which are necessary.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD, for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. DENT), for Monday, April 28, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 60 minutes, on May 1; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONABLE, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 1 hour, on April 30; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. RUTH), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 15 minutes, on April 28, 29, 30, and May 1.

Mr. DIGGS, for 1 hour, on April 29.

Mr. BUSH, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. DENNEY in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. MIZE in three instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. JONAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DIGGS in four instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in six instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances.

Mr. FLOWERS in two instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. TUNNEY in two instances.

Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. RODINO.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 25, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3832. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the total active duty strength of the Marine Corps exceeds 200,000.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

703. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of work experience and training project in Lake County, Ind., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

704. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the American National Red Cross for the year ended June 30, 1968, together with the combined statement of income and expenditures for the same period, pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

705. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings by improving evaluation of competitive proposals for operation and maintenance contracts, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

706. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improvements needed in the management of the urban renewal rehabilitation program, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

707. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS. Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8654. A bill to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10578. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act or to child's or widow's insurance benefits on the basis of disability under section 202 of such act, and individuals in the corresponding categories under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII

of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10579. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for sex education in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 10580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers in qualified States to claim a credit against Federal income tax for 40 percent of the net cost of State income taxes and State general sales taxes, to transfer to the several States the responsibility for certain Federal education and welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 10581. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 in order to make assistance available to Indian tribes on the same basis as to other local governments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10582. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in order to make assistance available to Indian tribes on the same basis as to other local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 10583. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10584. A bill to amend section 4356 of title 39, United States Code, relating to certain mailings of State departments of agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10585. A bill to enlarge the Redwood National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10586. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 10587. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10588. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10589. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide that no charge alleging an offense punishable by death may be referred for trial until approved by the Secretary concerned, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOREMAN (for himself, and Mr. RHODES, and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 10590. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in order to make assistance available to the Navajo Indian Reservation and other Indian reservations which are located in more than one State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10591. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 10592. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 10593. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the entire cost of certain minimum health benefits for employees and their families shall be paid by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 10594. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEPPE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WINN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WOLD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. OLSEN):

H.R. 10595. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 10596. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Codes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 10597. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10598. A bill to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to permit unmarried judges of the courts of the District of Columbia who have no dependent children to terminate their payments for survivors annuity and to receive a refund of amounts paid for such annuity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10599. A bill to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act of 1916, as amended by the act approved August 21, 1957, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10600. A bill to prohibit the leasing of submerged lands under the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif., for exploration, development, and removal of minerals, and to rescind all such existing mineral leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10602. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL (for himself and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 10603. A bill to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10604. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 10605. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10606. A bill to increase to 5 years the maximum terms for which broadcasting station licenses may be granted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10607. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act), to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the protection of U.S. vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10608. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10609. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10610. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to base the amount of an educational opportunity grant on the student's expenses for tuition and books, to increase the maximum annual grant to $2,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10611. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in the establishment of programs designed to provide for the advancement of medical knowledge with respect to the causes and effects of malnutrition, and to facilitate the detection and treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 10612. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons, and to increase the criminal penalties for violation of this section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 10613. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10614. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide relief to certain individuals 65 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through a system of income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 10616. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. CABELL):

H.R. 10617. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. CAHILL):

H.R. 10618. A bill to provide for the redis-

tribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10619. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 10620. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 10621. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs, and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. MATHIAS):

H.R. 10622. A bill to provide full Federal financing of payments made under the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to recipients who do not meet the duration-of-residence requirements of the applicable State plan, where such payments must nonetheless be made because of court determinations that such requirements are unconstitutional; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 10623. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10624. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 10625. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for certain motor vehicle maintenance employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 10626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 10627. A bill to provide full Federal financing of payments made under the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to recipients who do not meet the duration-of-residence requirements of the applicable State plan, where such payments must nonetheless be made because of court determinations that such requirements are unconstitutional; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 10629. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10630. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniform services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 10631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing for percentage depletion rates for oil, gas, and certain other minerals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing for gains from the disposition of depreciable realty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10633. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 10634. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10635. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 10636. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 10637. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10638. A bill to provide for improved development of public airports and related facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 10639. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10640. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 10641. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as so to permit certain individuals retiring thereunder to receive their annuities while serving as an elected public official; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10642. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a national wildfire disaster control fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY (by request):

H.R. 10643. A bill relating to voting rights of members of the Yakima Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10644. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent or dependents who have intellectual limitations to the extent that ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society is impaired; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10648. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10649. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10650. A bill to limit payments to farmers, increase the authorization for food stamps, and increase water-sewer grant authority for rural communities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10651. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not approve any grant to assist a construction project under the Public Health Services Act, the Mental Retardation Facilities Act, or the Community Mental Health Centers Act unless he has obtained adequate and enforceable assurances that the recipient of the grant will provide relocation assistance for persons displaced as a result of such project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10652. A bill to amend section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize the issuance of conditional entries to refugees from Northern Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 10653. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 10654. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 676. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 679. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 226. 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 Janerio, 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 LODE

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 unanimous 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 Chappie 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 Ali 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 Chadbourn, 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 Maidenburg, 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 relationship 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 intergovernmental 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 uninformed 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 (ghettoes, 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 goodby 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 policy-making 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, undereducation 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 explicity 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 antitobacconists 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, aberations, 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 SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. 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 Hinninger. 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 unshakeably 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 steadying erosing 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 Treasury 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 per cent 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 per cent to 5 per cent 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 SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. 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 redecorating 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.

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

[In thousands]

Employment status	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 NEIGHBORHOODS [1] BY COLOR, SEX, AND AGE

[In thousands]

Employment status, sex, and age	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.

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

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 atmophere 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 colloqium 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 colloqium—which was sponsored by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—was held to discuss establisment 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 singleminded 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 signators.

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, interfering 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 Northhampton 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 Ayoob; 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. Transatlantic 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 airlanes 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 Nutritions 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 famililes.

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 Agriculture, 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 Committee 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 competition 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 parsuaded 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, 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

[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.

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 inquires 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 heirarchy. 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 expedient 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 300,000 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 independence 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 Mummers 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 symoblized 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 cotch 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 pious 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-Christs 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 Amercan 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 people, 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 astoromical 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 lusty scrap in Congress relating to progress. The latest has been touched off by conservationalists—preservationalists 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 Lilienthal. 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 Flemming 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 overseer 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 unforgetable 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 fellowers, 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, sumptious 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 Benscoter, 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 certain 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 liquefication 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 upate 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 reminder.

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, yippies 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 debonair 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 continous 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 preflight, 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 read 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 LAKESHORE

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. Jainsen:

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. Jainsen 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. Jainsen puts it, the plan envisioned 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 Vineland, 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, hopefully 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 francise.

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 Disrtict 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 nonpartisan 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 political 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 unsnarl red tape, speed up official action, or right a wrong.

Cassidy's superiors know him for the fighter he has always been.

A few years ago we had occasion to deal with Social Security Administration officials all the way up to the headquarters in Baltimore, in connection with a news story. We found that all of them knew Cassidy. Many had felt his wrath.

When Cassidy took over Social Security here in San Jose, he had a staff of three, working out of the Post Office Building at First and St. John streets.

Expansion—He originally had a four-county jurisdiction—Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey.

Today, with geographic responsibility that does not even embrace all of Santa Clara County, he has 53 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-smocked 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. Luise, 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 accidential 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 black out 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 payload 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 survivaiblity 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 ⅓ to ½ 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: [1] ". . . 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 Talinn 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.[2]

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 graph [3] 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 deployment 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 USSR 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 ⅓ 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 [3] "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." [4]

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, 5]

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 [6] . . . 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."

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. McNamara [7]—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 nonexistent 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—[11]

"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[12] "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 pyschological 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.

Footnotes at end of article.

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 Talinn 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 that[14]

"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 brinksmanship. 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.

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)

[3] Kintner, Wm. R.; Peace and the Strategy of Conflict, Prager (New York, 1967).

[4] John Foster Dulles in a speech before the Council of Foreign Relations, Jan. 12, 1954.

[5] McNamara, Robert S.; The Essence of Security, Harper and Row (New York, 1968).

[6] 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.

[7] McNamara, Robert S.; 1968 Posture Statement, see Foreign Affairs, 47, 433.

[8] Aviation Week and Space Technology, October 23, 1967.

[9] Statement to the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 11, 1969.

[10] The full text of this speech appears in the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1967.

[11] New York Times, March 15, 1969.

[12] 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.

[13] This argument is summarized in D. G. Brennan, "The Case for Missile Defense", Foreign Affairs, April 1969.

[14] 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 goverment 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 immmediately 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 peninsual 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' officer, 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 voceriferous 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 Lifflander, 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 impropriety.

"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 campmeeting 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 Viands, 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 Neceffary Art Made moft Eafy" 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, Isaiah 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 Rudolph 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 Thiess, 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 Trevetin 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 intolerants 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 manuevers. 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)

DUC 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 ofcial 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 consumer 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 triumverate. *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 serices. 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 estabilshed.

A better coordinated and more efficent 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	351.11
Dues	268.00
Entertainment	849.68
Miscellaneous (small contributions, flowers, etc.)	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. ADDABBO 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 BRADEMAS 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 FARBSTEIN 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. GIAIMO 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 HOLIFIELD 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 Illinios; 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. PODELL, 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. ROBISON, 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 explaning 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 Demorcats 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 fail 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 princple: "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 reinstituted 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.

DANGEROUS 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. RARICK 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 commitment 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 wilt 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-