

By Mr. MADDEN:
H.R. 10706. A bill for the relief of Danica Sekulovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:
H.R. 10707. A bill for the relief of Marie Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10708. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Ognibene, Mrs. Grazia Ognibene, Giuseppe Ognibene, and Domenico Ognibene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:
H.R. 10709. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Masood Ghouse, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,
98. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Madison, Wis., relative to the establishment of a Subcommittee on Computers and Automation, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ORREN BEATY: A JOB WELL DONE

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate has confirmed a new Federal Co-chairman for the Four Corners Regional Commission, I would like to take this opportunity to tell you about the outstanding performance of Orren Beaty, Jr., the first Federal Cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission.

The Four Corners Regional Commission, established pursuant to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, is designed to stimulate economic growth in a 92-county area within the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. Its members are the Governors of those four States and the Federal Co-chairman. Orren Beaty was appointed by President Johnson in August of 1967 at the time the Commission was being organized.

The success of this Commission is dependent upon the good will of the people in the region and the close cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies. From the day he took office and up to the very last day of his term, Orren Beaty worked to create and maintain these relationships.

He consulted frequently with the Governors and their staffs to gain their interest in the program and to insure their continued cooperation, and the Governors are working together with the recognition that there are problems common to all these States and that solutions may be more readily obtainable on a regional rather than on an individual State basis.

Through his extensive knowledge of Federal Government agencies and personnel, Mr. Beaty was able to enlist the support of the Federal agencies for this program.

Important as all of this is, it tends to obscure one very significant aspect of the job he did. In an area which has been traditionally hostile to government, especially the Federal Government, getting the trust of the people who are to benefit from the programs is crucial. Orren Beaty traveled all over the region talking to people—explaining the program to them and asking what they hoped to gain through the Commission. He visited the Indian tribal leaders, the farmers and ranchers, the small towns, opening up channels of communication between people and their government which are rarely available.

The Commission, under Orren Beaty's leadership, has already accomplished much in its short history. All four States now are actively pursuing comprehensive

statewide planning programs. One year ago Arizona had no statewide planning program and planning efforts in the other States were generally in the formative stages. The highway departments of the four States, working with representatives of the Commission, are now developing a regional highway plan for the Four Corners areas. The Commission has also undertaken studies of the vocational education needs of the area, rail transportation facilities and requirements, and manpower needs.

For the past 19 months Orren Beaty has devoted his time and his considerable talents to the difficult task of discovering ways of improving the economic conditions of one of the most underdeveloped areas of the Nation. The job is far from complete, as he himself would be the first to say, but, due to his efforts, we have made a good beginning.

We thank him and we wish him well.

COMPUTATION OF RETIRED MILITARY PAY

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced S. 364, a bill which would return the computation of retired military pay to the basis on which it was figured before 1958. My bill would allow the armed services of the United States to honor a moral obligation which had become very close to a contractual obligation as the result of 150 years' use.

This matter of recomputation is of vital importance and concern to the men of the Armed Forces of the Nation who have fulfilled their service duty and retired. Every day these men contact my office to ask about the progress of S. 364. In order that Senators may share in their expressions of concern, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published in the April issue of the National Association for Uniformed Services Newsletter, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RECOMPUTATION—HOTTEST ISSUE FACING 91ST CONGRESS FOR SERVICE RETIREES

Recomputation or equalization of retired pay—call it what you will—is the hottest item before the 91st Congress as far as Uniformed Service retirees are concerned.

Recomputation would reinstate the pre-1958 system of basing retired pay on current active duty pay scales. Ever since 1958, when the system was switched preemptorily, a serviceman who retires keeps getting the

same pay as long as he lives, except for periodic cost-of-living adjustments.

As a consequence, a tremendous gap in retired pay has grown over the past ten years between retirees of the same grade and years of service. In short, it has created a marked inequality among peers—an inequality that will widen substantially with the upcoming pay increase and will continue to widen ad infinitum unless Congress restores the traditional system of computing retired pay on the basis of current active duty rates (re-computation).

There are three major forms of recomputation bills now pending before Congress:

The first form would let all retirees recompute their retired pay, beginning now and continuing into the future. This is the bill introduced by Senator Tower, among others, and specifically supported by President Nixon during his campaign.

The second form would give the benefit to those who were on active duty before recomputation was killed in mid-1958.

The third form would apply only to those who retired before mid-1958.

While there is merit to each of these three forms of recomputation (and NAUS objects to none, since each would benefit some portion of our membership), nonetheless NAUS strongly supports the first form listed above; that is, the bill sponsored by Senator Tower, and urges each NAUS member (and all Service friends he can muster) to write to his two senators and the congressman of his district to let them know politely but clearly that this is the legislation we want passed because it's the fairest, and because it benefits more than 99% of our membership.

We are fully aware of how much recomputation would cost; but we do not believe that all examples and comparisons are complete or necessarily valid. For instance, it has been stated that recomputation costs would be more than 17 billion by the year 2000. As a comparison of costs this figure alone is rather useless. Were these costs also compared with the expected government income tax revenue in the year 2000; or the expected personal income rates in the year 2000; or the projected national gross product figures for the same year? When compared to a few of these figures, the true story becomes more realistic, and the cited retirement dollars are relatively small.

Additionally, the 17 billion figure indicates the dollars that will be paid to retirees. It does not reflect the 20-25% of these dollars that will be returned to the government in the form of income tax or other federal revenue programs.

Everyone seems to have a pet comparison of his own, such as the one which alleges that the projected cost of recomputation would equal the cost of a new antimissile system. Nobody except the retiree himself seems to be alive to the individual inequities involved and how they shape up in the figures and facts. We suggest that defense analysts and columnists turn their thoughts to the foregoing and to these comparisons: A major or lieutenant commander retired prior to June 1958 with 22 years service has been deprived of \$17,000, plus interest, during the past eleven years—enough to put a couple of kids through college on an austere basis and make a healthy down payment on a home. During that same time, a sergeant major, master chief petty officer or chief

master sergeant retired prior to June 1958 with 30 years service has been deprived of over \$34,000 plus interest! Even by today's inflated standards, that represents a lot of money. And the acid irony of it is that it's money out of the pockets of those in the lower career pay brackets, those who not only can afford it least—but, in fact, those who cannot afford it at all!

Our Country prides itself for its concern for the individual—for its concern for people above things. We think it's time that that concern was reassessed with respect to Service retirees and today's active duty personnel, who some day will be retirees, by passing re-employment legislation in the form submitted by Senator Tower, which is the kind of legislation President Nixon himself has promised to support.

NURSE TALENT SEARCH

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at present rates of recruitment, the Nation will be short 151,000 nurses in 1970, a shortage which has already curtailed hospital services and the delivery of health care. On March 31, I introduced S. 1540 to combat this shortage by expanding the present nurse talent search program.

The type of activity this legislation is intended to encourage is illustrated by the You-In project being conducted in the Washington area to encourage students and motivate them to finish secondary school and pursue a nursing career. This project is especially directed at Negro girls; for Negroes, while comprising 11 percent of the population, comprise only 3 percent of all nursing students. The project is also designed to deal with the problem of the declining proportion of high school students selecting nursing as a career.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a description of the You-In project, which can well serve as a model to other communities.

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

OVERVIEW OF YOU-IN PROJECT

The purpose of the You-In project is to identify, encourage, and motivate students in the greater Washington area to finish secondary school and pursue a career in nursing. To attempt to accomplish the first objective (identifying students who may be interested in nursing careers) groups of students from youth organizations in the city will come together to participate in group discussion meetings. These discussions will give students in grades 8-10 an opportunity to express their concerns related to current issues of interest: school, home, community, vocational aspirations and reactions to nursing careers. From the group meetings students who indicate an interest in nursing as determined by group leaders, Project Director, parents, the students and what the students say in the group discussion, will be matched with a Registered Nurse. This nurse volunteer will meet regularly with the student and periodically with the parents and will provide guidance and support on a long range basis.

As a result of the project, hopefully, the student will become aware of the avenues open to him or her in nursing and can begin early to plan a career in nursing.

From the project valuable information on

methods to reach inner city students and encourage them to pursue a nursing career will be obtained. Also a description of the feelings, attitudes and beliefs of the students will result which can be helpful in reaching other students in different areas.

JOB CORPS CLOSINGS ILL TIMED

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last Friday it was announced by the Secretary of Labor that 59 Job Corps centers are to be closed, including two in Idaho—at Cedar Flats, near Kooskia, and at Mountain Home.

As much as any Member of the Senate, I realize the need for cuts in Federal spending to help stem the rising tide of inflation brought on by the continuing war in Vietnam.

But it is ironic that the Nixon administration would choose to gut the Job Corps program, in order to save \$100 million, while advocating the deployment of a dubious, if not unworkable, new ABM system, which will cost at least 70 times that much—for openers.

In the case of Idaho, nearly 300 corpsmen at Cedar Flats and Mountain Home now face uncertain futures. The closure of these camps demonstrates, once again, how seriously our national priorities have become confused.

Mr. President, perhaps the most telling comment I can make on the value of these camps—and those in other States affected by last Friday's order—is to let one of the officials most directly involved spell it out.

Mr. Paul T. McNutt, director of the Cedar Flats center, has written a short speech which he has delivered to local organizations explaining just what is involved in the center's programs—its costs and its contributions.

All who are concerned about the Nixon administration's decision to close these camps will find Mr. McNutt's speech a telling commentary on why they should be kept open.

I ask unanimous consent, that the speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JOB CORPS COSTS

We hear so many figures bandied about by politicians and critics and by friends and they are so divergent in their views that I would like to give you some real, hard facts about the costs of keeping a corpsman here at my center, Cedar Flats Job Corps, Kooskia, Idaho. The actual yearly, per capita cost to support a corpsman at Cedar Flats is \$4,168. Immediately the critics of the Job Corps program pounce on this and quote NEA figures on the average costs to educate a child in the public schools as being \$450. Let's stop and evaluate these two figures.

First, the \$450 figure given to us by the NEA represents the costs for salaries in the average school district over the entire United States for public education. In New York City, however, this figure runs closer to \$1100 per pupil and it is true in Chicago, Washington, and other large cities that the cost is near the \$1000 figure. This figure does not

include the cost of the athletic programs, the football stadiums, the janitors' salaries, the cost of shoulder pads, hip pads, and football shoes, the cost of any of the buildings, the hot lunch programs—only the teachers' salaries.

The figured cost for education for a corpsman at Cedar Flats Job Corps on the same basis as the NEA figures is \$900. This is higher than the national average and lower than the general figure for the slums of the large cities from whence these corpsmen came.

Now, let's go back and take this \$4,168 cost for each corpsman. First, subtract \$1,200 which we spend on each corpsman each year to buy cement, two by four's, plywood, culverts, fence posts, and other building materials which go directly into the beautification, repair, and the construction on the Nezperce and the Clearwater National Forests. This \$1,200 is charged against the cost of educating a corpsman, but it is, in reality, a permanent accrual to the benefits of Mr. J. Q. Public. This leaves a balance of \$2,968 a year on each corpsman which is divided roughly as follows: \$143 for dental bills; a similar amount for medicine, physical check-ups, and hospitalization; \$900 for schooling; \$75 for personal clothing which the corpsman gets to keep; and about \$100 for work clothing which remains at the center; \$819 for food; and the balance of the \$2,968 is used for defraying the costs of the buildings and equipment over a ten-year period.

Since this center was opened, we have spent approximately \$143,000 in Grangeville and Orofino on dental bills alone. We have spent \$75,000 on personal clothing, most of this in Grangeville and a considerable lesser sum in Orofino. To the Carnation Milk Company, operating out of Kamiah, we have purchased \$409 a week in dairy products and bread. This comes to about \$54,000 since the center opened in the latter part of 1965. So, never underestimate the impact of the Job Corps on the economy of your village.

I would like to direct your attention back to this \$4,168 figure that it costs to keep a corpsman going and compare it with some interesting alternatives which the critics of the Job Corps program conveniently overlook. How much do you think it costs to keep a man in prison for one year? Well, I looked it up and the figure is approximately \$5,000. Let's assume that the average prisoner stays in prison or in jail for five years. I don't have figures on this. Some prisoners stay lots longer and some stay less. This means that Mr. J. Q. Public has wasted \$25,000 on a prisoner.

This next one will really bug you. The average family on welfare costs the government \$8,000 a year. Now we can start toying with some figures a bit. If we assume that the average corpsman is eighteen years of age and expects to live until he is seventy years of age, he would normally spend fifty-two years on welfare and together with his family would cost the government \$416,000! Which would you rather do, plunk out \$416,000 to keep a kid on relief or \$25,000 to keep him in the pokey and then have him turned back on society to go back on relief for an additional \$376,000 or would you rather have \$4,168 now and attempt to break this vicious chain of poverty and welfareism?

Immediately you say, "Aha, professor! But not all of your kids get jobs and they don't all break the chain of poverty and welfareism." True. Of the 125,900 corpsmen who have gone through Job Corps, 84,601 (or 68%) are either back in school, are on paying jobs, or are in the Armed Services. The other 32% we have failed on and we presume then that they are on the treadmill of poverty and welfareism. Before he enters the Job Corps, the average corpsman earns \$639 a year. After Job Corps, the average corpsman earns \$1.70 an hour or \$3,536 a year. This corpsman graduate actually puts more money (\$707.80) back into the United States Treasury in the form of taxes than he earned

in a year as a high school drop out, non-Job Corps punk roving around the streets.

Another little item that our critics are prone to overlook is the tremendous emergency value of the corpsmen. Last year during the fire season at Cedar Flats, corpsmen did 17,000+ hours of emergency fire fighting at no cost for salaries to the government. Over the nation as a whole 326,000 hours of emergency work were done by corpsmen—or roughly \$500,000. Specifically at Cedar Flats, we figure that each corpsman has contributed \$105 worth of donated labor in emergency situations. This, of course, is over and above the regular 40-hour working week.

Another monetary return from this money spent on a corpsman is the fact that over two thousand public school systems in the United States have witnessed the phenomenal success in the youth in Job Corps-produced educational and instructional materials and at no extra cost to the school districts have adopted these methods and materials. Normally, this type of research costs huge sums of money.

I have one other set of figures that I would like to give you before I ask for questions. The average corpsman stays at Cedar Flats 5.6 months. While he is here he spends half of his time or 2.8 months in school and he progresses through one and a half times as much reading in his school as his counterpart would do in the public schools. In mathematics, he almost doubles—not quite (1.8 times)—the progress made by the average public school youngster. You ask why.

Well, first, we are extremely fortunate in having small pupil-teacher ratios and second, we refuse to accept the contention that these kids are just plain dumb! They are, rather, kids that have been rejected by society.

HEARINGS ON NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 reconfirmed the housing and community development objectives set forth in the statement of policy in the Housing Act of 1949. Beyond that, it established a firm goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated units over the next decade to eliminate slums and substandard housing from our towns and cities and from our rural areas as well.

The achievement of this goal will not be an easy task but it is well within the range of the tremendous economic potential of this country. It will, however, require us to follow wise policies and maintain a determined effort. Already the achievement of the levels of new home production necessary to keep us on schedule are threatened by cost increases and a shortage of mortgage finance.

Beyond the goal of 26 million housing units, we recognize the necessity of providing a suitable environment for all of our people and our objective requires success in all of our programs for community development.

Title XVI of the 1968 Housing Act not only set forth our goal but called for annual reports from the President on our progress and problems in carrying out this plan. These reports will provide the Congress and the Nation with perspec-

tive and insight on our housing and urban development programs. The first of these reports has now been received by the Congress and it deserves to be widely read and studied.

The Subcommittee on Housing will hold hearings on national housing goals beginning May 13 to make an intensive review of that report and of our housing goals generally. Already the Committee on Banking and Currency has held hearings to study the problem of the recent sharp increase of lumber prices which has implications for the full decade ahead. In later hearings, other special aspects will be considered. The subcommittee hearings will bring together the comments of top Government officials, industry leaders, and a wide range of professionals in the field of housing and urban development. They will also provide a useful background for our legislative hearings planned for later this session.

THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide supplementary appropriations for the educational and cultural exchange program of the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

The enactment of this legislation is needed to enable the Secretary of State to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act.

The President's Task Force on Education has submitted a report which among other things recommends the following:

The Fulbright program: We strongly urge immediate actions by the new administration to salvage the international educational exchange program through the following steps:

First, by means of a supplemental appropriation early in 1969, to close the \$15,000,000 gap in the levels of the Fulbright-Hays appropriations as between fiscal year 1968 (approximately \$46,000,000) and the current 1969 fiscal year (approximately \$31,000,000).

My bill is designed to implement this suggestion and reverse the continuing decline of this most valuable program. The projects which have been sponsored under the auspices of Fulbright-Hays have been very popular and beneficial to the interests of the United States. In spite of this, the program has been subjected to drastic cuts in funding. In fiscal year 1966 the mutual educational and cultural exchange program operated under a budget of \$53,000,000. This has been cut to \$31 million for fiscal year 1969.

The drastic curtailment of funds has forced the State Department to suspend their participation in many cultural and educational exchange programs and has discouraged private contributions for these jointly financed programs.

I would like to describe to my colleagues some examples of the exchange programs operating in California.

Project India, Ceylon is sponsored by

the University Religious Conference at UCLA and Watkins House at the University of California at Riverside. The program has sent a team of students to India each summer since 1952. Project Ceylon was begun in 1968. Both of these programs have received substantial contributions from private individuals and the students themselves. The State Department has made up the difference. However, due to the drastic curtailment of funds, the State Department has diminished its support until now it provides no funds at all.

Project Pakistan and Project Nepal-Afghanistan have, in the past, been jointly sponsored by the State Department and by the University Religious Conference and Associated Students of the University of California at Santa Barbara. Also due to a curtailment of funds the State Department has decided to discontinue its participation in these programs.

Mr. Speaker, the support of the State Department is necessary for the continuation of these valuable programs. Without State Department support, interest by foreign nations will diminish and private sources of revenue will dry up.

These exchanges are important conduits for student activity.

The headlines are filled with stories about student unrest. Little is written about student participation in educational and cultural exchange programs or the Peace Corps or other similar beneficial and public spirited programs. Yet we now find that another door to public service is being closed to young people. Tremendous interest has been generated for these programs and their impact both at home and abroad has been great. But success has only produced failure. Faith has been broken by our Government. The hopes and aspirations of many people have been left unfulfilled by a decision which they view as impersonal and arbitrary.

Let us act to encourage public service not discourage it. Let us move to channel the energies of youth into educational and cultural activities rendering a social and public service rather than curtailing such activities and encouraging more campus unrest and ill-advised disruptive activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this supplemental appropriations bill be carefully considered. I believe my colleagues will find that the investment would be beneficial.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY DR. ALLYN P. ROBINSON, OF DOWLING COLLEGE

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, revolution on our campuses was the topic about which I spoke at the commencement exercises of the State University College of Buffalo in New York on February 2, 1969. The widespread foment among American college students is due in no small part to the prevalent tend-

ency among today's youth to search for meaningful ways to serve society and constructive and significant outlets for generous impulses and noble ideals. Most students are dissenters, not disrupters, and it is the administrators of our universities who are charged with assisting the student to translate his dissent into action.

On the same day that I was delivering this commencement address the first president of a new and exciting college was being inaugurated. I say new and exciting because of the impressive career of public service of Robert Dowling, the man after whom the college was named, and the tone of the inaugural address of the first president of Dowling College, Allyn P. Robinson. President Robinson is to be commended for the astute welcome he has extended to the student rebel and the compassion and understanding he has shown to those of our Nation's youth who are anxious for change.

I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address of Allyn P. Robinson be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN PURSUIT OF WISDOM

(Address by Dr. Allyn P. Robinson on the occasion of his inauguration as first president of Dowling College)

This is an occasion to rejoice.

I am sure that in the not too distant past the congratulations which college presidents received upon occasions such as this were without qualification. It has been interesting—perhaps a bit disconcerting—that many of the messages I have been receiving not only from this country, but from abroad have included a note of sympathy.

The college campus is not always looked upon today as the peaceful haven it once seemed to be.

I do not however ask for sympathy, instead I seek a commitment that will allow Dowling College to become an instrument to serve the three-fold goals set forth in our motto: Learning, Wisdom, and Compassion.

The encouragement of learning is certainly a major task. This is no small undertaking in a day when the body of knowledge increases in almost every field more rapidly than even the experts in those fields can appropriate it. But learning means far more to us today than acquiring knowledge. It means more than learning the skills that will be necessary for our vocations. It means relating ourselves to ancient and contemporary discoveries in ways that can provide self-esteem without arrogance, sensitivity without dominance.

Because of the nature of the learning that I hope we will seek, I am glad that our college has not only placed an emphasis upon experiment and innovation but has been committed to an inter-disciplinary approach.

In the end, it is the understanding of the relationships between the segments of knowledge that man has acquired that is the mark of an educated man, to say nothing of the fact that no single discipline can adequately solve the vital problems of our time.

Our innovation and experiment must not, of course, be limited to the classroom or seminar. The success of our teacher-internship program underscores again the fact that we learn by doing and there are many other areas open to such internships if we can pursue them with imagination. It becomes clear that significant learning is achieved by active student participation in the affairs of the

college. Long ago John Stuart Mills said that, "participation in government may be the first step toward liberation from the chains of custom and conformity." If such liberation is indeed a goal of liberal education then the practice of democracy on the campus is a vital part of the pursuit of the liberal arts. I am convinced by what I see on our own campus that capacity to act responsibly grows with opportunity. The ability to think is a major goal, but our thoughts must be matched by behavior.

The pursuit of wisdom is elusive. Who among us, looking at the state of our society, upon the perverseness of our own natures . . . who then is bold enough to assume that we are in a position to impart wisdom. And yet wisdom as well as learning must be part of our common pursuit.

Although wisdom is not to be found in the content of our disciplines, it may be the import of this content. If we cannot provide it through courses and seminars, it may be embodied in the individuals who teach these courses, or in the students whom they teach.

Whatever else wisdom involves, it involves values and our institutions of higher learning have had in recent times, a tendency to shy away from values. In the name of the great god "objectivity" or in the names of even lesser gods, we have thought we should eschew values as if they were unworthy of sophisticated men. In the process we have sometimes become idol worshippers.

For we will have—we do have—values of some sort. Without them we would stay in bed. We would surely not have a college, and you who support Dowling College and make it possible, would not be here today.

This is not to say that the college is not committed to a search for objectivity. Always it must be a place where there can be uninhibited criticism, untrammelled intellectual debate, where heresy does not inspire witch hunts. It must always be the duty of a college to help our society by destroying its prejudices, by sharply scrutinizing its myths. But if those under our tutelage find life meaningless they will not learn and we should not marvel if their actions are random and destructive.

Life without meaning is not life at all. Dostoevsky wrote, "If it were desired to crush a man completely, to punish him so severely that even the most hardened murderer would quail, it would only be needed to make his work absolutely pointless and absurd." The Nazis proved the point. They drove prisoners out of their minds by subjecting them to meaningless work, requiring them to laboriously dig deep holes and then to fill them up again.

Recently I listened to our three Lunar astronauts. In their profound honesty, and simplicity in their very real humility, they were deeply moving. A statement made by one of them, I found significant and rather disturbing. He expressed understandable gratification in the fact that they had given to the American people "something to be proud of, something to hang on to." I find only gratitude that this is so, but I find tragedy in the fact that we have had so few symbols that could express our common values not only as Americans, but as men.

Our society will move toward wholeness or destruction not on the basis of our cleverness but upon the basis of our values. If the launching of Sputnik could trigger a decade of scientism on our campuses, what would it take to develop a more active humanism? If an urban crisis, the tragedy of Vietnam, the exploding ghetto, have not done it, what can reveal to us the paucity of the qualities that make us men?

Wisdom surely must encompass compassion and if it does not, our learning can make us mad.

One recalls the words of T. S. Eliot: "Between the idea and the reality falls the

shadow." Intellectuals have been known to give leadership to infamous causes. They made a poor stand in Hitler's Germany. Many have been capable of distorting science to serve national ends. Some of them, right now are engaged in perfecting a biological warfare that might make even a nuclear holocaust seem pleasant. Liberal education must lead the struggle against anti-intellectualism but it must not settle for intellectualism alone.

I am convinced that by their very nature institutions tend to incarnate power and prejudice. Almost any institution being composed of human beings—always subject to a tendency toward self-love—will tend to seek their own enhancement and survival with too little regard of the common good.

It is no wonder then, that the college and the university have been seen by many of our younger generation as part of an establishment to be attacked. A great deal of the revolt of youth, however unpleasant, however at times destructive and short-sighted, must be seen, I believe, as a kind of inverse idealism.

A society that has in too many instances substituted the products of technology for human values needs its critics. An affluent society that leaves many men and women without dignity and many children essentially without hope needs its critics. A society that possesses a new potential for total destruction yet seeks military instead of human and political solutions needs its critics. A society that allows utterly irrelevant racial distinctions to crush the human spirit, heaven knows, needs its critics.

It is a mark of greatness in a society to be able to raise up its critics and most importantly to listen to them. I welcome the voice of the young rebel. Youth, though now many doubt it, can still be the hope of the future. Youth, free from the chains of caution and compromise that so quickly bind us oldsters, have frequently had a way of seeing clearly what we comprehend but dimly.

There are some who see a generation gap so great that none can span it, so wide that one cannot even speak across it. I am not convinced. Must a nation born in revolution be frightened by the stirrings of revolution in our time? It is rather the quality and direction of this revelation that should concern us.

If there is cause for concern, it is not that our campuses are alive these days with revolutionary zeal, but rather that one portion of our youth has opted out . . . turned on . . . retreated to their own mystical islands. Equally tragic—another portion has enlisted in a revolution of despair. The destructiveness and random violence that has erupted on many campuses suggests a tragic air of hopelessness, a blind striking out against a world they do not like without any hope that it could become the world they want. In many instances they have not even troubled to draw the broad outlines of such a world. Here and there we see welcome signs of restraint. I recently enjoyed a cartoon that showed a student leader instructing his colleagues . . . "Remember, this time we take the soft approach—we break all the windows, but we don't burn the building." But if moral outrage is not enough, youth alone must not be asked to bear the moral obligation.

What somehow we must do, is to translate the revolution of despair into the revolution of hope. The world, I suspect, will not be vastly changed by the advent of student power, or black power. I do not minimize the importance of power. If our democratic creed means anything, the disinherited will not be left in that estate. But our sickness is greater than this. It is a sickness of spirit that keeps us from any vital sense of community. Peter Ustinov, who is a man of many parts, writes with insight in a recent issue of Center Magazine when he says that

"power is always superseded by other power: mutual respect is eternal."

The task, obviously, is enormous. As a Christian, I have always felt that the doctrine of original sin, no matter how we may modify it in this age of science and rationalism, was describing a basic fact of human life. And to the proclivities of human nature, you must add social forces larger than any of us that obstruct our progress. I am not always sure what students and others mean when they talk about "the military-industrial complex," but they are right in assuming that men often institutionalize their predatory natures. I am not proposing that we encourage utopian spiritual expectations. That could be as disastrous as the belief in inevitable progress from which we are only beginning to be free. But, though enormous, our task is not impossible.

What I am asking is, that we recognize that if man is part devil, he is also part God. Even if you reject this religious terminology, you have found, I am sure, in your own experience, that men can love as well as hate, that men can be concerned about their brethren, that men are capable of generosity and sacrifice and that such men have made a difference.

My friend, Cardinal Cushing, had planned to be with us today and would have been except for illness. In recent correspondence, I chided him for making the headlines again in connection with a famous marriage. Quite typically, he wrote that his only reaction to adverse criticism was to recall the words of Pope John XXIII spoken in private audience: "I don't care what they say of me, I must be good and kind always to everybody." Spoken lightly, this is a sentimental statement but accepted as a goal, it is part of what we mean by compassion—a compassion based upon the dignity of all men and the mutual respect that unites them.

To the extent that adult leadership, through political and social organization, can share this same compassion, we will not only narrow the generation gap but transform the revolution of despair to a revolution of hope.

The revolution of hope will have to be based upon an adequate concept of man and of his destiny and perhaps we are getting help these days from new quarters. The poet, Archibald MacLeish had some reflections on the recent voyage to the moon: "Men's conception of themselves and of each other," he pointed out, "has always depended upon their notion of the earth. When the earth was the World—all the world there was—and the stars were lights in Dante's Heaven and the ground beneath men's feet roofed Hell, they saw themselves as creatures at the center of the universe, the sole, particular concern of God—and from that high place, they ruled and killed and conquered as they pleased.

"The medieval notion of the earth put man at the center of everything. The nuclear notion of the earth put him nowhere—beyond the range of reason even—lost in absurdity and war. This latest notion may have other consequences. . . . To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold—brothers who know, now they are truly brothers."

This once seemingly large world, has turned out to be a small world after all. We can almost see it as one campus—on which, if we are to survive we must struggle together to learn, to seek wisdom and to be capable of compassion.

As I accept the charge that has today been given me, I know that I can perform it only if all of you, students, faculty, administrators, Trustees, members of the community, will commit yourselves, along with me, not only to the College, but to a world that needs what we can bring to it.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL: A GROWING RURAL PROBLEM

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the problems of increasing amounts of garbage and solid waste should be receiving more attention in this country.

From time to time I have used this forum to point out the need for more concern over the many aspects of this challenge.

Too often the problem of garbage and solid waste is thought of as relating only to urban areas. While the disposal of the vast quantity of solid waste in urban areas is indeed of great concern, the problem is also acute in small towns and rural areas.

The Moulton Advertiser, which is published by Arthur Slaton in Moulton, Ala., has vividly pointed out how the garbage disposal problem affects rural parts of the country.

The news article is an excellent definition of the serious problem, and I want to commend the Moulton Advertiser for this unusual public service in pointing out the great need for attention to this problem.

So that my colleagues may be aware of the scope and nature of the garbage disposal problem which affects every section of this country, I include the article from the Moulton Advertiser as a part of my remarks at this point:

GARBAGE DISPOSAL—A GROWING RURAL PROBLEM

What is the No. 1 problem facing rural areas today—in Lawrence County as well as throughout the state?

The answer to that is probably garbage disposal. At least health officials and concerned individuals cite this at the top of the list in discussing what's wrong with rural America.

And the discouraging part about it is that no workable solution has been found.

The problem is just as much present in Lawrence County as other areas of the state and although it is discussed by many, little has been done about it. Not because of a lack of interest, but because there seems to be no immediate solution.

THE EVIDENCE

A Sunday afternoon drive through rural parts of Lawrence County gives an idea of how much a problem garbage disposal has become. Along roadsides, in creeks and streams, it collects—a breeding place for flies and other insects.

Who is concerned with this problem?

Sanitarian Elvie Terry at the Lawrence County Health Department says many residents are. They call frequently to report that someone has been dumping garbage along the road near their house; they want the health department to do something about it.

Terry said he receives numerous complaints. He follows them up with an investigation; a trip out to the reported site to see for himself. But other than that, he has no authority to do anything about garbage being dumped on someone's property or on the state right-of-way.

The affected landowner can take steps to have the garbage removed if he finds out who dumped it by contacting that person or by legal action if other means fail.

The State Highway Department posts pro-

hibitive signs at places where garbage has been dumped; stating that anyone convicted can be fined heavily. But still the garbage collects there.

FOUR BIG PROBLEMS

There are at least four problem areas in Lawrence County that of which Terry is aware, all on unpaved roads. Perhaps the worst, he said, is at Brook Springs south of Town Creek, an abandoned recreation area.

Others are located on Harding Creek, off Alabama 157 near Hatton; one is in the Salem Community and the other problem area is south of Alabama 24 between Berea and Fairfield communities.

The possibility that others exist in the county is certain, Terry said, even though they are not reported. He receives more complaints, however, on these four.

The majority of complaints come from residents who live near the dump areas. They complain the odor is bad or the road is cluttered with garbage to the extent that it is hardly passable. And many residents who take pride in their community feel these areas are unsightly to visitors, as well as a health menace for those living nearby.

The private property owner doesn't like the situation but he would have to keep the sites under surveillance both day and night to catch persons dumping their garbage on his land. In some cases this is impossible since the landowner lives many miles away.

ATTRACT DOGS

One resident near the dump on Harding Creek is concerned with stray dogs that are attracted by the garbage. The half-starving dogs run in packs, he said, and are known to attack live farm animals for food.

He reported four of his calves were attacked by the dogs and there were others in his community who lost animals. His main concern, he said, is that the stray dogs are a threat to human beings as well as animals.

Another neighbor reported some of his animals died after drinking the water from Harding Creek. It seems the water has been contaminated by certain garbage dumped into the creek.

These are some examples of problems created by garbage dumped along roads or on private property. But in spite of this, garbage continues to collect.

NO PICNIC NOW

Brook Springs near Town Creek—which seems to be the worst site for dumping—was once a favorite gathering place for family picnics and outings. Because of the plentiful water running from an underground spring, it was used many years as a recreation area.

No one goes there any more for picnics. Only to dump their garbage. Over the past five or 10 years, residents have been throwing their garbage along the road until it has become unsightly. People in the community complain about it but the dumping goes on.

CONCERN GROWS

Only recently—in the past two years—has garbage disposal in rural areas received much attention. State and local health officials particularly are concerned over the situation and are now seeking a plan that could remedy this growing problem.

They know that unless it is stopped it can only become a greater problem in the future.

But what exactly is being done?

According to Terry, several things. For instance, the North Alabama Association of Sanitarians of which he is a member appointed a committee to study the problem of garbage disposal and come up with recommendations.

An investigation was made and the committee's findings were reported. Their recommendation is that one or more sites be approved for dumping in the county and that

a garbage pick-up system, similar to what the city has, be implemented.

Under this plan, residents in rural areas would pay a small fee to have their garbage picked up on scheduled days. The fee would pay the expense of hauling the garbage and the salary of someone to supervise the dump.

"Lawrence County needs one or two properly supervised dumps," Terry said. "The most practical method is a sanitary land fill where garbage can be buried."

In the past, landowners have given permission for individuals to dump on their land but this didn't work out since people abused the privileges they were given.

LEGISLATION EYED

Terry, like many of his associates, believes the problem of garbage disposal cannot be solved without legislation. If this becomes necessary it could involve more taxation.

He pointed out, "I think the person who receives the service should have to pay for it and I hope it can be worked out without taxing everyone."

The sanitarian said other counties have a rural garbage pick-up system and with enough cooperation and support, the same type of program could be successful in Lawrence County. But it may take a long time yet to work out a plan of action.

Meanwhile, there is not much to do except ask for the public's cooperation in keeping garbage disposal under control, he said. If people continue to dump on private property as they have been doing in the past, the problem will only worsen.

Most people have more pride in their community than to make it unsightly by throwing garbage along the roads, Terry surmised; it has been found that outsiders are usually the ones who do the most damage.

But until someone comes up with a plan that will provide the rural people with a means of getting rid of their garbage, there probably won't be any vast improvements. . . .

COLLEGE ADMISSIONS POLICIES

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a column published recently in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat has been brought to my attention. Entitled "College Admissions Policies Restrictive," it was written by Mr. James Harvey, director of admissions at St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa.

In my opinion, Mr. Harvey's column highlights with peculiar lucidity and incisiveness the problem faced by many a black graduate of a high school today. Although often the product of a decidedly inferior primary and secondary school system, he is nevertheless expected by many colleges to compete on equal terms with his white contemporary. Black students from ghetto areas cannot be expected to do as well as whites on college entrance examinations which presume adequate secondary schooling, yet these tests are often decisive in determining whether a student will gain admission to college.

As Mr. Harvey implies, colleges which are unwilling to bend their admission standards for a black student who has an obvious desire to learn but whose academic record is poor run the risk of seeing such standards broken in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that Mr. Harvey's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

COLLEGE ADMISSIONS POLICIES RESTRICTIVE

In March 1968 the Kerner commission released its report which concluded that America was moving toward two separate and unequal societies, one black and one white.

White society is deeply implicated in the ghetto, the report reads. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white institutions condone it.

If the institution of American higher education can be taken as typical, we are forced to admit the statements. By its very nature, higher education has catered to the white middle and upper-class population.

In itself, there is nothing wrong with this type of approach. However, in cutting off the poor in general, and the black in particular, American colleges and universities have been as guilty as any in maintaining the divisions in American society.

Now, when some colleges and universities are attempting to remedy the situation, an amazing development occurs: people from all walks of white America decry the lowering of admissions requirements.

There are a number of points which should be made before we discuss the admission of black students to college.

First, on the national average, 40 per cent of the students who enter a college do not graduate from it. Not all, of course, are failures. Some graduate from other colleges; some drop out for personal reasons. However, a significant number do fail; in fact, colleges feel quite proud of themselves if no more than 10 per cent of their freshman class flunks out in the first year.

So, admissions requirements, particularly College Board results, are not exceptionally reliable predictors of college success. The high school record is the best indicator of college prospects. The boards are a distant second. This is not to say that the boards are not a good test. As tests go, the boards are one of the best. The point is that they are far from being 100 per cent accurate, and nobody, least of all the College Board itself, claims they are.

Second, a review of the alumni of any college will show that academically less-capable students have been able to complete college and go on to success in the world.

Third, most students from poor areas but particularly the ghetto child are in no way prepared for the College Boards. The quality of education in ghetto schools, the quality of ghetto life and the quality of the ghetto family all contribute to the lack of motivation and achievement of the black student. These factors are the foundation of the poor results of black students on the College Boards. The results are, indeed, miserable. Whereas about 20 percent of all white high school seniors will score 500 or higher on the verbal section of the S.A.T., only one or two percent of all black students will reach this level. The results have absolutely nothing to do with the intelligence or innate ability of the black student; the results are a function of his environment and background. Many educators equate the poor results to cultural bias. Simply stated, cultural bias means that tests devised in one culture cannot validly be applied to individuals in another culture because the basic beliefs and values of one culture may not be basic in another.

The cure to this educational problem lies not only in the high schools and colleges but also in society. Too often, colleges have blamed the secondary schools for not properly preparing black students. However, the high school can only do so much. It cannot clean out the ghetto or normalize the home life of its students. It is not expected to. Unfortunately, because of the money made

available to these schools, they often cannot even do an adequate job of educating their students.

Similarly, the colleges can only do so much. Even the best remedial work in college, even the most intense counseling, even the most sincere commitment from any individual institution cannot save all the minority-group students enrolled. This is true today when only the best motivated of these students are enrolled in college; it will be even more true in the future. The failure should not be surprising; after 12 years on the slag heap of education and 18 on the slag heap of life, turned out a college graduate in four years, or even five or six years, is a tall order. However, the difficulty is no excuse for ignoring the task.

Let us be honest about one thing. All of us receive something from our society—roads, subsidized airlines or housing loans. Some elements in our society need more. Until society is willing to meet its obligations, it should not carp because some colleges have at least made a beginning.

Since less gifted students in the past have completed college, since admissions requirements are at best tenuous and since S.A.T. results discriminate unfairly between economic and racial groups, the objection that colleges are lowering standards is nonsense. Furthermore, at a time when American society is rocking at the foundations, denying black students admission to college on the flimsiest of excuses is just one more prejudice in black eyes. If society is willing to keep admission to college restrictive, and therefore segregated, it can do so. But it does so at its own risk.

SDS: A GROWING DANGER

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have had three articles which were distributed by the radical Students for a Democratic Society inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One of those documents dealt with the attempt of this organization to exert its influence in the labor world. It was entitled "Work In: A National SDS Summer Project," and appeared on page 10263 of the RECORD for April 24, 1969.

This group, which I believe is more properly named the "Students for the Destruction of a Democratic Society," has long been known for its disruption of our Nation's campuses. Recently it has turned its attention to the business world and is now wreaking havoc in this area. The people of the Nation must be made aware of the subversive nature of this group and of its intention to destroy the very foundation of our society and of its institutions. The following article clearly indicates the directions the group is taking. In this case they forced the closing of an automobile plant, disrupting the lives of 1,900 workers and causing the obvious loss of pay and production:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1969]

SDS, NEGROES FORCE FORD PLANT TO CLOSE

MAHWAH, N.J., April 28.—Dissident Negro workers and members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) led by Mark Rudd forced a halt in night-shift production today at the sprawling Ford Motor Co. plant here.

A Ford spokesman said about 500 of the 1900 workers on the night shift were absent so the plant was closed. A similar job action

on Friday night also closed the plant and more of the same was pledged for Tuesday.

About 53 percent of 1900-strong night shift are Negroes.

Earlier today, the dissident workers, members of the United Black Brothers (UBB), had threatened to close the plant for the night shift unless their demands, which center on elimination of alleged racist policies, were carried out by management.

The dissident workers and the SDS members, about 300 strong, gathered in the parking lot of a building housing the headquarters of Local 906, United Auto Workers, which represents most of the Ford employees. Rudd, who was instrumental in the 1968 Columbia University student disorders, led the SDS members.

Just before the 4 p.m. shift was to report, about 100 whites and Negroes marched a half mile from the union hall to busy Route 17 and began passing out leaflets urging night shift workers to boycott the plant. Meanwhile, plant officials at the main gate used bullhorns to urge the workers to go to work.

The trouble began Wednesday when a white foreman allegedly called a Negro worker a profane name.

I was gratified to note that Mr. William C. Sullivan, Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in remarks before the national convention of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, had taken pains to point out the danger which the SDS movement presents to the business-man.

In a continuing effort to point out the very serious danger which this group presents to our entire Nation I commend Mr. Sullivan's remarks to my colleagues. I ask each of my fellow Members of the House to note the many documented instances of subversion and sabotage which are indicated in Mr. Sullivan's speech. I hope that the recent indications that full-scale investigations of this group are to be undertaken will be realized. I will continue to bring material relevant to this situation to the attention of this House.

Mr. Sullivan's remarks follow:

EXTREMISM AND BUSINESSMEN

(By Assistant Director William C. Sullivan, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

(The revolution of equality—racial and economic—has given life to new hopes and aspirations, but it has also unleashed deep and dangerous passions.—Morris I. Leibman, American Bar Association.)

THE PROBLEM

We are living in an era marked by continuing conflict, endless crises, and profound changes. The world today is revolutionary in a sense never before experienced by mankind. No other period in history has witnessed such far-reaching changes as those that have occurred in the 20th Century. The revolutions of science, technology, industry, communications, education, religion, and morality are spreading rapidly throughout the world. It is indeed true: "The recurrent shock of our age is the discovery that concepts and patterns of action of a more secure past no longer fit present reality."

Revolutionary changes, of their very nature, produce challenges, and today, on the national level, we are facing critical challenges to our freedoms, traditional principles, accepted values, and historic goals. These challenges come from various individuals and groups beyond the pale of the vital center of moderation in our land. The strident demands of the extreme left, black nationalists, and white hate groups threaten to polarize our society into a confusion of bitter, hate-ridden segments. The confrontation, conflict, and varying degrees of civil strife, evident in this country for some years,

have reached the academic community and cities all over the country.

Part of the problem is irrational behavior based on irrational thinking. While this irrationality is a factor in civil disorder in our communities and universities, the premeditated activities of organized extremists are becoming a dominant factor. We have long opposed tyranny by the majority, but today we are faced with tyranny by the minority, and a small minority at that. If it is not confronted wisely, promptly, courageously, and decisively the final outcome for this country could be totalitarianism.

THE NEW LEFT

One of the principal movements responsible for the current wave of lawlessness and violence on the campus has been the New Left. This movement, an amorphous, largely undisciplined collection of political and social malcontents—many with emotional problems—grew out of legitimate, widespread student participation in the civil rights struggles in the South in the late 1950's.

To the casual observer, the New Left deviate, in its initial stages, may have appeared to be a highly motivated, idealistically inclined social reform movement. As it has evolved, however, the violent exhortations of its leaders and the terroristic acts of its adherents have clearly demonstrated that the New Left is a revolutionary, negative, minority force dedicated to the total destruction of our traditions, our democratic concepts, and—in truth—our open society itself. It does not represent the valid viewpoints of the overwhelming majority of American students.

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) forms the very core of the New Left today and has instigated much of the unrest on our college campuses. SDS, in an early policy statement in 1962, expressed contempt for the existing social order and declared its intention to move toward the establishment of a "participatory democracy." More and more since that time, it has embraced Marxist-Leninist philosophy and an increased militancy.

The anarchistic character of SDS was clearly obvious at its June, 1968, national convention in East Lansing, Michigan. In a workshop held on sabotage and explosives, the participants discussed acts such as flushing bombs in toilets to destroy plumbing; firing Molotov cocktails from shotguns; jamming radio equipment; and dropping "thermit bombs" down manholes to destroy communications systems. Subsequent efforts of the SDS to explain away this workshop have been ludicrous.

Sit-ins, seizures of campus buildings, destruction of university property, and holding school administrators hostage are disruptive enough to our Nation's universities. But today these acts are accompanied by something even more alien to our society; naked terror. This terror is all the more devastating by its appearance within the heretofore calm rationality of the academic community and on the often pastoral setting of our college campuses.

TERROR ON THE CAMPUS

Recently, there have been a number of incidents of violence, destruction, and physical injuries on college campuses all over the country. At Lane College in Jackson, Tennessee, for example, on the night of March 20, 1969, the Science Building was destroyed by fire during a period of student unrest. Estimated damage was set at \$400,000.

The automobile of a campus police officer was destroyed by fire on a parking lot at the University of California at Los Angeles on March 17, 1969. Parts of a homemade bomb were found after this explosion.

On March 7, 1969, two students working in the Computer Building at Loyola University at Los Angeles, California, heard suspicious noises and detected an odor of gasoline. Examination of the area revealed that a

bomb had been placed under the building but, fortunately, had not exploded. This bomb had been made from a gasoline can rigged with a clock as a timing device.

On the night of March 5, 1969, a bomb exploded in the Creative Arts Building at San Francisco State College. In this case, the bomb exploded as it was being planted, with the result that the individual placing it was severely injured and may be permanently blinded. A search of the building disclosed a second bomb had been placed and set to explode. These devices had been prepared from more sophisticated materials including dynamite, batteries, and clocks. San Francisco State College has been under almost continuous siege by student revolutionists egged on by a dissident faculty element since the beginning of the current academic year.

A secretary at Pomona College, Claremont, California, was severely injured on February 25, 1969, when a bomb, wrapped as a package, exploded while she was removing it from a mailbox located in one of the college's halls. She subsequently lost two fingers of her right hand, was blinded in one eye, and will require plastic surgery as a result of facial damage.

On April 11, 1969, at the University of California at Santa Barbara, a custodian noticed a package lying outside a door to the University's Faculty Club. When he picked up the package, it exploded. He died as a result of burns suffered from this explosion.

At Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, a student who was an SDS member was seized on December 3, 1968, by authorities as he placed a fire bomb at the campus headquarters of the University ROTC. He was later convicted in Federal court on a charge of sabotage and was sentenced to five years' imprisonment.

At Cornell University, on April 19, 1969, 100 students took over Willard Straight Hall, forcing 70 occupants to leave the building, including 30 parents of students who were visiting the University. When the demonstrators evacuated the building 36 hours later, 17 of them carried rifles or shotguns.

At the State University of New York at Oneonta, on April 21, 1969, a group of 20 irate students submitted a list of demands to the president. One of the demands called for a weekly allowance of \$35 for these students as spending money.

These are but a few incidents that have occurred during the current academic year. Property damage resulting from these disturbances totals in excess of \$2 million. Over 2,400 arrests have been made during student disorders.

Many events on our campuses this year lead to the inescapable conclusion that certain elements in the academic community, consisting of both students and faculty members, have, in truth, already launched a revolution.

STUDENT REVOLUTIONARIES

The small revolutionary elements on the campus are being exhorted to action by professional agitators, both domestic and foreign.

Among the many domestic professional agitators are such individuals as Thomas Hayden, Mark Rudd, and Michael Klonsky, all leaders of SDS. Klonsky, currently SDS National Secretary, is the son of a former official of the Communist Party, USA. On April 11, 1969, Klonsky spoke at a rally at the University of Florida, during which he said that the SDS had helped to organize the student strike at San Francisco State College. He declared that it was time for revolution and for students and the oppressed minority to kick out the present system and form a "truly communistic society that would work for the poor and the oppressed."

Among the professional revolutionists from foreign countries who have toured the United States are Ernest and Gisela Mandel, of Brussels, Belgium. This couple spent two months in the United States on a speaking tour of

college campuses last fall. Ernest Mandel, a German-born revolutionist, is a leading member of the Trotskyite United Secretariat of the Fourth International, which has headquarters in Paris, France. The Mandels spoke at over 50 colleges and universities during their stay in this country.

In his first speech, which was given at Rutgers University in early September, Mandel told his audience that socialist scholars must educate students for their role in the coming revolution. Students, he said, are the detonators in the formula for triggering a social explosion creating a revolutionary situation. At the University of Pennsylvania, he stated that students should organize in force because the time is ripe for overthrowing the capitalist system and bringing about a change within the framework of Marxist-Leninist theory.

During the period from February 25 to March 12, 1969, Karl Dietrich Wolf appeared at some 13 colleges and universities in this country. Wolf, a professed Marxist and an official of the Socialist German Students Federation, a militant leftist-orientated student organization in West Germany, was on a fund-raising tour. He told his listeners at the University of Michigan that there is a need to build an international revolutionary alliance, as a victory for the movement in one country is a victory in another. He criticized students in the United States for not working together as they are in Germany, and said that the time has passed for just sitting around discussing matters—they should act.

Some faculty elements have also aided and abetted student revolutionists. A few university administrators have been thwarted by members of their own faculty when they attempted to preserve the integrity of their institutions. Doctor S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president of San Francisco State College recently observed in connection with the student demonstration at Harvard University that the president of this University "was doing the right thing but he was double-crossed by his faculty."

In this connection, Doctor Hayakawa made the following additional comments: "There's an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college-educated against those who are not college-educated, he said, "a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals and businessmen. They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

BLACK EXTREMISTS ON THE CAMPUS

The call to revolution sounded by New Leftists is being echoed by black extremists who have also selected our colleges and universities as priority targets for their confrontations. Black extremist student groups have made demands for campus power at over 50 colleges and universities across the country during the current academic year.

Best known of the black extremist student organizations are the Black Student Unions, which are particularly strong in California. The Black Student Union commanded considerable publicity through its disruptive actions at San Francisco State College. The student strike at that school began in November, 1968, after George Mason Murray, a Negro instructor in English and Minister of Education of the Black Panther Party, had been suspended for saying that, in order for Negroes to be free, they must "kill all the slave-masters."

Following Murray's suspension, the Black Student Union called for a student strike. On November 6, 1968, members of the group and their supporters disrupted classes and committed acts of vandalism. Acts of terrorism, including bombings, characterized the later stages of this strike.

The highly publicized Black Panther Party, whose members have been involved

in numerous acts of violence against police, recently turned its attention to black students on the campus.

Over the weekend of April 11-13, 1969, a black cultural festival was held at Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Mississippi, a predominantly Negro institution. Black extremist speakers from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Black Panther Party urged college students to overthrow the Government, by arms, if necessary, and to arm themselves and support the third world movement.

At this festival, the head of the Black Panther Party in Boston waved the Party's newspaper as he asked for student support. This newspaper, which preaches hatred of the white race, revolution by blacks, and Chinese communist propaganda, has grown in circulation from 20,000 copies to 40,000 copies in just the past few months.

BLACK EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS

Today, there are over 100 different black extremist groups in the United States with many thousands of members and additional thousands of sympathizers. The major black extremist group is the Black Panther Party, based in Oakland, California. Less than a year ago, this group had 125 members in Oakland; today, with a phenomenally expanding membership it is operating in some 24 cities with over 60,000 sympathizers. The Party is self-described in its literature as "the armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution."

The Black Panther Party's propensity for violence and its hatred of police, or "pigs," as it calls them, are illustrated by an event which occurred in Oakland, California, in October, 1967. Huey Newton, a cofounder and Minister of Defense of the Black Panther Party, was stopped for a traffic violation. He shot and killed one police officer and wounded another. He was subsequently convicted on a charge of voluntary manslaughter and sentenced to serve from two to 15 years.

Again, in April, 1968, violence erupted when Oakland police questioned occupants of a parked car. Fifteen members of the Black Panthers opened fire and a 90-minute gun battle ensued, leaving one Panther dead, one wounded, and two police officers wounded.

In early April, 1969, 21 members of the Black Panther Party were indicted in New York City on charges of conspiring to commit murder and arson and for possession of weapons and explosives. It was alleged that these individuals had conspired to dynamite the tracks of the New Haven branch of the Penn Central Railroad in New York City; that they had planned to place bombs in downtown department stores; and that they had plotted to bomb a police station to assassinate police officers.

The Black Panther Party was recently described by communists in this country as the fastest growing organization in black America and "the most radical political party to take root among the black masses since the American Civil War."

Several other black extremist organizations have also engaged in acts of violence. In July, 1968, for example, a black extremist group called New Libya attacked police with high-powered rifles in Cleveland, Ohio. Three police officers were killed and 14 wounded. Eight other persons were killed. On March 29, 1969, members of the black separatist Republic of New Africa engaged in a gun battle with Detroit police, resulting in one police officer wounded and one killed.

Black extremist groups have made tremendous gains. This is in striking contrast to the failure of the pro-Soviet Communist Party, USA, to recruit and retain Negro Americans. As J. Edgar Hoover has observed:

"One of the bitterest disappointments of the communists has been their failure to lure any significant number of Negro citizens into the Party."

One factor in the communist failure to win the Negro has been the outspoken op-

position of responsible Negro leaders. This opposition to one form of extremism—communism—is also needed to oppose black extremists.

NEGRO LEADERS SPEAK OUT

Negro leaders are now beginning to voice this kind of opposition. Roy Wilkins and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People spoke out in the NAACP magazine "Crisis" last December:

"Let it be known that the preachers of hate, the defeatists afraid to compete in the open market, the name callers who substitute epithets and slogans for reason, the exhorters who summon Negro youth to death in futile shoot-outs with the police and the military—let it be known that these media-created 'leaders' are not our spokesmen."

Archie Moore, the Negro boxer who literally fought his way out of poverty, warned his fellow Negroes:

"If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams."

America does not lack for Negroes who have risen to preeminence in their field despite the handicaps of a minority race. Negroes have acquired steadily increasing political recognition and stature in recent years. More and more Negroes are being elected or appointed to local, state, and national offices. The prominence and accomplishments of American Negro athletes and entertainers are well known. Negro prizefighters and professional baseball, football, and basketball players are among the highest paid athletes in the world. Many Negro entertainers enjoy international reputations. These are Negroes who can help stem the tide of black extremism and, moreover, can give the lie to the propaganda of the white racist extremists.

WHITE AND BLACK EXTREMIST PARALLEL

There is a disturbing parallel between the black extremist movement and such white extremist groups as the Klan organizations, Nazi groups, and the National States Rights Party. This extends even to the Klan and Nazi ideologies of anti-Semitism which are mirrored in the black extremist movement. A black extremist, Charles Kenyatta, leader of the American Mau Mau, has asserted that "the slaves of Black Africa thank Hitler for destroying six million Jews" and are "hoping that he will appear again in America."

Stokely Carmichael, in manifesting anti-Zionism, during a press interview in Liberia in September, 1968, said the "so-called State of Israel" is an "unjust and certainly immoral State." He claimed that "the same Zionist" that exploits the Arabs exploits the Negroes in the United States.

Another black extremist, Max Stanford, echoed this prejudice when he said the "Zionist design is to build their cadres as the new militant leadership in order to gain control of Black America and to manipulate it according to its design."

WHITE EXTREMIST VIOLENCE

The use of violence is not limited to campus revolutionaries and black extremists. It is also the tactic of white hate groups.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, the celebrated authors of "The Strange Tactics of Extremisms," also touch on the subject of extremism in their latest book, "The FBI In Our Open Society." In this book, which is a forthright and factual account of the operations of the FBI, they make the following incisive comment:

"Both the Right and the Left are overcrowded now with individuals and organizations that have, in effect, revised Voltaire. Their tactics proclaim, 'I disagree utterly with what you say, and I will oppose to the death your right to say it.'"

The murders of civil rights marcher Viola Liuzzo in Alabama, Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn in Georgia, and the three civil rights workers—Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman, and

James Chaney—in Mississippi are deplorable acts of terror and violence. Moreover, the bombings of houses of worship, including the Birmingham, Alabama, bombing that killed four innocent Negro children, are crimes of the worst kind.

EXTREMISM AND THE BUSINESSMAN

Extremism presents a major challenge to the American business community. It is a challenge that can be met successfully, however, because the history of America is a continuous story of individual initiative, dynamism, courage, and sacrifice.

The businessman has several roles to play in our society. He is, of course, primarily a businessman, but he is also a citizen, a parent, a contributor to educational institutions, and a community leader. In each of these roles he is faced with a challenge from extremism.

AS A BUSINESSMAN

The business community must maintain the vitality of our economy in the face of efforts by the extremists to destroy it. For it is the vitality of our economy that will have a decisive role to play in maintaining, in the years ahead, the stability of our economic, political, sociological, and educational institutions.

Understandably, businessmen are absorbed in their immediate interests. However, there may be times when the individual businessman will be faced with the hard decision, which he alone can make, of whether or not he should temporarily and voluntarily modify his traditional standard of profit and loss in the light of more overriding, long-range consideration of national interests. Our ultimate success in the struggle against extremism may well depend on the individual businessman's awareness of long-range national goals and the realization that individual, temporary sacrifices may, at times, be required.

The businessman has already sacrificed much at the hands of extremism. Because of the wave of extremism, many businessmen have been denied the rights, privileges, opportunities, and benefits which our country affords its citizens. In the past five years, civil disorders have taken a shocking toll in the forms of deaths, injuries, and property damages. The April, 1968, riots in Washington, D.C., for example, caused business loss and business property damage estimated at \$55 million.

Since 1964, when riots and disorders first erupted in the United States, there have been 192 major riots and serious civil disturbances; 207 people have been killed and 8,525 injured; 61,463 arrests have been made; and an estimated property damage of over \$283 million has been incurred.

The actual cost to the businessman can never be fully established. For instance, a recent survey shows that of the estimated 1,600 businesses damaged or destroyed in the April, 1968, riot in Washington, nearly half have not as yet reopened. This means, then, that some businessmen and their employees have in effect been deprived of their livelihoods. The resulting hardships will, therefore, never be known.

As the result of the April, 1968, riot in Washington, insurance claims totaling \$17½ million were filed for property and liability losses. Insurance was later cancelled on a fourth of those buildings that were damaged but not demolished.

The businessman has also suffered from the effects of having his personnel recruiters subjected to verbal and physical harassment on college and university campuses. In February, 1969, for example, 200 students forced a United Fruit Company recruiter to discontinue interviews of prospective employees at the University of Washington. This demonstration, sponsored by SDS, was directed against this recruiter because SDS claimed the law office of the late John Foster Dulles

had done work for the United Fruit Company and the late Allen Dulles, the former Central Intelligence Agency Director, had once been President of the United Fruit Company. Incidents such as this have occurred with increasing frequency in recent months.

Demonstrations against business concerns, while largely directed toward those companies producing material used in the Vietnam War, are not limited to this area. The SDS Chapter at the University of Washington is now planning a demonstration against the Weyerhaeuser Lumber Company because it has manufacturing outlets in Africa. SDS has said that this is to be part of a campaign against what it describes as "United States imperialism that exploits people around the world."

The American businessman has every right to combat the organized campaigns of the extremists. At the same time, the businessman should take time to ask himself some pertinent questions about his relationship as a businessman to his fellow man. Is he satisfied with a reasonable profit on his investment? Does he comply with the spirit, as well as the letter, of building codes, especially leased residential property? Is there a tendency to take advantage of the lesser privileged when selling to them the necessities of life such as food, shelter, clothing, medicine, and health care?

More and more, businessmen will have to become involved in society's problem. Consider the following taken from a report released by the General Electric Company last year:

"The U.S. public will expect more with respect to the quality of life in business organizations and the quality of business services to society."

AS A CITIZEN

More than the average citizen, the businessman has a personal stake in our enlightened free enterprise system. Like the average citizen, the businessman must have protection under the law against terrorism. During 1968 alone, civil disturbances resulted in at least 70 deaths and more than 4,000 injuries to our citizens.

We must be able to walk the streets without fear of attack from extremist elements. It is incumbent upon all citizens in all areas of life to help eradicate the underlying causes of extremism. Obviously, there is a great need for sound programs through which poverty, hunger, and social inequities can be eliminated. We must encourage a moderate and rational approach, while discouraging extremism and hysteria in grappling with grave social problems.

The disorders resulting from extremism must also be thought of in terms of financial cost to the citizen. The San Francisco and Berkeley, California, Police Departments have estimated that it has cost them nearly \$1 million to cope with student demonstrations. Legislation is being considered in California requiring educational institutions to pay for extra policing from their budgeted funds. These costs must ultimately be passed on to the citizen in the form of higher taxes and higher tuition fees.

The time has come for all of us to re-examine our lives, to reappraise our values, and to ask ourselves if we are really willing to assume the individual responsibilities which go hand in hand with the free enterprise system and the liberties we enjoy. If we are not prepared to accept these responsibilities, Theodore Roosevelt's admonition of many years ago may, unfortunately, prove to have been prophetic. He warned:

"Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity and hardihood—the virtues that made America.

"The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, safety-first instead of duty-first, the love of soft-living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

AS A PARENT

Like all parents, businessmen are concerned with what their children learn in college beyond academic requirements alone. You must insure that America's future leaders learn the responsibilities of citizenship rather than the revolutionary concepts of communist or fascist totalitarianism. An immediate concern to all parents of college students today should be the increasing incidents of violence, the use of obscenities, the abuse of narcotics, the degradation of human personalities, and the destruction of property on our campuses. Our campuses must not be allowed to become the habitat of the terrorist, the degenerate, or the anarchist.

Pictorial displays and photographs too obscene to describe or to be exhibited here have become common fare for the underground press which has flourished on many college campuses throughout the Nation. These can only be the products of sick mentalities.

The family, which has been described as society's basic unit, has an important role to fulfill in the proper development of society and in combatting amoral influences. However, the successful fulfillment of this role will be directly proportioned to the dedication and cohesion of the family's members. Just as the individual can act as a spiritual leaven for the family, families can influence and promote public morals. In this day and age when rivalry between some families for the material things of life is the vogue, there is a definite need to call public attention to the more important values—the spiritual values.

Beyond the family, we must see to it, as parents, that our campuses are places for molding those to whom the future of the Nation will be entrusted and that they must not be places for spawning those who would destroy the very system that has given them every opportunity.

Those with children in college should encourage them, representing the majority as they do, to democratically oppose and lawfully control the nihilistic, destructive, revolutionary student. The increasing violence and propensity on the part of extremist students to destroy the educational process are causing more and more students to react so the educational facilities will not be destroyed and educational processes disrupted. A recent example of this took place on April 23 here in Washington, D.C. On that date, a group of students at American University refused to permit campus agitators to occupy an administration building from which they had ousted the university president.

AS A CONTRIBUTOR TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

What can extremism and terrorism mean to you as an actual or potential contributor to educational institutions? For one thing, it can negate your personal efforts to expand the opportunities for higher education or to improve the quality of that education. Contributions which might normally serve these purposes may have to be used in the restoration of damaged facilities. Little return can be expected when the contribution is utilized to replace campus buildings and equipment destroyed by student revolutionaries. During the Columbia University uprising of a year ago, for example, it was estimated that damage to campus buildings alone totaled approximately \$250,000.

As a taxpayer, your contributions to both higher learning and the national defense have been adversely affected by acts of extremism. One of the targets of the New Left is military service, especially ROTC training on university campuses throughout the country. In a series of mysterious incidents in recent months, ROTC buildings and equipment on at least five campuses have been damaged by explosives and fires. As a crane and six military vehicles burned at

the Navy and Marine ROTC location at the University of Oregon, on September 29, 1968, some New Left students stood nearby chanting, "This is number one, the fun has just begun."

In this regard, it is significant that recently 29 independent college newspapers published simultaneously an identical editorial demanding that ROTC be abolished from all campuses. If the New Left extremists can accomplish this objective, it is not difficult to imagine the effect it would have on this Nation's defense posture.

What benefits can a businessman or corporation envision as a return from a contribution to an institution that has taught that enlightened free enterprise is evil, or to an institution that has, under the guise of academic freedom, turned its graduates into roving bands of anarchists? Thomas Hayden, a founder of SDS, has given one answer. In May, 1968, he stated that if college administrators do not make themselves subordinate to students, "We will close them (the colleges) all down."

Another answer was provided by SDS National Secretary Michael Klonsky in October, 1968, when he declared that students should tear down the power structure and replace it with "people power." The students would then control the universities, he promised, and the workers would operate the factories.

Every contributor must look at his offering in terms of what return can be expected in building a stronger, freer America, or what it will return by way of lessening human hardship and suffering both in this country and in the world. Are you, as a contributor, satisfied that students are getting the facts in school about the accomplishments of the free enterprise system in the United States and an objective comparison between this system, with its admitted inequities, and other systems in operation throughout the world today?

AS A COMMUNITY LEADER

Extremism impairs efforts to build and strengthen our communities. It stifles efforts to resolve differences among ethnic groups. While there is little hope that community leaders can convert some of the radical extremists with reason or persuasion, efforts must be made to reach those who have not as yet closed their minds to reason and persuasion. At the same time, there is need for firmness in dealing with those on the campus and in the community who, in the name of dissent, flout the law and invoke violence. These extremists must be repudiated. Responsible community leaders must speak out against their excesses.

White racist extremists, the New and old Left, and black power advocates have as their objective the destruction of our traditions and the democratic concepts of our society. Our history as a great Nation has been marked by our ability to meet new challenges with constructive changes. If our institutions are to keep pace with the demands of the changing world, they must be infused on a continuing basis with new concepts, new life, and new vigor. If this does not happen, they are doomed to irrelevancy and oblivion.

Former Ambassador George F. Kennan has correctly said this country is in more serious danger today than at any time since the Civil War. Because extremism is a most important cause of danger, it is imperative that all of us, in every walk of life and in every section of this country, do everything possible to eradicate the underlying causes of our hazardous national predicament. This means, among other things, making ignorance give way before knowledge; inequality before justice; oppression before freedom; lawlessness before law and order; irrationalism before rationalism; intolerance before tolerance; immorality before morality; and evil before goodness; and making despair, which sometimes grips us, give way before hope.

This means in the educational world recog-

nizing legitimate grievances. Businessmen are certainly aware that students in many of our universities and colleges have legitimate grievances involving curricula, dormitory facilities, faculty relations, the role of American higher education and the like. These legitimate issues must not be obscured by the strident "non-negotiable" demands of a small minority which openly espouses disruption, nihilism, and violence as shown by their statements and actions.

We must restore and develop freedom under law—freedom of thought, expression, action, worship, inquiry, dissent, experimentation of education—and freedom to educate the whole student personality.

This is the task before us. It is a task that will not be carried out successfully by "doing business as usual."

FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ESTABLISHED IN NEW YORK

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a few days ago I had the opportunity to meet James F. Ragan, vice president of a newly organized foundation called the Center for the Development of Cooperatives. I was deeply impressed by the objectives and the projected plans of this new nonprofit housing institution. Building upon the initiatives that Congress has taken in expanding opportunity for home ownership by low- and moderate-income persons, CENDEVCO hopes to stimulate community action in a wide range of social and economic programs by establishing housing cooperatives as an institution of influence and motivation.

I believe that housing cooperatives represent a most worthwhile attempt to bring thousands of low-income families into the mainstream of American life. The center seeks to use rehabilitation as the primary means of creating new housing. Moreover, its staff intends to devote considerable resources to technical assistance and training for cooperative ownership and management.

Mr. President, I hope that future congressional action in the housing field may strengthen this approach and assist the expansion of housing cooperatives.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published recently in the New York Times, discussing the Center for the Development of Cooperatives, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1969]

LOW-INCOME CO-OPS ARE PLANNED HERE

(By Thomas W. Ennis)

A nonprofit foundation has been established here to convert rent-controlled apartments occupied by low-income families into cooperatives for families with incomes of \$3,000 to \$7,500.

The co-ops would be established with Federal, state and city aid.

The foundation is called the Center for the Development of Cooperatives. In the next six years the foundation's officials expect to sponsor 58 co-ops in the city, with a total of 12,000 apartments.

Their long-range objective is the conversion of 100,000 apartments into co-ops over the next 10 or 15 years. They are beginning their operations with a 197-family, rent-controlled apartment development at 1680 Crotona Park East in the Bronx.

The foundation, whose offices are at 527 Madison Avenue, was established last fall by Robert T. Bonham, its president, and James F. Ragan Jr., vice president. A substantial part of the initial operating costs were provided by a \$135,000 personal contribution from John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, which is being given over a two-year period.

Mr. Bonham was with the old Federal Urban Renewal Administration, and was at one time real property manager for the Department of the Navy. From 1958 to 1962 he was president of Greenbelt Consumer Services, which operates a cooperatively owned chain of supermarkets, gasoline stations and furniture stores in the Washington-Maryland area and in Virginia.

Mr. Ragan is a former foreign service officer of the Department of State and a former management consultant in Washington.

The foundation's statement of purpose declares that there is "considerable evidence that ownership, an important ingredient of economic power, is increasingly desired by below-middle income groups."

The sponsors also believe in using the housing cooperative as an institution to influence community action "in such areas as police protection, education, sanitation services and recreational facilities." Pride of ownership can help prevent neighborhood decay, the foundation notes.

In the plans for its initial co-op at 1680 Crotona Park East, the foundation has an option to purchase for \$935,000 three six-story buildings from the family of the late A. M. Brand, who built them in the nineteen-twenties.

Most of the 197 tenants are of Puerto Rican origin. The foundation has contracted with the Scholarship, Education and Defense Fund for Racial Equality to organize and instruct the tenants in the responsibilities of cooperative ownership.

The co-op's sponsors propose to purchase the building and modernize it with a mortgage loan from the Federal Government of about \$2.6-million under Section 221 (d) (3) of the National Housing Act, which provides below-market interest rate financing for low and moderate rental housing. The loan, which will have an interest rate of 3 per cent over a term of 40 years, is being negotiated with the New York multifamily housing insuring office of the Federal Housing Administration.

In addition to the \$935,000 purchase price, the loan will cover the modernization costs, estimated at about \$1.2-million. The renovation work includes the installation of new kitchen equipment, plumbing, wiring and heating systems, roofing, ceilings and windows, and the refurbishing of the lobbies.

Most of the apartments have one and two bedrooms, and some have three bedrooms. The tenants may purchase their apartments with a down payment of \$225, but the total price will average \$3,750 a room. Monthly carrying charges are estimated at \$25.72 a room.

OFFSHORE DRILLING PERMITS TO OIL COMPANIES

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, today, legislation to democratize the system of granting offshore drilling permits

to oil companies. The people are the sovereign owners of the Continental Shelf. The people hold in fee the public beaches. It would appear that the people who own these natural resources and who are so severely affected by accidents and mismanagement should play a determinative role in the exploitation and extraction of such resources.

My bill would not permit the Secretary of the Interior to enter into any mineral lease until the people living on the coast of the submerged lands under question had been given an opportunity to voice their opinions at a public hearing. It would relieve people in coastal areas of the constant worry that the oil pumps will be set in operation before they find out that drilling was even being considered. Under existing regulations, the only way citizens can find out if the submerged lands off their coasts are targets for the oil companies' drills is to read the Federal Register every day. The Register prints notices of oil companies' lease requests. The Interior Department can enter into a lease contract without asking the people on the adjacent coast their opinions. There are no hearings or other methods of citizen consultation. Only when an alert citizen reads of the drilling request in the Register and stirs up enough complaints can he pressure the Department to hold hearings.

Drilling operations can vitally affect the adjacent coast. Disasters can be created when the oil companies are not familiar with geological structures or when they use faulty procedures and machines. The situation in California is still fresh in everyone's mind. We must not allow it to be repeated. Oil drilling can ruin fish, wildlife, and natural beauty. It can destroy the economy of tourist centers. Yet, the Interior Department can make its decisions without considering these factors.

By requiring that hearings be held on proposed lease agreements, my bill would force the Interior Secretary to think twice before giving permission to drill. It would make him weigh the desire for increased Federal revenue against the prospect of destroying, perhaps forever, some of our Nation's most beautiful natural assets.

I urge my colleagues in this Congress to join me in providing a place for the voice of the people in decisions concerning the disposition of their valuable assets: the oil of the submerged lands, the sea life of the Continental Shelf, and the public beaches and parks that abut the areas of potential production.

THE CANDIDATE THAT CANNOT BE BEATEN

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article that should be of interest to everyone in public office:

CANDIDENTIKIT

As a public service, Punch hired a computer for the afternoon which, fed with the

requisite data, came up with "The Candidate That Cannot Be Beaten."

ALF FEATHERSTONEHAUGH

Son of a voluptuous Northern charlady and a thrice-decorated Southern marquis who gave up his title to breed dogs. His mother is now a much-loved non-denominational preacher on Tyne-Tees TV, and his father is playing Soames in a Welsh version of *The Forsyte Saga* currently touring Merionethshire. The family meets once a fortnight in Stoke as part of its much-publicised campaign to promote tourism in the Black Country.

Alf Featherstonehaugh himself is fifty-five, but can be made up to look thirty; so that traditional loyalists turning up at public meetings find a solid, dependable man, and the TV audience is offered a wisecracking business executive in a yippee caftan able to end every party political broadcast with an up-beat protest song concerning the shortcomings of his opponents. Originally educated at a depressed village school, he won a scholarship to Eton, took a double-first in Greats at Oxford, and immediately went down the mines. In 1936, having, by sheer hard work, built up a successful stockbroking concern operating on a mail-order system from the Rhondda, he gave up everything and went to Spain to fight with the International Brigade. Though severely wounded, he discovered that he was fighting for the Communists, and immediately changed sides. Upon learning that he was now supporting the Fascists, he came home and opposed Appeasement. He volunteered on the morning of September 3, 1939, and, after some time as a private in the Army, transferred to the RAF after Dunkirk and played a major part in the Battle of Britain before accepting command of the frigate *Anthrac*. Torpedoed off Archangel, he returned to London on a plank, and was immediately parachuted into France, later receiving the Croix de Guerre from General de Gaulle, who is the godfather to his children.

The war over, his first thought was to represent England in the 1948 Olympics; he was picked for the pole vault, but gave up his place in order to cut sandwiches for round-the-clock Berlin airlift pilots, for which he received the Nobel Peace Prize. Pausing only to turn the cheque into a children's playground for the orphans of Mau Mau terrorists killed by the British, he went to Ireland to promote local industry. By 1955, he had made three million pounds from his eighteen factories and retail outlets, which he donated to the Transport and General Workers' Union strike fund; he was made a Papal Knight, given the freedom of Liverpool, and carried shoulder-high through the Ford canteen at Dagenham, the only time this has happened to the best grouse-shot in Britain.

In 1960, he turned down a peerage offered for his services to the coloured community in Britain on the grounds that this would encourage immigration from countries which could not afford to have their most ambitious citizens taking their keenness and talent to Britain. He himself now has a Jamaican daughter-in-law, and a son destined for high office in the Roman Catholic church; his other daughter married a rabbi who bowls slow left-arm inswingers for Pakistan and owns a public relations firm in Amman.

Unfortunately, Alf Featherstonehaugh was away on his round-the-world solo rowing bid when his first play was put on at the Royal Court. A nude teenage verse-drama, it is an attempt to rehabilitate Winston Churchill's reputation, and received universal critical acclaim; the film to be made from it has already been chosen as next year's Royal Film Performance, the proceeds to be given to a home for unmarried mothers of the Scottish Presbyterian faith who wish to see Britain back on the Gold Standard.

Needless to say, Featherstonehaugh has been approached by all three major political

parties; as yet, he has not made up his mind, but, as a loyal Europeanist who wants to see Britain restored to her former world position, and an ardent nuclear-shield supporter of pacifism who prays daily for a multi-racial society in which all men could compete under a laissez-faire system of planned welfarehood, he has declared himself ready and willing to answer any call that may be put to him in his country's hour of need.

OBSTRUCTING RECRUITING FOR U.S. ARMED FORCES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, deliberately interfering with and obstructing recruitment in the U.S. armed services is a serious Federal crime. Why are not those who willfully do this sort of thing prosecuted for crime? They should be, regardless of how the academic community may view such conduct.

Such prosecution is a continuing responsibility of the Department of Justice. Reports will be requested by this Congress concerning how many have been prosecuted in the current year.

In this connection I insert in the RECORD at this point an illuminating column by David Lawrence pointing out that such conduct beyond specific statutory offense tends toward treason:

PERSUADE YOUNG MEN TO BECOME TRAITORS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Young men, misguided and misinformed about the dangers to America's security, are being persuaded to become, in effect, traitors to the United States. They are interfering with the system of armed-service recruiting, and are impairing facilities of research, as unlawful seizures and riots sweep the campuses in many colleges and universities.

This has become a federal problem. It is not being dealt with effectively on a local basis. For university authorities are being intimidated, and most of them refuse to call in the police. Also, when police are summoned and arrests are made—as happened at Harvard last week—the faculty promptly votes to drop the charges.

General Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., the commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, makes public the fact that some college administrators not only are failing to control student protests but are refusing to provide recruiters for the Marines sufficient time and central locations on the campus in order to obtain volunteers.

Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Democrat of Virginia, asserted in a recent speech that some college administrators are using postponements and excuses to block recruiting, and "are simply inventing dodges to avoid laying down the law to their student bodies."

Both the Army and the Air Force are encountering similar obstructions. The Army sends recruiters each spring to more than 500 colleges and universities. The Air Force, too, reveals that its recruiters have been confronted with instances of abuse.

Students, moreover, are protesting the maintenance of courses for officer training purposes—a process which has been carried on for many years.

Who is benefiting most by the actual interference with the right of the United States government to get efficient officers for its military services? Wouldn't the Soviet government be the gainer if, inside this and

other countries in the free world, the training system for the armed services were seriously impaired?

There seems to be a feeling among some people in the academic world, including faculty members, that the college administrators should not deal sternly with antiwar and other protests, even when buildings are seized and the governing authority is threatened with more and more disturbances unless student "demands" are met.

President Nixon has uttered some generalities on the subject of "law and order," but he happens to be the commander-in-chief of America's military services, and it is difficult to see how he can ignore much longer the problem of interference with recruiting. The realistic truth is that there are more than 500,000 Americans engaged in a war today, and the casualties in Vietnam have already exceeded the figure in the Korean war.

The Department of Justice has several statutes available which can be invoked to seek indictments against the instigators of the disturbances on the college campuses. For these now are directly related to interference with military recruitment.

The opportunity is at hand for the federal government to ask for indictments and tell the students of the country that when a nation is at war they cannot, under the Constitution, give "aid and comfort" to the enemy without subjecting themselves to punishment. The Supreme Court has recently said that "demonstrations" cannot be viewed as free speech when violence or the use of force is involved. That's "the law of the land" today, but many college students mistakenly insist that campus activities are free from interference even when they impair the military operations of the United States.

Meanwhile, private colleges are bound to suffer great harm to their operations. Alumni throughout the country are demanding that the laws be enforced and police brought in whenever there are disorders and property is seized. Nearly all of the private colleges depend on alumni for financial support, and the graduates generally do not believe the college authorities are being firm enough in dealing with disobedience.

EISENHOWER QUARTERS WOULD REFLECT AMERICAN INTEGRITY

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution urging that new quarters be minted with a likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower on one side.

The late President Eisenhower stands as one of the greatest Americans of all time. Like Lincoln, he rose to greatness from humble beginnings. Like Washington, he came to be "first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." For millions the world over, Eisenhower will tower in history as a foremost example of American integrity, decency, and goodness. I believe, therefore, that honoring his contributions in this fashion is both fitting and proper.

Certainly, we do not wish to detract from the greatness of George Washington, whose likeness appears on quarters as well as on \$1 bills. But the coin honor should be shared as truly great Americans make contributions of a lasting character to the United States.

The Secretary of the Treasury has authority to utilize an Eisenhower design on 25-cent pieces under section 3510 of the revised statutes and under authority vested in him under reorganization plan No. 26 of 1950. My sense-of-Congress resolution would simply urge him to exercise such authority to mint new quarters bearing the Eisenhower image.

BISHOP ZOLTAN BEKY RECEIVES GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, many years ago I met a young and promising minister in Carteret, N.J., named Zoltan Beky. His parishioners and I soon discovered that he was outstanding in many ways. Able, dedicated, and compassionate, he has great love in his heart and soul for God and people.

His parishioners quickly learned to respect and love him and looked to him for sound guidance and real inspiration—and they always found these important qualities in this man of strong and abiding faith. Dr. Beky's qualities of leadership also came to the attention of his superiors, who elevated him to the position of bishop in Trenton, N.J., giving him jurisdiction over parishes in several States, ranging from New York to California.

I watched Bishop Beky come to Washington, where he presides over the welfare of members of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, of which he is president. I know that Members of Congress of both political parties have a very deep respect for Bishop Beky, for he is a man and leader of distinguished ability, integrity, and achievement.

His many friends in the Congress were happy and proud to hear that on April 16, 1969, Bishop Beky received the George Washington Award of the American Hungarian Studies Foundation.

The award is presented "for contributions to research, human knowledge, and the arts." Bishop Beky has not only contributed to "human knowledge." He has also excelled in advocating—and practicing—human understanding and human love.

An article published in the News Tribune of Perth Amboy, N.J., included details of the award to Dr. Zoltan Beky—a great bishop and a great man.

The article follows:

DR. ZOLTAN BEKY GETS GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD

Dr. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Reformed Church in America, last night received the annual George Washington Award of the American Hungarian Studies Foundation.

Dr. Beky, one of four recipients, received the award from Rt. Rev. Dezzo Abraham of Perth Amboy, current bishop of the Hungarian Reformed Church.

Others honored at the Plaza Hotel in New York City were motion picture producer Joseph Pasternak, Antal Dorati, chief conductor of the Stockholm Philharmonic Orchestra and recently named director of the

National Symphony Orchestra, Washington, D.C., and Dr. John Lotz, former Columbia University professor who is presently director of the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington.

Dr. Beky currently is serving as president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America in Washington.

The award is presented annually by the American Hungarian Studies Foundation for contributions to research, human knowledge and the arts. In name and symbolism, the award was inspired by the statue of George Washington that was erected in the City Park of Budapest, Hungary in 1906 through contributions by Hungarian immigrants living in the United States.

It is believed to be the only statue of Washington in Eastern Europe.

The foundation is a non-profit organization devoted to furthering the understanding and appreciation of Hungarian culture and historical heritage in the United States. It was established in 1954.

Through grants, it supports Hungarian studies, fellowships and research programs at American universities and colleges. Its headquarters are at 177 Somerset St., New Brunswick.

STOP CAPITULATING TO STUPID DEMANDS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of disbelief that we read of the incredible actions of certain college administrators around the country in their efforts to deal with student unrest which has become our new national sport. Therefore, I was interested to read the comments of Mr. Bayard Rustin, prominent civil rights leader, as he urged college officials to "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students."

May I add my hearty amen to that sentiment and include the entire article appearing in the April 28 issue of the Peoria Journal Star in the RECORD at this point:

NEGRO LEADER URGES COLLEGES STOP CAPITULATING TO STUPID DEMANDS

NEW YORK.—Negro civil rights strategist Bayard Rustin urged college officials yesterday to "stop capitulating to the stupid demands of Negro students . . . and see that they get the remedial training that they need."

Rustin, organizer of the 1963 March on Washington, said Negro students are "suffering from the shock of integration" and are looking for "an easy way out of their problems" by demanding separate dormitories and study programs.

"What are soul courses worth in the real world?" Rustin asked. "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."

Rustin spoke with newsmen before addressing a luncheon of the American Jewish Committee.

Rustin said he favors bringing Negro and Puerto Rican youths into the nation's colleges and universities, "if it is done with the understanding that you're going to do remedial work for them."

He said it is a "cheap way out" for college officials to give minority group students separate programs and living quarters.

Some white professors, he said, desire a "revolution by proxy," and are using unwitting Negro students toward this end.

Rustin said Negro students, for the most part, are "ill prepared for college education" and that there is a lack of "social courage on the part of this generation of Negro students."

"We don't want the agony of educating the Negro," he said, was the view of many white professors.

The only way out of this "very dangerous situation," he added, is for "another couple of school generations of integration."

WHAT IS RIGHT IN THE POSTAL SERVICE?

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most lucid thoughts on the problems of the post office that I have read was recently published in an editorial on April 24 in the Puget Sound Mail, of the State of Washington.

I think it would be most edifying to be aware of this editorial and I would also like to call it to the attention of the Post Office Department officials through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I commend it to all critics of the Department and I call special attention to the remarks in the editorial regarding standardization.

WHAT'S RIGHT IN THE POSTAL SERVICE?

Since the report of the President's Commission on Postal Organization (June 1968), just about every periodical covering current events has spent several pages briefing the report.

Included in those commenting were "The U.S. News and Report," "The New York Times," and the "American Legion Magazine".

A number of very competent people were on the Commission to study the Postal Service. Their recommendations are most worthy of consideration although the employee associations have found fault with the report, particularly the recommendation that the Postal Service be made a government corporation. This was former Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien's idea and Mr. O'Brien is certainly a very effective organizer, as well as an observing person.

The post office is vital to each one of us, and since it is a Government service, it is naturally subject to widespread comment and criticism. Is it all that bad? Consider, if you will, the New York Stock Exchange. They found it necessary to dispense with business for one day a week for a while and now operate on a short day. The situation in that business, supposedly run by experts, is another example of failing to keep up with the business volume of today.

Telephone companies, who pride themselves on being just a little ahead of the game, also have their troubles. It took five attempts and three operators (not to mention a recording or two) to get a LaConner telephone call completed from Edmonds a few evenings ago, and just about as long for a return call to get through.

It is easy to criticize, and unless you understand the real problems, why should anyone listen. Those who do criticize should at least offer a few constructive suggestions. So far as the Postal Service is concerned, we do have a couple of suggestions.

No private industry anywhere the size of the Postal Service has been a success until they standardized the product. When they did

this, they could plan effectively, engineer and tool to mass produce an article. Henry Ford pioneered mass production—"Ford" is still in the competition! American Can generally manufactures only a few sizes of cans. General Motors pretty well sticks to standard conventional automobiles.

On the other hand the good old post office will take just about anything, hotel keys, ski poles, day old chicks, soap samples, bottle tops—you name it, they'll take it. They take it and digest it in staggering volume. They handle well over 80 billion pieces of mail a year. Who can even think this big? They expect to be slugged with 100 billion pieces annually real soon. Can they continue to take it? The answer is no, not under the present circumstances.

Would it really work a hardship on many if the size of letters was limited to three dimensions? (1) Small, or short; (2) business size, or long; and (3) flats, 9x12". With these sizes the post office could effectively machine to cope with the volume. Parcels, what's wrong with limiting the size of these? If a mailer wants to send something he can't get in on of three standardized envelopes or parcels, he should pay what it costs for the special and personal handling of the odd sized pieces.

Government Bureau or Government Corporation, if anyone is going to handle the volume, they are going to have to standardize or simply refuse to accept some of it. Can there be a choice?

What else? Do we really need mail delivery service in this day and age on Saturday?

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that air travel is most dangerous during the approach, landing, and takeoff phases. It is in these phases that air traffic control is most crucial and the pressures upon our air traffic control system are the most severe. It is necessary that we examine whether we have enough properly trained controllers and whether their workloads and working conditions are optimal for air safety.

As further evidence that we are not taking optimal safety precautions, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the vivid article by Derek Schoen on "Traffic Jam in the Sky" which appears in the May issue of The Progressive:

TRAFFIC JAM IN THE SKY

(By Derek Schoen)

He is only thirty-three years old, enjoys good health, likes his job, and—according to his supervisors—is quite good at it. Yet for James Krantz, one of the nation's 14,000 air traffic controllers, time is fast running out.

"I'd only be kidding myself if I said I could take more than another five years at this," Krantz says of his job as a controller at Washington's bustling National Airport.

Krantz and his colleagues fulfill one of the most brutally demanding, and least well-known, functions in the booming air transport business. In essence, controllers are skyway traffic police, charged with keeping the burgeoning fleet of commercial, private, and military planes flowing smoothly and safely.

After years of anonymity, and of having their pleas for more men and equipment put on a back burner by the Government and

Congress, the controllers last summer decided to take their case to the public.

A first step was the formation of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO), a militant body that quickly outnumbered its more conservative and less active counterpart, the Air Traffic Control Association (ATCA). Within weeks of its creation, PATCO became embroiled in a nationwide controversy involving charges that its members were staging a slowdown at major terminals.

Whether the charges were true or not—PATCO denied them, insisting the controllers were merely adhering more strictly to the rulebook—air passengers and the nation's news media suddenly became aware that airlines were running far behind schedules on weekends. Passengers griped about being "stacked" for as long as two hours before being cleared for landing.

At the height of the summer air crush, you might have boarded a plane in Los Angeles and had to wait an hour before taking off. Or you might have been on a West Coast flight bound for New York when you noticed the plane was circling in a stack with other planes over what from aloft looked suspiciously like Colorado—and was.

The summer's skyway traffic jam focused attention on the creaking condition of America's air traffic control system, and on the 14,000 Federal Aviation Administration controllers who form the system's backbone.

Air traffic control is a job that involves split-second decisions, the mental juggling of vast amounts of information, and the ability to come up with alternatives to every situation—decisions and alternatives on which often hinge the lives of hundreds of airplane passengers. It is a job that for many controllers, including James Krantz, breeds haunting memories of disasters narrowly averted. He vividly recalls, for instance, a five-second point in time when two airliners came within a few feet of colliding on a National Airport runway.

"I was working as local controller that day," remembers Krantz. "I gave the go-ahead for one plane to take off. Meanwhile another plane is in a taxiway that crosses the takeoff strip. I'm watching the takeoff when suddenly I notice the second plane is taxiing right into the runway. Ground control is yelling at the taxiing plane to stop and meanwhile the plane taking off has a full head of steam.

"I just can't believe it's happening. I can hardly talk—my mouth is like filled with cotton. The planes merged on the radar screen, like they do in a crash. Actually, they just missed."

Although the incident happened more than four years ago, and he was cleared of any responsibility—the pilot of the taxiing plane ignored instructions from ground control—Krantz told me he still grows almost unbearably tense each time he sees a plane taking off while another occupies an adjacent taxiway.

But not all airplanes avoid collisions. And not all controllers avoid even more serious after-effects from their involvement, however indirect, with such tragedies.

Oswald Ryan, former general counsel of the Air Traffic Controllers Association, has written about the effect on two controllers of a 1958 mid-air collision over Maryland of a National Guard training jet and an airliner.

"Following the accident," wrote Ryan, "the [air traffic] supervisor suffered a complete nervous breakdown," spent eleven months in a mental hospital and wound up permanently disabled. The controller responsible for guiding the airliner, although found in no way responsible for the collision, had to leave air traffic work and continued brooding over the accident. The man finally committed suicide with an overdose of barbiturates, Ryan wrote, adding: "His last words, addressed to his doctor, were: 'Doctor, I

guess I was not able to overcome the guilt complex."

Marvin Smith, thirty-nine, a shift supervisor at National Airport, told me few controllers remain at peak effectiveness past age thirty-four, or after more than ten years of working at a busy facility.

"They burn up at about the same rate as pro athletes," Smith said. "You watch the fireballs come in, raring to go. Then you watch them wilt, little by little, over the years."

Not long ago, both Smith and Krantz were on duty in National's control tower, a glass-walled area atop the main terminal. Krantz was supervising local traffic—the segment of air traffic control that directs landings and takeoffs. There are about a thousand a day at National.

Rocking from foot to foot and rapidly switching his gaze from Washington's sooty skies to taxiways where sleek jets lined up for takeoff, Krantz spat out a steady stream of instructions into his headset microphone. Responding immediately to each tower order, the jets lumbered down National's three intersecting runways, crossing paths with only seconds to spare, while other jets were gliding in for landings close on their tails. To a layman, it was like a giant roller derby—except that each "skater" was not one person, but a hundred or more. And a collision would not mean a bump or a bruise; it would mean death or dreadful injury.

Later, performing another of his daily tasks, Krantz went to a floor below the tower and joined other controllers working in a dim, windowless room. Their faces were painted a sickly green by the glow from eight radar screens into which they stared. Light beams swept the circular screens unceasingly, leaving in their wakes small slivers of white—radar blips—that were the one hundred or so planes within a sixty-mile radius of the Washington tower. The job of the radar room controllers: to guide the National Airport-bound planes into the proper air lanes and into a sequence that eventually, in the hands of the local controller, became the order of landing.

In controllers' language, the name of the game is "vectoring," or constantly juggling and reshuffling the time and space relationship between the fast-moving planes. Put most simply, planes approach airports for landings on a horseshoe-shaped path. By keeping one plane on a leg of the horseshoe for a longer or shorter time than another plane, a controller can manipulate distances between the planes and thus calculate their "touchdown" times—meanwhile tying this information in with the timing of other planes taking off.

The extent of the problem is seen when it is realized that a controller may be handling up to fifteen approaching planes at a given time, while another fifteen await their turns to take off.

Senator John Stennis, Mississippi Democrat, who has urged Congress to beef up the ranks of controllers and provide them with more up-to-date radar and other electronic equipment, last year told his colleagues:

"To the uninitiated, it seems beyond human capability to weave a safe and orderly procession of air traffic from the slashes of light on a radar display that may represent nearly one hundred aircraft at one time. At any instant, during peak periods of air traffic, there may be as many as 10,000 aircraft under the controllers' care in the skies of the United States."

The problem is greatly intensified and the dangers magnified by the fact that the aircraft are not spread evenly across the country; a substantial proportion of these planes are moving to and from a handful of the nation's busiest airports, overcrowding the connecting airlines, and placing enormous strain on a small number of controllers.

Many of these controllers work in the nationwide network of the "en route centers," providing what is called in the trade "separation," which means making sure two 600-mile-an-hour planes do not reach the same sky space at the same time. All commercial planes, along with many private and military planes, are in the hands of the en route centers from the time they are airborne until they are "handed off"—turned over to the local airport control.

Stennis also described for his colleagues the problems faced by the air traffic control system when a plane not under its guidance suddenly enters the picture. The controllers, said Stennis, "are constantly haunted by unknown aircraft, not in communication with the air traffic control system. Popping up suddenly in the heart of their carefully ordered three-dimensional matrix of airways and airspace, this 'unknown' may affect flights thousands of miles away as an entire segment of airspace is reshuffled to make way for it."

The strain imposed by responsibility for resolving such crises on a daily and even hourly basis, with the full knowledge that the lives of hundreds of men, women, and children are at stake, is what convinces James Krantz and others that air traffic controlling cannot be—and should not be—a lifetime occupation. Najeab Halaby, former chief of the Federal Aviation Administration—for which all but military controllers work—has compared the stress of the job with that of a soldier in combat.

The FAA is currently conducting a scientific survey designed to measure the effects of this strain on the health of controllers. Even though earlier Government studies have been less comprehensive, enough data has been compiled to present a convincing case for the thesis that air traffic control work is not conducive to continuing good health.

For instance, a two-year FAA study published in 1968 compared controllers with pilots and other crew members and found controllers were nearly twice as likely to develop heart problems. Controllers also suffered much higher rates of hypertension and ulcers. For anyone who might conclude that ulcers and hypertension tell more about the type of men who become controllers than about the strain of the job, FAA psychological tests revealed that, in relation to the general population:

"Controllers were found to be more intelligent, realistic, conscientious, and tough, and also to possess more self-discipline and control. Compared with the average person, they also exhibited less anxiety and anxious insecurity."

But the strain grows daily as an average of one new commercial airliner and several non-commercial planes—many of these airliner-size executive jets—join the nation's air fleet. Today's total of more than 106,000 non-military planes—of which only some 4,000 are commercial passenger airliners—is expected to swell to 180,000 by 1977, and the end appears nowhere in sight. Along with the growth in sheer numbers, the increase in the size and speed of airliners further complicates the controller's job. As one veteran controller told me: "It makes me sick, literally, just to think about having responsibility for planes with 400 or 500 people on board."

On the basis of past governmental and Congressional responses to the growth of aviation and changing needs, the controller has ample cause for concern. The evidence adds up to an indictment of both the executive and legislative branches for grossly underestimating—or simply ignoring—the aviation boom of the 1960's.

In 1960 there were 12,034 air traffic controllers. By 1967 the number had slowly climbed to 12,743, an increase of not quite six per cent. But in those same years commercial passenger air traffic had almost

doubled, and the swarm of private planes had grown by tens of thousands.

Under Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, the Bureau of the Budget consistently slashed FAA requests for money to hire more controllers. Between 1960 and 1968, the Bureau sliced an average of \$22.3 million a year out of the FAA's proposed operations and maintenance budget, which includes running and staffing the air traffic control network. The FAA fared better with Congress, losing an average of only \$6 million a year to the Capitol Hill scissors wielders during the same period. And in three of the ten years, Congress actually appropriated more for FAA operations and maintenance than the Administration asked through the Budget Bureau.

During all this period, the FAA bore these budgetary onslaughts with rare public composure, never raising its voice in protest. The FAA in 1967 even refused to support an Air Transport Association recommendation that Congress appropriate supplemental funds to let the agency hire more controllers, a rebuff that stunned officials of the Association, which represents all major domestic airlines.

Last summer's high incidence of delayed flights spurred the FAA to ask Congress for a supplemental appropriation to add 2,500 more controllers. Congress approved funds to hire 1,800. But because it takes three years of training and working under supervision to raise a controller to journeyman status, the effects of the new men on the controllers' work loads will not be felt immediately.

Until it is, many controllers—especially at the high-density facilities like LaGuardia and Kennedy in New York and Chicago's O'Hare—will continue working forty-eight hours or more most weeks. It was only recently, in fact, that the FAA ordered an end to regularly scheduled six-day work weeks for controllers at these airports. And an FAA spokesman admits that "while men no longer are formally scheduled to work six days, many are actually working forty-eight hours a week and more." One Air Traffic Association official told me he shudders in the knowledge that controllers are working extra shifts.

"I have seen these guys go without lunch, tired to the bones, in just a regular shift," he said. "You start pushing them to work an extra eight hours a week, or sixteen hours in a row—and it happens all the time—then you're just asking for it."

"It," of course, is a major catastrophe such as the mid-air collision of two big passenger planes. Aviation officials will tell you privately that they feel some FAA rules and regulations governing controllers actually enhance the likelihood of such a disaster.

For instance, the FAA has ignored repeated requests by controllers' groups for a system in which controllers working at high-density facilities could be transferred at their request to smaller airports. Thus, a controller who may feel himself slipping is forced either to quit outright or stay on a job that he himself may realize he can no longer handle adequately. Nor is there an early retirement plan for controllers, with the result that men robbed of their ability—their nerves frazzled by too many years of stress—today are making decisions affecting every air passenger's life.

Many controllers keep working at the profession, even when they realize their dwindling capabilities, simply because they have no place to go. A high percentage of veteran controllers got into the business through air traffic tower training received in the Air Force or Navy. Few have college educations. That—and the lack of private employment calling for their kind of experience—explains in large part their reluctance to leave positions where they average about \$14,500 a year, and in which some earn as much as \$20,000.

But at least some of these problems have finally come under attack in a bill introduced this session by Senator Vance Hartke, Indiana Democrat, on behalf of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization. His measure, to be considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, on which he is the third-ranking member, is the first that recognizes the unusual circumstances under which controllers work.

The bill would require controllers to retire at age fifty or after thirty years on the job, whichever occurred first, and provides handsome pensions for those forced to step down. At the same time it offers a \$2,000-a-year bonus for work performed at high density airports—a move designed to encourage controllers at smaller airports to seek the tougher assignments, thus opening less demanding jobs for some tired veterans.

Hartke's bill would reduce long hours by requiring the FAA to pay double time to controllers for anything over forty-four hours a week. Currently, they are paid time and a half for all work over forty hours.

Meanwhile, the FAA also is moving, however slowly, to ease the controller's burden. New electronic equipment is being installed that will eliminate the need for much of the current conversation between controllers and pilots. Data identifying an approaching plane and giving its altitude will automatically appear on the controller's radar screen, facilitating the decision-making process and cutting down plane-to-tower talk. By 1973, the FAA hopes to have in operation more computerized equipment that will automatically estimate an airplane's ground speed and calculate its estimated time of arrival—clerical chores now performed by the controllers.

But neither Hartke's bill nor the electronic advances will solve America's air traffic crisis, although they will help. The larger problem is not one of air space but of ground facilities. As the average person tends to think instinctively, sky space is indeed virtually unlimited. The rub comes in the lack of enough airports and runway space. The situation is best understood if the air traffic control system is seen as a big funnel. It pulls planes from the vastness of the sky into what is—because of the shortage of ground facilities—a narrow opening.

Until more airports are built, there is no way to widen the funnel's neck, and with the proliferation of planes, it promises to become even more clogged. The traffic system cannot control the elements entering the funnel's neck—but it must keep them flowing, and safely.

So it all comes back to the controller, on whose skill, for the foreseeable future, depends the safety of millions of Americans.

What can be done to ease the burden on the controller and thereby make air travel safer for all of us?

As a first step, the FAA should begin pressing Congress for funds to hire more tower and en route center personnel and step up its computerization progress. The agency's top officials should demand—taking their case to the public if necessary—that the Administration and Congress provide for the hiring of the minimum 2,500 controllers the agency now proposes to add to its total each year. Because of their subservience to the Budget Bureau and to Congress, previous FAA administrators must be held in part accountable for the understrength condition of the nation's controller corps.

For its part, Congress—in view of the financial drain of the Vietnam war and the need to spend vast amounts on urgent domestic problems—should find a new means for funding airport construction and a strengthened, modernized air traffic control system. One possibility lies in imposing additional taxes on commercial air travelers and privately owned planes that use the system. The airlines have made clear their support

of an increase in user taxes—but only if Congress creates a special trust fund as a guarantee that the additional revenues will be spent on improved aviation services.

Congress is always reluctant, and with some justification, to decrease its options by tying up tax revenues in special funds. But given the magnitude of the problem, and the irrevocable fact that many millions of dollars must be spent if ground and support facilities are even to keep pace with aviation's growth, the airline industry's position is sound. Congress should adopt it.

Finally, the ever-increasing numbers of air travelers should insistently demand improvements in a system that in a very real sense controls not only the planes they ride in but—so long as they are airborne—controls their lives as well.

SECRETARY LAIRD'S DEFENSE PROGRAM ENTHUSIASTICALLY RECEIVED IN FLORIDA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Florida was highly honored last week by the presence of the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense, in our State. At Panama City, in my district, he was honored for public service by the Florida Unipress Association and by the Panama City-Bay County Chamber of Commerce on the night of Friday, April 25. At this meeting, which was attended by the State's leading publishers and editors, by business and civic leaders, and by high-ranking military officers from throughout the State, Secretary Laird gave a highly impressive policy speech which reiterated the essentiality of continuing a strong national defense at all levels for the United States—a key part of which would be the ABM system. His strong and vigorous message was enthusiastically received by this important cross-section of Florida's leadership. We were pleased and privileged to have Secretary Laird as our guest, and I take pride in presenting the speech he delivered at Panama City for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FLORIDA UNIPRESS ASSOCIATION, PANAMA CITY, FLA., APRIL 25, 1969

Governor Kirk; Congressman Sikes; Chairman Darley; distinguished guests: I was very pleased to receive the invitation from the Florida Unipress Association to address your annual convention this year and am very happy to be here with you this evening. As members of the communications media and as interested citizens, you are vitally concerned with the great public issues that face our nation. Though the Vietnam war remains the number one problem facing the defense community today, the Safeguard ABM proposal of President Nixon currently is receiving the most attention.

The overriding national security goal of the United States is to restore peace in Vietnam and to preserve peace as we face the future. Both our strong desire to move forward with arms limitation talks and our decision to proceed with the Safeguard ABM system are aimed at achieving the goal of peace.

President Nixon, Secretary of State Rogers

and I have repeatedly stated our determination to proceed with strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviets because the Nixon Administration believes that this would be the most desirable way of ensuring peace. But the Administration has also made it clear that we cannot base the security of our nation simply on the hope that such talks will begin and be fruitful.

The Safeguard system is the minimal step necessary at this time to ensure that the safety and the security of the American people will be preserved if arms limitation talks are not successful in the coming months and years.

At the outset, let us be clear about what the President is proposing to the Congress. He is seeking authorization now to begin work toward deployment by late 1973 or early 1974 of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System to protect two of our strategic missile wings, one in North Dakota and one in Montana. This is Phase I of a system that could be expanded, if circumstances warrant, to provide additional protection for strategic missile sites and, in addition, to protect the entire nation against any attack by the Chinese Communists that can be foreseen in the 1970's or the irrational or accidental firing of a missile by any power.

President Nixon's decision is to reorient the ABM system proposed by his predecessor in 1967 and approved last year by the Congress. It cuts back new obligational authority for the ABM in Fiscal Year 1970 by approximately \$1 billion, and moves the contemplated missile sites away from the cities.

The Johnson Administration, as well as the Nixon Administration, felt very strongly that some kind of ABM system should be constructed. The previous Administration was aware of the possibility that the Soviet Union might seek to develop a capability to overwhelm our land-based missiles and bombers. It was also aware of the potential threat from the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles by China. It had decided a year and a half ago that the time had come to take steps toward increasing protection against China. At the same time, it continued to watch the missile buildup in the Soviet Union, believing, however, as Secretary McNamara said in January, 1968, that the growth of Soviet ICBM forces would decelerate instead of continuing at a higher rate.

Neither of my two immediate predecessors as Secretary of Defense believed that the survivability of the missile forces of the United States was assured for the indefinite future. Both warned that additional steps might be required if that survivability was to be maintained in the 1970's. Just before leaving office, Secretary Clifford expressed his "increasing concern" about "the continuing rapid expansion of Soviet strategic offensive forces." He went on to warn that "we must continually re-examine the various ways in which the Soviets might seek to strengthen their strategic forces beyond what now seems probable, and take appropriate actions now to hedge against them."

A careful review and analysis of intelligence on the Soviet weapons buildup, received during the closing days of the Johnson Administration, convinced those with special responsibility for national security that we must take the first steps toward deployment of an ABM system to protect our long-range missiles.

To make the threat aspect of the problem more understandable, it is necessary to talk a little bit about Defense planning and some of the ingredients that go into it. Defense planning is not, as some seem to believe, the result of gazing into a crystal ball. When properly done, it represents an informed judgment that can serve as the basis for responsible recommendations to the Pres-

ident and the Congress on our Defense program.

Two factors are critical: The rapid rate of technological progress and the time requirements for production of weapons systems. These two factors taken together require us to begin work on major weapons systems often as long as five or ten years before they actually become operational. This makes it necessary to try to anticipate what kind of a situation we will face during that time period in terms of the threat from potential enemies.

The second thing the Defense planner must recognize is the difference between a potential enemy's intentions and his capabilities. It should be obvious that any attempt to determine what the other fellow's intentions will be five years from now—or even at the present time—is a futile exercise. Even if we could monitor his thoughts—and we cannot—we could not place reliance on them because he might be replaced by other decisionmakers. Nevertheless, we must recognize our own potential for influencing his intentions by our actions.

The principal gauge for assessing what we might face five or ten years from now from a potential enemy is to determine what his capability is today and, based on that, what it can be in the future.

There are several ways in which we might approach this problem of estimating capability. We must begin with known facts. With our current methods of intelligence gathering, we learn with a relatively high degree of accuracy, what a potential enemy has in the way of military forces, what he is testing, what he is constructing, and the present and past rates at which he has proven his ability to perform. I should point out that even this amount of knowledge cannot always tell us the precise capability of his force.

Our minimum goal must be to prepare responsibly to defend our nation and to insure as best we can our continued capability to deter nuclear war. To do so, we must at the very least consider the potential enemy's capability determined by projecting his current level of activity in the weapons field.

Arguments are often made that a potential enemy will not maintain his current level of military development or production. But this argument is almost invariably based on some premise as to what that enemy's intentions are. This could lead to a major and irretrievable miscalculation if our judgment on intentions proves faulty. From a Defense planner's standpoint, it would be much more realistic to allow for an acceleration from his present level of effort to a higher one. As a matter of fact, it is this capability for acceleration that has most often caused our estimates in past years to be sadly inaccurate. If a mistake in assessing the potential threat is to be made, it would be far safer to err on the side of overestimating the threat. The consequences could be very grave if instead we based our plans on the hope that the potential enemy will scale down his level of effort and that hope falls to materialize.

In planning, therefore, we must compute the size and nature of the threat by projecting the current level of effort of a potential enemy. In doing this we must grant him a level of technology which is based on his past and present levels of accomplishment.

Based on this formula and upon the best information available to me as Secretary of Defense, I must conclude that the Soviet Union has the capability of achieving by the mid-1970's, a superiority over the presently authorized and programmed forces of the United States in all areas—offensive strategic forces, defensive strategic forces, and conventional forces.

It is not possible within the time available and within the bounds of security limitations to illustrate this comprehensively. As you know, superiority is a function of

both quantitative and qualitative factors. But assuming, for the purposes of illustration, that there is a qualitative balance in strategic forces between the Soviet Union and the United States, let me illustrate my point in quantitative or numerical terms.

In our strategic offensive forces, we now have 1054 ICBM's, 656 Polaris Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM's) and 549 intercontinental bombers. Except for a reduction in bombers, this is the level of strategic forces presently programmed for the 1974-1975 time period in numbers of delivery systems.

At the present time, the Soviets also have about 1,000 ICBM's in hardened silos, including some 200 of the very large SS-9's. They have about 140 older ICBM's on soft launchers and more than 630 intermediate-range or medium-range ballistic missiles (IR-MRBMs). In addition, they have some 200 SLBM's and about 150 heavy bombers.

In the past two years, the Soviet Union has more than trebled its force of ICBM's, from 250 to 900, and this year the Soviets will have more ICBM's than the United States. They are also producing Polaris-type submarines at the rate of 6 to 8 each year.

Based on the Soviet Union's level of activity in recent years—including test, development, and production—they have the capability of achieving by the 1974-1975 time frame a force of 2,500 ICBM's in hard silos compared to the 1054 programmed by the United States. In addition to keeping and modernizing their IR-MRBMs force, they have the capability in the same period—again at present levels of production—to increase their Polaris-type submarine forces to a size larger than our 41 Polaris Submarines.

In strategic defensive forces, if we project their current research and development activities on new ABM components, they can deploy anywhere from 200 to 2,000 ABM missiles by the mid-1970's.

Air defenses are very difficult to quantify, but the Soviets spend about twice as much per year as we do for bomber defenses.

Let me come back a minute now to qualitative factors. In our own program, we have included what are primarily qualitative improvements in our strategic forces—development of multiple warheads for our Minuteman and Polaris systems, Safeguard for our Minuteman missiles, and new attack missiles for our bombers. These programmed improvements are among the minimal steps essential to assure the sufficiency of our military forces against the Soviets' potential for achieving numerical superiority in the mid-1970's and beyond. Obviously, we cannot be sure that the Soviets will not also demonstrate a capability to make similar qualitative improvements—they are testing multiple warheads for the SS-9, for example, and just last week tested an SS-9, as Secretary Rogers pointed out in his recent remarks in New York. The fractional orbit bombardment system (FOBS), which they are also testing, is another example of their attempts at qualitative improvements in offensive strategic forces.

If they make significant qualitative strides, which accompany their approaching numerical superiority, we may find it necessary to further reassess the threat and the sufficiency of our own program.

In the area of conventional forces, I should point out that a comparison is neither simple to quantify nor easy to evaluate. Such a comparison is meaningless if made in the abstract, for only in an assumed force confrontation does it have a value to the defense planner. The variables which must be taken into account are therefore as numerous as the possible places and conditions of confrontation of conventional forces. Indeed, it would be stretching the imagination to conceive a situation involving most of Soviet and American conventional forces in which forces

of third nations are not also involved on one or both sides.

For purposes of planning, I would not suggest that any and every imbalance of Soviet and U.S. conventional forces be corrected by adjustments in our own forces. To make such planning realistic, for instance, we must weigh the forces of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact into the equation when planning to cope with any possible confrontation in Europe.

It is a fact, however, that in projected numerical comparisons under authorized peacetime manning levels, the Soviets by 1974-1975 will probably have a superiority in ground forces, if measured in numbers of personnel, of roughly 3 to 2. In numbers of tanks, the Soviets even now have several times as many as has the United States. In tactical aircraft, our current projections show that they can have several hundred more than the United States is programmed to have by the 1974-1975 time period and this includes our carrier-based aircraft. And, in terms of naval forces, we will face a substantial threat from Soviet submarine forces. Today, the Soviets already have approximately four times as many submarines as we have. The majority of the Soviet submarine fleet is conventionally powered at the present time and many of those submarines are short- to medium-range ships. But the fact remains that their very rapid buildup in submarine forces poses a serious and growing threat to our own naval forces.

Let me again remind you that quality as well as quantity has a bearing on the effectiveness of a nation's forces. Let me also restate what I have said many times in the three months I have been Secretary of Defense. Today it would be suicidal for the Soviet Union to attempt a first-strike attack on the United States. Although such an attack might well bring unimaginable destruction and loss of life to the United States, enough of our offensive capacity would remain under any circumstances to cause unacceptable levels of destruction in the Soviet Union.

We accomplish this in part by maintaining three different types of strategic offensive systems. Preserving a mix of seabased missiles, land-based missiles and bombers is a fundamental premise in our own force planning. First, it confronts the enemy with complex U.S. attack plans, which increase our level of assurance for accomplishing any tasks. Second, it causes the enemy to allocate resources for defensive systems, which might otherwise be expended on offensive systems. Third, it avoids technological surprise in any one area of defense which could tend to degrade our deterrent.

If, however, the Soviet buildup of the kinds of weapons that can erode our deterrent or retaliatory capability continues, obviously the margin of safety which the United States now possesses will diminish.

Of course, we do not know what the Soviets intend to do with the SS-9's they are now deploying or the Polaris-type submarines they are turning out at the rate of 6 to 8 per year or the fractional orbit bombardment system which they are continuing to develop. As I said earlier, we cannot read the minds of those in the Kremlin today, much less the minds of those who may be there eight or ten years from now. Last year, the dominant official assumption by the United States was that the U.S.S.R. by now would have begun to slow down and halt the expansion of its ICBM force. That assumption proved false.

We cannot gamble on estimates of Soviet intentions. If the Soviet Union is developing a capability that could endanger this nation, we must be prepared to counteract it.

Most of us still remember vividly a moment of supreme national peril in 1962. It was widely assumed then that the Soviet Union would never install offensive missiles in Cuba and this presumption prevailed right up to

the time that photographic evidence proved it wrong. As Secretary of Defense, I do not intend for this country to go through that kind of crisis again, but if we must, I intend to see that the United States is in a position to meet such a crisis successfully.

We came through that crisis unscathed because we had a credible deterrent. What the outcome would have been if our strategic capability had been in doubt is a question that should be kept in mind as we discuss the Safeguard system.

Against this backdrop, the Nixon Administration proposes the Safeguard ABM system to accomplish these two principal objectives:

(1) To insure that we are in a position to protect our retaliatory capability against the potential of a Soviet nuclear force in the mid-1970's designed to erode our deterrent; and

(2) To insure that we are in a position to defend our population against the potential Communist Chinese ICBM threat if it materializes, or against an irrational or accidental attack by some other nation.

We propose to begin ABM construction on two sites, which will provide us with an option to expand if the threats we have postulated do, in fact, materialize. Having estimated the threat potential, we recommend only that we protect our options to offset it, should it materialize.

Hopefully, arms limitation talks will achieve success, making further expansion of our ABM system unnecessary insofar as the Soviet threat is concerned. There appears to be less likelihood of effective arms limitations agreements with the Chinese Communists, of course. The Nixon Administration's reorientation of the ABM system improves chances for effective negotiations with the Soviets, for Safeguard is more defensive and less provocative than its predecessor, Sentinel.

In summary, the Safeguard ABM decision protects our options to meet the potential threats while:

(1) reducing and postponing our financial exposure for missile defense and deterrent protection; and

(2) avoiding a provocative posture which could inhibit arms talks and heat up the arms race.

When considered against the potential threat we face and the dire consequences of military inadequacy, the Safeguard proposal is sound, essential and deserving of the support of the public and authorization by the Congress.

STATEMENT ON POSTAL RATE INCREASE

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the recent news that consumer prices were rising at an annual rate of 10 percent during the month of March shatters my hope that we could avoid postal rate increases this year.

If we are to bring the destructive wage-price spiral this administration inherited under control, Government revenues must be increased and we must achieve a budget surplus in the coming fiscal year.

There is no other course, Mr. Speaker, but to support the President's proposal for increasing letter-mail rates by 1 cent, along with increases for second- and third-class mail.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that if we

do not increase postal rates, the Department could run a deficit of more than \$1.4 billion in the coming fiscal year. This deficit assumes that postal workers will receive, on the average, the 4.7 percent phase III wage increase recommended by the Civil Service Commission. The way prices are rising, we know this increase will be a minimum.

This deficit is intolerable in view of the inflationary pressures at work in our economy.

We must support the President's recommendations for increasing postal rates and slashing the deficit in this big Department.

EXTENDING THE COVERAGE OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT TO FARMWORKERS

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation to extend the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to farmworkers. Agricultural workers are notoriously the most underprivileged group of wage earners; few people see their plight and fewer care. They are excluded from most of our social legislation. Certainly their deplorable conditions result to a considerable extent because they are denied access to the Federal law protecting the right of employees to join a union of their own choosing and, through it, to bargain about wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

Bargaining from a position of "protected" strength would bring these workers better wages, working conditions, and health, and so forth, benefits. Taft-Hartley safeguards would protect them from interference with their formation and administration of a union; from discharge or discrimination because they invoked Taft-Hartley procedures; and from having their union, once certified, being challenged by another union within a year. Employer-employee disputes would be far more likely to be settled peacefully if the workers have a union to represent their interest under a collective bargaining agreement.

The bill which I introduced would extend to farmworkers, who often labor under the harshest physical circumstances, the same rights and responsibilities most other working men and women, in more comfortable and remunerative employment, have had since 1935. It is not "special-interest" legislation; it would merely abolish an exclusion which put one segment of the working force into not only a "special" but actually an "underprivileged" class. It does not merely favor the worker, for the employer would derive many advantages. So would the general public, not the least being that both employer and union would be prohibited from engaging in "unfair labor practices."

Favorable consideration of this most desirable proposal is strongly recommended.

MASONIC ORATION OF BOB SIKES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, many honors have come to my friend and colleague, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, in his long and illustrious public career of service. He was my Congressman until I had the privilege of being elected to a seat in a new district which had been partially carved out of his large district in west Florida.

Last week, BOB SIKES made a stirring address to the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of Florida, Free and Accepted Masons, as its grand orator. The spontaneous applause as he was interrupted time and again made this one of the most stirring addresses ever heard in the 140 years of the grand lodge's existence.

I, therefore, would like to have those remarks reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for others to read. They are stimulating and say so much that needs to be said at this period in our history:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. F. SIKES FOR THE MEETING OF THE GRAND LODGE F. & A.M. OF FLORIDA IN JACKSONVILLE, APRIL 22, 1969

I am fully mindful and highly appreciative of the honor bestowed on me at this great assembly. It is a rare privilege—a most unusual opportunity—for any man to stand before this distinguished gathering.

Now I have some questions for you. Have you looked at your country lately? What kind of country do we have? Have you thought on its future? Are you really interested?

We are members of a great brotherhood, the brotherhood of Freemasonry. There have been many times in our country's history when our members filled a great mission. America's early leaders who mapped the destiny of our land were Masons. And the course they charted was a far safer one than our Nation now follows.

What of the present and the future of Freemasonry? Do we still have a mission which extends beyond the walls of the Lodges where we meet? How shall we—as Freemasons—best serve our God and our country? Is there, after all, a problem which concerns us?

No country has endeavored more successfully than ours to convert its resources and its scientific achievements to useful purpose. America has created a tremendous technological power with unbelievable capacity to provide for the needs of our people. But we should have obtained in this process individual improvement and progress and national unity far beyond our present status.

We can circle the moon and send back revealing photographs of the world and the stars, but we still cannot penetrate the jungle cover of Vietnam and tell what is hidden underneath, or solve the conflict which frustrates us there. We possess the power to destroy hundreds of millions of people with a single massive strike, almost in a single instant, but we haven't conquered disease, and we haven't eliminated poverty even for those who are willing to work to escape poverty.

Modern technology is expanding more rapidly than our power of foresight; more rapidly than our understanding of the consequences of the improvements we hail. We in America should be masters of our destiny, but in today's confusion it would be risky to predict that we can really determine where that destiny leads. New leadership is needed now to help delineate a safe course for the nation. Where better than through leader-

ship such as that which Masonry contributed in the early days of our Nation and which is still taught in the Lodges where we meet.

We have created the greatest wealth and established the highest standard of living in the world, but we know these in themselves are not enough. Gross national product, which achieves stupendous new heights each year, does not really spell out the contentment or tranquility of the people. Only leadership will do these things, leadership which attracts the confidence of the people while charting the safe course our nation needs. It is the absence of that type of leadership which has encouraged dissenters who, in reality, offer nothing more than destruction of the very goals for which our nation has been building. We as Masons can help at least by encouraging those around us to stand for the right things.

These are troubled times, uncertain and in a sense directionless, times. Which way is our country going? We obviously are living in a time of great social change; we face unprecedented crises from day to day. Those who administer the law do not seem to know how to respond to strange and querulous protests of minorities of our citizens. Established institutions are under attack, and accepted principles of morality, law and order seem to be in question. We hear strange proposals—and strange talk of appeasement from the most unexpected sources.

It requires no great intellectual capacity to be aware that the American way of life is in danger. It is in danger because vested authority has not shown the courage, the resolution, or the conviction to fully resist disorder, chaos, or anarchy. Somehow, the great majority of our citizens seem unable or unwilling to prompt or inspire the sort of action which will insure for us an orderly society, moving forward to greater things with minimum damage to old institutions, most of which most assuredly deserve saving.

President Abraham Lincoln observed in 1864 that "The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty' and the American people, just now, are very much in want of one." That comment is very apt today. What is really needed may not be so much a definition of liberty or freedom as guidelines for its proper use. Freedom also means the exercise of rights and franchises under restraints and protections which are justly imposed by law. Freedom implies the presence of reasonable rules for the protection of the community and for the promotion of public health, safety, morals and welfare.

Daniel Webster said, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." If the objectives of liberty and freedom are honorable, as I believe them to be, then the uses of freedom must be no less honorable. Freedom requires individual responsibility, and each man must be a guardian of responsible freedom. When the element of personal responsibility is added, freedom becomes a prevailing force, exerting its influence on men and governments—protected by courage, fortified by wisdom, and nourished by the roots of private morality.

Now if that isn't plain enough, let me say it this way. There must be law and order. It is time to discipline the nut fringe, to enforce the law, and to stand up for the things America stands for—at home and abroad. We cannot afford any more Pueblos, but we have just had Pueblo No. 2. It is time for action. The time for protest is past. We cannot continue to turn the other cheek. We have run out of cheeks to turn. America does not dare to be directionless. There must be purpose and determination, and for these there must be leadership based on sound values.

Shall I be more specific? There are demonstrators and outlandish demands for recognition which have been noted in too many colleges and universities. Those who dissent destructively should be given short shrift to get back to their books or get packing. The

Justice Department finally has awakened to the fact that some of the dissenters are law violators with communist affectation. They are not students and they have no claim to be treated as students.

And what of the courts? The blame for the shocking increase in crime must be placed in part on the rising judicial concern in recent years which has seen judges and courts becoming more perturbed over the "rights" of criminals than they are for the rights of law-abiding citizens.

In its rulings, the United States Supreme Court has established policies which threaten the very foundations of the Constitution. It has struck down the laws against communists working in defense plants, laws against subversives teaching in public schools, laws against pornography; even laws against school children demonstrating in force in classrooms. It has set the stage to absolve Cassius Clay for refusing to serve his country in uniform as other young men must do and most of them proudly do. And finally, this is the court that said little children cannot have the advantage of prayer in the schools, and upheld insults to the American flag.

How long will our nation and its lawmakers and its President tolerate this destruction of basic Constitutional process?

In his great farewell message, which should be required reading for every American, George Washington held that our nation cannot survive without morality and religion. In an age in which leadership was synonymous with membership in the Masonic Order, he was both a great leader and a great American. He lived for the principles for which our Order stands, and his contributions to America reflect the teachings of Masonry. He provided leadership of the highest order. Ours is another age—with new problems. Now in our time what is our responsibility? How is Masonry to accept these strange new philosophies. Are we to try to adjust to them and live with them?

I can tell you that neither Masonry nor America can survive in a nation which tolerates a continuance of the practices which we now are witnessing. The United States needs the principles for which Masonry stands, for these are the principles on which our nation was founded.

How do we achieve these things and uphold these principles? By not waiting for someone else to accept our own responsibility—by showing our pride in America—by standing up and speaking out for our country in the manner of the men of old—most of whom were Masons. By living the teachings of Masonry.

Again George Washington, in his letters to Alexander Hamilton during the days when the unique American system of free government was being formed, wrote: "It may be laid down, as a primary position, and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services to defense of it."

This was in 1775, a year before the Declaration of Independence. A year after our freedom as a nation was declared, in 1777, Thomas Paine said: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

And again Daniel Webster, in an address on June 3, 1834, stated this basic American principle with even more firmness and clarity. "God grants liberty," he said, "only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

And we can take guidance from the words of General Westmoreland who, speaking of the sacrifices and dedication of America's fighting men and of the need for support which is required for them at home to preserve freedom and perpetuate democracy, said: "Not for fame or reward, not for place or rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty

as they understood it, these men suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all, even died."

Some of you saw a TV program which told of the love of country and patriotic contributions of one Oklahoma family, an Indian family, incidentally, by the name of Poolaw. In this family, the father died a hero's death in uniform. Three sons have seen service in Vietnam. One of them has lost a leg. The amputee said that his principal regret was that he cannot go back to Vietnam and serve again to help his country. The prospect of a lifetime without the limb he gave poses no terrors for him. He has the courage to look ahead beyond the far horizons to a greater America. What a change from so many of the scenes we are forced to view night after night!

Yes, throughout the history of our free nation, there have been those who understand and appreciate our Freedoms—those who perceive that freedom is not free—those who fully realize that we must invest our labors, our devotion, even exhibit to the world the fact that we are willing to sacrifice life when necessary. Without such patriots, America stands in danger of losing the priceless heritage which is ours. There must be modern patriots—men who believe in God and country and who are unafraid to stand up for both. That is our mission—the mission of those who will live the teachings of Masonry.

We, as good Americans and as Masons, can contribute to a secure and progressive tomorrow. We will have great tasks before us and they are tasks which will test our strength, and our character; sometimes our very souls. But what a wonderful opportunity will be ours in the process. We will be seeing this great land with new vision and new appreciation, and we will be helping again to write a page—our page—in the matchless saga of America. Tomorrow can still be bright with promise. We have problems, and they are serious, but we have had problems before and we have overcome them. America has strength and resources that have barely been tapped. All around us there are wonderful things which make this nation the greatest one on earth, which give us so many reasons for being proud that we are Americans.

It is time to start thinking of the opportunities which are ours to render a greater service to our own country. It is time to encourage the great overwhelming majority of the people who believe in America to speak up for it.

Those of us here today understand what I am talking about for these are the things which Masons have been taught to believe and practice. I am proud that I am a Mason for I see in Masonry a temple to a great principle to which all free men should be devoted. Take your Masonry outside of the Lodge. Let the people know where we stand.

In this hour, when America needs courage and leadership, let us rededicate ourselves now to America's mission under God and together take the vow that we will keep alive the spirit of those who gave us our freedoms and our country.

FRANCE AND ITS WORLD WAR I DEBT

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution declaring it the sense of Congress that France should begin payment of its World War I debt to the United States. Since General de Gaulle has stepped down and France is

about to elect a new President, we should go on record as reaffirming our intentions to collect this long-standing debt. I would hope that both the Congress and the administration will make known to those candidates seeking the French Presidency that we will not continue to ignore this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the people of America have a right to expect this debt to be paid, and they have a right to expect the Congress to take steps to collect it. I sincerely hope the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to act on this resolution in the very near future.

THE MENACE OF ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the President's recent message on organized crime was a welcome one to me. In this message he demonstrated awareness of the corrupt syndicate in every part of the country.

With a "take" of from \$30 to \$50 billion a year, organized crime has powerful resources which it is using to infiltrate legitimate business and to push its illegitimate activities everywhere.

My own State of Arizona has seen a heavy influx of known Mafia types. Recently, a very widely known businessman in Tucson plunged to his death from a downtown hotel window. It came as an even greater shock to the community to learn that he evidently had been under heavy pressure from persons connected with a national crime network. This was just the most recent incident serving to underscore the threat facing many communities. Previously this same city was the scene of a series of unsolved, gang-style bombings.

Fortunately, the Tucson press has been vigilant in uncovering and reporting evidence of underworld influences there. I have been encouraged, too, by hard efforts made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department, and other Federal agencies to gather evidence against syndicate members. These efforts are continuing. In addition, I have urged the administration to establish a Federal strike force in Arizona, or, at least, to include the State within the scope of a Federal Racketeering Field Office which may be established in the southern California metropolitan area.

Since my days as a county attorney in Tucson I have known the insidious undermining of society by unscrupulous and, unfortunately, well-financed underworld elements. There is no quick and easy solution to the crime of conspiracy. Evidence to convict is difficult to come by. But the battle must be waged actively and persistently.

The President's specific proposals need careful study, but I am glad he has spoken out on this issue.

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS IN NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 22, 1969

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to address the executive board meeting of the National Association of Letter Carriers in New York City. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss their upcoming political action conference in Washington, D.C. The National Association of Letter Carriers has always presented its position to the Congress in a reasonable and effective manner, and I look forward to meeting with their leaders and members in Washington. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my speech to the executive board of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING, APRIL 22, 1969

There is probably not one person in a hundred in the United States who has not heard the phrase: "neither rain nor sleet nor snow shall keep the mail from going through." Americans assume, as a matter of faith, that their mail will be delivered on time and in a hurry.

The fact is, of course, that they are right, for we have the best postal service of any nation in the world.

But while we are concerned with getting our mail, we often overlook the dedicated public servant who brings it to our door. When it is delayed, for whatever the reason, we rise in collective indignation and protest the delay. When it is on time, we sit in collective silence, without saying a word.

The fact is that we are not giving proper consideration to the employees of the United States who perform one of the most difficult and thankless tasks in public service—that of carrying the mail.

I for one do not believe that we can ignore the basic rights of 700,000 postal workers.

I for one believe that we should pay for what we get, and what we are getting is the best postal service in the world.

There are many specific issues of interest to postal employees which will be raised in your political action conference in Washington on May 12th, including salary, health benefits, and others. I think all of these are important, and, as in the past, I expect to support legislation favorable to the postal employees.

But I believe that central to all of these issues is the basic question of employee-management relations, which at present are weighted in favor of management.

Let me use the issue of postal salaries as an example. Postal salaries are dictated by the archaic hominy and grits of economy of rural America. Dedicated postal clerks, letter carriers and other low-paid postal workers are the victims of the skyrocketing cost of living.

And yet, postal workers and their unions have barely limited processes available to them to redress wage and working condition grievances.

At the heart of this problem is the present one-sided relationship between employees and management. I have introduced legislation, which many of my colleagues in Congress have also introduced, which would

improve these employee-management relations.

The bill sets up an orderly program of administrative procedures and appeal mechanisms while spelling out the rights and privileges of both labor and management.

It also provides for compulsory arbitration of disputes and establishes an independent Labor-Management Relations Panel patterned after the procedures which have governed labor-management relations in private industry for more than three decades.

In short, this bill would extend to postal employees the same basic protections which have long been enjoyed by their counterparts in the private sector.

This is actually not a new proposal. We had the beginnings of a better policy on employee-management relations with a Presidential Order first effected by the late President John F. Kennedy, which belatedly accepted limited collective bargaining and union recognition in the Federal structure.

But while this order was a significant breakthrough then, and effective for a time, it had no statutory root, and it is weighted against employees and may be freely violated by management.

Therefore, I think this bill to improve employee-management relations is necessary, and I am hopeful that it will be considered and passed by the Congress as soon as possible. As I said before, I think it is central to most of the issues now being considered by your organization.

I want to wish you good luck in Washington next month during your political action conference. You have always presented your position to the Congress in a responsible and effective manner, and, as in the past, you may count on my support.

Thank you.

TAX TIME

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Garner, sales manager of the Eli Bridge Co., of Jacksonville, Ill., is the author of a very excellent comment published in the newsletter of the company. It expresses some uncommon common-sense comments about taxes and the role of Government in American life. Here it is:

That time of the year we all look forward to with fond anticipation has just passed—Tax Time.

At this time of the year we become even more acutely aware of what appears to be an ever-increasing cost of taxes, over-spending and waste of our tax dollars by government, and some of the inequities we seem to feel exist where our tax dollars are concerned. For example, do you ever find yourself thinking or wondering as follows:

When your Congressman tells you "there is a bill on the floor" of the House or Senate—do you get the feeling that YOU are the one that is going to have to pick it up and pay for it?

Or, that when the government tells you they are going to "reduce the federal deficit," you can bet your bottom dollar (and it might well be) they are going to do it by increasing taxes?

That Urban Renewal is an expensive program that makes it possible to demolish old slums and build new ones?

That it seems the "Impoverished people" we have heard so much about turn out to

be our Congressmen who have found they cannot live on some \$30,000 per year plus fringe benefits? (Now that they have solved their problems we wonder if they can do anything for those of us in the "affluent society" who have been getting by on considerably less for years!)

When our Congressmen talk about our affluent middle class, are they talking about our pay checks—before or after taxes?

Now that government has told us that smoking is dangerous to health; drinking is a national disgrace; and automobile exhausts pollute the air—how much of the price of these products (cigarettes, alcohol and gasoline) is taxes? What portion of these taxes is being used to correct the "ills" these products supposedly cause?

The government often justifies increased taxes by saying they use the money to support our welfare. Did they ever stop to think if they left tax rates alone, or even reduced them, that would also support our welfare?

Our legislators often cite "increased gross national product" as an indication and justification that the American public can afford to pay higher taxes and support more federal programs. This may be true. But, to a large extent, isn't "increased gross national product" simply the result of paying a dollar for what we used to buy for forty cents or less?

Now, this is one worth thinking about! We are told that increased taxes, interest rates, and so on, are necessary measures to take money out of the hands of the public in order to slow down spending and inflation. Then the government increases its spending, and wonders why inflation does not slow down.

So many people talk about getting "free money" from the government. From where do they think the government gets the money in the first place? So, you give money to the government and they give it back to you, what's so bad about that? Well, when you were a kid, do you remember asking a buddy to hold your ice cream cone for you? He always took a big lick of it for himself before he gave it back, didn't he? The same principle (and result) applies in both cases!

But all joking aside, the "Old U. S. of A." is a pretty good place to live—in spite of taxes, etc. Where else can you burn your draft card in the guise of doing your duty; tear down and stomp or burn the national flag in the name of patriotism; riot, loot and burn in the name of peaceful demonstrations; show complete disrespect to your fellow citizens and their rights in the name of equal rights; completely ignore and even stand against the basic principles of home, God, and country; refuse to accept the responsibilities of adulthood and constructive leadership; and still loudly proclaim to being a man among men, a patriot, a responsible citizen and a good American?

We hope this, in its end result, will give you something interesting to think about.

JOB CORPS CENTER SHUTDOWN

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with several of my colleagues today in a resolution expressing the sense of the House that the shutting down of 59 Job Corps Centers be suspended pending congressional review of the proposed action.

Because this decision may adversely affect the lives of thousands of ghetto

youths involved in the present program, it seems highly inappropriate that such a decision should be taken without consultation with appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

In the Toledo area alone, with which I am especially familiar, between 145 and 158 youths from broken and underprivileged homes are to be phased out of Job Corps training programs in which they are now enrolled. These young men need educational and occupational training desperately. For many of them, it represents a choice between a life of crime and a respectable job.

The administration may very well be right in shifting the emphasis of the Job Corps from conservation to manpower training; however, I think that such a decision should first be subject to congressional scrutiny. This is particularly so when the proposed in-city substitutes have yet to be established.

PORNOGRAPHY LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the youth of our Nation are daily being subjected to material that is clearly obscene. This unsolicited material, which is distributed through the mails, inflames the minds and imagination of our young people in an extremely objectionable and distasteful manner.

It is estimated that nearly 100 million pieces of objectionable material is sent through the mails each year. The greatest majority of it is directed at the young. Pornography mailers pay high prices for the names and addresses of young people below the age of 18.

I know this material is being sent to minors because of the tremendous amount of mail I receive from parents whose sons and daughters have received such material. Recently a 12-year-old boy in my district received this type of objectionable material.

This problem is not just restricted to California. A great majority of my colleagues have also received complaints along the same lines as those from my constituents.

In addition, there are those who think smut mailers should not be permitted to use second-, third-, and fourth-class mail privileges. I agree that the American taxpayer is under no obligation to make the pornography business profitable by permitting them to advertise using reduced postal rates.

I think the time has come for us to take action to protect our young people from being the victims of smut peddlers. We should also stop mailers from using second-, third-, and fourth-class mails as the vehicle by which objectionable material is distributed to adults.

I am today introducing legislation to amend titles 18 and 39 of the United States Code to make a certain category of material, designed to appeal primarily to the prurient interests of the viewer,

reader, or listener, nonmailable to minors, persons under the age of 18 years, and nonmailable as second-, third-, or fourth-class matter to any person.

Nonmailable material is defined as any picture, photograph, drawing, sculpture, motion picture, or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body, any book, magazine, or other printed matter, however reproduced, or any sound recording, which depicts genitalia, sexual conduct, or sado-masochistic abuse in a manner designed to appeal to the prurient interest of the viewer, reader, or listener.

Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing of any material defined in this act to be nonmailable shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, for the first offense, and shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, for each additional offense.

The Postmaster General may revoke the second-, third-, and fourth-class mailing privileges upon a finding that material defined as nonmailable has been posted as second-, third-, or fourth-class mail. Administrative hearings, however, must be held before a ruling can be made of the withdrawal of mailing privileges.

The amendments made by this act shall become effective on the 30th day after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced will put an end to the mailing of objectionable material to minors and will end the subsidy to pornographers.

FIESTA OF FIVE FLAGS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in 1559 Don Tristan DeLuna, conquistador under King Phillip II of Spain, first planted the Aragon colors on the sandy shores of Pensacola, Fla., when he landed there to found a settlement, the first white colony in the United States. Since that time, Pensacola has been under four other flags. The 20th anniversary of Florida's fabulous fiesta at Pensacola is being celebrated this year and, in this connection, Don Canton and Ray Sterling have written an official theme song, entitled "The Fiesta of Five Flags." The lyrics follow:

Come to Fiesta of Five Flags
Both you and Pensacola will be glad
At the Fiesta of Five Flags
You'll have the finest time you ever had
Yes the Fiesta of Five Flags
In Florida is something you should see
Bring the family one and all
And you'll have yourselves a ball
Cause the Fiesta's where you'll want to be
Now there'll be racing, dancing, pageantry
And also beauty contests natur'ly
And planes that fly high in daring stunts
There'll be a fish fry and treasure hunts
There'll be a big spear fishing, rodeo
And lots to do beneath the sun
Take a vacation
For recreation
And come on down and join the fun.

This song is presented by out-of-State bands in the fiesta parade and has become popular with thousands of home folks and visitors alike.

I am pleased indeed to have it reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE PARK

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker in recent days the Dunes National Lakeshore located in the northern part of my State has become an issue of public discussion throughout the Nation.

Proponents of the lakeshore, and I count myself in their number, have advocated the appropriation of \$10 million in fiscal year 1970 in the form of \$5 million in land acquisition funds and \$5 million in land contract authority funds for the Dunes National Lakeshore. This appropriation would be a major step toward making this national park the recreation facility envisioned by Congress when it authorized the Dunes National Lakeshore in 1966.

It has been suggested that legislation to reduce the acreage of the Dunes National Lakeshore may soon be introduced in an effort to reopen the controversy between industrial and conservation interests. However, Congress wisely studied this issue carefully and at length before authorizing an 8,000-acre national park on the southern shore of Lake Michigan 3 years ago.

I, therefore, strongly oppose any effort to reduce the authorized acreage of this national park.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Hammond Times and an article written by Jack Colwell of the South Bend Tribune voicing opposition to any attempt to decrease the size of the Dunes National Lakeshore:

[From the Hammond (Ind.) Times, Mar. 31, 1969]

LANDGREBE'S FOLLY

That opponents of the Dunes National Lakeshore haven't surrendered is incredible.

They've waged a losing battle for several years against the forces of reason and public pressure. Carrying their banner now is Rep. Earl F. Landgrebe (R., Valparaiso) who wants to reduce the lakeshore's authorized size.

Landgrebe thinks that 2,000 or less acres rather than the 8,000 set aside by Congress is adequate. Why he picked that figure is anyone's guess; perhaps because it compares favorably in size with the neighboring Indiana Dunes State Park.

The state park is worn out, rapidly becoming a shambles under the grinding feet of millions of users. If Landgrebe is no judge of supply and demand, fortunately others among his Congressional colleagues are.

But the congressman has another pitch. He wants this part of his constituency preserved for industrial and commercial development. Porter County's taxable wealth needs enriching, he contends.

Congress has already weighed such argu-

ments and found them wanting next to the greater need for enriching the people's recreational treasury and the preservation of a natural habitat unlike any other in the country. Thus it is inconceivable that Congress will miraculously accede to Landgrebe's desires.

Meanwhile, the interior subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has before it a request for \$10 million for continuing land acquisition. Another \$100,000 is sought for operating expenses. Both should be approved.

Considerable acreage in the authorized area remains to be purchased and until it is, its owners are in a quandary. No one wants it for development purposes. Taxes must be paid. Those with homes would like to get their money and move.

It is unfair to keep these owners waiting longer than necessary.

And from the taxpayers' side, purchase of these lands with all due speed will save them money—which should be Landgrebe's principal goal. The longer acquisition is delayed, the higher go land values.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Apr. 25, 1969]

WHO'S STANDING IN WAY OF "INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS"?

(By Jack Colwell)

One of the most impressive sights in Indiana is visible along the Toll Road in Lake County.

Surely almost everyone at some time while driving past—and closing the car windows—has marveled at the billowing signs of steel plant production.

Usually there is some comment, such as, "Gee, Gary (cough) must be a delightful place in which to live and work."

And some day that industrial complex stretching along what is left of Lake Michigan could reach out all the way across Northern Indiana to South Bend, Mishawaka and Elkhart—forming an uninterrupted stretch of urban and commercial development, doing away with grass and trees and blue skies and all that useless, jazz.

There are obstructionists, however.

They want to save a few spots of green and even, if you can imagine this, save some sand.

They currently are interested in preserving an area located mostly in Porter County for something which would be known as Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

They want this land to be obtained by the federal government before it is snatched up by the land speculators for industrial and other commercial interests.

There are some strange aspects to this obstruction:

Why would anyone want to turn to the federal government to provide park space when the state of Indiana has done such a remarkable job of providing park and recreation areas in Northern Indiana?

How come anybody other than some kind of nut would want to preserve dunes, those silly heaps of sand which keep shifting around anyway?

LOOK AT CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

Even though the Lakeshore project wouldn't stop industrial growth and economic development, what is the sense of setting aside a recreation and conservation area right in the middle of all this expansion? (After all, our major cities, like Chicago and New York, have grown without any such planning.)

The nuts with their toy sand buckets must not stand in the way of (cough) progress.

U.S. Rep. Earl F. Landgrebe, R-Valparaiso, is trying to do something about this obstructionist threat. He wants legislation to slash the proposed size of the Lakeshore to a fourth of what has been planned.

It might seem to be a paradox for Con-

gressman Landgrebe, who is a conservative, to oppose conserving the Indiana Dunes.

Actually, though, it probably isn't. The congressman contends his real purpose is more adequate definition of the park boundaries.

The definition just happens to chop the Lakeshore to a quarter of the size planned in the port-park compromise which hastened development of the Burns Harbor port.

With the present nebulous boundaries, it is difficult for land speculators to operate with assurance. Why they might wind up with property which would become nothing but a useless park.

And if people want recreation areas, let them fly to Alaska in the summer and Hawaii in the winter. There still is a lot of available recreation space in those new states.

Obviously, there is no sense in holding back the progress planned by developers of the type who have made Gary what it is today.

FARM BUREAU PROGRAM

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, one of the important decisions yet to be made by the Nixon administration is the direction to be taken with respect to farm programs. The American Farm Bureau Federation has recently proposed a fairly comprehensive farm program. Their program encompasses new and bold approaches for several problems. An editorial in Wallace's Farmer of April 12, 1969, contains a good analysis of the Farm Bureau's proposed program:

NEW FARM PROGRAM PROPOSED BY FARM BUREAU

Farm Bureau is pushing a new look in government farm programs. It's the nearest thing we've seen to a truly national program with real promise of being both acceptable and effective.

Essentially, the proposal is a two part program which deals separately with commercial farms and low income farms. Separation of the "farm problem" into manageable units is, in itself, a forward step.

Since Iowa would be affected chiefly by the commercial farm part, let's look at it first.

Taking land out of production is still the tool for curbing excess productive capacity. But the method of doing so has some new twists. Long term, whole farm retirement would be emphasized.

This has the advantage of removing labor and capital as well as land from the resources invested in agriculture. Previous programs had tended to be self-defeating in that retiring some land on a farm released capital and labor to do a more intensive job on the acres remaining in production.

The new feature is using a competitive bid basis for determining which land is retired. An owner could put a rental price on his land and offer it. The government would start with the lowest offers and work upward until the desired amount of land was retired.

Such a program tends to concentrate retirement in marginal areas—this could be especially important to areas where wheat production is marginal. Violent opposition from these areas appeared in the "soil bank" days. So Farm Bureau's proposal limits the amount of land that can be retired in any one community.

Even with this limitation, this part of the program tends to work with economic forces rather than to fight a losing battle against them. It would let regions and individual farms concentrate on producing that in which they are most efficient.

The Farm Bureau proposal anticipates retiring at least 10 million acres in each of 5 years.

Some careful figuring will indicate that 50 million is not enough.

As whole farms are being retired, the proposal would provide a gradual phase out of present feed grain, wheat, and cotton programs. Loan rate would be set at not more than 85% of previous 3 year average price.

Resale price of commodities in CCC hands would be not less than 150% of loan rate plus carrying charges, except when sales are offset by purchases on the open market.

Tho this 150% applies to the 85% moving loan, there appears to be no adequate provision for trimming CCC stockpiles to more reasonable levels.

Programs of the past have caused some production dislocations, especially in cotton. Southeastern cotton producers, often small operators with low incomes, have grown cotton of a type that is in surplus. Southwestern producers have grown another type which moved to market.

But southeastern congressmen with seniority control of important committees have guarded jealously cotton allotments for their voters. There's no change in this committee setup.

So some other bait has to be provided to get this essential support. This is where the second phase of the Farm Bureau program has real appeal. The special program for low income groups lets the congressman take something back to the voters who elect him.

These low income operators could retire whole farms. In addition, they could receive compensation for permanent cancellation of acreage allotments.

This wouldn't solve all their problems, of course. So retraining grants up to \$1,000 would be provided. Adjustment assistance up to \$2,500 per year for 2 years would be available. Loans under existing credit programs would also facilitate the transition.

The Farm Bureau bill makes such help available to farmers with less than \$5,000 gross income and less than \$2,000 nonfarm income.

This aid to noncommercial farmers could let southern congressmen vote for a program which could phase out the inefficient producer of less desirable cotton.

The bill as written has some weaknesses in this area, however. It would apply to farm operators only, while the need also includes farm laborers.

The bill also ignores effects on rural communities, except by limiting the amount of land that can be retired in one area. Rural community development effort is a necessary counterpart.

There's additional question about whether long term land retirement alone has the necessary flexibility to handle year to year variations in production and demand.

With some changes in language, the bill could be amended to shore up weak points. Hopefully, leaders will support the modifications necessary to improve the program's effectiveness.

Vital point in any farm legislation is cost. Farm Bureau leaders figure the commercial part of the program would save perhaps \$7 billion over the next 10 years. This \$7 billion would make a big start in covering the costs of aid to low income farmers.

Since agriculture contains an important segment of the nation's poor, funds aimed at the poverty problem could make up any additional amounts needed. A coordinated attack on this long ignored portion of the farm problem is a desirable social goal.

THE 1970 DECENNIAL CENSUS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of confusion and apprehension concerning the 1970 Decennial Census questionnaires which will be mailed to all households next year.

I am sure most Members of Congress have had letters of inquiry from constituents upset about the personal nature of some questions, the purpose of these questions, and the mandatory nature of the questionnaire.

The distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Maurice Stans, recently wrote a letter to all Members to allay these fears and to outline the changed procedures upon which his administration has decided.

First of all, 3 million fewer families will be required to struggle with the 66-question form. They will join those receiving the questionnaire containing only 23 questions.

Questions relating to the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom facilities have been reworded to remove any implication that the Government is interested in knowing with whom these facilities are shared.

A cover letter explaining the great need for census data and emphasizing the confidentiality of all responses will accompany each questionnaire.

Secretary Stans points out that it is exceedingly difficult to obtain adequate response from a voluntary, rather than mandatory, procedure. The Census has been mandatory ever since the first one in 1790. If left on a voluntary basis, the results would be unreliable and practically useless due to distortions and deficient statistics for whole groups of people and for entire areas.

Nevertheless, after the 1970 census a blue-ribbon commission will be appointed to fully examine a number of important questions concerning the Census Bureau. One of these questions is whether the decennial census can be conducted on a voluntary or partially voluntary basis.

In addition, questions for future censuses will be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress 2 years in advance. The advice of additional members of the general public will be utilized in formulating census questions.

Mr. Speaker, the nature of many census questions makes it understandable why many citizens feel the Government is prying or invading their privacy. They wonder to what possible use such information will be put, if used at all.

As Secretary Stans points out in his letter, census data are used by every Federal Government department, State and local departments, and the private sector. Government programs on poverty, housing, education, welfare, agriculture, transportation, veterans, and senior citizens require and rely on census tabulations. Congress would be seriously hampered without census data.

Information about kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, for example, is of

keen interest to the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development—not on an individual basis, of course, but in the context of identifying areas of urban blight and slum conditions. Such information will not be available by name and address to appliance dealers, salesmen and the like.

Questions concerning marriages and children born are essential in estimating and planning for family welfare and dependent children care programs and population growth. Here again, the Secretary assures us the answers will be kept entirely confidential.

Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act extension which we are considering this week is a classic example of the need for more accurate and full census data on school-age population.

I shall urge my constituents, and all other citizens as well, to cooperate fully in the 1970 decennial census by filling out accurately and returning promptly their questionnaires.

I congratulate Secretary Stans on the steps he has taken to minimize misunderstanding and to assure a more reliable response.

BARBARA GOLEMAN NAMED TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Shaw once wrote:

Teaching would be impossible unless pupils were sacred.

Barbara Goleman, a teacher at Miami Jackson High School in Florida, is intensely committed to the belief that there is nothing more important than education. Because of her outstanding contribution in this field, she has been selected by Look magazine as national "Teacher of the Year."

I was delighted Monday to participate in White House ceremonies honoring Barbara for her accomplishments. It is true that teaching is a noble cause, for our society must rely on education to solve many of our most pressing problems. In dedicating herself to helping the young people at Miami Jackson High learn what they must know to participate in our society, Barbara has made a profound personal contribution to a better life for all of us.

Barbara entered teaching in 1954, year of the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation of schools. The decision had a sweeping impact on Florida, as it did on many other States. Later, Miami Jackson evolved from a nearly all-white and Cuban school to one nearly all black. The period of change was one of great pressure for the staff to leave, too, but Barbara fiercely believed that it was just as important to teach the new black students as their middle-class predecessors. She elected to stay, and help give quality education to the students. More impor-

tantly, her intense belief in this need convinced others to stay, too. "Barbara's influence in holding the staff together was critical," said the principal, Donald A. Burroughs.

New programs were devised and a sense of dedication to a sacred cause was instilled at the school. Now, the students respond to a teacher who cares—and they find the ways to escape the despair of the ghetto. Several of the students, exemplifying the hope and optimism of the South's new generation which Barbara is helping to instruct, came to the White House ceremony this week. They are Kenneth Mayland, Jose Mateo, and Velma Rolle, and to me these fine young people give cause for satisfaction. I can understand why Barbara would dedicate her life to them.

Truly, Barbara Goleman deserves her honor as teacher of the year. She is an outstanding member of a great profession.

JOB CORPS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply disappointed at the administration's decision to close some 60 Job Corps centers across the country, in what has been called an "economy measure."

In view of the outstanding success these centers have achieved in offering tens of thousands of young men and women, who were out-of-school and out-of-work, another chance to develop their potential and return to society as useful, productive citizens, I believe this administration decision will prove to be a foolish and false economy.

The dollars "saved" by such an unfortunate Job Corps center closing move, if allowed to proceed, will in reality cost our Nation greatly in the months and years ahead in terms of lost opportunities to help these young people help themselves up and out of the disadvantaged dependent category and into a position where they can stand on their own feet, and support themselves and their families in dignity as contributing members of their home communities.

Mr. Speaker, because I think this decision is extremely shortsighted, and not in the public interest, I am joining with a great many of my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives in introducing legislation to express the sense of the Congress that the administration should take no action to implement this decision until such time as Congress has had a full opportunity to review the entire question thoroughly, and make its own legislative decision in extending the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, and in providing appropriations for that program.

As further indications of the value of the Job Corps program, and of the vast harm that the administration's center closing decision would cause, I would

like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of a letter I recently received from Mr. Hunter P. Wharton, general president of the International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO, in which he explains the fine work his union has been doing in making the Job Corps a success by helping youngsters "who want to help themselves."

Finally, I would like to insert in the RECORD an excellent article by Los Angeles Times Staff Writer Jack Jones on the tragic effect the closing decision would have on the Fenner Canyon Job Corps Center in southern California.

I have personally visited the Fenner Canyon Center and have firsthand evidence of the worthwhile work being done there. In my opinion, it would be a real tragedy if such a tremendous national effort were to be ended in the name of a shortsighted and false economy.

The letter and article follow:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS,

Washington, D.C. April 10, 1969.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Recent news stories regarding proposed cutbacks in the Job Corps program have caused serious concern among the members of our union. Our membership of 360,000 has supported the concept of a "latter-day CCC" since first proposed in Congress a number of years ago. We were very pleased to see the idea become a reality in the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Not only have we supported the Job Corps in principle, we have supported it in action. Since 1966, our International Union has provided training as heavy equipment operators for sixty-five to seventy Corpsmen annually at Jacobs Creek, Tennessee. In July of 1968, we extended this program to the Conservation Center at Anaconda, Montana where we have a trainee census of about fifty. We have placed almost all of the Jacobs Creek graduates in union jobs across the country, and anticipate placing some one hundred more graduates from Jacobs Creek and Anaconda this summer. I am attaching typewritten copies of several of the many letters received by the Center staff from young men who have gone to work and become taxpayers instead of "tax eaters."

While not all Job Corps graduates can tell as significant a story, there is one overriding reason that this program should remain intact. About sixty per cent of the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers entrants have reading achievements below grade level 3.5, making them—for all intents and purposes—functionally illiterate. Where will they go? Our society cannot afford to carry them forever and they are not capable of caring for themselves.

I earnestly solicit your assistance in maintaining the conservation centers so that we, along with others, may continue to help these youngsters who want to help themselves.

Very truly yours,

HUNTER P. WHARTON,
General President.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 21, 1969]
JOB CORPS CLOSINGS BAD NEWS TO SOME AT
PALMDALE CENTER

(By Jack Jones)

The chill of Big Rock Creek carrying the melting snow down from Mt. Baden-Powell past the Fenner Canyon Civilian Conservation Center near Palmdale may not be as icy as the chill the camp's Job Corpsmen feel in the runoff from Washington, D.C.

"These kids are concerned about what's going to happen to them," said Robert Lucy, a U.S. Forest Service carpentry instructor at the center which is among those Labor Secretary George P. Shultz has announced will be shut down. "You can't blame them."

"I loved it here," said Henry Thomas, a 19-year-old Negro corpsman from Cuthbert, Ga., who arrived a year ago barely able to read and write. "I learned more in Job Corps than I ever did in school."

Thomas did, indeed, learn, Fenner Canyon camp officials say. He progressed so rapidly that he became a corpsman leader and was being considered for permanent staff employment—if the center were to remain open.

NO DENIAL OF TRAINING

In disclosing that 59 of the nation's 106 Job Corps centers will be scrapped with a shift in emphasis from conservation work to urban vocational education facilities, Secretary Shultz said no enrollee will be denied training—somewhere.

But he insisted that the conservation centers cost too much to operate, are unable to keep enrollees in the program, do not adequately improve reading and math skills and do not place enough graduates in jobs.

Training, he suggested, should be in the cities, closer to the youths who need the program and closer to potential jobs. "Long-distance hauling of trainees from cities to remote camps, he said, contributes to a high dropout rate.

He said three out of 10 enrollees drop out between signup and arrival at camp. Of the arrivals, 38% drop out within 90 days, he added.

But Stanley Lynch, 49, U.S. Forest Service professional who has been director of the 4-year-old Fenner Canyon center since last summer, said he cannot agree that transporting young men from city slums and ghettos to the clean air isolation of conservation camps is not worth the money.

NEED SOCIAL GRACES

"Removal from the environment is a big thing," he said. "A lot of these boys have never been treated with kindness and respect before. When they get here, many aren't socialized. They have to learn to get along with people . . . and that all adults are not against them."

In the city, he pointed out, "they would still be in their old neighborhoods with all the same old distractions and influences. Who's going to get them to show up at the training center every day?"

While Lynch and his staff are convinced the dropout rate for city training centers would be higher than at the Forest Service-administered Fenner Canyon camp and other conservation centers, homesickness and the feeling of isolation do take a toll of incoming trainees.

Eugene Norris, counselor and placement officer for Fenner Canyon, agreed that about one-third leave for home within the first 90 days, "but once a boy gets past the first few weeks, he'll probably stick it out."

Lynch hastened to note "Remember that all of these boys have dropped out of school in their home towns. They are the very kind who have to learn to finish what they start."

A similar point was made last Thursday in Washington by pollster Louis A. Harris, who told a congressional committee that a massive study of Job Corps for the Office of Economic Opportunity showed the program has had a positive impact on the employment and earnings capabilities of "bottom-of-the-barrel" youths.

Harris said the survey also showed that Negro youths "can make it" in society if given an equal opportunity with whites and added that any evaluation of Job Corps must take into consideration the type of person it is dealing with.

HIGHER EARNINGS

The annual earnings of the enrollees who completed training were \$1,147 higher six months after leaving Job Corps than they had been before training, Harris said. But he noted that earnings gains trail off later—possibly because the ex-trainee finds himself back in "the same world of disadvantage, discrimination and don't care" he once left.

As for one of the other objections raised by the Department of Labor as it takes Job Corps over from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Lynch said he is "very proud" of Fenner Canyon's educational program.

Corpsmen spend about half their time in a remedial program that stresses reading and math with each being taught individually at his own pace. The goal is to get him to pass a high school equivalency test.

Lynch said the average enrollee makes about three times the reading and math progress at Fenner Canyon that he would make in a city school. In nine months, he advances three full years.

Fenner Canyon corpsmen generally do conservation work—cleaning trails, building campgrounds and the like—only during the first 30-to-60-day prevocational training period. Once in vocational training, they are not out on the trail work crews.

PART-TIME STUDENT

The vocational training program includes automotive servicing, masonry and bricklaying, culinary services, heavy equipment operating, carpentry and welding. Each corpsman must go through standard steps to reach apprentice level.

In the meantime, he is spending half his time learning to read and do math, being taught the attitudes expected of him by the "world of work," handwriting, language skills and the simple business of how to study.

Lynch pointed out that since the Fenner Canyon center opened in June, 1965, early stage trainees have done \$592,800 worth of improving in that part of the Angeles National Forest—public campgrounds, trails, water systems and reforestation, among other things.

"We couldn't have done all this without them," commented Lynch. "A lot more people are using the forest than ever before and we just don't have enough campgrounds."

Winter rains and flooding downed so many trees and eroded so many roads that "we have more work to do now than we can handle. If they close the camp, it's going to take a lot longer."

More than 650 young men from the poverty neighborhoods of the nation have completed the course (several months to a year, depending upon individual advancement) at Fenner Canyon since 1965.

Although figures on those who went on to become steadily employed taxpayers are not easy to compile, placement officer Norris said 75 of the 126 who have been graduated since August, 1967, have gone on to advanced training at urban centers, to specialized conservation centers and heavy-equipment training programs operated by unions.

Thirty-three of the 126 have been placed in jobs in the Los Angeles and Antelope Valley areas or have gone into military service.

Tracking down the employment status of those who left Southern California is next to impossible, but in June, 1967, the Job Corps said 53% of those finishing training had gone on to jobs. (That figure, however, included urban centers—many of those for women—as well as conservation camps.)

Lynch said the national figure for the graduates who have gone to jobs is now 72%.

Although the Fenner Canyon staff has yet to receive official notice that the center will shut down (presumably about July 1), reports of the Labor Department's intentions produced an immediate reaction among the 132 corpsmen now there.

"They just don't want to go back to their

home environments," Lynch said. "They felt something had been taken away from them. We explained that we'll probably be able to place them in other training programs . . . but they had been told before that this was their last chance."

DETERMINED TO STAY

Surprisingly, the news did not trigger any sudden surge of dropouts. Norris said there was, instead, an apparent determination by the corpsmen to hang on.

One approached Lynch and pleaded for more time each day in his concrete block-laying training so the center could not close before he had enough ability to find himself a job.

In the mess hall, a 16-year-old Negro from Ft. Gibson, Miss., said he had been at Fenner Canyon only a week and was hoping that he can be transferred to an urban center to get into computer training.

Speaking with polite shyness, he said he had seen a science class film about computers while still in high school ("I was starting to mess up in school and knew I had to go someplace to learn").

He wants to stay in Southern California, he said, because his chances of getting such training in Mississippi would not be good.

LIKES THE PLACE

Joe Almaraz, 16, of Huntington Park, had been at Fenner Canyon three weeks and had been looking forward to learning to operate heavy equipment. "I like this place," he said. "You feel like learning something."

Lynch said his 29-member staff is more concerned about the program than about their own jobs (many would simply move to other U.S. Forest Service posts) "because they've put so much of themselves into this place."

Looking over the scattering of dorms and vocational shops, the education building and the gymnasium—a complex built from scratch—he drew on his pipe and said:

"It really makes me want to cry when I think of the waste. That's what really hurts."

STATEMENT OF INCOME

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my previous practice, this is a statement of income as shown on my most recent tax return.

My form 1040, line 1, shows congressional salary, \$30,000; miscellaneous other income totaled \$3,393.65; the principal item of which was \$1,659.12 from the law partnership of Hungate & Grewach, Troy, Mo. Other sources of income, each under \$1,000, were rents, interest and honoraria.

After deducting \$3,000 for allowed living expenses attending Congress in Washington, D.C., the total figure for income from all sources was \$30,393.65.

Total income and self-employment tax due was \$5,832.09. Total tax withheld and paid by estimate was \$7,629.63. The net overpayment was \$1,797.54, of which \$800 has been applied to 1969 tax estimate and the balance requested as a refund of the amount overpaid.

Neither my wife, my self, nor the law partnership own any stocks or bonds and we have not bought any real estate since the date of my last report.

Campaign funds raised for me are han-

dled by committees and held in trust so that I have no direct control over such funds.

IN THE NAME OF ECONOMY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alameda Times-Star for Wednesday, April 23, published a pertinent editorial entitled, "In the Name of Economy," relative to the closure of the Job Corps centers throughout the country. This article is particularly concerned with the one located at Pleasanton, Calif. The Pleasanton center trained hard-core unemployed and was successful in getting over 50 percent of them into gainful employment. This is an impressive record.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

IN THE NAME OF ECONOMY

In one breath the new Administration in Washington plumps for a multi-billion-dollar ABM system, and in the next it decides to slash \$100 million from rehabilitation represented in the Job Corps training program.

The recently-announced plan to discontinue the Job Corps is shocking in its implications of presidential disregard for the plight of minorities. For no other program is providing skills for jobs and upgrading the minority image, and making it part of the American way of life.

Last year's report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Report) which received widespread acceptance for its clear-cut analyses of the problems involved, minced no words in ascribing the lack of jobs as a root cause of riots and disorders in the cities across the nation. On page 91 of this report the following is said to be a basic cause of tension in the minority community: ". . . the continuing exclusion of great numbers of Negroes from the benefits of economic progress through discrimination in employment and education, and their enforced confinement in segregated housing and schools. The corrosive and degrading effects of this condition and the attitudes that underlie it are the source of the deepest bitterness and lie at the center of the problem of racial disorder."

Clear cut enough? Yes, indeed, but apparently not to Mr. Nixon who with one cavalier stroke of the pen is abolishing a program which has trained thousands, turned them from delinquents into employed citizens, and was considered by economists and sociologists to be the only such successful program in the history of the nation.

Since the Word was passed that the Job Corps Center in our area—Pleasanton—was marked for extinction, this newspaper has obtained some significant data we would like to pass on in the hope there will be a reappraisal in Washington.

The Center has been functioning four years. Litton Industries, Inc., are under contract to train 2,000 Corpsmen at a time.

Since the Center was opened in April, 1965, a total of 14,292 young men have entered training. As of this moment, 1,700 are there.

Of those who have completed training in the last 48 months, 6,729 young men are employed, finding work through State Employment Service offices.

The equivalent of a high school diploma has been earned by 1,853. And 671 have

returned to school—many moving to the junior college level.

The military has absorbed 1,329.

The cost of training these young men—early dropouts, products of broken homes or slum environments, is now \$5,276, down nearly 50 per cent from the first-year cost into which also included costs of reconditioning a demilitarized army base, establishing a new-type training program, and purchasing equipment.

In addition to the nearly 7,000 employed through the State Employment Service, it is estimated that another 2,000 Corpsmen found work without using the Employment Service, and are presently employed.

In other words, 9,000 or more young men were pulled out of a hopeless, degrading environment, learned how to become productive citizens, and are now earning their own way in self-respect and dignity.

While there may have been some mistakes, it was a new venture for all concerned, a pilot program in which there was much learning to be done by Litton as well as agency people. But there has been progress. The surrounding community, too, has benefited economically: \$4 million annually into the economy for food (\$1,430,000), rent (\$1,190,000), taxes (\$1,000,000), utilities (\$376,000), clothing (\$245,000), transportation (\$179,000), medical (\$120,000), insurance (\$120,000), savings (\$106,000).

The Administration says it will open new training centers within the cities, and that 200 or 300 will be accommodated in place of the 2,000 now being helped.

This statistic is enough to tell the whole sad story.

The program is being mercilessly slashed, will be replaced with a token substitute. And 1,700 boys now being readied for useful roles in society will be tossed back to old haunts, idleness, a dead end.

This story repeats in all the other Centers. It is to be hoped that Congressmen sympathetic to the needs of the underprivileged in urban communities will prevail upon the White House to reconsider and revoke the closure order.

Perhaps it is not too late to change the executive decision. The Times-Star urges all to let their feelings be known to their elected representatives. Perhaps this incipient wrong can yet be righted before it results in throwing gasoline on the coming "long, hot summer."

MRS. OTEPKA RECALLS ORDEAL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much has been written concerning the long and trying case of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department security officer who, without authorization, gave information to a Senate subcommittee to correct false testimony against himself rendered by one of his superiors. Putting "loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department," as the Code of Ethics for Government Service directs, Mr. Otepka never faltered in his battle of over 5 years with the State Department.

As in the case of other men who have successfully overcome monumental obstacles, Otto Otepka's courage was matched by the resolute dedication of his wife, Edith. Drawing on that religious strength which has been the hallmark

of this Nation's greatness, Mrs. Otepka, like her husband, refused to yield an inch in the face of a vicious campaign, which must have hit an all-time low in Federal Government relations.

Vera Glaser, writing for the North American Newspaper Alliance, recently reviewed the key part played by Mrs. Otepka in the historic case. This excellent interview should be a source of encouragement to those beset by seemingly insurmountable troubles whose only sustenance at times is the force of moral conviction.

The article, "Mrs. Otepka Recalls Ordeal," from the Washington Star of April 27, 1969, and written by Vera Glaser, insert in the RECORD at this point:

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.

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."

CITIZENSHIP AND THE STUDENT'S ROLE IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly besieged by news stories telling us something is wrong with the youth of today. These stories seldom tell us how many of these young people are growing to be useful citizens.

A young man in the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina suffered a tragic swimming accident 3 years ago at the exciting age of 17.

For many days Sidney White was not expected to live and even now he is completely paralyzed from the waist down. Nevertheless, by his own courage and fortitude he has refused to accept the verdict of his doctors that he would never

again be able to sit or stand. Today he does both, though he is mostly confined to a wheelchair.

But Sidney, the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil White of Rockingham, N.C., is not content to mark his growth in physical progress alone. He has been accepted by St. Andrews College of Laurinburg, N.C., with a goal of becoming a high school English teacher.

To prove his capabilities for this vocation, Sidney recently won first in the Civitan Essay Contest for area No. 6—the North Carolina District West. A district victory would place him in competition for international honors.

I am pleased and honored to be able to present his essay for all to read:

CITIZENSHIP AND THE STUDENTS' ROLE IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Sidney O. White)

The youth of today knows clearly what he is opposed to, yet finds difficulty in stating clearly what he favors. It seems that everyone can find something to criticize, something toward which he or she can casually and with little effort direct a discouraging statement. On the other hand, only the sincere and energetic person will take a positive stand. It requires effort to be for something. When one says openly, "I am for this and I will work to see that it happens", he assumes the responsibility of being committed. If such a statement is made in earnest, a hard but often rewarding road lies ahead. The energy with which that person will strive will usually be in direct proportion to the willingness of the person to stand firmly upon his principles. There is a trend in the United States toward standing against everything and for nothing. People are failing to project the proper image.

Wherever you go, whatever you say, you project an image to whomever you meet. Few people are aware of this projection; if they were, they would probably be more conscious of their behavior, for their impression represents what type of citizens they are. No matter how a person conducts himself, and no matter how mischievous he is, that person wants to be recognized. His behavior in itself is evidence of this need. By misbehaving this person is drawing attention to himself. He is doing this in an effort to impress his peers. People are striving for citizenship. The means which they employ are usually a reflection of their standards. Before one can know a proper means toward recognition, he must first set a goal and contrive a method to achieve it.

The first step toward setting a goal is knowing what citizenship is. Citizenship is simply conduct. It is the attitude with which you approach and overcome a problem. It would seem that citizenship boils down to a matter of attitude, so the initial step toward becoming a good citizen is to assume the correct frame of mind. Be a positive thinker, and remember to project a good image. Do this and you cannot go too far astray.

The youth of today must realize his responsibility in becoming a mature, productive citizen. He must become aware of the image which he is projecting. Once this awakening takes place there will be no limit to the potential of our citizens. Within youth lies the energy which is needed to thrust this nation onward. How this energy is directed will determine how our history will be written. Will we progress, or will we regress? We must all labor to be good citizens in order to insure progress, and we must place our youth clearly in the forefront of the struggle. The future is the estate inherited by youth; and as Americans, our heritage is proud. Let us see that it remains proud for posterity!

As a student, your role in the United States should be clear. You are tomorrow's America. Take your positive stand and work for a better United States, never forgetting the past, and always looking ahead. Profit by your nation's mistakes, rather than dwelling upon them. Be a citizen of America—not just a member of its government! Love her as a mother, for she has given you freedom—a gift often valued above life itself.

THERE IS RESPONSIBILITY IN MOTION PICTURE DISTRIBUTING

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, these days we hear much of what is evil in our national life, including how the arts are being utilized to corrupt. Such is not always the case, as the following illustration will show.

Mr. Sheldon Tromberg, president of Boxoffice Attractions, Inc., of this Capital City, has set a different tone by the pictures he chooses to handle, the manner in which he presents them, and the example he sets within his own industry. It is one of his major aims to see to it that first-class entertainment is made available to young people. By the life he leads in business and otherwise, he has brought great credit to his family and industry.

A graduate of Columbia University, he is president of his own enterprise in Washington, and acts as a motion picture reviewer for the Washingtonian magazine. He has spoken before a good many other groups involved in the motion picture industry on the subject of the speech which I am including here for reprinting in the RECORD. This address is a first-rate exposition of the situation our film business and theaters face now, and an outline of what they must do to remain relevant in the future.

The speech was given on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the National Association of the Theater Owners of America in Detroit, Mich. A final note is in order here. Mr. Tromberg is the son of the family which has operated Tromberg's Department Store in Bensonhurst, at West 10th Street and Avenue O, Brooklyn, N.Y., for the past 40 years. He is a credit to these people, who have been an institution in their neighborhood for all these years.

The speech follows:

MOVIES: THE THIRD ACT OF THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Sheldon Tromberg)

Who will write the 3rd act of the motion picture industry in the 20th century?

We see a new generation of Americans attuned to the visual arts: They have seen the light! Have we seen the light?

They are a new breed Artistotoleans.

They tell us that images, of whatever sort, have a cathartic effect.

They tell us that what they see visually allows the human mind to release impulses and aggressions.

The 1st act of the 20th century began with a movie show at Koster and Bials and, then to the opening of the first movie theater in Los Angeles.

Immigrant Americans learned the English language through subtitles on films.

Movies were the mass entertainment. They harnessed the dreams and hopes of the working classes.

People were concerned with structure, plot, content and spectacle. They were Platoists. The first act ended with a revolt.

The flaming youth of the 1920's and 1930's revolted against the deadly, dull lives of their parents. They demonstrated for greater freedom of speech and personal relations.

Motion pictures reflected their preoccupation with petting parties, new dances and fast cars.

Film-going became a necessity as an outlet for the entertainment and awakening learning processes.

The 2nd act of the 20th century began on the street corner apple carts of our major cities. Depression-bound and depression-minded, America's film audiences were "treated" to gala screen achievements—color—sound—and stars!

All these ingredients were guaranteed to mask and relieve their depression. It was sporadic cinema sluiced and spiced for mass consumption, and bought with gusto.

The 2nd act ended with the influence of European film-makers—just as the 1st act began with the influence of European immigrant audiences.

America's experiences during the 2nd World War brought on a new wave of realism.

The film, "The Best Years of Our Lives" brought down the curtain on the 2nd act, the act that began with "The Jazz Singer."

And now, we have, generically speaking, films everywhere! Television, homes, hotels, ships at sea, planes in the sky, trains on the rails, submarines beneath the oceans, space-ships in the outer world, hospitals, country clubs, schools, prisons and theatres.

And, it's still the cinema that remains the mother religion—it is still cinemas that set the patterns and create customers for film everywhere.

Movies have become the outlets for rebellion. Once again, the battle is aimed against the traditionally structured society.

America's movie goers are "tuning out" the story and "tuning in" on their environment. They are "groovy". They are visceral. They don't hear the dialogue—their receptors are tuned to the changing scenes, the shapes and motions, the sounds and lights that are flashed on the screen.

They are concerned with the totality of images. They want to experience and feel what they are seeing, rather than intellectualize.

They are boxoffice existentialists.

As Karl Baedeker put it, "There is a need for a balance between the world inside us and the world outside us. It is a reciprocal process: Both worlds form a single one".

Motion picture courses are the hottest elective subjects on our college campuses—with a present enrollment of about 60,000 and with the thousands growing monthly, the young are politicizing; they practice the art of controversy.

They believe that man makes his own way in the World and leads his own life thru conflicts, seeking identity thru blunders.

This new generation of indigenous Americans have their own films rising from an underground. There are films fractionalized to satisfy every sub-culture in American society.

Who will be the film leaders in the 3rd act? How will they react to the 3rd act?

Will they give us giant cartoon-sized films, filled with stupefying trivia, marked for the fast buck?

Will they give us narcotic fantasies rendering our lives relatively simple?

Will they pursue the idea that great art evokes great emotions?

Will they bureaucratize, pasturize, homogenize and alphabetize movies as if brand-

ing films is as easily done as candling eggs and grading meat?

Will they be opulent opuscles or frizzy fritherers or anonymously euphoric conglomerate choruses of political and corporate functionaries?

Movies remain entertainment in a world of new social freedoms, technological improvements and scientific advances.

Allow me to give you my recommendations for the 3rd act:

(1) I suggest that motion pictures be taught as an art form on screen and thru books and be included in all grade school curriculums much as music is taught.

(2) We see book and stageplay reviews for children: book and stageplay reviews for teenagers and book and stageplay reviews for adults covering many pages in our nations publications. We see record and concert reviews for children, for teenagers, for classical and pop music fans in our nation's newspapers. 8 million sailors and 11 million golfers get much more space in our publications than our 40 million theatre movie goers, besides the other millions seeing movies elsewhere. In proportion, then, it seems logical that there should be more separate and specialized movie reviews for children, teenagers, and families in our daily newspapers.

(3) For the preservation and growth of the film industry, I would ask for new, major technological improvements in screen sizes and shapes. Over a 40 year period, we might have accomplished more advances than just sound and color, Cinemascope, Cinerama and 70 mm.

(4) The reformation of the motion picture industry will not lead to its regenesis and expansion without its involvement in education. There is a need for the industry to find its place within the nations college level school systems. We need training programs and special educational instruction. I see 2 year post high school courses leading to technological degrees in motion picture management, advertising, promotion, booking, buying, sales, distribution and public relations.

(5) I would ask that theatres keep in mind that movies remain a habit formulated at the earliest age levels! That is a fact of life. There should be a scheduling of quality films for children in theatres built for children for both weekend and full-time showings.

Let us resolve not to make the movie screen a "witch box" for shoddy entertainment.

We at Boxoffice Attractions have embarked on a program concerned with family films, making them a substantive and major force in the leisure world market.

Our first venture, "The Children's Film Festival"—a movie party for every boy and girl—is now playing theatres across the nation. (It opens in 48 theatres in Michigan this weekend and, if we had had the extra prints, we would have been able to fill the more than 100 playdates submitted to our distributor.)

It is attracting audiences, strikingly enough, composed of 1/3 adults. It is the first matinee movie show for children to have been submitted to the nation's critics, and to have received consistently rave reviews in all sections of our daily newspapers.

I am pleased to receive your "special award of appreciation" "for the children's film festival" and I hope that exhibitors around the nation continue to support me and others concerned with quality family films. For, it is clearly in that area that your future will stand or fall.

The film you play in your theatres today will be seen as mass entertainment on television in the future. Today's average grammar school graduate has seen 3,500 hours of T.V.; the average high school graduate has seen 15,000 hours of T.V. and 5,000 hours of films. If you press for and consistently book self-serving pornography and bloody, violence drenched films, you will be unwittingly

pre-selling these films as television bonanzas for their producers. They will make good use of you as a respectable group of community minded Americans; salesmen for profitable producer T.V. sales. And, when the sexiest "X" and "double X" films are shown on T.V. within the next act, what will you do for an encore?

Will you be left with "triple X" films and have the cinema labeled "censored to the community"? or "off-limits in this neighborhood"?

You've got some things to plan for before the curtain closes on the 3d act of the 20th century; and one is whether or not families in suburban communities and satellite cities will be curious enough about buying tickets to your theatres anymore and whether you will be a priority entertainment factor.

There are alternatives to sending them to their film cartridge projectors and pay T.V. sets in their family recreation rooms during the 3d act just as you set them up for T.V. during the 2d act.

Do something about it now or prepare to fall into the orchestra pit before the 3d act ends. Your profession as showmen must remain young enough not to yield to a pattern of "don't fold, spindle or mutilate."

Showmanship is a unique, individualistic and creative profession. And movies at cinemas are the quintessence of showmanship.

COMPLETE PEACE IN ETERNAL LIFE

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, S. Burman Long, D.D., of my home city of Worcester, Mass., a most distinguished theologian, is the registrar of the Massachusetts Association of the United Church of Christ and the minister of the Hope Congregational Church of Worcester.

Dr. Long recently extended, through a letter to the editor of the Worcester, Mass., Evening Gazette newspaper, that appeared in the April 15, 1969, issue, his very timely and most thought-provoking remarks on the incompleteness of life on this troubled earth, which I include in the RECORD at this point:

THE FUTURE LIFE AS A FULFILLMENT

To the EDITOR:

The item, "Ike Left An Unfinished Volume," in The Gazette April 8 that states that former President Eisenhower had the object of completing a book even after he was hospitalized last May and that "he had worked with zeal and the perfection of a professional writer before the doctors ruled out any further work on the volume."

That attitude on the part of the former president and general testifies to my theory that man never completes himself on earth and that it is an intimation within the soul of the reality and need for the future life.

Here on earth we never get complete justice, complete love, a complete home or complete friendships. We want to live on in our minds which needs immortality in the Greek sense and Eternal Life in the Christian. That requires the future life to complete the life on earth is within the plan of God for every person.

The future life is spiritual, of course, but our minds have spiritual connotations and the future life will be real. Easter is a reminder that Jesus is the first fruits of the

Resurrection. He expected to live on, and we have similar notions of life's completeness. That helps to make this life positive and hopeful.

THE REV. S. BURMAN LONG

87 Monadnock Road,
Worcester

The Reverend Dr. S. Burman Long was born in Carlisle, Pa., and attended high school in Chambersburg, Pa. He earned a B.A. degree from Lebanon Valley College, a B.D. from Union Theological Seminary, and M.A. and D.D. degrees from Syracuse University. He has served as moderator of the New York Congregational Christian Conference; he has been registrar and scribe of the Cheshire Association, New Hampshire; Union Association, New York; and Pilgrim and Worcester Associations in Massachusetts. In addition, he has been president of the Pilgrim Club of Boston, the Ministers' Associations of Syracuse, N.Y.; Quincy, Mass.; and Weymouth, Mass. He is a member of the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JUDSON P. GALLOWAY POST OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, NEWBURGH, N.Y.

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following tribute paid by a former distinguished Member of this House and founder of the American Legion and the chairman of the committee that wrote one of the noblest documents in American history—the preamble to the American Legion constitution. As a matter of fact and interest, former President Harry S. Truman in a conversation with me described it as comparable to Lincoln's Gettysburg address. Hon. Hamilton Fish, Sr. on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Judson P. Galloway Post of the American Legion, Newburgh, N.Y., delivered a speech which I am honored to insert in the RECORD:

Speaking at the 50th anniversary meeting of the Judson P. Galloway Post of Newburgh on Saturday night, March 29th, I paid a tribute to the Legion pioneers who founded that Post, and other Legionnaires who organized posts in other communities throughout Orange County 50 years ago.

I was at that time the first district commander of the American Legion whose main function was to appoint a chairman in all of the counties of both the 9th and 3rd judicial districts whose duty it was to organize the Legion. I appointed Ray Egan of Newburgh as the Orange County Commander, and Hon. Arthur Brundage and Hon. Elmer Lemon were the main organizers of the Legion post in Newburgh.

The Legion has grown from a small acorn into a mighty oak with 1,700 posts and over 3 1/2 million members, strictly non-partisan without regard to race, color or creed, composed of veterans who have returned to civilian life. It is today one of the most powerful and influential organizations in America; for God and Country, and in support of the Con-

stitution, Freedom, Justice, Democracy and Peace.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Legion pioneers of Orange County, particularly of Newburgh with whom I was closely associated 50 years ago: Hon. Ray Egan, Hon. Arthur Brundage, Hon. Elmer Lemon, Townsend Cassidy, William McGiffert, Maj. Sheehan, William Stanton, Albert Whitehill, William Penoyer, Jimmy Mulholland, Philip S. Levy, E. Nelson Mooney, Frederick Kingston, Eddy and Milton Zeligfried, Morris Cohen, Terrance Newsone, Bill Joy, Joseph Monihan, Bill Keefe, John Flanagan, John Zimmerman, Edward H. Johnson, Newton J. Flemming, Hon. William Lamont, Ray McDowell, Bill Dehl, Theodore Valleau, Vincent Canade, Frank Gallow, Nicholas Farina, Maj. McKay, Arthur Burnett, William J. Smith, Dr. Charles Reed, John E. McLean, Howard McElrath, Broadway Levenson, Bill Broderick, Tommy Doulin, Terrence McDermott and Alfred McLean. Middletown: Hon. Wilson Van Duzer, John Korchen, Clayton Jones, Dr. Bradner, Sgt. Bailey, Dr. Moses Stivers, Chester: Sanford Durland, Roy Howard, my former orderly, Goshen: Lester Roosa, Augustus Wallace, John B. Connelly, New Windsor: Col. Harry Monell, Highland Falls: Walter Garrison, Walden: T. S. Millspaugh and Homer Stevens. Montgomery: Dan Taft. Port Jervis: Dr. Hamilton. Monroe: Joseph Dally. Cornwall: William Burke.

Many of them have gone on to greener pastures but they were the real founders of the American Legion in Orange County including others who cooperated with them and helped to build one of the greatest organizations in America which will survive as long as Freedom prevails in the United States.

This list was compiled by me with the help of Hon. Arthur Brundage and Hon. Elmer Lemon and will be added to by Hon. Martin McKneally who has agreed to insert it in the Congressional Record along with the remarks I made at the golden anniversary meeting.

In honoring the Legion, I also want to pay tribute to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of which I have been a member for 50 years who also have fought for the same principles of patriotism, Americanism, and for the preservation of Freedom.

If there is any country worth living in, any country worth defending, fighting for, or dying for, it is the United States of America. This, together with the Preamble is the credo of the American Legion. God bless freedom, the American Legion and the United States.

HAMILTON FISH, Sr.

"PUEBLO"-TYPE ELECTRONIC INTELLIGENCE MISSIONS MAY ENDANGER U.S. INTEREST IN MAXIMUM FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent events affecting U.S. intelligence missions off the coast of North Korea, and in view of inquiries now being conducted by committees of the House, I should like to submit for the RECORD some remarks recently made at the 63d annual meeting of the American Society of International Law relating to legal aspects of the *Pueblo* crisis.

On April 24, 1969, the Society sponsored a panel on "The *Pueblo* Crisis: Facts, Law, Policy." Addressing the meeting were Mr. George H. Aldrich, Acting

Deputy Legal Advisor of the Department of State, and Mr. William E. Butler, a research associate of the Harvard Law School and an associate of the Harvard University Russian Research Center. Serving as interrogators were Profs. Jerome A. Cohen and Oliver J. Lissitzyn of Harvard and Columbia Law Schools, respectively. The panel chairman was former U.S. Ambassador Arthur A. Dean.

Mr. Butler, who has published several scholarly articles and a monograph on Soviet approaches to the law of the sea, expressed misgivings about the impact that U.S. electronics intelligence missions as presently constituted may have upon our relations with smaller coastal powers and upon our long-range interest in maximum freedom of the seas. To illustrate his concern, he assumed the role of devil's advocate and suggested a variety of arguments which North Korea might have used in the *Pueblo* seizure and which similarly-situated states may invoke, in one form or another, in the future.

His observations are thoughtful and stimulating and merit serious consideration.

With unanimous consent the text of Mr. Butler's remarks and the New York Times account of the panel session are placed in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1969]
LEGAL SOCIETY TOLD "PUEBLO'S" SEIZURE MAY HAVE BEEN JUSTIFIED

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The American Society of International Law heard arguments today that North Korea and other small countries might be justified in taking drastic action to protect themselves from electronic reconnaissance by the great powers.

William E. Butler, a research associate of the Harvard Law School suggested that "the established law of the seas has been outmoded by the advent of electronic intelligence." He noted that modern monitoring devices could "penetrate to the heart of a country's inland defenses," calling into question the long-standing immunity claimed by reconnaissance vessels on the high seas.

George H. Aldrich, assistant legal adviser of the State Department, argued that by established international law "the *Pueblo*, as a foreign man-of-war, was entitled to absolute immunity from seizure by the North Koreans."

CHANGE IN LAW POSSIBLE

Mr. Butler did not dispute this point, but argued that established law might be changing. "Coastal states cannot be blamed if they view offshore electronics intelligence operations as a substantially new phenomenon in international life," he said.

He argued further that the great powers, with their wealth and technological capabilities, were taking unfair advantage of smaller, poorer countries that could not afford their own reconnaissance systems. The great powers, he said, are engaging in espionage, but claiming an immunity of the high seas intended primarily to protect navigation.

Mr. Butler, who made it clear that he was arguing a case as a lawyer and not necessarily speaking from personal conviction, was challenged by former Ambassador Arthur H. Dean and Prof. Oliver J. Lissitzyn of Columbia.

Professor Lissitzyn asked if "a new norm of law" was developing from the *Pueblo* and EC-121 incidents that entitled coastal states to declare zones from which reconnaissance vessels would be excluded. Mr. Butler replied

that no state had yet done so, but that "we'll just have to wait and see."

Mr. Aldrich sought to justify electronic intelligence as a legal extension of visual observation. "A state cannot prohibit a passing vessel from looking at the shore through field glasses," he said.

IRRELEVANCE POSSIBLE

He conceded that long-standing distinctions in the law of the seas might not be relevant in the era of electronic reconnaissance. For instance, the difference between 12 miles offshore and 15 miles offshore—the first a possible intrusion, the second not—makes little or no difference to radio monitoring vessels.

Ambassador Dean, the chairman of the panel, noted that much of the law of the seas had been formulated in the era of sailing ships, when a three-mile limit or, later, a 12-mile limit was generally considered to offer adequate protection to a coastal state.

Another convention at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, the Federal Power Bar Association, heard Clark M. Clifford, former Secretary of Defense, defend the necessity for great powers to collect intelligence.

"If a nation is getting reasonably accurate intelligence, it is less likely blindly to strike out at some country it thinks is its enemy; it is less likely to be disturbed by rumors and guesswork and so, in a moment of hysteria or deep concern, launch an all-out effort," Mr. Clifford said.

"Intelligence collection stabilizes the relationship among nations; intelligence gathering is an aid toward peace and not a hindrance toward peace."

THE "PUEBLO" CRISIS: SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS

(By William E. Butler, Research Associate, Harvard Law School)

If we are to have a meaningful discussion of the legal aspects of the seizure of the *Pueblo*, it must be asked whether there is any merit at all in international law for the position taken by North Korea. Let me, therefore, assume the role of devil's advocate and outline for your consideration the range of arguments North Korea or a state similarly-situated might have made in response to the legal position of the United States in the *Pueblo* crisis.

The *Pueblo* incident raises legal issues of great scope and diversity. It would be possible to list these in the time allotted to me but not to explore their complexity and their ramifications. Hence, the decision to confine this presentation primarily to legal aspects of the seizure and detention of the vessel.

The United States Government bases its contention that the *Pueblo* seizure was illegal on the time-honored rule of international law that a naval vessel on the high seas enjoys absolute immunity from all but flag-state jurisdiction. This rule is also embodied in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas, said to be generally declaratory of established principles of international law. Non-recognition of North Korean statehood by the United States and the fact America was influential in excluding North Korea from participating in the preparation and adoption of the Convention may complicate our position, but, by representing itself to be a member of the international community and by failing expressly to reject the rule of absolute immunity of warships, North Korea presumptively is bound to respect that rule.

Ironically, it is socialist states which are the vanguard of those insisting upon the total immunity of state vessels. Article 18 of the Rules for Visits by Foreign Warships to USSR Territorial Waters calls for first a warning and then a request to leave if a foreign warship violates established rules, including the rule prohibiting unauthorized entry into Soviet territorial waters. Writings

by Chinese jurists indicate that the People's Republic of China also recognizes the extra-territorial status of warships in law and practice.

It is noteworthy that the Soviet and Chinese press, in reporting the Pueblo seizure, made no reference to customary international law or the Geneva Conventions of 1958. The North Korean version of the seizure, the "confession" of Captain Bucher, and the North Korean legal position were reported factually, without editorial gloss. The affair was accorded brief treatment and then ignored. One gained the distinct impression that the Soviet Union did not care to publicize or discuss any legal implications of the Pueblo incident, an understandable reaction considering the sizable Soviet fleet of electronics research vessels. The reasons for Chinese silence may have related to disruption attendant with the cultural revolution or may have reflected Chinese realization that if the North Korean action were sanctioned, the PRC would be expected to follow suit when an American warship infringed Chinese territorial waters.

Implicit in the United States attitude is the notion that the conduct of visual and electronic surveillance of a coastal state by a vessel on the high seas is not a marked departure from the traditional practice of maritime powers in peacetime. Undoubtedly, it has been customary for warships to hover offshore of other states, to chart coastal defenses, to observe with telescope and camera the movements of shipping, details of harbor installations, and so forth. But coastal states cannot be blamed if they view offshore electronics intelligence operations as a substantially new phenomenon in international life. A vessel such as the Pueblo not only carries away visual impressions of the external appearance of a country along the coast; it pierces the very interstices of the defense establishment by monitoring inland communications, by identifying—perhaps jamming—inland radar installations, and by performing the variety of other tasks for which electronics surveillance is suited. The result is that the flag state of the intelligence vessel obtains vastly more detailed, composite data on the defense establishment of the coastal nation than the latter can obtain on the observing state, unless the coastal state also has the resources and know-how to engage in reciprocal activity. Under such circumstances, it is hardly unexpected for small coastal countries to question the appropriateness of granting absolute immunity to electronics intelligence vessels or to seek other means for redressing their comparative technological disadvantage in advanced electronics.

By what rationale might coastal states attempt to exercise some degree of legal competence over electronics surveillance by sea as a response to such activity? One tempting approach would be to seek analogies in actions against pirate broadcasting or in the concept of "nuisance"; but intelligence vessels are state-owned and there is no "vacuum" of jurisdiction as in the case of some pirate broadcasting cases. A second approach might draw upon the rationale of domestic precedents relating to wiretapping and eavesdropping. American courts have tended to reject the applicability of trespass in such cases, implying that the reception of sound waves by devices outside property boundaries did not violate the close. Instead, they have placed severe restrictions on the use of data obtained by such means. But in the international community, once intelligence data is obtained there is no way of restricting how it may be used; moreover, the principle of sovereignty, which is a territorial concept, is central to the exercise of state jurisdiction. Resting the legality of electronics intelligence by sea on whether a vessel is merely receiving, as distinguished from sending, energy impulses across a state

boundary would be an unacceptably artificial solution and difficult to supervise. Given these considerations, small coastal states may be reasonably expected to resort to a territorially-based response by establishing broad contiguous "security" zones in which electronics intelligence activities by foreign vessels would be prohibited.

Security zones have been employed in the past to cope with technological change and have received legal sanction. They are now a constituent part of air law; they have been invoked to close areas of the high seas for missile or nuclear tests; the Soviet Union created such a zone in 1928 to prohibit wireless radio broadcasting from ships within ten miles of Soviet coasts. Yet the International Law Commission rejected such zones in drafting its Articles on the law of the sea, fearing widespread abuses. After the Pueblo incident, Soviet intelligence vessels were seized by coastal authorities off Latin America on at least two separate occasions. It is not clear whether these were warships or where exactly they were seized, but they were state-owned vessels.

There is, of course, another response to electronics intelligence. Although not yet elevated to legal precedent, it is found in recent state practice. In two cases prior to the Pueblo, United States destroyers conducting electronics intelligence in the Gulf of Tonkin off North Vietnam and a U.S. intelligence vessel on the high seas off Israel were allegedly attacked without warning by the aggrieved coastal state. In the latter instance, grave losses of life and property were inflicted. A surprise armed attack of this character is clearly a disproportionate response to the threat posed by an electronics intelligence vessel, but it nevertheless is illustrative of the magnitude of concern felt by the coastal state.

Within this range of alternatives, is there any merit to the legal case postulated by North Korea in justification of its response to the Pueblo? From the North Korean point of view, the Pueblo was one in a series of electronics intelligence missions conducted off its coasts. On January 9, 1968, two weeks before the Pueblo was seized, North Korea broadcast a protest against the intrusion of armed vessels mingled with fishing boats, all allegedly under escort by armed warships, into its coastal waters. This was one indication that intelligence data was being gathered in the area under several guises. Moreover, although the Pueblo was under specific secret orders not to penetrate the North Korean 12-mile belt of territorial waters, missions prior to the Pueblo were apparently authorized by a general order dated February 28, 1966, to approach up to 3-miles of the North Korean coast.

The public record is not yet clear as to whether the Pueblo may have unintentionally intruded into North Korean waters. The North Korean claim that the Pueblo was seized 7.6 miles from the coast has been rebutted by evidence released by the United States. On the other hand, American reports on both the point of seizure and on the furthest penetration landward are inconsistent. Furthermore, testimony at the Court of Inquiry revealed the Pueblo's main navigational system developed errors as great as five miles. Even though other aids were frequently employed by Pueblo officers, there is no absolute assurance that at some point the vessel did not violate the North Korean boundary.

Thus, if it is assumed that the Pueblo did enter North Korean territorial waters and further assumed that North Korea regarded the Pueblo's intrusion as being in defiance of prior North Korean protests against the activity of similar vessels, seizure of the Pueblo in territorial waters would not appear to be an excessive coastal state reaction, considering that the vessel might have been attacked without warning. Under such cir-

cumstances, it is difficult to imagine effective measures short of seizure that North Korea might have taken. North Korea is not a party to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea, and the requirement of Article 23 of that Convention stipulating that foreign warships failing to comply with coastal state regulations are to be escorted from territorial waters is not, so far as I am aware, a principle of customary international law.

Assuming the Pueblo did not violate North Korean territorial waters, is there nevertheless any legal case to be made for seizure of the Pueblo on the high seas as a response to or defense against electronics intelligence? North Korea characterized the Pueblo seizure as a "decisive measure of self defense." A right of self defense has always been recognized by international law, although more recently the exercise of the right as a matter of law has been restricted to instances of armed attack or, perhaps, an immediate threat of armed attack. Apprehension of the introduction of Soviet missiles into Cuba led the United States to invoke the principle of collective self defense and to establish a naval quarantine in 1962. At stake was probably not a threat of armed attack, but a fundamental reordering of the balance of power in the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere. The principles of self defense and freedom of the seas acquired a new dimension as a result of the Cuban crisis. North Korea's situation is indeed different, yet the threat to its defense establishment perceived by North Korea in the operations of the Pueblo and similar vessels may have been as imminent as the Cuban threat was to us. North Korea was confronted by vessels which penetrated the heart of its defense network and which were operated by its primary adversary in the Korean conflict. To conclude the Pueblo posed no threat of armed attack against North Korea begs the question; the threat posed by the Pueblo was the acquisition of data that could render the coastal state defense establishment vulnerable. The problem of secrecy is something with which all states must live, but they live with it to an unequal degree. North Korea possessed no comparable capability to obtain equivalent data on the United States defense system. If there is no precedent or scholarly support for invoking self defense in this kind of situation, neither is there a large body of experience with this kind of enormous technological gap which presently exists between naval powers and smaller coastal powers.

It should be noted that the Pueblo incident did not occur under normal peacetime conditions. In describing the Pueblo's intrusion as an "act of aggression, a violation of sovereignty, and a gross violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement," North Korea probably had in mind an actual penetration of Korean territory by the vessel. But these accusations might be construed to have broader meaning.

The Preamble to the Korean Armistice Agreement provides for a cessation of hostilities and all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peaceful settlement is achieved. Article 15 stipulates the Agreement shall apply to all opposing naval forces, which "naval forces shall respect the waters contiguous to . . . the land area of Korea under the military control of the other side . . ." The definition or limit of "contiguous waters" is not specified, but the failure to use the term territorial waters surely is suggestive. Under this reading of the Agreement, electronics intelligence might be interpreted to be a hostile act, as distinguished from an act of armed force, in North Korean coastal waters. A strained interpretation of the text, perhaps, in light of its negotiating history, but hardly beyond the pale of reason. However, such an interpretation would raise other, exceedingly complex, legal issues as well. For example, was the United States a belligerent

in Korea, or do we continue to distinguish between the United Nations Command and the United States? Politically speaking, North Korea has regarded the United States as being primarily responsible for the Korean hostilities and, from the viewpoint of international law, there is an arguable case for treating the United States as a belligerent. Indeed, since North Korea itself was engaging in probes across the demilitarized zone, it may have been all the more apprehensive about the Pueblo's presence.

Underlying all my remarks up to this point are two assumptions contrary to those implicit in the position of the United States: first, that electronics intelligence does constitute a revolutionary departure over previous technology; second, that the Pueblo crisis was not just another "cold war" incident but rather was a clash between the interests of a major naval power and a small coastal state. It is especially the latter point that gives cause to reconsider the legal implications of stationing intelligence vessels near states unable to operate such missions themselves. Technological superiority allows major powers to gather intelligence while claiming immunity from coastal response by invoking principles of maritime law pre-dating the electronics revolution. We cannot expect to indulge in such activities without retaliation from disadvantaged countries. The principle of freedom of the seas has always represented a delicate balance between coastal state and international interests. Unless electronics intelligence activities are confined to states with an equivalent capability or are otherwise circumscribed to reduce the threat to technologically "backward" countries, the major powers may do themselves and the international community a great disservice by irreparably disrupting that balance to the detriment of freedom of navigation. As pressure mounts to convene a new international conference to resolve the territorial sea issue, the impact of electronics intelligence missions on the attitudes of smaller maritime countries deserves constant and careful reappraisal.

Three further aspects of the Pueblo crisis deserve mention. The Pueblo was disguised as a (naval) oceanographic research vessel; yet many have disputed the notion of a clandestine operation by asserting that mere visual observation was sufficient to clearly identify the Pueblo as a naval vessel equipped with electronics intelligence equipment. If this be true, why further jeopardize our non-military oceanographic research program by pretending, however transparently, that the Pueblo and its sister ships are something they are not?

Moreover, we know disturbingly little about North Korean approaches to international law in general or to the law of the sea in particular. North Korea does claim a 12-mile limit of territorial waters and since 1966 has enforced a 70-mile fishing zone against Japanese vessels. Copies of legislation defining these limits appear to be unavailable in the West. It is unclear whether North Korea measures its territorial waters from the low-water mark or employs straight base lines. The Soviet Union uses the former method, and Mainland China the latter, but China, not being a party to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea, drew its lines so that a much larger expanse of water is enclosed than would be allowed by the Geneva Convention rules. North Korea may follow Chinese practice, but, in order to make the seizure of the Pueblo more plausible to the international community, it may have given false coordinates to minimize differences in legal theory. This is all speculation, of course, and there may be no theoretical differences as to where the territorial sea begins on North Korean coasts. Perhaps the academic community will help develop a systematic body of materials on the approach of North Korea and similarly situated states to international law.

By insisting that the Pueblo was engaged in lawful activity on the high seas, the United States implied that electronics intelligence activity within territorial waters could justifiably be considered unlawful espionage by the coastal state. The United States objection to the North Korean document which was signed to secure the release of the Pueblo crew, and the basis for its immediate repudiation, was that "we could not apologize for actions which we did not believe took place." Therefore, signature of the document "will not and cannot alter the facts." While this formulation disposes of our "admissions," it leaves intact the fourth paragraph of the North Korean document wherein firm assurance is given "that no U.S. ships will intrude again in the future into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea." A logical reading of the phrase would be the territorial waters claimed by North Korea, and it would appear that the United States may have extended its first formal recognition to a 12-mile limit.

There remains the question of return of the vessel. The United States insists the vessel be returned since its seizure was illegal; North Korea insists upon its right to confiscate the Pueblo as a spy ship. One approach toward resolving these intractable legal postures may be quietly but firmly to point out to North Korea through all available diplomatic channels that violence has been done to a socialist principle of international law—the absolute immunity of state-owned vessels—and that it would be to North Korea's long-term international legal interests to release the ship.

These reflections do not begin to exhaust the legal and policy dimensions of the Pueblo incident. There remain vexing questions of the legal status of the Pueblo crew while in captivity, the applicability of the Code of Conduct to military personnel on the vessel, the role of apology in diplomatic practice and international law, and others. Having a fuller public record will be of immense assistance in responding to all of these issues. Until we do have it, reflections must remain tentative, subject to revision.

FORESTRY IMPORTANCE GIVEN EMPHASIS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Second Congressional District were privileged and honored to play host at Lee, Fla., in Madison County on April 17 to the "silver anniversary" cooperative field forestry program sponsored by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad.

This program brings together business and governmental leaders to again emphasize the importance of forestry to this Nation and to the world economy. I can think of no finer presentation than the two which I have witnessed in my district since coming to the Congress.

We have passed the day when sawmills cut over an area and left a desolate and denuded landscape. Today we recognize the value of scientific tree farming and the need to keep these lands in a productive condition.

In attempting to tell the story of this outstanding day, let me begin with the insertion of the remarks of Robert N. Hoskins, assistant vice president, Sea-

board Coast Line Railroad, who opened the program with these introductory remarks:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS FOR THE 1969 CO-OPERATIVE FIELD FORESTRY PROGRAM, APRIL 17, MADISON COUNTY, FLA.

(By Robert N. Hoskins, assistant vice president, Containerization and Special Projects, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., Richmond, Va.)

Governor Kirk, Members of the Cabinet, Distinguished Platform Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It has been said, "There will always be a frontier where there is an open mind and a willing hand." Looking back over the years, we have found many willing hands who have helped towards the success of these meetings.

We realized in the early years of our Co-operative Field Forestry Programs that changes must be made—and, in so doing, we discarded the idea that past routine . . . past ways of doing things . . . are probably the best ways. On the contrary, in handling our cooperative programs over the years we discovered early that there are better ways of doing almost everything.

Those of you who recall our early woods meetings will be the first to concede that they have come a long way. This year marks our "Silver Anniversary," so to speak—and, in 25 years of sponsoring such meetings as you are about to witness today, our main objective still lies in strengthening the economy of each state we serve. We recognize the importance of forestry to the economy in Florida and this will be clearly pointed out by many of those participating today.

We are well aware that more than 60 per cent of the lands in the area served by our railroad are classed as timber crop lands. We know that if we are to meet the needs of our people for today and tomorrow, then every effort must be made to keep those lands in a productive condition. This calls for total land use and sound management practices.

Never before in the 25 year history of our program have so many from such a wide diversity of interests been united in the common cause of forestry betterment. Our program affords a rare opportunity to find out what is going on in forestry today. It is truly a cooperative endeavor.

This year, for the first time, our program is being expanded to include "Containerization." With the world getting "smaller" all the time, you will surely welcome an opportunity to explore the new "intermodal concept of transportation." You have perhaps already discovered in our midst some of the distinguished Counselors of Shipping from the Embassies in Washington, D.C., as well as Port Officials and Executives from the Steamship Lines who are with us in honor of the occasion.

This actually marks the ninth year in which we have run special trains in connection with these meetings—and again, as in the past, we are highly gratified to have outstanding representation from the Florida Legislature.

We bid you all welcome—we are delighted to have such a fine turnout—and we do plan to run this meeting on time.

Now it is my privilege to introduce to you a man who is well known in Transportation circles throughout the nation. He holds directorships too numerous to mention. He is a Major General in the U.S. Army Reserves. He has served with distinction as the President of three railroads—and he is today the distinguished President of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company. It is a pleasure for me to present to you at this time—your friend and mine—W. Thomas Rice.

Mr. Speaker, George Wackendorf, business editor of the Florida Times-

Union, Jacksonville, wrote an excellent article which described the event:

LEE.—Mushrooming population, shrinking forests and the need for broad national agreement on multiple use of timber lands key-noted the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad's (SCL) "forestry day" near this Madison County town Thursday.

The note was sounded by Gene C. Brewer, former president of U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers Inc. and a member of its board, in the principal address in an event and celebrity-studded gathering celebrating the forestry industry.

Special guests for the occasion, more formally called the cooperative field forestry program, were more than 500 top executives and legislators from 25 states and six foreign countries. They arrived in droves by special train from Jacksonville and bus from Tallahassee and stayed four hours, from 10 a.m. till 2 p.m., for a program which included speeches, displays and demonstration built about forestry—Florida's No. 2 industry.

Gov. Claude Kirk was on hand for a brief welcome to the guests after an introduction by SCL President W. Thomas Rice in which Kirk was described as an outstanding wit, a completely fearless man and a great governor "who let's you know where you stand." Rice also introduced Brewer and U.S. Rep. Don Fuqua, who made brief remarks.

The SCL president was presented with an honorary membership in the Florida Association of the Future Farmers of America by State President Tim Kelly, who cited support the group has received from SCL.

It was the 25th anniversary of the Seaboard's forestry program and the second run of the "Forestry Special" train in Florida since its inauguration nine years ago.

The site of this year's program in the SCL's continuing efforts to encourage woodland owners to practice sound management in their timberlands, was near Lee, Fla., a half mile east of the St. Regis woodyard, on property of the Container Corporation of America.

Twenty-eight corporations and government agencies cooperated in the presentations.

In his address, Brewer called for the continuing of cooperation between the private sector and government agencies in working toward multiple land use—that is the use of the nation's timberlands for timber harvesting as well as recreation and conservation.

"With respect to our industry, the sheer arithmetic of our forest base is sobering," Brewer said. Turning to statistics, he pointed out that in 1901 with a population of 77.5 million, there were 11 acres of growing timber per capita. Today there are 200 million Americans with three acres per capita and by the year 2000 "and that is only 31 years away, less time than it takes a tree to grow—it is estimated that there will be only 1.5 acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of more than 300 million people."

The U.S. Plywood-Champion Paper executive cited both the increasing need for land to provide housing and road systems for an expanding population but the continuing withdrawal of forest lands from use by the timber industry to provide recreational areas.

Although Brewer referred only obliquely to the forces of the conservationists, noting that the industry has been plagued of late with "confrontations," the seriousness of lack of public understanding of the need for timber-cutting in the economy was underlined throughout his talk.

He said that since the establishment of national forests in 1897, about 16 million acres of producing timberlands have been closed to harvesting. Since 1964, he said in the 12 Western states alone, 1.9 million acres, or 21 billion board feet of timber, have been lost to the industry. Over the next

five years, he said, present plans call for another 9.7 million acres, or almost 31 billion board feet, to be taken out of production.

With 70 percent of the population living on 2 percent of the land in urban centers, he said, most of the public has "some vague idea about preserving the trees and saving the forests. And yet they want their plywood and their paper and all the other products."

The speaking stand at the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad's ninth annual cooperative field forestry program was well-populated by the prominent.

Among the speakers was master of ceremonies Robert N. Hoskins, SCL assistant vice president of containerization and special projects; Milton M. Byran of the U.S. Forest Service; State Forester C. H. Coulter, State Director of Agricultural Education, C. M. Lawrence; and Vice President George G. McManis of the Trailmobile Division of Pullman Inc.

Demonstrations, which included a fire-bombing show by the Florida Forest Service, were staged by Lee Draper, of Fernandina Beach, Container Corp. of America; Charley J. Rogers of Jacksonville, St. Regis Paper Co.; H. K. Mikell of Tallahassee, Florida Forest Service; P. D. Kidd of Palatka, Hudson Pulp and Paper Co.; James L. Buckner of Panama City, International Paper Co.; D. W. House of Atlanta, Southern Wood Preserving Co.; Robert Entzinger of Tallahassee, U.S. Forest Service; Henry B. Lange and John L. Smith of New York, ITT Rayonier, Inc.; James A. Edsen of Jacksonville, Owens-Illinois Inc.; James R. Moody of Perry, Buckeye Cellulose Corp.; John Beall of Tallahassee, St. Joe Paper Co. Inc.; Alton H. McCullough, of Charleston, S.C., Koppers Co. Inc.; L. H. Scott Jr. of Jacksonville, SCL; Frank E. Frasier, of Pittsburgh, U.S. Steel Corp.; and Dave Rawls and Charles E. Cook of Jacksonville Port of Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate at this point to insert the very excellent resolution adopted by the Florida Legislature acknowledging the importance of the day:

H. CON. RES. 455

Concurrent resolution acknowledging invitation to members and officials of the Florida Legislature to attend the 1969 Cooperative Forestry Field Day Program of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company to be held near Lee, Florida, in Madison County on Thursday, April 17, 1969

Whereas, an invitation has been extended the members and officials of the Florida Legislature by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Company to attend as special guests the Cooperative Forestry Field Day Program on Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 10 a.m. in Lee, Florida, and

Whereas, this occasion will bring together industrial leaders from major corporations across the country as well as international trade officials and representatives of foreign governments, and

Whereas, The Forestry Field Day Program will include presentations on all aspects of modern forest management and the manufacture of forest products, and

Whereas, transportation of forest and other products particularly through the use of the significant development in world trade of containerized freight and the facilities planned for such modern transport in Florida will be highlighted in the program, and

Whereas, this program will provide an unparalleled opportunity to members of the Legislature and to the invited business and trade leaders to participate together in exploring the vast potential of Florida's forest assets and its unique attributes for shipping and international trade, and

Whereas, the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad has offered transportation to the site of the program and has made extensive

preparations for the visit of members of the Legislature. Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, the Senate Concurring:

That the members of the House of Representatives and the members of the Senate of the State of Florida appreciate and acknowledge the invitation to the Cooperative Forestry Field Day Program to be held Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 10 a.m. near Lee, Florida, in Madison County under the sponsorship of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, and those members who are able to do so will attend this program.

Be it further resolved that the Legislature extends its commendation to the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad for the significant effort it is making in this program to assist and encourage the further development of industry and international trade in Florida.

Originated in the House of Representatives; adopted by the House of Representatives on April 9, 1969 and has been examined and found to be correctly enrolled.

Mr. Speaker, at this point let me pay tribute to the outstanding cooperating industries and agencies who made this event possible. They are as follows:

- ACF Industries, Inc.
- Buckeye Cellulose Corp.
- Container Corp. of America.
- Florida Association, Future Farmers of America.
- Florida Department of Agriculture.
- Florida Department of Education.
- Florida Forest Service.
- Florida Forestry Association.
- Florida Power Corp.
- Forestry Service Products, Inc.
- Hudson Pulp & Paper Corp.
- ITT Rayonier, Inc.
- International Paper Co.
- Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce.
- Jacksonville Committee of 100.
- Jacksonville Port Authority.
- Koppers Company, Inc.
- Madison County (Fla.) Forestry Committee.

- Morbark Industries, Inc.
- Owens-Illinois, Inc.
- Ring Power Co.
- St. Joe Paper Co.
- St. Regis Paper Co.
- Southern Wood Preserving Co.
- Timberjack Machines, Ltd.
- Trailmobile Division, Pullman, Inc.
- U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Inc.
- U.S. Steel Corp.
- U.S. Forest Service.

Finally, I would like to present for your consideration the remarks of U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers' Gene C. Brewer whose inspirational address was entitled "America's Most Lively Factory: The Forest":

AMERICA'S MOST LIVELY FACTORY: THE FOREST
(An address by Gene C. Brewer at Seaboard Railroad Outing Day, Jacksonville, Fla., April 17, 1969)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen and my fellow citizens: Thank you for asking me to be with you here today. I have a great many personal friends in Florida and it is always a delight for me to renew those friendships, and hopefully make some new ones. Among my friends, of course, I count the men at the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, who first conceived of the annual Forestry Special eight years ago. But while this event is only in its ninth year, the railroad is marking the silver anniversary of its forestry program, and I wish to take this occasion to commend

the Seaboard staff for its ongoing efforts and for taking the lead in what is a true partnership of interests.

So, as I have indicated, people are the reason I am here today. I am here to speak to this audience about a subject of tremendous concern to all of us—the concern of our forest industry about our priceless heritage, our land and our forests, and to advance a concept already adopted by our industry called multiple use.

But I am also here to talk about people in general—all of the people, who together make up this vast nation of ours. I am here to discuss with you what these people want, what they need, what they believe, what they are doing today, and what their desires and needs will be in the future. And I hope to show why our industry must be aware of those needs and respond to them.

But before I talk about the people of today, let me dwell for a moment on two people of antiquity from Greek mythology—a rather famous hero named Hercules, and a giant named Antaeus. This giant derived his strength from the earth, and somehow he became embroiled in a death struggle with Hercules.

Hercules, of course, was a mighty wrestler, and managed to hurl Antaeus to the ground time after time. But Antaeus, since his strength came from the earth, would be revitalized every time he was thrown, and would spring up to renew the battle.

Finally, Hercules had to hold Antaeus aloft and choke him to death.

Like many mythical tales out of mankind's past, the story of Hercules and Antaeus has an obvious moral. We, too, like Antaeus, derive our sustenance and strength from the earth. We too face strangulation unless we can revitalize ourselves through the proper use of our land.

Now let me skip ahead in time, from the days of ancient Greek mythology to the days when America's early settlers reached our shores.

Our forefathers found stretching before them a vast timbered continent, whose very size, shape and form was largely unknown and this ignorance was to the good. Because if they had known the magnitude of the wilderness and the dangers they faced, they might well have despaired.

Here was a land of hostile Indians, wild beasts and none of the comforts of the civilization they left behind.

But here too were wood for their homes, land to be cleared and farmed, game to be eaten, crops to be planted. In short, here was a land to be tamed, to be wrestled with just as Hercules wrestled with Antaeus. Here was a land to be conquered.

And now let us jump ahead again approximately 300 years, to the present, as we continue to examine people and what they want and need. Let us look at the physical and spiritual heirs of the Pilgrim fathers, the 200 million people who make up today's great American citizenry.

Not surprisingly, some of their basic needs and wants have changed very little.

But there is a difference between how we as a nation go about meeting our needs for forest products and how our Pilgrim forefathers turned the trick. They had a land to wrestle with, and to conquer. But the conquest is now complete. The frontier is closed. The endless nation no longer stretches into the horizon ahead of the gaze of the pioneer. In a word, we need no longer battle the land and tame it; instead, we must nurture the land and coax it to provide us with its wealth.

With respect to our industry the sheer arithmetic of our forest base is sobering. And there is no need to go back to the time of the Pilgrims, when the amount of land seemed unending. Let us instead look at this century alone.

In 1901 there were 11 acres of growing timber to supply the per capita needs of a population of 77.5 million. At present there are three acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of 200 million citizens. In the year 2000—and that is only 31 years away, less time than it takes a tree to grow—it is estimated that there will be only 1.5 acres of growing trees to supply the per capita needs of more than 300 million people.

Stated differently, the situation may be summed up like this: as population increases, the available land supply shrinks but needs expand.

That equation poses a problem for us as an industry. How do we supply the lumber, plywood, furniture, pulp, paper, cellulose, chemicals, naval stores, you name it, essential for the welfare of our people, at a time when our land base must also supply us with grazing for our livestock programs; when our land must also grow our grain and corn and sorghum and cotton and soy beans; when the land must be the foundation for our factories, when our residential areas must expand to meet the needs of an ever-increasing population, as must our highway system and our airport programs?

But before I address myself to how we are meeting this challenge, let me set to rest another myth, and this one isn't of ancient Greek origin.

I am talking about the myth that our forest base is fixed; that we enjoy a vast amount of timber on a certain amount of acreage set aside for that purpose.

While the United States does, indeed, have an unchanging amount of territory, we have already seen that the amount of land devoted to tree production is decreasing.

Since the establishment of the national forest in 1897, under law which stated as its purpose, and I quote, ". . . To furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States," some 16 million acres of producing timberlands have been closed to harvesting.

Since 1964, in the 12 Western states alone, one million, nine hundred and nine thousand acres, representing almost 21 billion board feet of timber, have been lost to harvest.

Over the next five years, present plans call for another nine million, seven hundred thousand acres to be taken out of production, representing a loss, over the next five years, of almost 31 billion board feet.

For years we have argued that the nation cannot withdraw acre after acre of woodland from the timber supply and curtail cutting on the remainder while continuing to enjoy an ever-rising degree of wood product use. Until quite recently, our message seemed to fall on deaf ears.

But finally, only last month, President Nixon ordered an increase in the sale of timber on publicly owned land. The federal forest managers were told to allow the harvest of publicly owned timber to rise by more than one billion board feet over the next 15 months.

The President acted primarily in response to a short supply of lumber and plywood and attendant higher prices which quite clearly related to a timber supply problem. But what he was doing, in effect, was recognizing that it is indeed possible to boost timber production on federal lands without doing the land or the forest the slightest harm.

Indeed, along these lines, let it be stated that the chief of the Forest Service, our mutual friend Mr. Edward P. Cliff, is aware that the Federal forests are not being utilized to their fullest.

On Nov. 26, at a hearing of the Small Business Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, Mr. Cliff testified in these words: "On national forest lands, in the Douglas fir region, for example, preliminary results

of a study now under way indicate that the annual allowable cut could be substantially increased gradually over the years. This might be done through an annual program of investing funds to intensify management practices such as commercial thinning, prelogging, salvage, reforestation and timber stand improvement. Much of this would depend on an access road system to do the work where and at the time it is needed."

Later on in his same testimony, Mr. Cliff added, and again I quote:

"In addition to the Douglas fir supply study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on national forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of national forest commercial timberlands."

The forest can indeed be managed to boost her yield. And that, gentlemen, is my basic message today. The forest is, in a sense, a living, viable "factory" manufacturing a whole "line" of vital "products." Indeed, among all of the wonders in the world, the forest is unique, bordering on the miraculous, in that it is our only renewable natural resource. This fact cannot be overstated. Coal, oil, iron ore, copper, natural gas—these are all our other minerals—once they are mined or tapped are lost forever. But the forest responds to cultivation. The practice of forestry restores beauty to the land and makes it yield even more than it did originally.

Bruce Barton, the author of "In His Steps," once said that "if the tree were invented today it would be considered the miracle of the ages."

How true this is: Let us consider, for a moment, the product line of this woodland factory, in addition to the basic wood and paper products for our material needs. Men also need water, and a managed forest provides water. Men enjoy sharing their planet with wildlife, according to the scheme of the Supreme Creator of the universe. The managed forest provides for wildlife. Man requires recreation—a place to meditate and renew his soul. The managed forest provides recreation opportunities and a climate conducive to meditation.

This then is multiple use. Our task remains that of expanding and elaborating on it, making it fully understood so that the motives and programs of our industry, both public and private, need never be questioned.

And the products of these "factories," under man's careful stewardship, need never run out. The factories need never suffer a shortage of materials or market glut or any of the other plagues which hamper most man-made factories.

After all, I believe that God, in His infinite wisdom, created the land, as well as the tree, for the ultimate use of all. I cannot believe that the Lord, and Nature, gave us the tree and its unique and unmatched characteristics without intending that its benefits be available to all the people.

The forest products industry, and the Forest Service, have jointly developed the concept of multiple use as the only way in which this nation, with its fixed land base, can enjoy the forest and obtain at the same time from it the material things our society needs. The multiple use concept has been enacted into law and declared to be public policy by the Congress.

And it was here in the South, where approximately 92 per cent of the timberlands are privately owned, the multiple use concept, which I have chosen to call the living factory concept, was first conceived and has been pursued even more vigorously.

Nationally, those of us in the forest products industry have had to come to grips with a harsh fact. We hold only 17 per cent of the producing forest land. As a result, we

have had to make those lands work all the harder, and have had to push the idea of the living factory. We have had to treat trees like most other crops, applying the most advanced methods to increasing yields and improving stock.

We have applied scientific farming techniques. We have engaged in genetic selection, in thinning, in the application of the best available fertilizer. And we have produced "super trees," which grow stronger and straighter in less time than before. Like good factory managers, we are making our "product" better than ever. We are improving on Bruce Barton's miracle.

But we are not merely timber managers. Our forests can no longer be looked at only as a timber reserve but rather as a manageable asset. In the process of meeting the nation's needs, and in utilizing our "factories" to the fullest, we have become total forest managers. Whether we like it or not, we are also in some ancillary businesses. For example, recreation.

We welcome the hunter and the fisherman and the hiker. We welcome the camper and canoeist, the bird watcher, the seeker of solitude.

A survey conducted only last year revealed that more than 95 per cent of the land studied—some 65.6 million privately owned acres—are open to the public for its use and enjoyment.

And these are not lands designed as parks or wilderness or scenic areas. They are working forests—"factories" turning out products for mankind. They "manufacture" homes and paper and as a sideline turn out a complete variety of watersheds, game preserves, campgrounds and ski trails.

And they are far more productive than lands which have been left for "nature to take its course."

What happens when the practice of forestry is ignored? Without touching on the controversial question of harvesting in the national parks, let me cite a recent letter from the acting superintendent of Yellowstone Park.

He indicates that on the basis of aerial surveys, there are about 111,280 acres of bark beetle infestation affecting one billion, seven hundred million board feet of timber. He estimates that of this infestation, approximately 100 million board feet will probably suffer extensive damage. Similar circumstances have been cited recently in other Western forests.

But we are faced by public apathy and sometimes even animosity on the question of scientific forest management, whether it be called multiple use or the forest factory concept. The why is not hard to see.

Today, some 70 per cent of the population lives on 2 per cent of the land, in our urban centers. These people have some vague idea about preserving the trees and saving the forests. And yet they want their plywood and their paper, and all the other products we have already mentioned.

How many city dwellers are aware of the concept espoused before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, when an industry spokesman stated that forest management involves "skillfully using the forest to serve people," and actually, isn't that really what we must do?

He also made the point that in some places, 200-year-old timber, averaging 50,000 board feet per acre, had stopped growing but was not scheduled for harvest for another 50 years. "If such a stand were harvested and used today," he said, "and replanted and managed, it could grow just about as much wood all over again in the next 50 years."

What he was really saying is that we have the know-how, the technical skills, to make every forest our ideal perpetual factory.

Here in the South, you are especially

blessed because your climate, your soil and the trees themselves all combine for excellent growth.

I recall some years back when the World Forestry Congress was held in Seattle. Several optional field trips were offered to our foreign visitors. They could have gone to the Northwest, or the California Redwoods country, or the Lake States. The Soviet delegation was unique among all attending. Without exception its members asked to go South. They wanted to visit, and I quote ". . . where the trees grow like corn."

The South has a reason to be proud of what its private-enterprise living factories have accomplished. And there is more to come.

For two years, the Southern Pine Association, Southern Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers, Forest Farmers and the American Plywood Association have been cooperating on the report of the Southern Forest Resources Analysis Committee.

The objective of this study is to find ways to more than double the current rate of growth of Southern forests to meet the anticipated demands of the next century. It anticipates that by then, the South will be called upon to supply more than half of the nation's timber products—2½ times the current output. And it intends to meet this goal in the face of yielding up some of its forest lands to the inevitable urban sprawl, to highways, and to all the other uses which modern America finds for her land.

The program would encourage the growth of timber on small lots through altered federal agricultural programs.

The program would develop landowner associations to assemble manageable parcels of private woodlots.

The program would reform the tax structure and assure timber growers of regular income while offering assurances of eventual harvest.

The program includes recreational use of the land and recognizes the urgency of ecological balance.

The program includes such tools of modern management as public relations and research and development.

In short, the program would create our living factories, for the good of all the people.

The forest industry is acutely aware of its responsibilities, and aware of the fact that the American public wants and needs what it produces. The timber industry does not take lightly its obligation to make certain that tomorrow's forest resources will be adequate for tomorrow's needs. The very nature of our business requires long-range planning of the highest order. We are aware too that as stewards of our woodlands, we carry major responsibilities.

And we are also aware and we can be proud that on balance we have been doing a good job which will have to be done even better. In a sense, we can be pleased that the United States today has a per capita paper consumption of 540 pounds per year.

In other advanced countries, such as Sweden and Canada, the figure is also high—over 300 pounds per capita.

But paper consumption in the Soviet Union is only 42 pounds per person annually. And in China, where paper making began, the average consumption is estimated at only six pounds per capita.

So we take pride in the fact that one of our products may be used as the very yardstick of our development as a people—and remember, my theme today concerns people, and how they live and what they need.

People want a roof over their heads, a home if you will. They want factories and offices and commercial buildings, to give them places to work and shop and be entertained. They want schools in which to educate their young. They want churches in which to pray. They want furniture to fill all these structures.

And in all of these wants and more—in more than 5,000 products in everyday use—wood plays a major role.

I said before that most of our people had migrated to only 2 per cent of our land, a fact which the New York Times recently called "a social movement ranking in American history with the wave of immigration from Europe between 1890 and 1930 which brought 22.3 million aliens to our shores." Rural population has dropped from 30.5 million in 1940 to 10 million today. And while this migration of 20 million people from the country to the cities may be near an end, its effects will continue to be with us, in the pressing social need to rebuild our cities, for example.

And this is another of the responsibilities of the forest products industry, which must supply much of the raw material to meet our housing problems. Recent hearings disclosed an astonishing lack of information about these matters—e.g., congressman, etc.

I have already mentioned the responsibilities of the forest products industry, as the steward of America's woodland heritage. And I have briefly described how we are meeting this responsibility, while at the same time we are experiencing difficulty in making the people understand what we are trying to do.

So we keep trying, using forums such as this one. And at the same time we shoulder our responsibility to our employees, our customers, our shareholders. We must make sure our markets are being served as they wish to be served. We must be good businessmen, because the economic aspects of forestry must pay also for the social aspects, which are largely not self-supporting.

And all the while, the forest industry must talk to the passing parade. While modern technology, especially here in the South, has cut the time it takes a tree to grow, in some cases from 60 years to 40, or from 40 to 30, we are still concerned with relatively long periods of time.

As a result, our audience constantly changes. As a youngster, I can remember an old growth timber area which was harvested. Today, that land is yielding its bounty all over again on a sustained yield basis. It is in fact one of those everlasting forest factories, and it has come about in my time.

But the casual observer is not aware of this. He knows only that he wants his forest products, and his wilderness too. Our forest industry must show him he is getting both, due to the techniques so widely and prudently developed here in the South.

As I see it, the real danger is not that tomorrow's America will run out of forest products. We have the skill and the resources as an industry and we are willing to spend the necessary funds to reach our goal.

The real danger lies in losing our contact with the land, as Antaeus did, and in so doing being strangled. The real danger lies in losing sight of the fact that God gave us forests for the benefit of all. The real danger lies in locking up our natural resources and treating them as if they were museum pieces.

Instead, we, the private sector and government agencies working together and we are working together must manage that priceless heritage, our land and its forests, so that they are developed on a perpetual basis to their fullest potential for the good of all.

We must maintain contact with all the users of the forest, and we must reconcile every point of view. Our objective, after all, remains the same: A better life for every American.

A tall order? You bet it is! Let us now get on with managing the liveliest factories in the nation—our forests, for we Americans are excellent factory managers. And as such, I am certain that we can see that the benefits of our forests will be shared by all.

DAVENPORT FLOOD FIGHTERS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Davenport, Iowa, and a number of other cities bordering on the Mississippi River are now engaged in a massive battle against the river. This battle occurs each spring, more or less. Some years it is a minor skirmish, and others, such as this year, it takes on the flavor of an all-out assault. Early predictions by the Weather Bureau indicated that 1969 would be a recordbreaker. Favorable weather conditions have reduced the threat considerably. And, now the crest has passed.

I would be remiss if I did not take notice at this point of the outstanding job done this year by all concerned. The officials on all levels, city, State, and Federal, including the Corps of Engineers, performed marvelously. The cities in my district have never been so well prepared to meet a flood threat. Operation Foresight, under the authority of Public Law 99 has been especially helpful, and those responsible for its organization and operation deserve high praise.

A "well done" is in order for all concerned.

The Christian Science Monitor recently covered the fight against the river in Davenport. Their article does an excellent job of pointing out the caliber of the army fighting this year's "battle."

The article follows:

DAVENPORT FIGHTS SURGING RIVER

(By Guy Halverson)

DAVENPORT, IOWA.—Davenport, Iowa, is under siege. Yet the citizens of this picturesque, hillside town are hurling forth a grim challenge to the surging, swollen Mississippi River: that no matter what the cost in volunteer effort or to the city treasury, the river won't be able to smash through the seven miles of diking now installed along parts of the town's riverfront.

And what's happening in Davenport is being duplicated all along the Mississippi, from St. Paul, Minn., on the north to St. Louis on the south, as federal, state, and local officials mobilize to prevent a recurrence of the severe flooding that engulfed the upper Mississippi basin in 1965.

To the onlooker, the almost inexhaustible activity can only be called heroic as night after night the long truck convoys rumble through the quiet streets, sandbags piled high, college and high-school students perched precipitously in stark silhouette against the evening moonlight. One watches and one recalls old photographs of Leningrad and London under siege and the herculean efforts of their citizens at defense.

CIRCUMSTANCES COMPARED

Indeed, the analogy of a community under attack is hardly an understatement. As of this writing, flooding in the upper Mississippi basin has resulted in 10 fatalities and more than \$110 million in damages. It also has driven some 25,000 people from their homes, mostly in North Dakota.

But perhaps more important damage to date has been below that recorded four years ago, a circumstance attributed to the precautionary measures taken by communities like Davenport.

"In 1965 Davenport was caught almost totally off guard," says Mayor John H. Jebens, who like his father a former mayor, has watched the Mississippi rise and fall, year after year.

"Before 1965 the previous high for the river here was 18.5 feet," he said, leaning back in the office chair after a quick helicopter tour up and down the river. "We just didn't expect the water to top that mark. The [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] didn't give us any hint that it might. And neither did the [U.S.] Weather Bureau until it was too late."

LOSSES NOTED

That year the flood waters crested at 22.5 feet four feet above the previous high crest. Financial losses to the city alone came to more than \$750,000. Though Davenport subsequently received federal disaster areas funds amounting to about \$600,000, the final debt—ironically—wasn't fully paid off until two weeks ago.

Davenport began preparations this year in early February. By the end of March the city had incurred direct costs (excluding salaries for city employees) of more than \$30,000 on flood-abatement measures.

That amount now has soared to between \$60,000 and \$75,000. Main effort has been concentrated in the riverfront "Garden Addition" of the city, which was hardest hit four years ago. At the same time, major retailers, such as Peterson's Department Store, have been ringed by sandbag dikes.

In the Garden Addition, local residents have formed round-the-clock teams to patrol the dike and ensure that the polyethylene and sandbag coverings for the earth filled structures withstand the intense buffeting of the wind-swept river.

VOLUNTEERS FED

While last-minute work is under way, representatives of the Red Cross, civil-defense agencies, and Salvation Army meet daily in the Scott County Courthouse to coordinate local plans. The Red Cross and Salvation Army have been feeding as many as 600 volunteers at key sandbag-filling and dike installations.

"The city has done a tremendous job. We're far better prepared now than we were in 1965," says John Stange, one of the city's two Democratic aldermanic officials. The other eight alderman, like the Mayor, are Republicans.

Like many other residents here, alderman Mr. Stange believes that future floods can really be prevented only by either dredging the Mississippi channel or building giant watersheds north of the city. Some citizens grumble that the increasing rate of floods—recorded in 1951, 1952, and 1965, plus an ice jam in 1966—are the direct result of the series of Army Corps of Engineers dams constructed along the river near here, but few take such claims seriously any more.

Col. Walter C. Gellini, district engineer of the Rock Island District of the Army Corps of Engineers argues that the increased flooding along the river is in great part a result of the encroachment by local communities of the river's natural flood plains. "As the towns spread closer and closer to the river—as well as up and down the river—there's just little place for the excess flow to go," he says.

WINNING TAKES HARD WORK

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, John Roche, a teacher, Presidential assistant

to Lyndon Johnson, and now a columnist, recently wrote a column entitled "Winning Takes Hard Work." It underscores the adage that success is one-third inspiration and two-thirds perspiration. The way to fashion one's view into a majority view is by hard and sometimes dreary work, Mr. Roche points out, and not by easy oral broadsides and clubby cliques talking to themselves. It follows:

WINNING TAKES HARD WORK

Recently a young man named Billy Singer set the Daley machine on its ear in Chicago by narrowly defeating the organization candidate for City Council.

I found this interesting for a number of reasons both personal and professional, feeling pride in the accomplishments of a former student and confirmation of a deep-seated conviction that the "system" is vulnerable.

Spokesmen for the "New Politics" constantly talk as though the American political process were a massive monolith, when in fact we live in a society with an unbelievably disorganized and sprawling party system. Probably the Daley organization in Chicago is one of the high points of political organization, but Singer took it on and won.

The problem is that winning involves hard work rather than making speeches or writing denunciations of the Establishment in obscure periodicals.

Fifteen years ago I took almost a year out of my life in a campaign to take the Democratic county committee away from the Republicans, who had controlled it since time immemorial because they wanted the power to nominate the Democratic candidates for county Commissioner.

(In states like Pennsylvania where the constitution requires minority representation on county commissions, the majority party has a vested interest in capturing the minority commissioner. This insures that contracts and various disguised patronage operations will go through without controversy.)

That year was a real course in political science, and I have never since underestimated the degree of commitment required of a successful politician. It is almost like a religious vocation. One abandons family, regular meals, sleep, and leisure for an endless series of meetings with groups and individuals.

On any efficiency chart, most of the time is wasted. It consists largely not of wheeling and dealing, but of listening to life stories and developing an atmosphere of understanding and trust.

One township leader, whose cooperation was essential, put me through a six-hour wringer to learn, as he later confided, whether I would still be around if we lost the primary. If he put on war paint and lost, he had no place to hide; I could always retire to the college library.

One does not get ahead in this kind of politics by reading up on political theory; the street lists are far more important. In our own ward, for example, we discovered by checking the new registration list against the old that about 50 Republicans had shifted to Democratic.

This might have been reassuring—a real ego boost—except that further checking revealed that they were all employees of the Republican township and their families. We had to fight off a primary raid in our own backyard.

How far this world is from that of the new left matadors (or usually banderilleros) who will rush to Chicago, Washington or wherever the TV cameras are, throw their darts to the accompaniment of ferocious speeches, and then vanish.

Their idea of a real attack against the "system" is to write a letter to the editor of The

New York Review, or better, cut loose on a TV panel discussion.

Indeed, some years ago when a "peace candidate" ran for senator in Massachusetts, I discovered that his leading local spokesman was not even registered to vote.

Talking about "New Politics" is a relaxing substitute for working, and quite possibly winning, at the old. It is a natural for those who are more interested in airing their anguish than they are in victory.

The real lesson of the McCarthy candidacy last year was, ironically, not the need for a new system, but the vulnerability of the old system to new activists.

In New Hampshire, for example, the McCarthy delegates got elected by the simple technique of nominating only one person for each slot.

The Democratic barons in the state didn't bother with a slate, a number of candidates went for each position, and the touted organization split its votes and got clobbered. Similarly in New York, Paul O'Dwyer got the senatorial nomination with the support of less than eight percent of the state's registered Democrats.

Now Billy Singer has taken the low road of hard work and licked the Daley machine. Some of his classmates at Brandeis have become expert toreros, but he has done more for the "New Politics" in three months than they have in a decade of alienated griping. I doubt if they will ever forgive him for it.

EMPHASIS ON MILITARY SPENDING MISPLACED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, out of respect for my duty to report to my constituency on the important issues and votes which come before the House of Representatives, I issued a statement following the March 27 vote on the supplemental appropriation request for defense expenditures. This statement was printed in full by the St. Louis Argus weekly newspaper, April 11. Saturday, April 26, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried the Argus column on the Post editorial page.

I think it is past time that Members of this body speak their mind on military matters—even if it is a view which opposes that of the vast military-industrial complex. I cannot understand the reasons for soft peddling opinions on military issues—when they are obviously of such great concern to the public. The power center may not listen when we protest the increasing imbalance of priorities in this Nation—but as responsible citizens and public servants, we should register views on matters of policy which affect this balance.

Time and again I have heard it said that we cannot pull out from Vietnam and lose face with the people of Southeast Asia. Time and time again, I have asked persons who hold that view to explain—why are we more concerned with saving face in Southeast Asia than in honoring a commitment long overdue to citizens of this country who have never been offered the opportunities supposedly guaranteed all citizens of this free Nation. In the last 2 weeks, this ad-

ministration has announced its plans to pull out of the Job Corps program in 59 instances affecting nearly 17,000 American youth. They justified it in terms of money which will be better spent because of the closure of these centers.

No one was worried about saving face with these young people—and they have, in many instances, determined that this Government and this Nation has written them off. It is a tragedy that we take this pullout so matter-of-factly—when we cannot even discuss such a pullout in Vietnam. If the policy of this Government shall be to save face—the policy should start at home. If this Government is not responsive to the people it serves, the question of saving face with other people of other nations is unworthy of discussion.

I bring this statement to the attention of my colleagues in hopes that other Members who share my concern will join in public expressions of their opinions:

"No" VOTE ON ARMS SPENDING

(Congressman WILLIAM CLAY, in the St. Louis Argus)

On March 27, 1969, the Congress received a bill for \$76 million for more money for the Department of Defense. It was in the form of a supplemental appropriation request—in other words—it sought an additional \$76 million over and above the \$74 billion already appropriated for defense operations in 1969—a monstrous amount unduplicated in the history of the United States. I could not support this additional appropriation and I cast a "Nay" vote on this roll call.

In view of the disproportionate share of the federal dollar already assigned to the military complex, it is inconceivable to me that the defense of the country honestly depends upon an additional \$76 million in 1969. I cannot accept the notion that the needs for our defense are more dire or urgent than the suffocating needs of bare human sustenance within this country. This government has two primary responsibilities—to provide for the common defense and to protect the national welfare. Attending to one responsibility at the exclusion of the other is completely unsatisfactory. A disregard for either responsibility cannot be condoned but the pursuit of one responsibility at the expense of the other is an intolerable injustice which has too long prevailed in this nation.

Our cities are rotting, our air and water is being polluted and the human resource on which the life and future of any country depends is being eroded by hunger, unemployment, inadequate education and an over-abundance of despair. The federal responsibility for protecting these elements of the national welfare lags too far behind. Consequently, it is difficult to find justification for spending more money to support the vast military complex which continues to dominate the interests of the American public.

It is a question of priorities—simply defined, a question of values. Will our commitment be to the creation of a fair and just social and economic climate of democracy or will it be a commitment to amass the largest military force ever assembled on this earth? Shall we pursue the perpetuation of democracy in an effort to perfect it—or shall we pursue the perpetuation of a defense establishment which has too long reigned without question in this country? There are those of us who seek a balance between the interests of defending democracy and democracy itself.

Consider the \$74 billion defense budget for 1969 in contrast to the total appropria-

tion for education, manpower, housing and community development programs which, for 1969, is less than \$10 billion. It will not be an easy task to achieve a better balance in our priorities.

To the money spent for military operations must be added the precious blood of American soldiers which is also spent to defend the American way of life. If these sacrifices continue in the name of democracy, we must remain vigilant in examining the authenticity of the cause for which we dedicate our manpower and our money. If what we have in this country is not truly democracy with equal opportunity for all, we should divert those funds from military security to programs which will further the internal security of the United States. Our emphasis on military spending is misplaced when our domestic needs are so pressing as they are today.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Committee has recently issued its legislative program and aims for the 91st Congress. The legislative aims of the committee represent a thoughtful and well-analyzed consideration of the most urgent problems facing our society. Taken as a whole, the priorities urged upon Congress by the committee—which emphasize the prompt securing of peace in Vietnam and increased attention to the crisis in our cities—closely correspond to the reordering of Federal resources which I have repeatedly urged upon this body. I insert in the RECORD the text of the program advanced by the American Veterans Committee, and I urge my colleagues to give close consideration to the proposals contained therein:

STATEMENT AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

The task facing the American people and its elected representatives in the 91st Congress is:

To reaffirm in all its actions our American belief in democratic values; in government by, of and for the people; and in individual freedom;

To reject violence, racism and totalitarianism;

To prove by its actions that our democratic institutions and processes of government are coping with the domestic problems that face our nation and imperil its unity.

These problems are:

(1) overcoming racism and religious and ethnic prejudices in all their forms and in all areas of American life.

(2) uprooting poverty and its stunting effect on American life.

(3) improving the physical environment in which we live and the public services which we need.

(4) enabling minority groups (Negroes, Spanish-Americans, Indians) to assume an equal and active role in all phases of public life, and devising new ways to insure effective participation in government by all citizens at all levels.

But we also face problems abroad. The most critical of these is the fighting in Vietnam, which we must honorably end. We have

urged in the past and urge again a multi-lateral cease-fire and a political settlement on the basis of full self-determination of their future by all the people of South Vietnam. Such a settlement can be followed by a withdrawal of American, North Vietnamese and other foreign troops from South Vietnam. We expect that new steps will be initiated toward these goals and urge Congress to support them fully.

But regardless of whether an early end to the fighting in Vietnam or at least a de-escalation of its costs is attained, we must dedicate ourselves to dealing with the great domestic problems outlined above. Congress, as one of the principal voices of the people, must recognize without ambiguity the fact that the racist attitudes of most of the white majority of our people and of its institutions are the root cause of the discrimination, exploitation and injustices suffered by Negroes and members of other minority groups, as the Kerner Report so well pointed out. Congress must, therefore, visibly demonstrate its steadfast determination to uproot discrimination in the United States—in the minds of our people, in the administration of our government, and in our public and private institutions and enterprises.

Congress must within its constitutional powers satisfy the insistent demand of all segments of the American people to an active and influential voice and effective participation in guiding our nation, and this insistent and just demand cannot be denied.

In issuing this call for action we are aware of the fact that helpful legislation in the areas of our major concerns has been passed by recent Congresses and that many of the members of the 91st Congress participated in enactment of such legislation. Action by the 91st Congress means, therefore, in substantial part, insuring that the recently passed laws are fully enforced to insure to all citizens their rights thereunder, that adequate funds be raised from federal taxes, and that necessary funds and personnel are provided to this end. But the 91st Congress must also stake out new frontiers and find better solutions to the problems which confront the American people.

To achieve these goals, at least in part, during the coming Congress, we offer the following programs:

CIVIL RIGHTS

1. Extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, which expires in 1970, at the earliest possible moment so as to insure continued guaranties of voting rights for minority group voters.
2. Adequate appropriations and staffing for the vigorous and strict enforcement of existing federal anti-discrimination laws, executive orders and regulations. This applies to the U.S. Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions, the Department of Justice and to all other Federal agencies with Title VI contract compliance responsibility. We oppose the transfer of enforcement functions in the field of education from the Department of HEW to the Department of Justice which would signify abandonment of administrative sanctions and adjustments which have proved effective in this area.
3. Adoption of realistic financial contract sanctions, in addition to contract cancellation, against violators of laws, executive orders and regulations prohibiting employment discrimination by government contractors and their sub-contractors. Congress should investigate the effectiveness of the equal employment opportunity programs, especially in defense contracting.
4. Elimination of remaining areas of discrimination in federal employment by providing through statute for realistic relief in the form of compensatory back-pay and promotion for federal and District of Columbia

employees who have been the subject of discrimination in hiring, promotion or job assignment.

5. Expansion of fair housing legislation, including effective sanctions against all those who in any way, directly or indirectly, participate in the maintenance of housing discrimination, whether as financial agencies, real estate developers, builders, owners, sellers, landlords or their agents. It is imperative that victims of discrimination in housing actually receive the housing which has been denied them.

6. Outlawing discriminatory practices in the empanelling of juries under state laws.

ELIMINATION OF POVERTY

1. Strengthening of OEO as an independent agency, focusing on anti-poverty programs with the maximum feasible participation of the poor, adequately staffed and funded.
2. Continuance, expansion and full appropriations up to authorized amounts for job training programs, adult education and special educational programs for disadvantaged children. Job training programs must be oriented toward available jobs and skills needed in a modern technological society and provide general education, where needed, as the basis for the acquisition of greater skills. Such programs must also provide opportunity for the acquisition of business and managerial skills.
3. Financial and technical assistance to members of minority groups in establishing new independent businesses or expanding existing enterprises, including authority for government agencies to accept greater risks than those which private financial institutions and insurance companies will accept. The main emphasis in helping minority group entrepreneurs must be on direct Federal Government loans, rather than on guaranties to private lenders.
4. A humanely administered welfare system which must include (a) national eligibility and benefit standards, (b) a decent minimum standard of living for those unable to work for age, health or family reasons, (c) administrative procedures and practices which clearly set forth the rights and obligations of welfare recipients and which simplify the determination of eligibility and other adjudications or appeals. Welfare recipients should be permitted to retain minor assets, such as insurance payments for injuries or property damage, and to retain at least a portion of the wages which they are able to earn. Work incentive programs should be expanded but participation should be strictly voluntary.
5. Free food stamps should be issued to all needy persons unable to pay for them. The Department of Agriculture should be required to institute food stamp programs in counties not yet covered and to start food stamp and food donation programs even if local officials refuse to apply.
6. Funds must be appropriated by Congress to build all public housing authorized in past legislation and not yet built. Public housing must be upgraded technically and esthetically and unit cost limitations raised to realistic levels. To avoid ghettoizing the poor in public housing, rents should be adjusted upward so that working Americans of varied incomes may benefit from public housing facilities. Novel housing and urban improvement programs, such as repair of existing housing, assistance toward homeownership and rent subsidies, should be adequately funded so as to permit these programs to proceed effectively. Congress must assist in the modernization of the housing industry and of building codes so that housing costs can be reduced and kept within bounds.
7. Health care must be further improved and expanded to enable all citizens regard-

less of age to receive all medical and dental services which they may need. Congress should institute a full-scale investigation into all aspects of medical care with a view to its improvement and the reduction of its cost.

8. The Fair Labor Standards and National Labor Relations Acts should be extended to cover all employees subject to federal jurisdiction without any exception. Even recent amendments to the Fair Labor Standard Act have left numerous workers without coverage and with a poverty level of earnings. The minimum wage level should be further raised so that those remunerated at that rate, can earn wages above the poverty level.

9. The work of Congress, recently begun, in protecting the consumer against fraud, overreaching in terms of prices and installment financing, substandard or unsafe goods, etc., must be continued and expanded. Extreme watchfulness will be required to ferret out new practices replacing those banned by newly enacted laws.

10. Important as all these programs are, they cannot be expected by themselves quickly to end poverty and unemployment or underemployment and to counteract the effects of continued technological progress on employment. All of these programs must be buttressed by the obligation of the Federal Government to act as the "Employer of Last Resort" and to provide permanent and useful employment for those whom private enterprises cannot train for or provide with such employment.

THE PRESERVATION AND/OR RESTORATION OF A LIVABLE ENVIRONMENT

1. Expanded anti-pollution legislation to force those whose activities have polluted or continue to pollute air, water and land, to take promptly the steps necessary to end the harm which they inflict on our environment. Emphasis must be on speedy action for near-term results and the creation of production facilities for anti-pollution equipment of all types on a far larger scale than presently in existence. Congressional pressure on the automotive and oil industries must be maintained to bring about the production of cheaper and better anti-pollution devices for motor vehicles and of motor and heating fuels with less pollutants.
2. Reconstruction of city cores to create recreational, cultural and other public facilities for the preservation of the amenities of urban life. Such reconstruction must simultaneously, if not first, provide housing and business quarters for those displaced at reasonable rentals.
3. Revitalization of local public transport as a public service to attract maximum public use.
4. Expansion and preservation of national parks and other public recreational, forest and wilderness areas for public enjoyment and a healthful natural environment.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

1. Abandonment of the Electoral College system in presidential elections and the election of the President by a nationwide majority of the American voters. Any such plan must safeguard the integrity of the vote count, provide uniform residential and minimum age qualification for the right to vote, and prevent vote fraud.
2. Expansion of the right of the citizen to be heard and to participate effectively in the planning of public projects which concern him, such as anti-poverty programs, housing, urban renewal, model cities, highway construction and transportation and local health care projects. Provisions for public hearings prior to and after final preparation of plans in these fields should be uniformly adopted along the lines of those now proposed by the Department of Transportation.

3. Lowering of the voting age in all federal elections.

4. Equitable distribution of the burden of military service. The obligation of the citizen to support his country by performing military service should not be treated as a "punishment" imposed on those whose conduct affronts the susceptibilities of the Selective Service or local draft boards.

WATER POLLUTION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is considering the problem of water pollution, this article from the Monday, April 14, 1969, Christian Science Monitor should be of interest:

WATER POLLUTION

(By Robert Cahn)

DAVENPORT, IOWA.—The first major argument between a state and the federal government over water pollution control has developed into a full-blown fight.

After the opening round of a two-phase "conference," neither side was giving ground. State and federal officials who testified at the start of what may become a long hearing process were united in the objective of opposition to water pollution. How to achieve it, however, is being contested vigorously.

For two days, the water-control officials, expert scientists and a few representatives of the general public went to the podium in the Blackhawk Hotel ballroom to give their statements and then make rebuttals. Three blocks away, the object of their attention, the wide, muddy Mississippi rolled along, nearing flood crest stage.

AGREEMENT SOUGHT

Everyone who cared to could see from the hotel windows that the river was muddy. But was it "polluted"? Or how badly polluted? And was the amount of pollution enough of a threat to warrant imposing stronger (and expensive) waste treatment restrictions on cities and industries along the river?

These were the immediate issues in the first 12 hours of hearings before the conference recessed. It will resume April 15 in Council Bluffs to raise similar questions about the Missouri River on Iowa's western boundary.

The federal government's Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) is demanding that Iowa go along with the other 49 states and agree to general statewide plans for secondary waste treatment.

The Iowa Water Pollution Control Commission insists that the government's charges of pollution in the Mississippi are not proved by the facts, and that the commission is not empowered under Iowa law to order the degree of treatment demanded by the federal government for these two rivers.

It is not a case against Iowa as a "polluter." Iowa's record in fighting water pollution is considered good, especially for its interior streams. But Iowa is the first state to challenge the federal government's attempt to establish standards under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965.

Should Iowa be overruled now and choose to carry its case through the hearing process and into a court fight, the consequences could be serious for federal relations with other states, and in bringing about action and enforcement on standards already set.

ACTION URGED NOW

Yet a significant principle also is at issue—a testing of the section of the 1965 law concerning enhancing the quality of water even before pollution has become dangerous.

This issue was put into focus by two witnesses who led a small block of representatives from the League of Women Voters.

"Action now will prevent pollution from accompanying the predicted increase in population for the urban areas along this river," said Mrs. George G. Koerber, state chairman for water resources of the League of Women Voters of Iowa.

"Action now means the necessary treatment facilities will be in operation when the increase occurs—not five or more years later. We know that other areas of the nation have greater pollution problems. This fact, however, does not remove the need to prevent or control pollution in this river basin."

Added Mrs. Wade Hartman, water resources chairman of the Scott County League of Women Voters: "Perhaps this is the generation which must bear the cost and responsibility for reversing the process of pollution, which must not be satisfied with maintaining the status quo, but concern itself with the rehabilitation of our rivers and streams, while rehabilitation is still practical."

Except for the league and a few delegates from the Izaak Walton League and one other conservation group, public citizen participation in the conference was minimal.

TECHNICAL TESTIMONY

Most of the 12 hours of testimony involved highly technical factors in treating sewage and industrial wastes, their effects on the Mississippi River, and legalistic matters regarding powers of the state vs. powers of the federal government.

The Iowa conference was ordered by retiring Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who sought to leave office with all 50 states completing state standards for water-pollution control. Under the new federal law, the state standards would automatically become federally enforceable standards when accepted by the secretary.

By late last year, 48 states (including Iowa), had presented "acceptable" state plans. But a major "exception" granted to Iowa over the issue of secondary treatment on the two main rivers, and several minor exceptions were still unresolved after 18 months of negotiations.

Mr. Udall twice asked the then Gov. (now Sen.) Harold E. Hughes (a fellow Democrat) for help. But the state commission held to its position. Two days before he left office, Mr. Udall announced it would be necessary, in line with the 1965 law, to call a conference "to deal with the deficiencies in Iowa's standards."

New Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel tried to get an agreement that would forestall the conference. He asked the new Republican Governor, Robert Ray, for assistance. The idea of the federal government having to take action against a state would not only be embarrassing, but would be a setback to federal-state relations.

A private meeting was scheduled for March 27. Carl Klein, Interior Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution Control and Research, went to Chicago to meet with three members of the Iowa Water Pollution Control Commission and an aide to Governor Ray.

Agreement was reached on most of the minor problems. But on the issue of requiring secondary treatment, the meeting turned into a shouting match between Mr. Klein and Iowa commission chairman Robert Buckmaster. The meeting ended with positions hardened.

The Davenport conference was presided over by Murray Stein, FWPCA assistant director who succeeded in creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding of the issues.

POSITION SUPPORTED

The FWPCA paraded a number of expert witnesses to back its position that primary treatment of municipal and industrial sewage just doesn't do the job of removing the dangerous pollutants being poured daily into all the nation's waters.

The eight other states bordering the Mississippi and six other states along the Missouri River have agreed on the principle that it is necessary to start providing secondary treatment now and not wait until pollutants bring about obviously damaging effects, the government argues.

The Mississippi and the Missouri should be considered as units, FWPCA witnesses said. Just because damaging pollutants don't show up now along Iowa's shores is not adequate reason for refusing to improve the quality of the river by not adequately treating wastes before they enter the stream. This would benefit neighboring and downstream users, as well as Iowa.

Primary treatment removes only about 40-45 percent of the impurities, mostly solids that will float or sink. Secondary treatment will remove another 40 to 50 percent of the wastes (or a total of 80 to 95 percent), including potentially damaging pollutants such as nitrogen, detergents, petrochemicals, and other organic materials, and microorganisms believed to be hazards to health.

CHARGES DISPUTED

Although Iowa has extensive secondary treatment for all interior streams, only three out of 18 municipalities which presently discharge wastes to the Mississippi River have secondary treatment.

The wastes from these cities and their industries are equivalent to the wastes from a population of 1.5 million people, FWPCA said. Secondary treatment could keep the raw waste equivalent of 1.3 million persons from the Mississippi River each day.

The federal government also said that total manufacturing in the area is projected to double by 1980 from the 1960 level, plus a significant increase in the number of hogs and pigs. There also will be much greater recreational demand on the Mississippi River.

Iowa's witnesses disputed government charges as to the pollution of the Mississippi River.

"No evidence has been presented that secondary treatment was needed, that it would enhance the water quality any substantial degree or that it was economically feasible," said Mr. Buckmaster.

"We in Iowa have a long history of taking care of our own problems and of working with the federal government," he said.

RESPONSE PLEDGED

Mr. Buckmaster added that when scientific data gives a basis even of a projection of pollution, the Iowa Commission would take action to prevent pollution, although a change in Iowa law might be necessary to enforce secondary treatment.

Iowa also objected to FWPCA insistence upon providing secondary treatment facilities on the Mississippi by 1972, when at least one bordering state, Missouri, was being given until 1982.

In addition to the secondary treatment problem, the other disagreements which now seem headed for compromise solution include continuous (rather than seasonal) disinfection of controllable waste discharges, maximum temperature requirements on interior streams, standards for phenol and radioactivity, and an acceptable state policy on nondegradation (not lowering the existing quality of nonpolluted waters).

The record of the Davenport and Council Bluffs hearings will be forwarded to Secretary Hickel for a decision, which can be appealed by the state.