additional period in certain cases the special provision fixing the minimum Federal assistance percentage for a State under the medical assistance program at 105 percent of the Federal share of such State's medical expenditures under all of the public assistance programs during 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 10763. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to any individual who may not make a joint return but maintains his own household as his home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10764. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10765. A bill to authorize the President, subject to congressional disapproval, to raise or lower income tax rates by not more than 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10766. A bill to make Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 10767. A bill to extend, strengthen, and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10768. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the classification of positions on the special security police force of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 10769. A bill to rename a pool of the Cross Florida Barge Canal "Lake Oklawaha"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 10770. A bill to provide relief for the clothing industry by making special immigrant visas available to certain skilled tailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 10771. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing a permanent National Aeronautics and Space Administration Aerospace Museum; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10772. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide a more equitable standard for awarding the gold star lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10773. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to deem certain U.S. Coast Guard Reserve service during World War II as active service for the purpose of determining eligibility for benefits under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FRIEDEL, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Local Police Fight Crime Week," to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 689. Joint resolution designating July 5, 1969, as "Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Commission of the United States, the Republic of South Vietnam, and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam to study the ecological effects of chemical warfare in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the selection, term of office, and qualifications of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the popular election of the Judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Con Res. 233. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to international policy on satellite broadcasting; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Res. 384. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H. Res. 385. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 386. Resolution authorizing under certain circumstances the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings conducted by House committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10774. A bill for the relief of Adriana Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 10775. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw Juchniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10776. A bill for the relief of Dr. Percyvaldo Fonesca Wendler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 10777. A bill for the relief of Ugo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10778. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Di Pasquale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10779. A bill for the relief of Luis Enrique Silva-Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 10780. A bill for the relief of Gino Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

99. Mr. RYAN presented a petition of Prof. Charles Schwartz, University of California (Berkeley), and 728 other members of Scientists for Social and Political Action, calling for open congressional hearings on the entire military research and development program, including the anti-ballistic-missile system, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THOMAS A. EDISON, AS I KNEW HIM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow in which he provides some interesting insights into the life of Thomas A. Edison:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON, AS I KNEW HIM

(An address by George E. Stringfellow of Arlington, Va., former daily business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the Rotary Club of Palm Desert, Calif., February 14, 1969)

Mr. Edison was born in Milan, Ohio on February 11, 1847. He died in West Orange, N.J. on October 18, 1931—38 years ago.

February, in my opinion, is one of the most important months in the history of our Republic, for it was in February that Washington, Lincoln and Edison were born.

Washington looked after the welfare of our country as a father looks after his child. He guided it when it was young and gave leadership in developing the greatest form of government—in the words of Gladstone—"ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Lincoln held the nation together in one of the most trying periods in our history, and thus made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country, but to the betterment of the world.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

one of his largest businesses. Any success which I may have had in commerce or civic affairs is largely the result of my daily association with this great American during my early business career.

Edison is perhaps best known as the father of the electric light and power industry, however, he produced more inventions than any other man in the history of the world—over 1100.

Edison was passionately fond of work—

He was a genius in the application of organized knowledge;

He was infinitely patient and undaunted by failures;

He brought forth inventions which broadened the lives of mankind.

Great industries employing many millions of persons followed in the wake of his discoveries. We can truthfully say there came from his laboratory a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and a higher living standard for the world. His contributions were so great no one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least be said of Edison as it was said of Washington and Lincoln, and can be said of few others, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Three years before he passed on to his rich reward, a *special* Congressional Medal of Honor was given to him for development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization.

Few men have received, or receiving, deserve such a compliment from the United States Congress.

At the time of his death, it was suggested that as a tribute to him, the electric power of the nation be turned off for one minute. It was felt this token of respect would cause the people to realize Edison's magnificent contribution.

Upon further consideration, it was realized that somewhere in the bowels of the earth men digging in tunnels and mining ore are dependent upon electricity to drive the pumps that produce the fresh air without which they would soon perish. In hospitals surgeons in the midst of operations with lives hanging in the balance are dependent upon electricity to complete their work. Telephones, police and fire alarms are dependent upon electric power, and in hundreds of other situations there would be great danger to life and property if the power of the nation was turned off at the source just for a minute.

And so, in our very inability to pay as complete a tribute to Edison as we wished, we found a new and higher tribute to him. Life depends upon the light and energy he gave us.

Edison's approach to death was a wonderful example of unperturbed courage. Its inevitableness was thoroughly understood and on no occasion did he manifest any apprehension of spirit. He dealt with his failing health as impersonally as he did with any research problem. Before entering the drowsiness which turned into the final coma, Edison compared himself with an old machine beyond repair. On his deathbed he said, "It is very beautiful over there." How true that must have been with his coming and equally true it is that he made it very beautiful over here for us.

Among the lessons learned from the life of Edison are his uniformly courageous and optimistic outlook, his triumph over his handicap of deafness and his consistent exemplification of the doctrine of self-help.

In his achievements he reared for himself an enduring memorial. Commenting on Mr. Edison's passing, President Hoover said:

"It is given to few men of any age, nation or calling, to become the benefactor of all humanity. That distinction came abundantly to Thomas Alva Edison. His life has been a constant stimulant to confidence that our institutions hold open the door of opportunity to those who would enter. He possessed a modesty, kindliness, a staunchness of character rare among men."

Edison's last public utterance remains the best advice one could give to a gravely perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

INSIGHT INTO CAMPUS UNREST

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing problems our country faces today is widespread campus disorder. Exactly where the blame lies for the current crisis is a matter of much confusion. In an address before the Onondaga County, N.Y., Bar Association, Chancellor William Pearson Tolley of Syracuse University recently made an address which I think is both enlightening and encouraging.

As an administrator of a major university, Chancellor Tolley dealt with the many faceted problem of campus unrest in his address with great insight. Because campus disorders are so widespread and because the problem is so grave at this time, I would like to share Chancellor Tolley's remarks with my colleagues.

Also, because I think something has to be done to control such actions, I have introduced H.R. 10617 which will prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational institutions, the same bill introduced in the other body of the Congress by Senator BYRD:

SOME PERSONAL OPINIONS

(An address by Chancellor William Pearson Tolley, Syracuse University, before the Onondaga County Bar Association)

I am deeply honored to be here tonight. I must confess, however, that I accepted the invitation only because it was extended by your immediate past president as well as your president Jim Sullivan. David Fraser is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Library Associates of Syracuse University. He has given countless hours to strengthening our library resources and particularly our manuscript collections and our collection of rare books. I am here tonight because I recognize David Fraser's service to Syracuse University and my personal debt to him as a friend.

When Ponce de Leon looked for the Fountain of Youth at St. Augustine, Florida, he was on the right continent but in the wrong town. Moreover, he came more than a century too soon. According to the history books, he visited St. Augustine in 1513. At that time there were no colleges in America. We didn't get our first one until 1636. Surely, if one is looking for the Fountain of Youth the place to go to is a college campus. If my age were not a matter of public record, I should be tempted to conceal the fact that I came to Syracuse as a freshman in 1918 and have been on a college or university campus ever since. Thus in September 1968 I had been privileged for half a century to be at the place Ponce de Leon sought to discover. Perhaps the reason it seems only yesterday is that when one drinks at the Fountain of Youth time has no duration.

Because it has been half a century perhaps you will let me pose as an expert on universities. The word expert, however, gives me pause. The syllable "ex" suggests one who has made an exit. There is no denying I am not too far from that time. The second syllable has been defined as a drip under pressure. How better can you describe an American college president? But I want you to know we are not the only drips on the campus.

I shall share with you tonight some of the opinions I hold with respect to the current education scene. I have no illusion that wisdom will die when I leave this earthly scene. But each of us is entitled to a few opinions.

I shall speak to each of them but first let me state them in summary form. First, the mass media continue to do the educational institutions of America a grave disservice. Second, parents have a deeper influence on their children than is generally believed, even by them. Third, most college youngsters are wonderful. I have devoted my life to them and it has been a great privilege and a joy. Fourth, youth rebellions are worldwide. They preceded those in the United States. There are both communist and noncommunist student movements but the patterns are the same. Five, college faculties did not create the youth rebellions but here in the United States they have greatly aided and abetted them. In general faculties are more sympathetic to campus discord than are the rank and file of students. Without faculty support the student troublemakers wouldn't get very far. Six, the latest development is unrest among the black students. It couldn't have come at a worse time. It comes, however, because there is progress, not because the doors are still closed. The blacks have a new sense of dignity and pride, a new self-consciousness. For the first time there is opportunity and hope for them. They may be pushing too hard but they need a lot of sympathy, understanding, help, and T.L.C., (tender loving care). They too, however, must learn the limits beyond which they cannot go. Seven, there are several threats to the future of our universities. There is the threat from without—the danger of overreaction from a public fed up by the worship of youth and angered by the misuse of educational opportunity. There is the threat from within—from faculties who should know better and particularly from the new left. Power without responsibility is the new name of the game. The students want it. The faculty wants it. The labor unions want it. The legislature wants it. In this struggle for power the quality and the freedom of the university may be destroyed.

It sounds a bit grim, doesn't it? Perhaps it is a good thing the program committee plans to have my speech followed by some light-hearted skits. But first let me state my opinions in more detail.

I said the mass media do education a grave disservice. They focus their attention on two minor aspects of the educational scene, athletics and the public tantrums of undisciplined brats. Education they do not understand, and they leave it unreported. The day by day advances in scientific knowledge are largely ignored. When they are reported they are jazzed up and sensationalized. Significant developments in the social sciences and the humanities—developments that may contribute far more to the solution of our urban ills than the billions poured into

jerry-built congressional programs—these take place completely unobserved. The hundreds of meaningful programs of service to the disadvantaged launched and paid for by the private universities without state or federal help, and maintained because of deep concern and commitment—are seldom adequately reported in the press. One would think we have been sitting on our hands, doing nothing.

As a consequence the universities are perhaps the institutions least well understood by the general public. They are the institutions that perhaps no one knows fully, and when I say no one, I include faculty and students.

When you analyze what you read in print and what you see on the television screen, it is no wonder the public is outraged. When sixty reporters and thirty television cameras appear in response to a mimeographed handout from the Students for a Democratic Society and report in detail the antics of a handful of students and non-students launching a campus demonstration, something is wrong with our mass media. And unhappily, after endless TV exposure of dissent and rebellion, faculty and students accept the distortion as true and they begin to clamor for a piece of the action. They begin to think "If this is in style, why aren't we doing it?" It is unfair to suggest that the mass media have encouraged the contagion of student and faculty discord? From my experience the evidence is overwhelming. Nor am I alone in feeling that the mass media no longer limit their role to reporting the news. They create it.

Even in reporting the news exaggeration is the rule, not the exception. This is true whether the topic is the use of drugs, the so-called new morality, the much abused "in loco parentis," or the pressure from small groups for change in parietal rules in dormitories, or for permission for booze and broads in fraternities.

Even the generation gap—as old as the first family—is treated as if it were the most recent of discoveries. Did you not experience the generation gap when you asked if you could stay out a little later and your parents said no? Did you test your teachers and parents to see what you could get away with? Did you think the older generation had a lot of wrong answers and that you, of course, had the right ones?

To be sure, in a time of very rapid change the generation gap is wider than ever. But human nature doesn't change. The basic problems between parents and their children are what they have always been. Don't let the press or some college professor convince you that this is a brand new phenomenon or that cocky and ill-mannered children need even more permissiveness because they are trying to tell us something.

A second conclusion I have reached is that the influence of parents is far greater than they or the general public have been led to believe. The children of politically conservative parents are themselves politically conservative. The children of outspoken liberals are outspoken liberals. In at least 80% of the cases the religious, social and economic views of students reflect the views and the experience of their parents. In many cases the young people will not admit this even to themselves. Again they respond to peer pressure to experiment with vices they know are wrong. But I continue to be astonished by the strength of parental influence. We put a stamp upon our children that is a lasting one.

Even in apparent exceptions the views of the children frequently turn out to be very close to those of someone in the family. A recent study indicates that the maternal influence on the present group of campus revolutionaries is in most cases very strong indeed. They learned the art of protest at their mother's knee. It did not begin when they went away to college.

My third conclusion is that college youth has been much maligned. Taken as a group they have been seriously libeled. No one talks about the majority of students. Their behavior is unreported. Yet they can be described only in superlatives. They are the best equipped in science and mathematics, the most widely traveled, the most art conscious, the most literate, the best prepared students we have ever had. They are taller, heavier, stronger, and better looking. They can run faster and jump higher and break all kinds of athletic and endurance records which not too long ago were cause for worldwide wonder. This remember is the description of the great majority of college students. They are the most wonderful youngsters I have ever known.

The percentage of young people who warrant no such accolades varies from region to region, from town to town, and from college to college. There are permissive institutions where the kindest thing you can say of faculties and students is that they deserve each other. These are colleges where a goodly share of students can be described as abrasive, arrogant, rude, and in the words of George F. Kennan, "floundering around in drugs, pornography, and political hysteria." They are unwashed, they are a sight to behold, and they are enamoured of themselves. They have been told that they are wonderfully gifted and they believe it. The number is larger than it should be and it is a group to be reckoned with. Most of them, however, will turn out very well. The problem is how to endure them until they grow up.

This, however, we can do. What poses a different problem is the handful of true nihilists, the campus revolutionaries. This is a minuscule group but it appears to speak for all students and increasingly for the many of the faculty as well. Small as it is, its ranks include high school and college drop outs. No matter how liberal the campus may be the number of real revolutionaries is seldom as many as thirty. The number at Syracuse may be closer to half a dozen. This is the group whose mission is to destroy. The objective is anarchy. These were the leaders at Berkeley and then Columbia, and now at San Francisco State.

In the case of both the revolutionaries and the activists hatred of America is so deep and bitter as to be almost pathological. You will hear no word of criticism of China or North Vietnam, no syllable of protest against the seizure of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. At a recent meeting at Princeton sponsored by the International Association for Cultural Freedom the point was made by some of the guest speakers from abroad that they found less conformity and more dissent among young people here than in their own lands. Eugene Loebl, who fled from Czechoslovakia during the last summer's Soviet occupation but who is still a Communist, made this comment after listening to the criticism of America by radical American youth. "If we didn't know the rest of the world," he said, "we might conclude that this is the worst country in the world."

Seymour Martin Lipset reports that, "Although the events which precipitated student activism vary from country to country, and the targets of student attack differ, there are more common themes than differences in the tactics and ideologies of the movements. Unlike the youth and student movements of the 1930's which were linked to adult political parties, the dominant ones of the present constitute a genuine youth rebellion, one which is almost as much levied against the major parties of the left . . . as it is against the moderates and conservatives. The lack of involvement in adult politics has given free rein to the propensity of youth to adhere to absolute principles, to engage in expressive rather than instrumental politics. Little concerned with the immediate consequences of their actions, the new left student movements appear ready to destroy all existing structures, including the university, and to use tactics which alienate the great majority, in order to make manifest their contempt, their total rejection of the intolerable world created by their elders. This rejection of responsibility characterizes student groups in Japan, France, Germany, the United States, and many other countries."

Youth rebellions are not new, and particularly not new on college campuses. On this point the medieval universities afford some bloody and memorable examples. In more modern times the lawless behavior of students in Latin American universities has reduced the value of their diplomas and made their institutions the laughing stock of the educational world. The loss of control by the civil authorities in Tokyo, Rome, and Paris has seriously impaired the academic reputation of what until very recently were great universities.

Student unrest was a phenomenon abroad long before it was imported here. Authorities are divided as to whether it is communist controlled. The truth probably is that there are both communist inspired and non-communist inspired student rebellions. But they always tend to merge. One sees the same names, the same faces in a score of countries. The patterns are the same, whether or not there is a central apparatus.

The faculty did not create the world-wide movement of student disorder. They did not create the confrontations and demonstrations that began with Berkeley in the United States. Here student rebellion grew out of the civil rights movement. The recent large scale disorders, however, have been encouraged by members of the college faculties. They could have been easily controlled but for the faculty.

The Vice President and Provost of Columbia, Dr. David Truman, told the truth about events at Columbia when he said that members of the Columbia faculty "substantially and decisively contributed to the catastrophe" that struck that campus in April of last year. The story is the same wherever there has been prolonged or repeated campus disorder.

It was de Tocqueville who remarked that tensions tend to increase when times begin to improve. The unrest of black students is not unrelated to the fact that their numbers have vastly increased and their social position on college campuses has been greatly improved. Institutions that have done the most in too short a time may expect the most trouble. Disorders are most likely in institutions where there has been an explosive change in the ratio of blacks to whites. The timing of the unrest is most unfortunate. When the boat is already rocking we don't need more people to shake it.

The black students are being given bad advice, but we must remember that many of their grievances are real. This is a new day for them. They are no longer resigned to things that cannot be changed. They know that things can and will be changed. What they are trying to do is to stop the stalling and overcome the inertia. They are giving rapid change an extra push. We will have to say no when their demands are unreasonable, but we should act quickly on some of their requests.

And now I approach my final point. We have the greatest universities in the world. In terms of quality there is nothing in Europe to compare with them. But they are in danger. The danger is both from without and from within. The first threat from without is from the general public. The public has reached the limit of its patience. The

public desires an end to violence, and particularly an end to violence by students and faculties it supports through public taxation. The public will get what it wants—but it may also get far more. The danger is an overreaction that may destroy both the freedom and the autonomy of the university, and with this, the high quality of the education offered.

A second outside threat is by the labor unions. A year ago the New York State Legislature took away the exemption of colleges from the requirement of collective bargaining. We will begin to pay the price of this in the spring of this year. The prediction is that all the units of the State University will be unionized—including the faculty—within the next five years. Can you see the feather bedding of the future? Can you avoid the retention of the most unfit teachers or their automatic promotion to the highest ranks? The faculty unionization of the units of the State University can spell nothing but disaster to the dreams of Chancellor Gould for a State University of the highest quality. And the private colleges face the same deadly threat.

But the threats from the public, the legislature, the congress and the unions are no more serious than the danger from within. And this danger is not so much from the students as from the faculty. The student rebellion has about run its course. It is the faculty rebellion that is still strong. If universities are destroyed it will be by the collective stupidity of the members of the faculty.

The interest of the faculty in administrative power is much greater than the interest shown by members of the student body. Like the interests of the unions it is a search for power without responsibility. Someone else will have to provide the money—they simply want the pleasure of spending it. They think they should run the university. They want power without limit.

Some of them also appear to want to change the nature and purpose of the university. The members of the new left would make the university a propaganda agency committed to partisan political ends. If they had their way it would no longer be an institution in search of the truth. It would announce what the truth is, and deny dissent to anyone who disagrees. It would have the answer to every question of public policy, although here they would have to wait until they are informed of the party line.

The favorite game of the faculty leftists is follow the leader. Any public pronouncement from a handful of radicals has a domino effect. An activist committee from Yale, Harvard or Stanford has only to stumble in the dark and all the new left will genuflect. Their behavior is predictable. The knee jerks are automatic.

In a very few minutes we shall be listening to skits prepared by members of the bar. If I were writing a skit for a faculty show, I would have an artist appear and paint a coat of arms for certain faculty groups. In the upper left-hand corner I would have him paint a pompous parrot, in the upper right-hand corner a group of chattering monkeys (monkey see, monkey do), in the lower left a braying ass, and in the lower right an ostrich standing with great dignity with his head in the sand.

But I should say this with a smile and I must correct myself. I should like to make it clear that I am speaking of a minority of the faculty—not of the faculty as a whole. It is the same minority that gives such strong support to student activists and revolutionaries. It is the same minority that presses for unlimited faculty power. It is the same minority that would change the nature and the purpose of the university. Numerically it is not large but its strength is increasing. We should not underestimate the threat from this group to the search for truth and freedom.

Let me repeat what I said at the outset. Power without responsibility is the new name of the game. The students want it. The faculty wants it. The labor unions want it. The legislature wants it. There is even evidence that the courts want it. In this struggle for power, the autonomy and, with it, the quality and the freedom of the university could be destroyed.

THE SPARK OF RESENTMENT

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. C. Caswell, publisher of the Clarinda, Iowa, Herald-Journal, has written an excellent editorial on what he feels may be an overlooked element contributing to the current wave of student disorders sweeping this country. Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial which should be of interest to my colleagues in the House for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clarinda (Iowa) Herald Journal, Apr. 24, 1969]

THE SPARK OF RESENTMENT

Political and economic leaders interviewing students involved in college campus disorders may be missing a point that I believe is a spark in these flare-ups. It is an ostensibly minor thing that is conditioning youths to become easily swayed by those itinerant instigators who show up at the schools but are not real students. It softens our boys when they leave the hometown, ready to fall for the lurid lure.

It is the minimum wage, which has closed the door to many part time and beginning jobs for boys just out of high school and ready for careers or college money. Many businesses in average towns and metropolitan environs that are large enough to employ several persons simply will not pay the high minimum; some curtail operations or abandon expansion, and small towns thus lose progress.

Our own business formerly always had at least one local young man learning the trade. Now our type of business gets new employees when needed from trade schools or has to hire them away from other shops.

When the minimum wage was instituted years ago under pressure from unions there was provision for obtaining permission for learners at a lower rate, the government to pay the difference. We tried it with two young men, but the amount of red tape soon stopped that, discouraging both the employee and employer.

I do not blame labor, for I think if our country didn't have organized labor it would be a nationwide sweatshop. The idea seemed reasonable—but setting it too high is the trouble.

Many youths go off to college on dad's expense or borrowed money with an inbred feeling of resentment at not being able to earn their way. In comes the itinerant rabble rouser with a few more such suggestions to add to the kids' resentment, and voila! A lot of impressionable youths see the excitement of remolding the school systems and all society.

Be it Communist or what, the stranger in guise of a student finds it easy going, and he needs only a small percent of the school enrollment to upset the whole school.

This same spark may be back of many of the other disturbances in our nation today.

—CCC.

LAUB SETS TORRID LEASING PACE IN CLIMB TO TOP AS OFFICE BROKER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the Real Estate Weekly, a leading publication in New York, recently selected Kenneth D. Laub as its "Man of the Week." Mr. Laub is doing much to advance the economy of New York City, and I would like to call this article to your attention:

LAUB SETS TORRID LEASING PACE IN CLIMB TO TOP AS OFFICE BROKER

Appearing on a television program recently, Kenneth Laub discussed the remarkable commercial growth of New York City and the outlook for future office building development.

Mr. Laub was a likely choice to discuss Manhattan office market conditions. During the past seven years, he has closed leases involving over $400 million in aggregate rentals.

At 30 years of age, Mr. Laub is recognized not only as one of New York's outstanding real estate brokers but has also demonstrated skill and sophistication as a corporate president and real estate executive.

As chief officer of Kenneth D. Laub & Co., he has managed to organize and build an active real estate organization in a comparatively few months.

As an indication of the firm's prominence, since its formation three months ago, the firm has accounted for over $100 million in various types of real estate transactions.

The Laub organization's rapid growth matches the personal success of Mr. Laub, who entered the real estate field at the age of 21, almost a decade ago, with Collins Tuttle & Co., Inc. Later he joined Tishman Realty & Construction Co., and was soon elected a vice president of Tishman Management Corp., a wholly-owned Tishman subsidiary.

It was at Tishman that Mr. Laub helped rent such prominent buildings as 666 Fifth Ave., 866, 909, and 919 Third Ave., as well as concluding deals for Tishman buildings in California, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. He also aided in the successful development of Tishman's commercial leasing division.

During his career Mr. Laub has represented a wide range of major corporations.

Mr. Laub, whose company was recently named by Tishman Realty as renting agent for One Marine Midland Plaza, a 300,000-square-foot office building now under construction in Rochester, is a graduate of Cornell University and New York University. He is a member of the Real Estate Board of New York, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Realty Club, and the International Real Estate Federation.

A SALUTE TO CAPT. PHIL BOATNER

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter I have

just received from one of my constituents, Capt. Phil Boatner, who is a patient in Brooke Army Hospital, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., after having been wounded in Vietnam. In a day when pseudocynicism seems much the fashion, it is very reassuring to know there are fine, young Americans such as Captain Boatner to strengthen the backbone of our Nation. I know you will want to join me in a salute to Captain Boatner.

Captain Boatner's letter reads as follows:

I am in Brooke Army Hospital in Fort Sam Houston. This is as close as Uncle could get me to home (McAlester) after I was hit Easter Sunday by four AK–47 rounds from the NVA very near Cambodia.

Sir, the doctor tells me my left leg will be permanently disabled. I have a lovely wife and two sons in McAlester.

I do not have a college education, but my government made me a Captain and allowed me to lead a rifle company in Viet Nam for the 1st Air Cav Div.

The men I led in Viet Nam, (hippies, educated, wealthy, poor, yankees, southern, Negro, Puerto Rican) are the greatest Americans I've ever been blessed by associating with.

The first AK round I took went through my left ear. I can't afford to feel sorry for myself I am too lucky just being alive.

I volunteered to go to Viet Nam. I don't have a college education but am working on one at Cameron in Lawton and through correspondence.

I shall never get smart enough to refuse my very life to my country.

I love Oklahoma and America and am glad to have done so little for so much.

I sincerely appreciate your dedication to our community and nation and want you to know that there are many great Americans in Southeast Asia eating C-Rations, no showers, poor mail service and many hardships but all smiles, courage and honor.

Thanks again and God Bless.

Respectfully yours,

PHILLIP C. BOATNER,
Captain, Infantry, U.S. Army.

WILLIAM PASSMORE OF EAST CHICAGO, IND., NAMED "HANDICAPPED AMERICAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1968"

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of East Chicago, Ind., and the Calumet region of Indiana are indeed proud of William Passmore who has received the honor of "Handicapped American of the Year for 1968." The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped announced Mr. Passmore's designation February 20 of this year.

The President's trophy, awarded annually by the President's Committee to the individual chosen the handicapped American of the year, will be presented to Mr. Passmore at the Committee's annual meeting tomorrow morning in the Washington Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C.

In announcing the award Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, stated:

Mr. Passmore is a double amputee. Though confined to a wheelchair, he has fought back against seemingly impossible odds to make a record for himself as a community leader and an inspiration to the handicapped.

Through his position as work Coordinator for the East Chicago's Committee on Social and Economic Opportunity, Mr. Passmore has opened many doors to employment for the handicapped and the disadvantaged so that these people may achieve economic independence and render service in community life.

All of Indiana may take great pride in Mr. Passmore's achievements because he is living proof that handicapped persons can earn their way and contribute to community life.

Previous to this appointment by Mayor John Nicosia of East Chicago, William Passmore, on his own initiative, visited hospitals, contacted industrial leaders, employers, and secured many jobs for handicapped people of East Chicago and the surrounding area.

Last Monday upon William Passmore's arrival in Washington he was formally received in Speaker MCCORMACK's office and congratulated by the Speaker; Majority Leader CARL ALBERT; Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD; and Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, minority leader of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an editorial tribute paid to William Passmore by Washington reporter, Ernie Hernandez, of the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune.

TOP PRIZE: U.S. HONORS AREA DUAL AMPUTEE

(By Post Tribune Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The highest tribute the nation gives to the handicapped for courage and determination will be presented by President Nixon to an East Chicago man May 1.

Popular William Passmore, 39, of 4930 Melville, a double amputee who has led the fight for jobs and equality for the disabled and disadvantaged in East Chicago, has been named "Handicapped American 1968."

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped selected him from nominations from all parts of the country.

The award—known as the President's Trophy—will be presented to him at the annual meeting of the committee at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

For the past two years, Passmore has been work coordinator for the East Chicago Mayor John Nicosia's Committee on Social and Economic Opportunity.

In this job, as he counsels and places disadvantaged youth in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, he has helped more than 100 young men and women find permanent jobs in private industry.

Passmore has been known also as one of the most enthusiastic basketball fans in Northwest Indiana. He and his wheelchair are familiar at East Chicago games, sectionals and regionals.

A football accident while he was a student in Washington High School eventually cost him both his legs and confined him to his wheelchair.

In 1946 when he was 16, he spent 11 months at St. Catherine's Hospital in East Chicago as a patient. In 1949 he returned to have his legs amputated.

Knowing the loneliness of being in a hospital, Passmore has made it a practice—since the late 1940's—to visit patients at St. Catherine's Sunday afternoon. In 1967, he received the hospital's "Visitor of the Year" award.

In 1951, he finished high school with the help of tutors, and he started work as a dispatcher for Red Top Cab Co. For 11 years, he toiled on the midnight shift while spending his days in volunteer work helping the handicapped and disadvantaged.

At the same time, he wrote a weekly column, "East Chicago on the Go," for the Chicago Defender. This is his 18th year as a columnist.

He also is a part-time student at Indiana University Northwest Campus, where he's majoring in sociology and criminology.

His interests in these two subjects stem from his work in rehabilitation and job programs at the Indiana State Prison at Michigan City. He helped set up "Convicts Anonymous," a group therapy organization in the prison, and "Convicts Unlimited," which helps ex-convicts find jobs.

Active in the East Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, Passmore served two years as president. Later he was named to the Senate of Jaycees' World Organization, a select, honorary group of young men.

Passmore was honored at a "Birthday Salute" dinner last April by the East Chicago community at which city officials, private citizens and representatives of service clubs and local industry attended.

His community activities are varied, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Northern Indiana Political Action Group, Anselm Forum, and St. Mark's AME Zion Church where he teaches a Sunday School class.

Under unanimous consent, I also include with my remarks a news comment from the Gary, Ind. community newspaper "Info" on William Passmore's recognition by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped:

NIXON TO PRESENT NATIONAL HANDICAPPED AWARD TO EAST CHICAGO'S BILL PASSMORE

The President's Trophy, presented annually to the handicapped American who has done the most with his own life and who has contributed meaningfully to his community will be presented by President Richard M. Nixon to East Chicago's Bill Passmore on the first of May in Washington, D.C. The President's Commission on the Handicapped which will culminate with the presentation of the trophy.

A large contingent of local residents will be accompanying Passmore to Washington, including the President of St. Joseph's College, Fr. Leftko; Superintendent of the East Chicago Schools, Earnest Miller; Executive Secretary of the Gary Urban League, George Coker; Director of Community Relations of the Trade Winds Rehabilitation Center, Harriet Fuller; Mayor of East Chicago, Dr. John B. Nicosia; Dr. and Mrs. J. Winston Harper Mr. and Mrs. Harold Bretzius of Highland and East Chicago Attorney, Henry Walker.

Meetings in Washington are scheduled between Mr. Passmore and Senator Ted Kennedy and Congressman Ray J. Madden. He is also scheduled to visit various hospitals, penitentiaries and reformatories.

The Mayor of Washington will greet Bill who will also attend a night game of the Washington Senators.

CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the March–April 1969 issue of the National

Sheriff contains an excellent article by Sheriff William J. Spurrier of Iowa County, Iowa, president of the National Sheriff's Association. President Spurrier's comments are most thought provoking, and I commend them to my colleagues:

CAMPUS DISORDERS

(By Sheriff William J. Spurrier)

America is suffering from a disease which, unless cured, can, like a cancer, continue to spread until the whole of American society has been consumed. That disease is "minoritytitis." It and its related disease, "permissiveitis" threaten to do what King George, Pancho Villa, the Kaiser, Adolf Hitler, and the Mikado were unable to accomplish.

When Nikita Khrushchev said, not too many years ago, "We will bury you," most of us laughed at his audacity and made jokes about his optimism. Now, as we continue in these last few months of the seditious sixties, we may well reexamine and reevaluate the goals of our enemies and our resolution (if any) to ward off each and every threat made against America and American institutions.

Perhaps nowhere is the illness being felt more than on American campuses. Colleges and universities . . . high schools and even elementary schools . . . are plagued with problems of disobedience and dissidence. Various bands of revolutionaries . . . the bearded and beaded beatniks . . . have disrupted and are disrupting American institutions of learning. Up to now, there has been little done except to give in to their demands . . . to allow what once were great universities to become little more than a shadow of their former selves.

Recently . . . within the past few weeks . . . there have been anguished outcries. These pleas for restoration of order on campus provide at least a modicum of hope that the trend may be reversed . . . that the illness is at long last recognized . . . and that treatment may be begun before the disease reaches a terminal stage.

The issue seems to be one of education for the majority or disruption by the minority. Intermingled with the traditional academic pursuits there is a group interested in majoring only in rebellion and revolution.

Too many educators and administrators have seemingly forgotten that college is not mandatory and therefore those who do not like a particular college or university or who feel it is not operated to suit their whims and fancies are free to leave and either go elsewhere or forget education entirely. The idea of depriving those students who want an education and who are, more often than not, attending the institution at no little financial sacrifice on the part of their parents, is deplorable. When the on-campus and off-campus rabble foment insurrection, sufficient force should be used to guarantee the rights of the majority of students to pursue their course of studies.

School authorities have been rather timid in their approach to the problem. Their *laissez faire* policies have escalated campus disorders into a major national problem.

Following an outbreak in one midwestern university, the Chicago *Tribune* wrote an editorial stating:

"Alumni and friends of Northwestern university must be profoundly dismayed by the university's response to the demands of black power insurgents who seized and held the old administration building for 36 hours. At the same time a handful of white student sympathizers took possession of the dean's office and were unmolested in their assertion of squatters' rights. . . .

"The university administration's capitulation is as complete and humiliating as any event since Henry IV crawled on his knees in sackcloth to Canossa and there made penance and the act of submission to Gregory VII.

"A courageous university administration, with a fit sense of values, would have ended this insurrection within the first 15 minutes and driven out the interlopers. It would have said:

" 'This is a private university. You are here on sufferance. You will abide by the regulations which all other students are required to honor. Your color gives you no sanction and no license. If you don't like it here, you are at liberty to go elsewhere. Now, clear out, or the force necessary to throw you out will be mustered at once.' "

William F. Buckley, Jr., writing of charges leveled against New York City police who finally were called to quash a rebellion at Columbia University, cites a headline which said "Mayor Scores Columbia Sit-Ins—But Backs the Right to Dissent."

The columnist continued, saying:

"That is as if, stumbling into Buchenwald with the liberating army, General Eisenhower had said, waving in the general direction of the corpses, 'I do deplore all of this but I stoutly defend German dissent from the Versailles Treaty.' "

A question which cries out to be answered is simply: Who is to be in charge of any particular school? Is it to be administered by professionals who have devoted a lifetime to study and to those chosen by the supporters, e.g., the taxpayers and/or the alumni, to administer the affairs of the college . . . or is it to be turned over to a group of advocates of free love and one-world socialism intermixed with a dash of treason and a sprinkling of anarchy?

At least one university administrator has demonstrated recently that he will tolerate no nonsense. Were there to be an award for compressing the maximum of good sense into the minimum number of words, the prize would have to go to the courageous and perceptive president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, who stated, simply and forcefully:

"Anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion, be it violent or non-violent, will be given fifteen minutes of meditation to cease and desist. They will be told that they, by their actions, are going counter to the overwhelming conviction of this community as to what is proper here. If they do not within that time period cease and desist, they will be asked for their identity cards. Those who produce these will be suspended from this community. Those who do not have or will not produce identity cards will be assumed not to be members of the community and will be charged with trespassing and disturbing the peace on private property and treated accordingly by law.

"After notification of suspension, or trespass in the case of noncommunity members, if there is not then within five minutes a movement to cease and desist, students will be notified of expulsion from this community and the law will deal with them as non-students."

Here, at long last, is an administrator of a major American university with the perspicacity and the intestinal fortitude to recognize the problem, define it, and to prescribe definite courses of action to be taken in case of attempted revolt within his sphere of authority. The question is, to paraphrase a syrup commercial seen regularly on television, "Why did it take so long?"

The U.S. Supreme Court has done little to help solve the problem. A recent decision involving students in a Des Moines school who had worn black arm bands to class to protest the U.S. involvement in Viet Nam, and at least by inference to show support for the Viet Cong, had been suspended by the principal of that school, after they had refused to divest themselves of the aforementioned black arm bands.

The venerable judges ruled that this deprived the students of their right to freedom of expression and ordered that they be allowed to return to their classes.

The Washington *Star*, shortly after the ruling, posited the possibility that this or that group might now wish to appear in class with bared thighs to protest something or other. Presumably this would be within their right to do so.

The "minoritytitis" has apparently caused a reversal of the Biblical concept that if one's hand offends him, that hand should be cast away. The modern trend appears to be that if the hand is offensive, cast away all but the hand and preserve that diseased appendage as a sacred object.

The right to dissent and the right to disrupt are two entirely different "rights." The old adage of two wrongs not making a right is, of course, as good today as it ever was. But we might add to it that in America today, any number of "rights" may make a wrong.

Father Hesburgh has written the best prescription yet on dealing with sick colleges, universities, etc. May other administrators make use of this same "wonder drug" before the patient, i.e., American education, dies and is buried by the enemies of America.

TRIBUTE TO A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Mr. A. Philip Randolph, a great American, who will be celebrating his 80th birthday on May 6, 1969. For half a century Mr. Randolph has been one of our most prominent spokesmen for civil rights for the Negro race. Mr. Randolph has carried on this fight during periods when the civil rights fight was not only unpopular but also dangerous.

At this time I include in the RECORD an editorial from the April 17 editorial section of the Bayonne Times. This article succinctly but justly praises Mr. A. Philip Randolph.

The article follows:

TOWERING BLACK LEADER

In an active and useful life that spans eight decades, A. Philip Randolph was a leader in the field of civil rights before the fathers of some of today's self-appointed black spokesmen were born.

In the 1920's, he fought for integration against the Black-to-Africa movement of Marcus Garvey, just as today he opposes the movement for black separatism.

In 1924, he began the long and arduous campaign to organize the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

In 1941, Randolph's plan for a massive Negro march on Washington convinced President Roosevelt to sign an executive order banning discrimination in war industries and setting up the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

In 1963, he conceived and directed the famous March on Washington, one of the landmarks in the civil rights struggle.

A. Philip Randolph was 80 on April 15 and remains passionately committed to the principles of democracy, nonviolence, integration and economic equality.

Those who demand more teaching about black heroes in the nation's schools could do far worse than begin with the study of this man's life.

BEES AND PESTICIDES

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, Washington's Fourth Congressional District, which I represent, is noted for the variety of fine agricultural products grown there and shipped to all parts of the country and the world. Our fine fruit products and many other crops are highly dependent upon honeybees for pollination, but in recent years the increasing use of chemicals for control of pests on agricultural crops has brought us face to face with a situation that carries threatening implications for the agriculture of Washington State and the rest of the Nation as well. An unwanted and unintentional side effect of the use of chemical economic poisons has been the widespread poisoning of bees and the destruction of thousands of bee colonies, causing hardship and financial loss to beekeepers and raising a question as to whether or not the pollination needs of U.S. agriculture can be adequately met in the future.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, are deeply concerned over this problem, which seems to be steadily growing worse. Last year, several of my colleagues and I sponsored legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to honey producers for losses sustained as a result of the application of economic poisons on, near, or adjoining croplands. This proposal was based on the same principle as the dairy indemnity legislation which Congress has approved for several years now.

The bee indemnity legislation would provide reimbursement to beekeepers who, through no fault of their own, have suffered bee losses from pesticide poisoning, and would help them continue in business and provide the pollination services so necessary to orchardists and other farmers.

Effective crop pest control is vital to U.S. agriculture. Without adequate control of insects and other pests destructive to crops, the cost of agricultural production in this country could be expected to skyrocket. The utilization of economic poisons by U.S. farmers has been a significant factor in raising yields and quality of agricultural commodities, and lowering production costs.

However, it is imperative that our attention be directed to the problems which have been associated with the application of economic poisons—such as the destruction of honey bees—and the need to develop more selective, less hazardous means of pest control. Perhaps the most promising possibility for a long-term solution to these problems lies with the development of biological methods of control. The Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been working in this direction for a number of years, and is achieving a degree of success that may eventually reduce the need for chemical economic poisons.

Today, a number of my colleagues and I are introducing bee indemnity legislation similar to the proposal which was introduced in the previous Congress. We are hopeful that this legislation will not only result in indemnification for the beekeepers who need it, but will also bring the full impact and significance of this problem more into focus for Congress, the administration and the American people, and thus bring increased attention to the necessity for a long-range, overall solution.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO ASA PHILIP RANDOLPH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to pay tribute to Mr. Asa Philip Randolph on his 80th birthday. Mr. Randolph has long been a man completely devoted to the welfare and progress of the Negro and the working man.

His achievements are well known. As the founder of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in 1925, he has followed a career dedicated to improving the lot of Negroes throughout the labor movement. As organizer and director of the march on Washington movement in 1941, he performed a lasting service to the Nation, and, as a result of this proposed march, President Roosevelt established the Committee on Fair Employment Practices. In 1957, Mr. Randoph became a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

The son of a minister, he early demonstrated the strength of character which marked his career. As a boy, he worked in a grocery store and sold newspapers. After finishing high school, Mr. Randolph left for New York City, where he worked in various jobs while continuing his education at CCNY.

Mr. Randolph's interest in the labor movement led to his organization of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, the first Negro union. Mr. Randolph's union led the struggle to end employment discrimination against Negroes.

I am honored to have this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Asa Philip Randolph on a lifetime of achievement.

RED ARMY'S POWER GROWS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the United States approach any discussions with the Soviet Union with a sound analysis of the situation within the Communist colossus.

Thoughtful commentary by an exceptionally well-informed observer of Eastern Europe was carried in the Springfield, Ill., State Journal of April 12, in a column by Copley Press correspondent Dumitru Danielopol.

The article follows:

RED ARMY'S POWER GROWS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"It is most probable that the coming 15 years or so the world will continue to live under the pressure and terrors of war and that the fighters for freedom in Russia and in the other Soviet republics will sacrifice themselves and languish in dungeons."

The man who predicts this speaks from experience. He is the former Yugoslav Vice Premier Milovan Djilas—a Communist who served two terms in prison because of his ideological break with Comrade Tito.

Djilas' look at the Communist world of 1984 is a far cry from the imaginings of George Orwell.

Orwell's "Big Brother is watching you" idea will have been modified, says Djilas by the growing nationalism within the Communist empire and man's insatiable struggle for freedom and independence.

Though there is a splintering in the world Communist movement—as well as an ideological collapse within the Soviet empire—that doesn't make the Soviet Union less dangerous, says Djilas, because it remains aggressively imperialistic.

"Soviet communism is in fact the merger of imperialism and totalitarianism, and it has essentially remained this to the present day," he says.

"Stalin's purges were not mad slaughter, but the violent transformation of Lenin's revolutionary party into a privileged and imperialist caste."

He claims revisionism and liberalization in Czechoslovakia were not the real reasons for Soviet intervention. He sees the motive as "imperialist aspirations and the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy."

The same reasons might prompt a Soviet adventure in Yugoslavia, Djilas warns, but he sees considerable resistance.

The danger in Russia, as he sees it, is that the Communist party is slowly slipping into the control of the Red Army.

"Without creative ideologists and leaders, the party apparatus will be in no position to offer resistance to the militaristic 'saviors' of the state and socialism," he says.

The Red marshals, he points out, have already rejected Dmitri Ustinov as minister of defense insisting that a military man, Marshal Andrei Grechko, take that post.

The ascendency of the Red military, he says, will be brought about chiefly by internal, not external, reasons.

The answer? Djilas and U.S. Defense Secretary Melvin Laird agree. It is counter-military might.

Djilas advocates a more united Western Europe and a continuing overwhelming American deterrent.

Meanwhile, the Yugoslav also sees a China stronger, better organized and more stubborn in its demand that Moscow return the territories once seized by the Russian czars. When that happens, he argues, "The Soviet militaristic bureaucracy will be forced to be more amenable to the West . . ."

Beyond 1984 he holds out the hope that the military despotism in the Soviet Union will eventually disappear because it will be basically a continuation of an already bankrupt old order.

But, he says, we had better keep our guard up until that day dawns.

URGES PROBE OF IOWA FIRM, MAIL OFFICIAL

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the administration will keep close watch over the situations like the one described in the following news stories from the Des Moines Register. That newspaper is to be congratulated for its participation.

The articles follow:

URGES PROBE OF IOWA FIRM, MAIL OFFICIAL—AWARDED CONTRACTS, JOINED COMPANY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator Gordon Allott (Rep., Colo.) Tuesday asked for a General Accounting Office (GAO) investigation of the policies of former Assistant Postmaster General William J. Hartigan in connection with contracts awarded to an Iowa air-taxi firm.

Last week, Allott declared that Hartigan, a key Kennedy political organizer, has become a vice-president of the Iowa air-taxi corporation that received a large number of contracts while Hartigan was assistant postmaster general.

In a letter to Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats, Allott said he had "received additional information which causes me no little concern" over the policies followed by Hartigan as assistant postmaster general in charge of transportation.

SURFACE TO AIR

"Such an investigation by GAO should attempt to determine whether Mr. Hartigan manipulated the regulations of the post office so as to enable the rapid and wholesale conversion of surface mail transport routes to air, and the extent to which he might personally have benefited from such action," Allott stated.

"In addition, it should be determined whether any particular carrier benefited from this conversion to a degree they now dominate the industry."

Hartigan has been "a consultant" for the Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville Stage Line, Inc., of Des Moines, since Mar. 6, 1968—about two weeks after he left his job as assistant postmaster general.

His contract called for $20,000 a year to be paid each month, officials of Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville told The Register.

Hartigan told The Register that he did have the official responsibility, and did approve more than 20 air-taxi mail contracts with the Des Moines firm in the six-month period prior to leaving the Post Office Department.

LOW BIDDER

However, Hartigan said that "all of the contracts were on bids, and Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville was the low bidder."

Hartigan said that he had avoided "any arrangement" with Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville prior to leaving the Post Office Department, but that he had "general offers" from that firm and others while still on the post office payroll.

The laws that prohibit making contracts with persons or firms dealing with a department make it difficult to make any arrangements before leaving government, Hartigan said.

"Once I got out of government, I didn't waste any time contacting some of the people who had offered me jobs," Hartigan said. "I have a wife and seven children, and I can't do too much sitting around between jobs."

NEVER SOLICITED

Hartigan declared that since he left the government he has "never solicited any contracts at the Post Office Department on behalf of Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville or any of my other clients."

The "conflict or interest law" prohibits a former employe or officer of a federal government agency from going before the agency "in connection with any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, charge, acquisition, arrest or other particular matter" as agent or attorney for any client.

Hartigan said he has been at the Post Office Department on many occasions "for social calls, and for obtaining explanations about government bulletins on transportation, particularly on safety."

In recent weeks, Hartigan has been made a vice-president of Sedalia, Marshall Boonville and may go to Des Moines to take on the full-time job with the Iowa firm.

FLOOR SPEECH

Allott's first criticism of Hartigan in a floor speech a week ago was based upon the information that Hartigan was becoming a vice-president of the Iowa firm.

At that time, Allott did not know that Hartigan had become a consultant for the Iowa firm at $20,000-a-year only two weeks after leaving the government payroll.

The Colorado senator has questioned whether it was proper for Hartigan to become an officer of the Iowa firm even a year after having made more than 20 awards of air-taxi mail contracts to the Iowa firm.

Hartigan, a Boston man, was an airline employe who was active in the Senate campaigns of the late John F. Kennedy in Massachusetts, and in the 1960 presidential campaign.

TED'S CAMPAIGN

He was rewarded with a White House appointment in 1961, and later moved to the Post Office Department. In 1962 he resigned as assistant postmaster general to work on the political campaign of Edward M. Kennedy in Massachusetts.

After the campaign was over, President Kennedy again appointed Hartigan as an assistant postmaster general in charge of transportation. He kept that job until February, 1968.

CLAMP SECRECY LID ON RECORD OF POSTAL AIDE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Civil Service Commission Wednesday clamped a secrecy lid on the spectacular promotional record of a Kennedy political appointee who made startling steps up the financial ladder at the Post Office Department under the tutelage of his brother-in-law.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress called the withholding of the records a "ludicrous" cover-up.

The records deal with the hiring and the promotion of G. Allen Brown, brother-in-law of William G. Hartigan, the former assistant postmaster general who is currently under fire in connection with a million dollars in mail contracts awarded to an Iowa air-taxi firm.

BARS THEM

Nixon administration officials say they are willing to make the whole record available on Brown or any other employe, but that a Civil Service Commission regulation instituted last December bars them from releasing the information.

James Henderson, public information director at the Post Office Department, told The Register that he had contacted the legal office at the Civil Service Commission to see if the promotional records on Brown could be made public and was told that this is barred by law.

Henderson and White House Communications Director Herbert G. Klein said Wednesday that it is "reasonable" to expect that the government would be willing to make public the work record of all government employes from the time they enter government until they leave.

Klein said that while he believes the information on Brown's promotional record should be made public, the Post Office Department is bound by the Civil Service Legal Department regulations "until we can straighten it out." "This isn't what a Freedom of Information Law was intended to do," Klein said.

"We are going to work on it immediately," Klein said.

FEW EXCEPTIONS

Representative John Moss (Dem., Cal.) declared that the Civil Service Department's regulations and interpretations of the Freedom of Information Law "are ludicrous."

Moss, one of the authors of the Freedom of Information legislation, declared that the law was intended to make all government information available with only a few carefully worded exceptions.

One of those exceptions was "personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

Moss declared that this "exception" was never intended to be expanded by civil service regulations into what amounts to a bar or release of any information except current job title and salary.

ONE SENTENCE

Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Ia.) declared that the Civil Service Commission regulation which was modified last December into an absolute barrier against disclosure of all but the most limited personnel information is "an outrageous distortion of the Freedom of Information Act."

"I do not know how any lawyers at the Civil Service Commission or any members of the commission could have interpreted that one sentence as such a blanket barrier to personnel information," Gross said.

Gross declared that the series of regulations that bar access to personnel promotions were instituted under the Johnson administration.

He added that it appeared that "the last regulation tightening the screws on this information came in the last month to make it more difficult for newsmen and others to find out information on the personnel juggling that was taking place."

NO LOGIC

The Iowa Republican, a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, said he will ask for legislation to change the ruling if the Nixon administration fails to force an effective change.

Gross declared that "there is no logic in barring the public from records of when a man started work for the government, his demotions and his promotions, as well as the pay increases he receives."

"It is public money that pays him, and it is public business he is doing," Gross said. "The manner in which he was promoted or demoted is a part of his qualifications for any job he holds in government, and it should be made public upon request."

SIDE ISSUE

The question of access to Brown's personnel record is a side issue that flowed from the controversy over Hartigan's employment as a "consultant" and later as a vice-president of the Iowa firm, Sedalia, Marshall,

Boonville Stage Lines, Inc., immediately after leaving the Post Office Department.

Senator Gordon Allott (Rep., Colo.) had revealed Hartigan's role in awarding more than 20 contracts totaling more than a million dollars to the Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville firm in the months immediately before he left his job as assistant postmaster general in charge of transportation.

Gross has contended that there is a possible "conflict of interest," and Allott has written a letter to the General Accounting Office (GAO) asking for a probe of possible "manipulation" of air-taxi contracts by Hartigan.

In his letter to the GAO, Allott raised a still unexplained question about "examining the role played by his (Hartigan's) relatives and close friends who were postal employes."

Brown was brought into the Post Office Department by Hartigan in 1961 as a so-called "schedule C" political appointee with a salary of about $13,000-a-year.

Hartigan made Brown, his brother-in-law, his executive assistant in the transportation division and later helped arrange for Brown to become a career Civil Service employe with a super-grade rank of GS–16.

DECLINES DETAILS

Under the Civil Service secrecy policies it is impossible to learn any details about this, and Brown declines to give any details. He has now risen from that original $13,000-a-year political job to a $27,400-a-year job as a career civil servant.

What is equally interesting to the critics of the general arrangement is the fact that Brown remains on the inside while Hartigan has moved on the outside as a "consultant" on postal transportation matters.

The conflict of interest law bars former employes of a government agency from going back to the agency for a year to seek contracts or other government rulings or decisions.

Hartigan admits that he has made many "social calls" at the Post Office Department, and has made many "inquiries" about postal regulations.

However, he says he has made no efforts to win contracts for the Iowa firm or any other firm, and believes he has done nothing that is a violation of the "conflicts of interest" law.

Brown was reluctant to discuss even his present job title, as director of program budgeting in the transportation division, or his $27,400-a-year salary.

NO FAVORITISM

Brown, a business administration graduate of Colby College in Waterville, Maine, spent 20 years in transportation work for American Airlines before taking the job at the Post Office Department in 1961.

He said there was "no favoritism" and that "my work experience qualified me for the job."

"I can't understand why anyone would be interested in what I'm doing," Brown said. "I'm just a career government official doing my job."

LIFT SECRECY LID IN POSTAL AIDE'S CASE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Civil Service Commission Thursday admitted it was "a mistake" to instruct federal agencies that it is a "violation of the law" to make public the government employment record of government employes.

The change of position by the legal office of the Civil Service Commission came within 24 hours of the time that The Register revealed that the commission had used the Freedom of Information Act to suppress release of essentially all personnel information.

RAPID RISE

David A. Nelson, general counsel for the Post Office Department, told The Register that he was notified early Thursday that the Civil Service Commission had made "a mistake" in telling Post Office officials that it would be "illegal" for them to make the step-by-step promotional record of government employes available to newspapers or the public.

The inquiries by The Register involved details of the rapid rise of G. Allan Brown from a $13,000-a-year job to a $27,400-a-year job while working for his brother-in-law, William Hartigan, former assistant postmaster general in charge of transportation.

Nelson told The Register that the detailed government record of Brown and any other friends and relatives of Hartigan will be made available to the press and the public now that the "erroneous" opinion has been reversed.

The dispute over the access to the record of Brown, now director of program budgeting and administration in the transportation division, was an off-shoot from an investigation that Senator Gordon Allott (Rep., Colo.) has demanded of Hartigan's role in the award of more than 20 mail contracts, totaling more than $1 million, to a Des Moines air-taxi firm, Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville Stage Lines, Inc.

ACCEPTED POST

A few weeks after Hartigan left his job as assistant postmaster general in charge of transpotration he took a $20,000-a-year job as a "consultant" for the Iowa firm, and in recent weeks it has been announced that he has accepted a post as vice-president of the firm.

Allott and Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Ia.) have raised questions about the propriety of Hartigan taking the job with the firm, and they also have raised questions of possible conflicts of interest.

In a letter to the General Accounting Office (GAO), Allott has asked for an investigation with special attention to the role of Hartigan and "his relatives and friends" on contracts involving the Iowa firm.

Access to the personnel promotion records of Brown and others was an essential step in the over-all investigation.

NO FAVORITISM

Hartigan and officials of the Iowa firm say there was "no favoritism" and that the mail contracts were awarded "on bids."

In the course of the investigation it has become clear that many persons who were given unusual treatment in job assignments and promotions under Hartigan have remained in the transportation division and that Hartigan has moved out into the Washington world as a "consultant" on mail transportation contracts.

"It is a convenient arrangement, to say the least," Gross said Thursday. The Iowa congressman said it was "outrageous" that the Civil Service Commission would even try to withhold the records on when Brown was hired and promoted under Hartigan.

"It was an outrageous distortion of the Freedom of Information Act into an information suppression act," Gross said. "I am pleased that the Nixon administration has forced the change in the civil service instructions, and I am hopeful that there will be more changes in the still too restrictive regulations of the Civil Service Commission with regard to personnel matters."

CONDUCT HEARINGS

Representative John Moss (Dem., Calif.), one of the authors of the Freedom of Information Act, called the Civil Service Commission's initial interpretation "ludicrous."

"If it isn't straightened out completely, we will conduct hearings on this matter," Moss said.

Senator Allott called the Civil Service Commission interpretation of the law "absurd and unreasonable."

"When Congress passed that law it intended that personnel information be kept secret only for good and sufficient reasons," Allott said. "In this case, I fail to see any such reasons. I was delighted to learn that the Nixon administration has taken the proper view of this question, and has assisted in the disclosure of proper information. This is certainly the will of Congress."

Herbert G. Klein, White House communications director, and James Henderson, director of public information for the Post Office Department, had commented critically Wednesday on the Civil Service Commission ruling as "unreasonable."

Henderson said Thursday that he still is unhappy about the restrictions on personnel information despite the fact that there was "an apology" for the initial "mistake" in ruling that it would be a "law violation" to give reporters the step-by-step promotion record.

Even now the civil service continues in operation a regulation which bars release of any information about a government employe's age, his education record, or employment record prior to becoming a government employe.

Karl Ruediger, assistant general counsel for the Civil Service Commission, said Thursday that present regulations still include release of such information as "a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy" under the Freedom of Information Act.

BEEN DISTORTED

An investigation of the history of the Freedom of Information Act and the interpretations of it show how a law designed "to protect the right of the public to information" has, in the words of congressional critics, "been distorted" into a tool for a cover-up of information.

The intent of the law was so clear that an attorney general's memorandum in June, 1967, said it was "an affirmative direction to all agencies to make information available to the public."

There were nine areas of "exemption" including "national defense and foreign policy" and "personnel files . . . the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

PLEDGES END TO SECRECY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—White House Communications Director Herbert G. Klein said Friday that he is preparing a directive to all federal agencies instructing them that the promotional records of all government employes must be made public.

Klein said he will take the action to assure that no other government agencies become involved in the "mistakes" and misinterpretations of the Freedom of Information Act that resulted in the Post Office barring access to nearly all personnel investigation.

Klein said that it had been called to his attention that a number of government agencies were interpreting the Freedom of Information Act in a manner that was inconsistent with the intent of the law. A provision on the law exempted from disclosure those parts of a personnel file that were "a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy."

Civil Service Commission lawyers had mistakenly interpreted this as barring the public and the press from all information except the name, position title, salary and place of employment of government officials.

Civil Service lawyers had instructed the Post Office Department's press office that it would be "a violation of law" to make public the various jobs a government employe had in government, the salaries and the dates when he was promoted or demoted.

CALLED LUDICROUS

Representative John Moss (Dem., Calif.), author of the Freedom of Information Act, declared this was "a ludicrous" interpretation of the act. Representative H. R. Gross (Rep.,

Iowa) called it an "outrageous distortion" of the act.

James Henderson, public information director in the Post Office Department, disagreed with his legal office and the Civil Service Commission and said he believed it "unreasonable" to withhold such information. However, he was told it would be "illegal" to give the employment record to reporters.

Henderson called some other agencies, and found that other public relations officials were either acting on the erroneous instructions of the Civil Service Commission lawyers or were independently misinterpreting the Freedom of Information Act into a justification for suppressing information

Klein said there obviously is widespread misinterpretation of the law on personnel files, and that he hopes to "clear it up" with a directive that can't be misinterpreted.

HARTIGAN CASE

The specific information being withheld from the press at the Post Office Department involved personnel records of a number of "relatives and friends" of former Assistant Postmaster General William Hartigan.

Hartigan, as assistant postmaster general in charge of transportation, took part in awarding more than 20 mail contracts totaling more than $1 million to a Des Moines air-taxi firm—Sedalia, Marshall, Boonville Stage Lines, Inc. A few weeks after leaving government, Hartigan took a $20,000-a-year consultant job with the same air-taxi firm, and in recent weeks he has been named a vice-president of the firm.

Senator Gordon Allot (Rep., Colo.) and Representative Gross have been critical of Hartigan for possible "conflicts of interest," and Allott has requested a general accounting office investigation of the whole affair.

The questions dealing with the Post Office personnel records were a side issue raised by Allott, who questioned the role "relatives and friends" of Hartigan had in the mail contract transaction.

G. Allan Brown, brother-in-law of Hartigan, was one of those whose record was sought. He entered the Post Office Department as a $13,000-a-year political appointee, and under Hartigan emerged as a $27,400-a-year career Civil Service employe in charge of program budgeting in the transportation division.

THE NEED FOR TAILORS IN THE CLOTHING INDUSTRY

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which I believe would serve the national interest by assisting a sector of our economy which is facing a crisis brought on by shortages in qualified personnel. The clothing industry in the United States is in dire need of obtaining thousands of skilled tailors.

We recognize that the clothing industry in this country has been a world leader in its field for many years. That leadership position is threatened today by a steadily increasing shortage of persons qualified to perform the skilled functions so vital to the industry. A source of tailors exists among nations throughout the world, but cannot be successfully utilized by the clothing industry due to our immigration regulations. My bill is designed to make special visas available to qualified aliens so that clothing manufacturers and retailers can find within foreign countries the tailors needed to fill domestic shortages.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give this legislation its careful consideration because the continued growth of the problems connected with insufficient numbers of tailors employed throughout the United States will have an adverse effect on a wide range of our citizens. This bill, in reality, is only a minimal step toward totally alleviating the crisis, but it is a step which requires some prompt action if we are to guarantee that the domestic clothing industry will be able to continue to responsively serve the clothing needs of the people of this country.

A WORD TO THE WISE

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a magazine came across my desk the other day entitled "Business Today." It is published by the Princeton Business Review Publishing Co. in Princeton, N.J., "by students for students."

I do not personally know the editors or any other staff members, but I was most impressed with their editorial, "A Word to the Wise," dealing with President Nixon's statement on campus disorders.

The editorial states:

The President is showing more patience than most of the public. But we wonder how long this will last. Or should last.

This editorial is particularly enlightening since it was written by one who obviously reflects the thinking of the vast majority of American college students today.

The editorial follows:

A WORD TO THE WISE

Richard Nixon's recent statement on campus disorders was notable for its restraint. He condemned the violence, urged "needed" reform and that was about it. The President is showing more patience than most of the public. But we wonder how long this will last. Or should last.

With few exceptions, college administrators have bent over backwards to appease demonstrators. And even if violence does come (which it usually does), they are loathe to do anything that people might mistake as punishment.

As "understanding" as such an attitude might be, we think that this one-sided tolerance makes a mockery of what a university is supposed to be—a place of rational thinking and rational discourse. Nor does this benign non-action seem to be cooling the urge of disrupters to disrupt.

More importantly, though, it is fanning the already intense resentment of the public towards demonstrators and students in general.

And so what if it does?

Well, if it does, it is going to endanger that cause all enlightened people supposedly worship—academic freedom. Ask a state supported college or university what it's like to live with a modicum of state political interference, multiply that by some high multiple, and that is what you are going to have everywhere if the present disorders continue.

Most colleges have the independence they have because society lets them have it. But that does not mean society will always let them keep it, especially if it thinks that this freedom is being abused.

And you can imagine what will happen to scholarship if any and every tin-horn legislator has the power to decide what the academic institutions may teach, whom they may hire, fire, admit and so forth.

Richard Nixon has given college administrators a respite. But that respite will be brief unless administrators recognize that their obligations extend beyond a handful of hotheaded, headline-hunting militants who exploit any cause, worthy and unworthy alike, for their own end—disruption.

THE FINANCIERS OF REVOLUTION

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the American Conservative Union released a special study which called for a crackdown on the tax-exempt status of the Ford Foundation, the National Student Association, and other groups which, according to the study, abuse the letter and spirit of the exemptions provided by law.

This is an outstanding study. As a member of the ACU board of directors the study has my complete support, and I urge my colleagues and the administration to support it. Written by Mr. Allan Brownfeld and entitled "The Financiers of Revolution," I believe this to be one of the most significant and important studies ever made on how certain foundations and organizations are using loopholes in our tax laws to promote partisan politics, lobbying for legislation favorable to their particular advocation, and sponsoring radical programs of social upheaval.

President Nixon clearly showed his concern about the special privileges enjoyed by these groups in his recent tax message to Congress, and I believe that hearings on tax reform before the House Ways and Means Committee in future weeks will indicate the growing suspicion with which they are held by our colleagues in the Congress.

As Mr. Brownfeld pointed out, a key offender is the Ford Foundation. In recent years the Ford Foundation has consistently engaged in activities under the guise of being "educational" and "nonpartisan" when in fact its grants were being used to finance racial strife and advance the cause of political candidates.

But of all these groups the most notorious example is that of the National Student Association. The Internal Revenue Service should have taken action years ago to revoke NSA tax exempt status, and yet nothing has been done to correct this gross inequity. NSA has been lobbying for leftist causes since its founding, and its programs call for everything from abolishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities—which is now the Internal Security Committee—to support for the admis-

sion of Red China into the United Nations.

There is absolutely no reason why these foundations and organizations should enjoy tax exemptions when they are engaged in activities expressly prohibited in the very law establishing their exempt status. It is sheer hypocrisy for these groups to get by with calling themselves "educational" and "philanthropic."

Mr. Speaker, the ACU report is a call for affirmative action to tighten up these loopholes, and I believe it will meet with widespread support, especially from the average American taxpayer who enjoys no such special consideration.

FREEDOM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a resident of my district, 1st Lt. Michael D. Hatt, recently won an award from the Freedoms Foundation for a speech which he wrote. This young man richly deserves an award for his excellent work, which I am happy to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

A FREE BALLOT—A FREE COUNTRY

You and I are stockholders in freedom. We share in the inherent rights and privileges that were won for us at Lexington and Concord and today are being defended in Vietnam.

Our stock comes in the form of a vote. Freedom's privilege enables mankind to mold his future and strengthen his share in democracy.

Periodically, our board of trustees, the governments at various levels, hold elections. Whether these elections are at town or national level, whether they mean a change in a local code or the election of the President of our nation; our stock is needed to exercise democracy.

When we enter the voting booth, we strengthen our stock in the future of America. We place an "X" in a square that gives direction to freedom. We drop our marked ballot in a locked box that will unlock the chains of servitude and enable men to walk proudly through a free country.

Being a stockholder in freedom does not require being a particular color of race or a certain creed. Its only requirement is that one realizes that voting is a privilege and that one uses it at every opportunity to help men of all races and creeds obtain and sustain their own liberty. But he must remember that as an individual his vote is powerful and significant.

A candidate or an issue can win by one vote, and that one vote can very possibly be cast by a ghetto boy who is voting for the first time. It could be cast by a service man who is performing his duties on the other side of the world. That one winning vote could be made by a disabled veteran who is voting absentee from the bed in which he will spend the rest of his life because he fought for the right to cast a free ballot for a free country.

The people who hold stock in our free system are people who care which way America is going. They care enough to read literature on the candidates and listen to both sides of the story on a bond issue. They care about America because they want to remain free and want their children to grow up in a country where prejudice and hate are nonexistent. They vote because their dream of a better America is the dream that keeps them free. They vote because they *are* the voice of democracy.

Today our country faces a great challenge. We are waging a conflict with a force that breeds destruction of individual freedom. We are confronted with dissenting sects of our nation, some of them just, and others contemptible. We face a constant changing face of America that requires that we help to mold her countenance into justice and liberty for all. Voting assures us that we the stockholders of this nation will continue to participate in the greatest governing system that man has devised.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF DESIGNATING JANUARY 30—THE BIRTHDAY OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT—AS A FEDERAL HOLIDAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, only a handful of the political leaders in all history can qualify for the illustrious title of "statesman," and one of these was Franklin D. Roosevelt, the 32d President of the United States.

It would seem proper, under the circumstances, that the Congress should designate January 30—the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt—as a Federal holiday. For here was a man who, in time of unprecedented crisis, with catastrophe at hand, led us on to victory. And having once performed the miracle, at the domestic level, he proceeded to perform it once again at the international level.

A man of genius, he charted new courses, and for so doing earned the enmity of everyone afraid of progress. A man of daring, he sought to force the mighty to serve the interests of the many, and for so doing aroused the fears of everyone afraid of justice. A man of knowledge, he sought to implement the wishes of the Founding Fathers, and for so doing frightened the pseudopatriots on every hand.

But, for every American he disturbed, there were two others who praised him to the skies. As the author of the New Deal programs of the 1930's, he revived the national economy in record time, to the benefit of grateful millions. As the leader of our national preparedness effort on the eve of American entrance into World War II, he set the stage for firm resistance to the onslaught of totalitarianism. And, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, he engineered one of history's greatest triumphs in World War II.

In the manner of all great men, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a highly controversial figure. And the controversy he aroused has not subsided yet, nor will it ever subside until the four freedoms of which he spoke become realities throughout the world.

In everything he did, Franklin D. Roosevelt appeared before the people as a man of the people—concerned not with self, but with the Nation, with civilization, and with the democratic tradition. That is why, I suppose, you can find his picture still displayed in the homes of many American families, to whom his way and the American way are seemingly synonymous.,

Nor was respect for the Roosevelt legend limited to his countrymen alone. Speaking in behalf of Western Europe, Winston Churchill declared:

In Franklin D. Roosevelt there died the greatest American we have ever known—the greatest champion of freedom who ever brought help and comfort from the new world to the old.

Hailed as a hero in his own time, and so recognized by history, Franklin D. Roosevelt deserves whatever honors we choose to bestow.

I therefore recommend the passage of this bill, designating January 30, the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a Federal holiday.

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN LIBRARY MATERIALS AND SERVICES

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as a trustee of the Brooklyn Public Library, on the occasion of National Library Week, April 20–26, I should like to address myself to the proposed cuts recommended by the administration which will indeed set our progress toward intellectual development back several generations.

During the previous administration appropriation levels never came close to authorizations for library materials and services. In title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year's appropriation was less than 50 percent of the authorization. Under President Johnson's proposed budget, title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act appropriation would have been $42 million, however, with the present proposed budget this important title has been cut to zero. This is indeed a tragedy in a time when our schools and teachers are begging us for materials with which to do their job. We can point to our libraries with pride and say that there are the schools of all of the people. Our libraries and librarians are the universities of the common man and we cannot afford to have these ignored or have the budget so drastically reduced that they must almost go out of business.

The library services title of the Library Services and Construction Act in the administration's proposed budget has been cut 50 percent and in the same act title II, which is the construction portion for new libraries, has been cut to zero. We just cannot allow this to happen in a time when our Nation needs more service, more libraries, more books, more education, not a curtailment of present insufficient library services and material.

The present administration has acknowledged by this proposed budget that they intend to give a low priority to education and to libraries and materials. They have cut the budget figures for the U.S. Office of Education by approximately $370 million, and of this total 25 percent

is in the field of library service. I might add parenthetically that I doubt this would have been allowed to happen if Commissioner James Allen had been here as I can point with pride to the library development both in school libraries and in public libraries in the State of New York under his term as commissioner of education. I feel certain that if he had been in service as U.S. Commissioner of Education that he would not have allowed these severe and drastic cuts in the administration's proposed budget for the U.S. Office of Education.

Because of National Library Week I would like to pay tribute at this time to the dedicated men and women who serve in our libraries across this country. I would like to formally acknowledge the debt that we owe to this profession and to the institutions they serve. We can give no better acknowledgment of this debt or recognition of their service than by restoring to them the funds needed for them to do their job.

LAW AND ORDER SHOULD COME FIRST

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the primary burden of ending the current disruptive confrontations on American campuses is on those who administer the colleges, those who teach in them, and those who attend them.

A recent Gallup poll indicates that campus disorders have replaced the Vietnam war as the No. 1 topic of serious discussion in homes across the country. This conclusion was made evident as the result of a national survey.

In this survey three questions were asked:

First. Do you think college students who break laws while participating in college demonstrations should be expelled or not? The answer: 82 percent said yes, expel them; 11 percent said no; and 7 percent had no opinion.

Second. Would you favor or oppose having Federal loans taken away from students who break laws while participating in campus demonstrations? The answer: 84 percent said yes, favored; 11 percent said no; and 5 percent had no opinion.

Third. Do you think college students should or should not have a greater say in the running of colleges? The answer: 25 percent said yes; 70 percent said no; and 5 percent had no opinion.

The distress of American citizens over this deplorable situation is evidenced in their communications with Members of Congress—written and oral. A recent article by the noted columnist, David Lawrence, places in discerning perspective this situation. I commend this article to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD:

LAW AND ORDER SHOULD COME FIRST

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the vote for George Wallace, or someone who takes his place on a third-party ticket, will be larger in 1972 and bring a closer result than in 1968. Maybe the American people in the congressional election 21 months hence will manifest their discontent also by voting against incumbent senators and representatives who will have failed to do something about the "law and order" situation in the United States.

The Johnson administration did not come to grips with this isuse. The Nixon administration thus far has been engrossed in "planning" and in getting organized, and there is no clear indication as yet whether the problem will be tackled positively.

Evidence has been available for a long time inside our government which proves that the revolts in several universities and colleges in this country—many of them involving white and black militants—are part of a well-organized Communist strategy. This is true also in 25 other countries around the world.

Law-enforcement agencies here know that Communist money and Communist planning have been behind a number of the radical and violent outbursts which have been witnessed in America since 1966. In fact, there is information in government quarters indicating that some of the big "marches" on Washington in recent years and the "demonstrations" in other cities where disturbances have occurred were in a substantial way aided by Communists.

One wonders why committees of Congress—which by their hearings have pointed up this trend—have not been successful in getting action by the Congerss itself. A few members, however, now are beginning to speak out. Rep. Edith Green, D-Oregon, said the other day:

"I'm sick and tired of a minority making it impossible for the majority who want to do so to attend classes. . . .

"We are faced with the fact that we have romantic revolutionaries and anarchists who are simply out to destroy the colleges and universities in which they are enrolled. . . . If a person on a college campus is not there to get a college education, he does not have a right to an education paid for by taxpayers."

But the federal government can assert another right—what has long been called "equal protection of the law." This doctrine can be applied in a statute providing for the arrest and imprisonment of any persons who violate the right of students or teachers to be free from physical interference in the pursuit of the educational process. Certainly seizure of college property is as much of an offense as the takeover of any private property elsewhere or the interruption of any business operations by force.

Unquestionably, the Communists have in some instances gotten into the planning of more trouble only after student organizations have initiated the rebellions. But the government agencies here have collected plenty of data showing that Communists from other parts of the country came across state lines to help foment and intensify disorders. This interstate phase permits federal intervention.

Believing that they will not be prosecuted, the Communists have gotten bolder and bolder, and have actually joined in the meetings of certain student organizations which have so often made headlines. Many of the college presidents have been aware of this but have been hesitant to call in police or state troops for fear of further outbreaks of a more violent nature.

The Congress of the United States, along with the President, has a clear responsibility to put "law and order" ahead of anything else and to secure the immediate enactment of stringent laws dealing with the Communist conspiracies as well as with the flagrant disregard of individual rights being practiced every day on the campuses of American colleges. Public opinion favors an abandonment of alibis, excuses and tactics which have meant "passing the buck" back and forth between the federal and state governments.

The significant fact is that the combined Nixon and Wallace vote of 41 million as against 31 million for the Democratic ticket in November 1968 was largely based on the belief that "law and order" should be promptly restored as the basic principle of American life.

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HANDICAPPED WORKERS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kansas generally and the good people of Iola particularly, are mighty proud of Miss Kathy Brown and her instructor, Miss Margaret Hackney.

Kathy recently wrote an essay "Ability Counts" in which she participated as a contestant in a program sponsored by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. She is in Washington this week, thanks to the generosity of the State AFL–CIO, attending the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

This is the third time in a row and the sixth time in the past 10 years that an Iola student under the tutelege of Miss Hackney has won this high honor.

I think that Kathy's essay, "What Every Employer Should Know About Handicapped Workers," is one of the finest essays I have read. Her ability and insight to the problems faced by the handicapped workers in America is truly an article I feel every employer should read. Therefore, at this time, I would like to share Kathy's essay with my colleagues and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Mr. Employer, this is your lucky day! A vast number of trained skilled workers are looking for the kind of opening you have. You will probably ask where all these workers have been hiding; you have been trying to fill that position for weeks. Naming a few of these people qualified for this position you may be surprised to hear the name of a man you interviewed and turned down just last week. Why did you turn him down? Was it because he lacked the required qualifications, or that his lack of a left arm startled you? This is the clue to the unemployment of these skilled workers—each is handicapped in some way. Perhaps his handicap is the loss of an arm or leg, or confinement to a wheelchair, deafness, or loss of sight; but having overcome his handicap, he is ready to match his skills with all others in his field. Isn't it time you overcame YOUR handicap, Mr. Employer?

Yes, you have a handicap that has been unapparent until this time. For many, the word handicap evokes a feeling of pity and compassion. The disabled person strives for ranking solely for his ability; not his disability. Through extensive rehabilitation in training centers, the handicapped person is given individual training to prepare himself for a job. When that man came into your office last week, he did not apply for pity and compassion. He applied for a position on your company's assembly line; one he had the necessary training and skill for.

The issue of the handicapped individual's general physical well-being has long been argued by those for and against hiring the disabled. It seems to be the general conclusion that many disabled are weak and may not hold up under the work strain. Proven surveys in large companies have shown that (1) the handicap's rate of absenteeism is no greater and often less than the other workers; (2) they are often the most loyal workers; (3) their over-all tenure is about the same as other workers; and (4) the "impaired persons" have fewer disabling injuries than the average worker under the same conditions.

But, you argue that although these facts sound encouraging, don't exceptions have to be made in working conditions for most handicaps? The answer is no! Three out of every four cases in my community showed that few or no exceptions had to be made for the handicapped worker involved. In fact, handicapped workers can and do rank among those successful in their field without special aids. For example, a highly skilled mechanic with a crooked arm and only one eye works each day at car repair and engine tuning; a deaf librarian charmed readers for thirty years with her wonderful sense of humor; an accountant manages a busy firm while undergoing extensive therapy for a painful knee disorder; a young teacher though suffering from multiple sclerosis inspires students with his courage; a dedicated doctor has suffered from heart attacks but continues to practice—the list could go on and on. The handicapped have proven themselves capable. When interviewing a handicapped person, an employer should consider only those disabilities that might in some way affect the handicap's ability to carry out the job in question. Just because the man you interviewed has only one arm does not mean that he could not check for the correct wiring in an appliance on your assembly line.

But wait! Suddenly a real problem comes to mind. Here is a factor you feel sure will be difficult to justify. Insurance rates must surely be sky high for those employing the handicapped. Sorry, but this is one of the most easily disproved myths concerning the hiring of handicaps. Insurance companies themselves are some of the top employers of the handicapped. Disabled workers are in no way insurance risks and bring on no higher insurance rates. Workmen's compensation rates will not be affected of the fact that workers are handicapped, they measure only the relative hazards of a company's operations and the company's accident experience.

Yes, Mr. Employer, the choice is yours. Here are people ready, willing and able to do the jobs you supply. They ask only the chance to achieve and compete like all others. Here is your chance to show yourself, those about you, and the handicapped themselves, that you realize ability counts. Now, don't you think it would be a good idea to let that applicant from last week know the job is still open for the man with the skill? His friends call him "Lefty".

THE TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE CALLS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF COLUMBIA AND NORMANDY DAMS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee General Assembly has passed House Joint Resolution 72 calling for construction of Columbia and Normandy Dams by the Tennessee Valley Authority on the upper Duck River.

The Tennessee Legislature in its resolution urged the appropriation of funds to initiate construction of these two most important projects.

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has recommended these two projects to the Bureau of the Budget which has denied TVA's request despite the broad range of support by the Upper Duck River Development Association and counties and cities in the area.

These are needed projects, fundamental to the growth and progress of this area, and funds to initiate construction should be appropriated for the next fiscal year.

Because of the importance of these projects to our people, I herewith place in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 72.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 72

A resolution to memorialize the Congress to appropriate monies to fund the Tennessee Valley Authority's Duck River Project, Normandy and Columbia Reservoirs Planning Report No. 65–100–1, at the earliest possible date

(By Lowe, Blank, Taylor (Lincoln), Richardson)

Whereas water resource development is vital to the overall economic growth and industrial development of the upper Duck River area; and

Whereas dams and reservoirs on the Duck River will stabilize stream flow, thus, providing needed flood protection benefits and improving the supply and quality of water for human and industrial consumption; and

Whereas dams and reservoirs at Columbia and Normandy will generate recreational development and provide facilities for recreational enjoyment by the citizens of Tennessee and citizens of other states who travel Interstate Highways No. 65 and No. 24 through the upper Duck River area; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That the Congress is urged to appropriate monies to fund the Tennessee Valley Authority's Duck River Project, Normandy and Columbia Reservoirs Planning Project No. 65–100–1, at the earliest possible date; be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to all members of the Tennessee delegation to the Congress.

Adopted: April 16, 1969.

WILLIAM L. JENKINS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK C. GORRELL,
Speaker of the Senate.
BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

Approved: April 23, 1969.

CONGRESS MOVES ON DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was one of the most significant days in the history of the United States in the field of governmental reform. The House Judiciary Committee has overwhelmingly approved an amendment to the Constitution to elect our President by direct vote of the people.

This is something I have worked toward for almost two decades. I am pleased by the approval of the committee on the direct election amendment, similar to my bill, House Joint Resolution 5, which was introduced on the first day of the 91st Congress.

My amendment, which I also sponsored in the last Congress, was drafted and endorsed by the American Bar Association. There is wide support in the Nation today to let the people elect their President and Vice President—directly, and not through the antiquated and archaic electoral college system. Public opinion polls report 80 percent of the public are for direct election, and many widely based organizations have supported this method.

I congratulate the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and the ranking minority member, Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, for their leadership in bringing the direct election amendment to the floor of the House. I hope the House will act speedily and favorably on this measure so the long process of ratification can take place. The American people should accept the challenge to minimize the possibility of unnecessary delays in this; for otherwise the reform will be years in coming about.

THE TAIL WAGGING THE DUCK

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure just how many duck hunters we have in the Congress, but I do know from listening to the Members in the cloakroom sessions, brag about the merits of hunting and fishing along the Mississippi River and its tributaries that many Members have an avid interest in preserving our wildlife for this and future generations.

In my own State of Alabama, we have one of the finest duck and goose hunting areas in the entire country, on the Tennessee River just to the east of the city limits of Decatur, Ala. Each year thousands of Alabamians enjoy their favorite sport on the Tennessee Valley Wildlife Refuge. Through the courtesy of my long time friend, and duck hunter without equal, and former State director of Alabama Department of Conservation, Dr. Walter B. Jones, each year I am privileged to enjoy some of this fine hunting. Dr. Walter Jones is most active in conservation work and is chairman of Ducks Unlimited, Inc., an agency which is doing much to promote and foster an increase in the duck population throughout America.

Recently, the good doctor mailed to me a most interesting editorial appearing in the spring issue of Ducks Unlimited magazine which sets out this organizations' appraisal of the duck population, which is somewhat in disagreement with the opinions of the director of the Bureau

of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Because of the impact of this report, which will no doubt provide much information as the department considers the possibility of reducing 1969 bag limits and even a possible closing of the duck season entirely, I would respectfully believe that this article would be of much interest to duck hunters everywhere.

The article follows:

[From the Ducks Unlimited magazine, Spring 1969]

THE TAIL IS WAGGING THE DUCK

On March 7, 1969, John S. Gottschalk, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, stated, "We have no intention of arriving at a conclusion concerning this fall's waterfowl season until we know the water conditions from our May survey and the population counts from our July survey."

The Director's statement was made because of the confusion and questions precipitated by the action taken during the week of February 16, 1969, by the Technical Section of the Mississippi Flyway Council, meeting at Paducah, Kentucky, voting without dissent (but with some states reportedly abstaining) to recommend a closed duck season this year in the Mississippi Flyway, because of a "critical shortage of mallards."

The Technical Sections of the flyway councils are advisory only and serve at the discretion of each council. The Technical Section is made up of the biologists of the State Fish and Game Departments and certain other biologists; however, those of the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife serve as non-voting, ex-officio members.

The flyway councils, served by the technical sections, consist of the directors of the Fish and Game Departments who, by their positions under law, are to represent the public and therefore are to be subject to the will of the people, under our American system of government.

In this instance much publicity has been given to the biologists' recommendation and many questions have arisen.

On February 27th Ducks Unlimited was asked for a statement concerning this recommendation to close the duck season and we stated the following:

"We feel that any expression concerning the size of the spring flight of breeders and the production rates at this time would be very pre-mature, as the ducks have not moved north to the breeding grounds yet. At this time we can only say that the prospects of a much improved water situation and breeding habitat are *excellent*, considering the late fall rains and winter snows experienced to date across the Canadian Provinces. In due time, following our Ducks Unlimited spring breeding pair and production surveys, we will have something factual upon which to base positive reports".

We especially felt that such early estimates of populations and possible production were premature, in light of the following report from William G. Leitch, Chief Biologist, Ducks Unlimited (Canada):

SNOW REPORT, FEBRUARY 28, 1969

"During the week 2 to 4 inches of snow fell in Alberta and Saskatchewan and up to 20 inches in western and southern Manitoba. At most prairie points precipitation since November 1 is now at or above normal and snow on the ground and available for runoff is the best in the last decade. This situation, combined with the good freeze-up conditions of last fall due to heavy summer and fall rains, should result in excellent spring water conditions on the prairies in 1969".

The data referred to by the state biologists, meeting at Paducah, were those supplied by the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. A biologist in the Bureau's regional office in Minneapolis told us that, "The State boys read the data and based the closure recommendation upon them".

The Mississippi Flyway Council meeting in Washington, D.C., March 2nd, reported thru its chairman that the council tabled its technical section's "closure" recommendation until its August meeting. However, the representative from the Missouri Conservation Department introduced a resolution urging its members to advise the public that a closed season is possible. This resolution passed, with Ohio, Kentucky and Alabama reportedly voting against.

The chairman of the National Flyway Council, of which the Mississippi council is a member, told us, "No statement about closure was given out by me nor was there any action taken concerning same by the National Council at their meeting March 2, 1969."

The biologists say the Mallard breeding population this spring will be 6.5 to 6.7 million. Is this *"critical"?* Apparently not, since in 1965 it was reported by the Bureau to be 5.8 million. Later this figure was changed to 6.1 million; however, it is still far less than that *"critical"* figure predicted for this year. Only two short years later, in 1967, the breeders were numbered at 8.6 million, almost 50% higher than the 5.8 million reported earlier by the Bureau.

Also, in 1962, the Mallard breeders were below (6.2 million) the estimated for this year (6.5–6.7 million).

History concerning waterfowl counts used to go back only to 1948, but the Bureau now reports that most Mallard data are not *really* reliable prior to 1955. Therefore, statements currently used must basically refer to the period 1955 to date and now span what the Bureau had earlier referred to as the excellent high populations of the mid-to-late 1950's.

We can note that the 1955 mallard breeder count was almost 4 million less than the estimated 1958 count, and there is good reason to believe that the count on mallard breeders in the early 50's was much less than that, and probably even less back in the thirties and forties—but the population grew steadily to the peak of the 1950's, or until the drought set in.

Strangely enough, the population was peaking while the Mississippi Flyway seasons were 70 days in length with 4 birds in the bag. Also, the hunting pressure, as measured by waterfowl stamp sales, was significantly greater in the mid-1950's than today. For example, there were 1,022,000 stamps sold in the Mississippi Flyway in 1956–57 and only 814,000 in 1967–68. Nationally the sales were 2,232,000 in 1956–57 and 1,934,000 in 1967–68.

The predicted effect of seasons and bag limits upon the returning Spring breeding population is typified by that testimony set forth in the record of the 1965 Dingell Congressional hearing committee report as follows:

The Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife testified that his biologists had recommended to him a set of regulations that were designed to drastically cut hunting opportunity in an effort to send 20% more breeding mallards back to the prairies in 1966. The Director further stated that he felt such would result in "too drastic restrictions" and reported that he recommended to the Secretary of Interior that "We should be putting back somewhere in the vicinity of 5–10% more breeding birds than we had this year (1965)".

The record now shows that instead of the projected 5–10% increase, the actual number of breeding mallards returned in 1966 was up about 24%. How necessary was it to even invoke the modified restrictions that were designed to send back a 5–10% increase?

At this same hearing the Bureau Director made another statement that causes one to wonder if the mallard situation is so "critical" now. Chairman Dingell questioned whether or not there would be birds to return to the breeding grounds in 1966. The Director said: "We are not dealing with anything that remotely resembles an endangered species. We are still talking about 6 million mallards at the very minimum with the possibility there are many more". Note that he said "6 million mallards". This statement was made on August 17, 1965. His Bureau report, dated August 9, 1966, showed that there were reportedly 5.8 million mallards. Either number is well under the 6.5 million referred to as being "critical" now.

Furthermore, the Mississippi Flyway "enjoyed" 40 and 45-day seasons with 4 bird bags (including 2 mallards) during '65, '66, and '67 and the spring breeding population of mallards increased to 8.6 million by the spring of 1967.

At the Paducah meeting the biologists referred to the mid-winter waterfowl surveys and, although the Bureau has questioned the feasibility of using such data, the biologists reportedly used these in arriving at their recommendation for closure.

Just how they arrived at this *"critical"* situation from data such as these poses a mystery, since the mid-winter survey showed the total ducks observed in the Mississippi flyway to be up almost 15% while mallards were only 3.5% below that of 1968. The '68 spring breeding population was reportedly the second highest in the last eight years.

In view of the facts stated above and the fact that the data used by the biologists are not so emphatically specific so as to warrant the manipulation of seasons by 1 bird or five days, why such a recommendation for closure before all the facts are in?

A statement was reportedly made at the Paducah meeting that, since the habitat for this year appeared to be considerably improved, this would be the year to send back more breeders, and to send back more in 1970. We might ask, "How practical is this?" After successfully imploring the hunters to send back more breeders during the spring of '65 and '66 by holding down hunting opportunity, in 1967, with 8.6 million breeding mallards and prospects of a production ratio similar to the excellent one of 1966, the biologists again said that *now* is the time to send more breeders back, and the Mississippi Flyway regulations were reduced below those of '66. The hunters tightened their belts *again*—and what happened? Another drought on the Canadian prairies. Not a predictable one of the type experienced during the early sixties but one that "set in hard right now". All the 'belt tightening' of those three years resulted in the very drastic restrictions for the 1968 season—and *now* the Mississippi Flyway biologists recommendation is for a closed season in 1969, at a time when the prospects for improved habitat on the Prairies are again excellent.

Closing the duck season to prevent the loss of a wild population is necessary, but closing it to attain a goal set without the consensus of those who help maintain much of the critically needed habitat throughout the flyways of the U.S. and Canada, poses a threat to our waterfowl resources. This is especially dangerous when such drastic steps are taken without benefit of timely data.

The tail is truly wagging the duck!

VIOLATIONS OF THE ANTIDUMPING ACT

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that the Bureau of Customs has announced a full-scale investigation of charges that British firms are dumping quantities of ceramic wall tile on the

U.S. market in violation of the Antidumping Act.

According to information presented to the Treasury Department, sales transactions at dumping prices are widespread and are occurring almost daily, particularly in connection with the more popular types of glazed wall tile. Statistics of the Department of Commerce indicate that wall tile imports from the United Kingdom in the last 12 months have increased by more than 100 percent over the previous year, and the share of the total domestic market made up of these imports has more than doubled.

The present investigation is particularly important because the U.S. tile industry has yet to recover from the effects of extensive dumping of wall tile by Japanese manufacturers, which was recently the subject of a separate investigation. I am gratified that the Bureau of Customs has taken prompt action, and I am confident that its investigation will be vigorously conducted.

DEFENSE SPENDING, THE ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE, AND THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and colleague, JOHN SLACK of West Virginia, spoke to the Charleston Civitan Club, Charleston, W. Va., and his subject was "Defense Spending, the Antiballistic Missile, and the Military-Industrial Complex." His subject was a very timely one, and I am happy to have it included in the RECORD for all to read.

DEFENSE SPENDING, THE ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE, AND THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

(An address by Congressman JOHN SLACK before the Charleston Civitan Club, April 18, 1969)

Just 194 years ago on this same date of April 18 a silversmith in New England named Paul Revere mounted his horse and rode, as history tells us, through "every Middlesex village and farm," to warn his neighbors of a military invasion.

Our American ancestors were few in number in 1775, and not blessed with an abundance of worldly goods. They lived off the produce of the land. They were dependent on Europe for almost all manufactured goods, including weapons. Indeed one of the first sources of friction between the colonists and the Crown was the requirement to buy iron nails from England alone. The nails were hand-forged and were so expensive that only a prosperous farmer could afford them.

The colonists were obviously no match for the power of England with its enormous professional army and the world's largest fleet.

You may well ask: "What was Paul Revere actually doing? What was the practical purpose of his famous ride?"

He was buying time for himself and his neighbors to prepare. They had no way of knowing whether the British Crown would turn loose on them a full-scale military assault. They could not know whether they were inviting a new Thirty Years War or a Hundred Years War. How could they be expected to fathom the intentions of an autocratic king? But knowing history, they were aware that the British Crown had always put down rebellion in its dominions, and had hauled the leaders to London Dock to be hanged for treason. It was this knowledge which prompted the famous comment by Benjamin Franklin after signing the Declaration of Independence: "Now we must all hang together, else we will hang separately."

So a few days or a few hours of advance warning could make the difference between life and death for them, or between organized resistance and the need to disperse into the wilderness beyond the king's authority.

Reflecting on American defense problems and costs today, one is struck with the close parallel between the situation facing the colonists of 1775 and our own uncertain outlook.

We are a nation without imperial pretentions. We have no desire to occupy any other nation, or to bend its people to our will. We have set up a vast establishment called the Department of Defense, and we insist that its mission be confined directly to the defense of this Republic. But even so, we find that a growing amount of our tax revenues each year must be applied to defense activities. Why is this so?

It is so mainly because we cannot know the true intentions of our enemies, and we must try to prepare for every eventuality. We must buy time for survival and response if such a situation is ever forced upon us.

We cannot hope to match in manpower the 1,300,000,000 persons behind the Communist Iron Curtain of censorship and secrecy. We have no means of certifying the true intentions of their leadership. We can only be guided by assessment of their past actions. The history they have chosen to write since 1917 offers small reason to place confidence in their good intentions.

The Communist world is trapped by its own dialectics. For over 50 years they have preached that an agreement with a capitalist is nothing but a chance to take advantage of a sworn enemy. During the same 50 years they have done everything in their power to weaken Democratic self-government anywhere in the world and to promote the creation of police states.

During the years between 1917 and 1937 they refined the operations of the forced labor system, the death camp, the mass starvation procedure, forced deportation of entire communities, destruction of family life, and every degradation of the human being which was later adopted and tuned to perfection by Adolf Hitler.

Their essential attitudes have not changed, but we must face each new day with a realization that they are in the world with us. They have advanced weaponry. Their commitments are unreliable. Their objectives are uncertain. Their good faith is obscured by regular planned actions which seem to support continuation of an international strategy of terror. And, worst of all, their interpretation of just what advantage may be gained from any given situation is unknown on this side of the ocean until after they have acted.

The foregoing is what the Pentagon would call a "situation report." The situation dictates the mission of our Defense Department. If that mission is to be changed, then the people must so signify. If the people are willing to risk a little more on Soviet good intentions, then we can spend less on national defense.

But a decision of that kind, with today's weapons, can involve the life or death of the entire Nation. It cannot and should not be made by a President or a Secretary of Defense or the Congress. Public officials can only weigh the risks and offer suggestions for protection from those risks. If the time arrives when the people conclude that the cost of that protection is too high, then the decision to recede and accept greater risks must be theirs to shoulder.

When I was first elected to Congress over 10 years ago, the national budget totaled about $73 billion. This sum financed the operations of the entire Federal establishment, aside from trust funds supported by special earmarked taxation.

This year Congress is asked to consider a budget in which the funds requested by the Defense Department total $81.1 billion. So the defense funding requirements of today have risen to the point where they now exceed the total Federal operational budget of 10 years ago. We have a high rate of Federal taxation and a surcharge on top of that. In substance, the defense budget request means that about 45¢ out of every dollar of your income taxes will go to defense or defense-related items. It is abundantly clear that the time has arrived to re-examine some of our national imperatives, goals and priorities. The trigger mechanism which powers a growing demand for such examination is a decision to build and deploy on this continent an antiballistic missile system . . . originally called the "Sentinel" but now re-labeled the "Safeguard System."

The idea of an ABM System is not new. It has been the subject of research for over 15 years. Ten years ago a leading military expert referred to the ABM as an effort to score a direct hit with a pin on a needle traveling at 20,000 miles an hour. At that time there was little hope held for its eventual success and only within the past two years has the state-of-the-art progressed sufficiently to justify manufacturing and testing. Even so, the Safeguard System now proposed has yet to be fully tested and certified for reliability.

So much has been said and written about the Safeguard System, mass confusion seems to have resulted. I believe, therefore, it would be helpful to summarize for you at this point:

(1) What Safeguard is designed to do as part of the Nation's defenses.

(2) The positions taken by those who oppose it.

(3) The responses of those who support it.

First of all, about the Safeguard System itself. As now proposed it is designed to protect our present land-based ballistic missile forces. Its elements will be located near those forces, beginning with two units scheduled for first construction in the upper Middle West.

It is an interception-and-destruction system, with both long-range and short-range radar identification of incoming enemy missiles, and long-range and short-range interception capabilities.

The long-range anti-missile—the Spartan—can intercept at several hundred miles. The short-range missile—the Sprint—can intercept at 25 miles traveling at unusually high speeds to meet whatever enemy missiles may have avoided contact with the Spartan.

In simplest terms, the Safeguard System is designed to give added protection to the ICBM force which we already maintain as a deterrent to nuclear warfare which might originate through enemy sneak attack.

The first two installations would be operational by 1973. The cost of the Safeguard deployment is estimated at $6.6 billion. The first funds requested to begin the program total $800 million for the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

There have been countless statements made by persons who claim to be in opposition to the Safeguard System since it was announced on March 14, 1969. As best I can determine, the substance of all of their arguments can be expressed in about the following 10 statements:

(1) There is no need for the new system. There is no "perceptible move by the Soviets or by the Red Chinese requiring an addition to our deterrents."

(2) We would be better advised to "harden our ICBM sites and improve the Polaris delivery system."

(3) The Safeguard System will only "cause the Reds to deploy larger quantities of their offensive missiles."

(4) The new system will "handicap disarmament talks and negotiations toward disarmament agreements."

(5) The money to be spent on Safeguard could be "better used at home for social welfare programs."

(6) The system "won't protect anything—it isn't much good anyway."

(7) It is just more of the continuing effort to keep government policies "in control of the business-industry complex."

(8) The Safeguard is only another device put forward by "an ambitious elite of high ranking officers eager to test new weapons."

(9) Rather than deploy the Safeguard, we should "launch our ICBM's as soon as enemy incoming missiles show on our radar."

(10) The Safeguard System will create a "new and disastrous spiral to the arms race."

I know you will agree that those who have proposed this system must have what they consider to be sound reasons. Their reasons are generally summarized in the following six statements presented on March 14, by Deputy Defense Secretary Packard:

"(1) We have not recommended deployment of a defense of major cities against a massive attack, the kind the Soviets could launch, because it would not materially increase our security. We must deter such attacks with our retaliatory forces.

(2) Protection against ballistic missiles can and should be made available to our land-based nuclear-war deterrent forces. Such added protection will help insure the survival of the American deterrent forces in the face of the still growing Soviet threat. We recommended that an ABM system be configured so that extra protection and warning will be given to missiles, bombers, and the national control center as the threat develops.

(3) The people of our country can be protected effectively from a small missile attack, the kind the Chinese Communists will probably be able to launch sometime in the 1970's. We judge such a defense to be a prudent and practicable measure and recommended that it be deployed as the threat develops.

(4) Locating sites away from major cities should make clear to the Soviet Union that the American defense is designed to preserve our deterrent—not to change the strategic balance. We recommended that the sites for ABM radars and missiles be determined by the needs of the defense and that they be moved away from cities to the extent practical.

(5) A careful review of existing ballistic missile defense components convinces us that the program is sound and feasible technically. We so informed the President.

(6) A phased installation of a ballistic missile defense will provide the option to meet the threats as they materialize. We recommended a specific deployment plan to meet this objective.

The philosophy behind this decision is, of course, the conviction that a first-strike capability is a *threat* of nuclear war, while a second-strike capability is a *deterrent* to war. Our defense officials are convinced that the Soviet Union maintains a second-strike or deterrent force against our ICBM weapons. If we attempt to neutralize the Soviet second-strike capability even by increasing our ICBM totals or by building an anti-missile defense system for our cities, then the Soviets would be forced to protect their own deterrent. They would have to build nuclear forces capable of surviving our attack and then of penetrating our defense.

On the other hand, there is no serious doubt that the best way to deter a nuclear attack on the United States is to maintain the unmistakable ability to inflict unacceptable damage on any aggressor, even after absorbing a first-strike on our forces.

It is interesting to observe at this point that after the announcement of the Safeguard System, there were no questions raised by the Soviet regarding our ability to inflict second-strike damage. They understood that the proposal is designed simply to further protect that ability. Initial reactions by the Soviet press indicated very little concern about the matter because they feel it is proper for us to try and protect our defensive capability. Up to this point there has been no reaction from the Soviet indicating that they consider this to be a threatening deployment.

Supporters of the proposal have had as much to say as the opponents:

(1) "If we can land on the moon, we can intercept an incoming missile."

(2) "If we trust the Russians, some day we may be in a position where they will not have to fire a missile—just say 'this is it'."

(3) "We are not considering the intentions but rather the Soviet capabilities. Defense planners are not required to outguess the intentions but rather to plan on the basis of enemy capabilities."

(4) "The opponents of the system could be right, but what if they are wrong? Think of the consequences."

(5) "I challenge the opponents to produce a satisfactory alternative."

(6) "If arms talks are successful we can stop this program just like we stopped Nike-Zeus. Why should we think we are committed forever if we make the decision?"

(7) The previous deployment suggested was completely unacceptable. "It offered all the terrifying defects of a doomsday machine: We could not be sure the President had time to evaluate the attack before retaliation; we could not bring the missiles back to the pad if the warning proved to be wrong; and the launch guaranteed doomsday not only for our enemy but also for us."

(8) The Soviet SS–9 is "ideally suited to take out some of our Minuteman missiles. They have installed more than 200 and are building sites for more. They are testing multiple warheads on the SS–9. If they triple their warheads on the SS–9 it will remove our confidence that a portion of our deterrent can survive in adequate numbers. This is a danger which we cannot ignore."

(9) "Safeguard gives the Soviets another incentive to negotiate. It shows them any effort on their part to achieve a successful first-strike is fruitless—that we will protect our retaliatory forces now and in the future and will do it effectively."

So much for the ABM System as military hardware and a weapon for defense.

But there is another point of vantage from which the ABM should be considered—a far more important one in my opinion.

During recent years there has been growing reference to a group called the "military-industrial complex." There have been charges and accusations that this complex consists of a powerful, but unidentified, body of business interests with defense contracts who hold entrenched positions of preference with high military officials. Their purpose is supposed to be the domination of our foreign policy, inflation of our defense budget and use of the "cold war" climate of mistrust to spend billions of tax dollars on new weaponry.

If this is true, then we are in a dangerous situation indeed. The ABM proposal has brought forth recent repetition of those charges although no convincing proof has ever been offered.

Could it be true that a sly and secretive organization of men in business and the Defense Department plan to whip up public fear periodically so they can create a public appetite for new weapons costing billions of dollars

Well, of course, anything is possible. But as a Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I can report that I have not detected any strong maneuvers in that direction. My colleagues on the Subcommittee have their share of keen curiosity about new weapons programs and many of us are not easy to satisfy. The probabilities are against the existence of any effective complex of this kind, dedicated to its own profits first and to the security of the Nation second.

Yet I do not doubt that there are many businesses which see eye-to-eye with one another and with top military leaders in support of the proposition that we must have the strongest possible defense to meet any possible military contingency.

And I do not doubt that their idea of the strongest possible defense is simply the most that the citizens can be convinced to buy with his taxes.

In this country there has always been a lingering suspicion of the motives of armament makers. As a Nation we are peace-oriented. We do not require aggression against other nations to survive and grow. We control a continent. We dominate a hemisphere. We provide industrial and technical leadership for the world.

But we have not forgotten World War I and the "merchants of death" . . . the secret arrangements between Vickers in England and Krupp in Germany and Schneider-Crusout in France to supply one another and share profits even during that war.

We remember some unsavory arrangements between English, French and German firms which existed when World War II began and continued up to the middle of that war. We remember the contemptible conduct of the Swedes who sold anything they could to anybody who would buy for gold at any price.

In years past there have been collusive arrangements between international cartels which made war profitable for nearly everybody except those who died. But I do not believe such a condition can exist today, simply because there is no way to influence the armaments industry of the Soviet Union.

The international climate of fear is fed primarily by the atmosphere judgment of Soviet intentions and on their demonstrated credibility in past international dealings. Their record is not a comfort to us. Any arrangement for disarmament or weapons limitation which is based on inspection is immediately denounced by the Kremlin. They expect to be taken on faith and promises.

If the international climate is to be dominated by fear, and if the free nations must over-arm and over-expend to prepare for any conceivable threat, then the natural market has already been created. No complex of military-business man is needed to generate a false demand—as did happen prior to World War I.

But our business community overflows with creative energy and willingness to take risks. If the market is there, you can bet your last income tax payment that they will jump in and try to share the proceeds of that market.

Furthermore, scientific advance today moves so rapidly in such diverse fields that many new products and techniques have both civilian and military application. Fifty years ago only a small section of the manufacturing industry—steel, explosives, electrical equipment and the like—had any major stake in armament production. In today's world almost any maker of a finished product can be considered for a defense contract—pharmaceuticals, plastics, dehydrated foods, artificial fabrics, data processing and thousands of others.

It follows that all of these people, once in the market, will keep coming up with new models and better systems, just as they do in the civilian market.

And as the fear climate continues, the pressure is on the military to buy every new model of every new item to be certain they have the best equipment for every hazard in prospect. Each new device is more complex than the last, and costs more. So that is how the defense budget grows.

In this situation no lurking group of business and military plotters is necessary. The circumstances feed on themselves and proliferate.

From the taxpayers standpoint, military procurement has one characteristic not found in the business world. Since there is only one customer, the action is not subject to the discipline of the marketplace. The customer sets the specifications, but cannot simply refuse to buy if the price is too high or the goods are shoddy.

I have felt for some time that we could save a great deal of money if we went about the defense buying job on a different basis. The operating services should be eliminated from procurement entirely. Let them stipulate the mission for a weapon, establish specifications, and that is all. A completely separate buying organization should take over at that point.

In Germany, the field commanders must approve a new weapon before it can be cleared for production and payment made. Perhaps this is a sound idea which we should adopt. It would eliminate a lot of middlemen.

Defense contractors are unique in one respect. They are frequently responsible for a product which everyone hopes devoutly will never be used. This is true of the Safeguard ABM System, for example. But all of the billions spent on national defense during the cold war years are nothing but a repetition of Paul Revere's ride. They are an effort to buy security for ourselves and time for the world to mature and solve its most dangerous problems without resorting to nuclear warfare.

Working slowly and painfully in that direction, we have met temporary setbacks which have caused good men to lose their lives. The weapons were used, and their capabilities were revealed in action, but not without a price.

The men who died in the Berlin airlift, the dead pilots of the X-15, those who went down with the submarine Thresher. All were victims of the same climate, fear. So were the casualties of the war in Korea.

And today we have Vietnam as part of the long chain of events during our groping search for assured peace in the nuclear age.

In view of all I have said on this very complex subject, and since I am your Representative in Congress, I would be offering less than you have earned by your patience if I failed to end by summarizing my own judgments and stating my own position:

(1) As of this time I am not committed to either support or oppose funds for the Safeguard Missile System. There is much testimony still to be heard, and I will listen most attentively and ask whatever questions seem pertinent.

(2) I will not support funding unless there is very convincing evidence that the System will work. Reliance on a faulty deterrent is more dangerous than no deterrent at all.

Individual components have been successfully tested—the radars, the Spartan and the Sprint, but the computers are not tested and the whole organism must be integrated before the System is assured of success.

Yet, we cannot overlook the fact that the Russian SAM System was a total failure in Vietnam against our Air Force. In early 1968 before the bombing halt there were 67 SAMs launched for every plane shot down. Our countermeasures were successful, and it proves a missile system can be nullified.

(3) I will not in any event base my position on accepting the good intentions of the Soviet Union. History forbids it.

We have held the Soviet Union helpless before our own power more than once.

During four years after the end of World War II, when we held monopoly nuclear power and the Soviet fighter force was useless against our strategic bombers.

After October, 1952, when we alone possessed the hydrogen bomb.

In the Cuban crisis when we held a missile superiority of five to one.

But the Reds have convenient memories and they still do not understand free and open debate in an open society. Neither did Hitler, and he confused himself finally and took a chance. We can't afford to give the Kremlin even that option.

The post-war path we have followed began March 12, 1947, when President Truman asked Congress for $400 million for Greece and Turkey, both threatened by Soviet expansion. Our journey on that path was never a partisan political issue. It is interesting to recall that in a letter written October 18, 1966, from his Gettysburg farm the late President Eisenhower listed the achievements of his presidency, and on that list were prevention of Communist efforts to dominate Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, Formosa and South Vietnam.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that many leading opponents of the ABM have always favored compromise at any cost. They fear confrontation. They fear the use of power by the American people. They fear the decision of the people. They would rather lecture the people on how to behave themselves. And in the crisis they would favor disarmament and surrender rather than face the terrible choice of power.

(4) I would oppose in this case, or in any other, the tailoring of a major weapon system to meet the shifting and slippery demands of diplomacy. Teddy Roosevelt told us in 1912 to "walk softly and carry a big stick", and his advice still commands respect.

We must face the fact that science is universal and holds no permanent secrets for exclusive use by any nation. Any weapon that *can* be built, *will* be built.

But it might not be *used*. Such was the case with gas and bacteria weapons in World War II. It should be the function of diplomacy to concentrate on securing such international agreements as will encourage friendship among all nations and gradually make weapon building an expensive folly.

Meanwhile, let's remember a police state *will* use any weapon, if it can do so with impunity, as Hitler did with the V-Rockets against England.

And let's remember that Pearl Harbor was a "first strike" of the 1941 model. Four years of blood and treasure were required to nullify that aggression.

(5) I *do* accept the definition of the Safeguard System as a wholly defensive weapon. A system with a range of a few hundred miles can hardly be an aggressor's weapon.

Yet, listen to the outcry from the same voices that always cry out in fear of any change on the chess board of world affairs.

We have been through their veil of tears before on many occasions:

In the immediate post-war era when we decided to build a nuclear weapons force.

Next when we decided to build a hydrogen bomb.

Then when we decided to deploy an intercontinental rocket force.

And again when we decided to construct a Polaris Submarine Fleet.

Each time the same people sang the same tune.

We were aggressors, building weapons to blackmail the world.

Now by some tortured logic these same people would tell us a system of rockets to cover a few hundred miles is escalation of the war threat because we are reducing the ability of an enemy to use his rockets against us. If we have an enemy who worries about that point, then he *must have aggressive* intentions.

Presumably we should trust their good intentions, as did the people of Czechoslovakia.

(6) I am convinced that we must reduce our total defense spending. I would work toward reaching a figure averaging 7% of our gross national product or less if possible.

Some policy of this kind is required or we will be drawn into a permanent and continuing role as world policeman.

I have confidence in our technology and our ability to remain ahead of an enemy qualitatively for as long into the future as we must. But since 1945, we have held together the ranks of the Free World and Communism has been exposed in all of its weaknesses. It is now time for other nations to exert and defend their nationhood if they will. And if they won't, our sons should not be offered as hostage for their failures.

The Kremlin has used our defense expenditures as an alibi for the obvious weaknesses of their political and economic system. Their failure to unify their satellites. Their failure to develop Russia internally. Their failure to meet consumer goods demands.

It is to our long-term advantage to shatter that alibi and force exposure of their weakness in the eyes of their own people.

There is no great cause for alarm. By world standards the Soviet Union is not yet even classed as an industrialized country, since over 30% of its labor force is still on the farm and food alone counts for 20% of its national income. In the largest Soviet grain region only 50% of all farm machinery is in a state of good repair, and in one of the largest provinces more than 2,000 tractors of the same type are immobilized for lack of spare parts.

(7) I believe we are entering a time of transition in the management of our diplomacy and our national defense. But the decisions to be taken must not and will not be influenced by the scuffling of beatniks in the streets or the bleating of quack intellectuals who still apologize for the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

So in connection with the Safeguard ABM or any other weapons system . . .

If it is a proven addition to the national security . . .

If changing events in the world require it as a response . . .

If there is no acceptable alternative to meet an identifiable danger . . .

Then I would support it.

Actually, a decision in support is no different than the first great military policy decision by the Continental Congress—to start its own Navy . . . to buy the old French ship Bon Homme Richard and arm her . . . to direct John Paul Jones to patrol the Atlantic as a first line of defense for this continent. In the context of the total picture, and of history as it has been written, I would consider my support to be the action of a dove, not a hawk.

For history leaves no doubt that only the strong can discourage attack and bring peace to the world of men.

A BILL TO AMEND THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which is a technical amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Section 104(b)(1) of that act provides for the establishment of a State advisory council and further provides that the members of the council shall be appointed by the Governor or

by the State educational agency in those cases where the members of that agency are elected.

The situation in New York State is somewhat unique in that the State educational agency—the board of regents—is elected by the State legislature. The Office of Education does not, under the terms of the existing statute, recognize the board of regents as an elected body for the purpose of appointing members of the vocational education advisory council.

The bill I have introduced would make it explicitly clear that the Congress intended the State educational agency to be the appointing authority when that agency is elected at large or by the members of the State legislature.

ADDRESS OF FORMER GOV. THEODORE R. McKELDIN, OF MARYLAND, DELIVERED AT MEETING OF FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, CAPITOL HILL CHAPTER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about law and order and, indeed, today we are more concerned with this matter than ever before. We are alarmed about the escalating rate of crime. Many question the wisdom of today's permissive society and ask where is the world heading?

One of the Nation's truly great men and certainly one of its acknowledged most brilliant orators—the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin—gave much thought to this subject. He was Governor of the State of Maryland from 1951 to 1959, and also served as mayor of Baltimore—the largest city south of the Mason-Dixon Line and the Nation's sixth biggest—for two separate terms, 1943–47, and again from 1963 to 1967. He is also remembered as the delegate who placed Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's name in nomination for President of the United States.

At a meeting of the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association held on April 17, 1969, former Governor McKeldin delivered a most eloquent and stirring address on the general topic of "Law and Order in Today's Society." What he said merits serious consideration and, therefore, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the words of this noted lawyer, scholar, gentleman, and statesman; they were as follows:

LAW AND ORDER IN TODAY'S SOCIETY

(Address by Hon. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin)

"Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in schools, in seminaries and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

So, in 1838, spoke Abraham Lincoln, then aged 29, to an audience of young men in Springfield, Illinois, and who is rash enough to deny that he was right?

"The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one."

So, in 1864, spoke Abraham Lincoln, then aged 55, to the Sanitary Fair, ancestor of the Red Cross, in Baltimore. Again, who is rash enough to deny that he was right?

He *was* right then, and he *is* right today. Indeed, I am tempted to say that neither in 1838, nor in 1864, was he half as right as he is in 1969. I would say it, except that I know that rightness is not something that can be measured with a foot-rule.

Each of those declarations is a plain statement of truth. Yet take them together and you have a statement, not of fact, but of the most baffling problem the American people have been called on to solve, namely, the reconciliation of reverence for law with love of liberty.

We still need a good definition of liberty, but we also need a good definition of reverence, specifically reverence for law. There is no lack of definitions of both, but most of them are partly and some of them blatantly false. For instance, Simon Legree, the infamous overseer in "Uncle Tom's Cabin", defined reverence for law as reverence for the blacksnake whip with which he lashed the slaves to their daily tasks.

Old Simon Legree is dead and gone, thank God, although sometimes I think I see his ghost stalking our streets, and even sneaking into the offices of high officials and into legislative chambers. But at least he is no longer a part of our professed creed, only a relic of ancient superstition, like fear of black cats and of the evil eye.

Very much alive, however, and visible—all too visible—in broad daylight are people who are giving to liberty a definition as monstrous as Legree's definition of reverence. Different people give them various names, "yippies", "hippies", "far outs", plain "nuts", and others, but you know the class I mean. I am not referring to mere eccentricity. If a man or woman chooses to dress in fantastic fashion, it is no concern of mine, as long as it does not involve indecent exposure. If people entertain what to me are eccentric ideas, that, again, is no concern of mine. It is not until this liberty begins to restrict mine that I have a right to object.

If a man finds himself alienated from society, he may have reasons that I must respect, even though I do not understand them; but if he is alienated from soap, he becomes an offense to the nostrils, which is no man's right. If a man disbelieves what I take to be truth, I may disapprove, but I may not distrain him. But if he assumes to forbid me to learn what I wish to know, or to believe what I choose to believe, then it becomes my right and my duty to assist in throwing him into the calaboose with what the Supreme Court calls "all deliberate speed".

I believe in the right of public demonstrations of approval or disapproval. I believe that "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances" cannot lawfully be abridged, by the police, by the courts, by the Congress, or by the President. But the key word in that guarantee is "peaceably". Shouting through a bull-horn is not peaceable. Obscene or opprobrious language is not peaceable. Squawk and squalls and shrieks intended not to refute but to drown out a speaker's argument, are not peaceable.

In any public place acts, language, even gestures intended to provoke a breach of the peace are disorderly conduct, which is a misdemeanor, punishable by fine, or imprisonment, or both. When people undertaking to suppress other people's liberty are themselves suppressed, liberty is not infringed, it is defended.

This is, I believe, sound theory, but when it comes to practice we run into that troublesome old maxim, "circumstances alter cases". Cool reason is just about the most fragile thing on earth. One touch of passion shatters it and often, much too often, the passion is due not to anything present, but to remembrance of things past which we call prejudice. To adapt an old adage, when prejudice and passion come in at the door, justice flies out of the window. There is nothing specifically American about this. It applies to all nations, for it is a law of human nature.

But has it occurred to you that civilization is merely an effort to repeal those laws of human nature that make for anarchy? It is a law of human nature to wish to hit the person who angers you, but civilized people seldom do it. A higher law takes precedence, and it is not merely a police measure, it is an effect of centuries of civilized living.

A little less than two centuries ago this republic was founded for the specific purpose of repealing what had until then been regarded as a law of human nature, namely, the proposition that a herd of men can no more govern themselves than can a herd of sheep. The proposition had been challenged before, but never with more than a momentary success. We have managed to make our challenge work tolerably well for nearly two hundred years, which made Lincoln call our nation, even when it seemed about to collapse, "the last, best hope of earth".

We have given the world proof that self-government by free men in an imperfect, but workable form, can be maintained for as much as two hundred years. That proof is the greatest gift that America has given or can give to the rest of mankind, for on the success of our experiment all their hope depends. If we now permit internal rivalries, dissensions and hatreds to defeat that experiment, we shall do more than bring ruin on ourselves, we shall also defeat the last, best hope of earth. Some sort of organization called a nation might survive, but the great republic would end as a wreck cast into the dust-bin of history.

Anarchy obviously would defeat the dream, but a police state would defeat it even more completely. Any division of our people into castes and classes would defeat it, and it matters not at all how the lines were drawn, whether racially, religiously, economically or in any other way that would divide Americans into first, second, and third class citizens. There are forces, as there have always been, drawing us toward that catastrophe, and to resist those forces is a double duty—one to our forefathers who pledged their, and our, lives, fortunes and sacred honor to the success of the experiment. The other is to our sons to the *nth* generation, that we shall not destroy their chance to kindle the world's spark of hope into a blaze, lighting it toward that day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more".

But to achieve it we, and I have in mind especially the rising generation, must surmount this crisis, which can be done only by the exercise of both intelligence and tolerance. We must neglect no possible source of power, however fantastic it may appear. The hippies and yippies are obviously blundering and confused; but there is a driving force within them that must be carefully studied. The raving students who are wrecking classrooms are damaging themselves, their property and their prospects, but they are moving, and movement is proof of kinetic energy that might serve a good purpose. The wild black extremists risk precipitating a blood-bath, but never again will the American Negro sink into the dull apathy that has held him in a sort of coma for a hundred years.

The dangers that confront us are terrific, and God forbid that I should pretend to know how to escape them. But escape them I

believe we shall, for wild days have afflicted the public ere now, not once but repeatedly, yet strong arms and stout hearts have always brought us through, and invariably into a brighter and nobler destiny than we had dared expect before. For one thing, when our forefathers declared our independence, "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions" it is evident that the appeal was not then dismissed, nor has it been for nearly two hundred years. I believe it is still in force.

Knowing full well how stressful are the times, dismayed as I am by riots, and revolts, and wild threatenings, almost ready to admit that we are witnessing Poe's "Tragedy, Man", "with much of madness, and more of sin—and horror the soul of the plot", I am yet steadfast in the faith that we shall yet find a clearer definition of reverence, and a sharper definition of liberty than Lincoln knew; and with their aid we shall give the world a larger pattern of government than we drew.

This is inevitably the work of the next generation, to which mine, I am certain, is glad to pass it on. For to the extent that we have done our best, I hope, I think we may share the feeling of those two old heroes of the first crisis of the republic, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. We, too, may say, as Jefferson wrote to Adams, "Laboring always at the same oar, with some wave ever ahead, threatening to overwhelm us, and yet passing harmless under our bark, we knew not how we rode through the storm with heart and hand, and made a happy port."

BIRTH OF CHICAGO TODAY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, April 28, 1969, marks a great day for Chicagoans and especially for newspaper readers of that city. On April 28 a new publication appeared in Chicago, a new publication which has grown from the hardy roots of a respected and established Chicago newspaper—Chicago's American. This new publication—new in format as well as in name—is to be called Chicago Today, a name which will convey the sense of immediacy and relevance which publishers of Chicago Today hope to incorporate into it.

The most obvious difference between Chicago Today and its predecessor will be its more compact tabloid format. More than format has been changed, however. As a story in the last edition of Chicago's American said:

> Chicago Today . . . will offer a kaleidoscope of features for the whole family.

Once again Chicago, already getting far better newspaper service than most cities of the Nation, has scored a coup. As President Nixon said in his congratulatory message to Chicago Today:

> This is a new landmark in publishing in the United States.

What is most significant, Mr. Speaker, is that in changing its format and layout, Chicago Today is responding directly to the desires of its readers. This is the kind of journalistic response that one does not often see. As Lloyd Wendt, publisher of Chicago Today, and Luke P. Carroll, its editor, told the readers of the first edition:

> Our dialog has been good. Your letters, your calls to our Action Line, and our surveys and studies have told us what to do to serve you better. A new kind of newspaper is what you had said you want. Compact, crisp, quick to bring you the facts. Organized, easy to read. Significant. Fresh. Attractive to the eye, convenient, exciting. Compact.

I believe that Chicago's American readers have been given what they wanted, and I believe all of Chicago will benefit.

I want to express my congratulations to the editors, publisher, and staff of Chicago Today for their imagination and courage. I wish them the best of luck and all success.

UNDERSTANDING THE AGED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there are 19 million Americans 65 years or older. The average aged person has to live on less than half the money available to a younger person. This difference in income is far greater than any possible difference in living requirements.

Our attitude toward the elderly has too often been to ignore them rather than to offer them opportunities to learn, to work, and to engage in social activities. We must begin to show senior citizens that reaching the age of 65 does not mean "dropping out," stagnating, or being forced to be completely dependent on others.

We need many new institutions to study the aged and their problems. The Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center in southern California is an important effort to bring dignity, spirit, and meaning to senior citizens. The center, designed to study the aging process, will include nine basic laboratories, graduate facilities, a specialized library on aging, and training facilities for older Americans. As an integral part of the University of Southern California, it will be staffed by well-known scientists and scholars.

In support of this worthwhile project I am introducing the following resolution and request my colleagues to join me in encouraging its adoption:

RESOLUTION

Whereas there are over 19 million older Americans 65 and over, and

Whereas the number of older Americans increases by over three hundred thousand per year, and

Whereas by the year 2000, 35% of our population will be 65 and older, and

Whereas the average life span of an American child born today is 70 years as compared with 47 in 1900, and

Whereas gerontology is a relatively new science, and

Whereas Congress is continually concerned with the well-being of older Americans, said concern having been demonstrated by the establishment of the Administration on Aging (P.L. 89–73), therefore,

It is the sense of Congress that programs of scientific research and training in Aging, such as the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center located at the University of Southern California, be encouraged and supported.

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, southeastern Washington State, which is the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is deeply concerned with the proper management of our timber resources—not only in the immediate locality, but throughout the United States.

The people of my district derive a high percentage of their livelihoods from the endless cycle of forest growth, care, harvest, and regeneration as well as from the conversion of this miraculous wood fiber into useful products essential to the well-being of Americans everywhere.

When a basic industry, such as lumber and plywood production, is adversely affected in the marketplace by sharply increasing prices which engender buyer resistance the people of my district suffer significant reverses. Prices for these basic building materials rose to levels nearly double the 1967 price during 1968 and a storm of protest echoed throughout the land as homebuilders and home buyers found it increasingly difficult to anticipate final construction and selling costs for the homes so sorely needed.

Both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees undertook investigations of the causes underlying the unprecedented rise in softwood lumber and plywood prices. These inquiries, drawing upon expert testimony from all parties concerned, both public and private, revealed that the Federal Government itself held the key to solution. The high cost of finished products had resulted in large part because the Government was not adequately funding the modern forest management methods necessary to realize maximum return from the Federal timber resource.

It was properly predicted that unless the Federal Government, which controls 60 percent of the softwood sawtimber inventory in the Nation, took positive steps to increase the supply of timber from its lands, prices for finished goods would remain high and might well go higher in the face of demand.

Consumer reaction was predictable. Believing that the Congress would act to enable the Forest Service to increase its timber availability, consumers stopped buying both softwood lumber and plywood and the price dropped sharply. The result was plywood plant closures since the high costs of Federal timber contracted for earlier meant that conversion of that timber into plywood in the face of a declining market price would oblige the plants to sell at a loss. Similar declines, although not so marked, were evident in the softwood construction lumber market.

It is irrational to expect producers of any product to manufacture and sell at a loss to themselves. Many mills in the West are caught in a severe squeeze between the high prices they paid for Federal stumpage and the buyer resistance to high cost plywood and lumber. And it is not only the management and stockholder who suffers in this condition. The workers are adversely affected due to layoffs and shutdowns.

The chain reaction triggered in such a situation extends across the entire Nation because builders stop building, carpenters are thrown out of work, other building trades suffer reduced employment opportunities, the distribution outlets are slowed to a stop, and, perhaps, most regrettably, the American people are denied the homes they have the right to expect to be able to buy for their families.

Correction of this economic dislocation is of a tremendous urgency and, it is for that reason, that I have introduced the National Timber Supply Act of 1969, which contains within it the essential element for relief of this and other associated economic ills.

Briefly stated, the National Timber Supply Act will establish a high timber yield fund as a repository for 65 percent of the timber sale receipts from Federal commercial forest lands. The Federal timber management agencies will be able to draw upon that fund, through the regular appropriations process, to obtain the dollars necessary to apply modern management methods to the producing timberlands under their charge. Funds deposited but unappropriated within 2 years will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

The dollars appropriated from the fund will be used to apply tested forest management methods to vast areas of Federal commercial timberlands which are now neglected or are reserved from harvest because there has previously been no long-range assurance that funds would be available for sustained commercial timber operations. The National Timber Supply Act will overcome this previous restraint on sound management of Federal timberlands.

There is another overtone which cannot be ignored because it responds to the direct county service needs of every constituency where Federal commercial forests exist. Under present law, 25 percent of the Federal timber sale receipts for harvest within a county revert to the county for the express purpose of supporting schools and roads. This procedure will be continued unchanged under the National Timber Supply Act, but there will be one significant difference—the total funds which will be returned to the counties for these basic purposes. The increase of timber sales on Federal commercial lands which will be possible under the new act, will materially increase the dollar total returned to the counties. It is simple logic that if the timber supply increases in the face of increasing domestic wood requirements, total sales will be increased, and thus the dollars earned will be higher.

Another aspect of the dollar return to the counties is that under the Knudsen-Vandenberg Act, timber purchasers must deposit a portion of the total sale value for reforestation of areas they harvest. This amount is credited to the timber purchaser on his final settlement but it is not reflected as part of the total cash receipts and thus the counties are denied the benefits of these deposits since their 25 percent is assessed against the sale price less the Knudsen-Vandenberg funds.

This has been a serious bone of contention between Federal and county officials in the past and the Congress has conducted hearings on this subject at the request of the counties who have felt that they have been shortchanged.

This particular difficulty will be overcome since the reforestation activities on Federal commercial timberlands will, under the National Timber Supply Act, be funded directly from the high timber yield fund and the need for separate Knudsen-Vandenberg funds will be eliminated.

I have not discussed the significance of the National Timber Supply Act to meeting our national goal of 26 million units over the next decade. This figure is specified in the Housing Act of 1968, which was overwhelmingly supported by the Congress. It has been clearly stated by such an authority as Eugene Gulledge, president of the National Association of Homebuilders, that it will be impossible to build the homes America needs without softwood lumber and plywood. I believe Mr. Gulledge and I believe that the Federal Government if it establishes worthy goals of this kind must support its intentions by following through to unleash the forest resource to make the goals attainable.

This Congress has it within its powers to update and maximize the bountiful return the Nation can derive from the Federal commercial forests. I believe it must be done and I will work vigorously for the passage of the National Timber Supply Act as a principal means to make the possibilities become realities.

TRIBUTE TO A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as I pay tribute today to A. Philip Randolph, above all else I honor him as one of the great visionaries of our times. Now, as he marks his 80th birthday, I believe that Mr. Randolph looks back at his accomplishments not as personal victories, but instead as achievements reached in a long and continuing effort to grant freedom, justice and equality to all citizens of the United States.

Too often the visionary gets overlooked in our society. Objectives are met, and laurels placed on those most near to accomplishments, and in fast-moving times, the originator, the visionary, gets relegated to the background.

When we talk of the struggle to permit collective bargaining, when we praise the Federal fair employment actions, when we remember the moving marches on Washington, we also should point with immense pride to A. Philip Randolph as the visionary whose foresight made possible each and all of these milestones over the past 40 years.

Last year, A. Philip Randolph stepped down as head of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, but, though he is retired in name, in reality his task to create a society based on liberty and equity goes on.

The A. Philip Randolph Institute will stand always as a living monument to the philosophy which exemplifies the achievements of the man himself.

The story of A. Philip Randolph is testimony to the belief that a minority American can rise from squalor and poverty to advance the welfare of all citizens. And it is through the work of Mr. Randolph that the added opportunity has been made for many other poor Americans—black, brown, and white alike—to follow and build upon these accomplishments.

If there is an American dream, that dream has been realized over the past 80 years by A. Philip Randolph. I wish him many more healthy and fruitful years to come.

GILBERT BILL TO BENEFIT BLIND PERSONS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to give serious attention to my bill, H.R. 6224, to liberalize the eligibility of blind persons for social security benefits. I ask every one of you to consider this bill because blindness is not a regional problem, not a racial problem, not an economic problem, not an urban or a rural problem. It is a crushing disability that can strike anyone, anytime, without regard to race, wealth or place of residence. It is a responsibility that each of us, as Congressmen, faces equally.

I ask you to consider this bill favorably because the social security laws currently governing the blind are harsh. They take virtually no account of the special needs of the blind. They are the standards that a cruel and insensitive society would set, and I do not think our country can live with those standards in good conscience.

This bill would allow any blind person to be eligible for social security if he has worked six quarters, rather than five of the last 10 years, as the current law provides. It would, furthermore, allow the blind to retain their earnings, rather than cut benefits off as soon as $140 a month is earned.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only tragic to be blind; it is also frightfully expensive. The blind need to hire people or have expensive animals to substitute for their sight. They need special books and papers. They often must live in special quarters. We must encourage them to work and to live decent lives, but our current laws penalize them for their affliction.

The cost of this bill to our social security system would be very small, but the measure of help it would bring to those who desperately need it would be very great. I urge my colleagues to look into their consciences and support H.R. 6224, a bill which is practical and compassionate.

EQUITABLE FARM INCOME AT THE MARKETPLACE

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we are searching for ways to strengthen the economic position of the American farmer and to reverse the decline in income he has suffered during recent years. Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin is currently conducting a series of meetings in various parts of the country in order to give farmers an opportunity to express their views and to submit their proposals for a solution to the farm problems.

An imaginative and instructive plan to strengthen the position of the farmers in the marketplace and to achieve for him a fair return on his labor and investment has been developed by Mr. J. J. Griffiths of Blackfoot, Idaho. I have had the privilege of reviewing Mr. Griffiths' plan with him and I am impressed by his understanding of farm economics and of the problems that confront the American farmer.

Mr. Griffiths has developed a plan to increase farm income through a system of land retirement financed by the farmers who benefit from the program. Mr. Dale Rockwood, of Idaho Falls, Idaho, vice president of the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, recently forwarded to me a copy of Mr. Griffith's proposal. Mr. Rockwood advises me that the plan was endorsed by the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation at the 1968 annual convention and that it was also approved by the American Farm Bureau delegates except for the self-financing feature.

Mr. Griffiths' plan is deserving of careful study by all the Members of Congress and by those within the executive branch who have the responsibility for shaping farm policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks Mr. Griffiths' proposal, as follows:

EQUITABLE FARM INCOME AT THE MARKETPLACE OR A CAPITALISTIC SOLUTION TO A CAPITALISTIC PROBLEM

(By J. J. Griffiths)

ABSTRACT

This plan provides agriculture with perpetual equitable income in relation to the non-agricultural segment of the country. This is done by recognizing that the failure to balance supply to demand does not permit agriculture to set a price on its production to cover cost plus a fair profit as is done by virtually all other producers. Generally, solutions to this problem that have been attempted in the past have not only fallen far short of the equitable income goal, but have not been compatible with the law of supply and demand. In other words solutions have imposed on the individual farmer restrictions or incentives foreign to good business-like management of his farm, in lieu of the true capitalistic principles of the supply-demand price at the market place. Restrictions, controls or regimentation implies management inflexibilities that reduce efficiency. Free markets and capitalism permit management flexibility leading to more specialization, production shifts, etc. that in turn lead to greater efficiency. It is desirable to have a solution that will positively accomplish equitable income and do it in a manner compatible with capitalism. This plan does just that.

Enabling legislation is called for that would permit land to be retired (without regard to specific crops) in the amount calculated to reduce overall supply to where overall equitable income for the farmer could be realized at the market place. This would be done by rental of whole farm units from competitive bids based on the established gross primary production of the land. Retirement on a whole farm unit basis is desirable because it is more effective in reducing overall agricultural costs, and in reducing supply. Competitive bids are necessary to make this plan voluntary and to keep costs near the actual rental value of land. Gross primary producnot feed lots, dairies, hen houses, seed processing plants, etc. which increase the cash sale value of the crops by the substitution of capital that can readily be duplicated. tion is defined as the cash crop value of the production of the land and water and

Land would remain in retirement on a long-time basis of indefinite duration at the option of the owner. For a variety of reasons some owners will be returning land to production as time goes by. As owners return land to production, additional land retirement rentals would be made as needed, to maintain overall income above some desired fair level. If prices raised too much above this level certainly economic incentive would automatically insure return of adequate land to production. The program would be perpetual and would automatically cease to function when not needed.

Rental costs are estimated at one to three per cent (This small investment is less than the government has spent every year for many years without accomplishing equitable income.) of the operating farms gross primary production to be financed by this gross tax on operating farms gross primary production to be financed by this gross tax on operating farms but as a recognized expense would be covered by increased prices at the market place. It permits the operating farmers freedom and flexibility, and leaves them at full efficient capacity thus allowing them to produce at the least possible cost for competition with the import-export market and to the benefit of the consumer as well. It concerns itself only with overall supply and income leaving the law of supply and demand through the price mechanism to tell the farmers which commodities to increase and decrease.

This plan creates a healty environment in agriculture by indirectly providing farmers with the overall supply supervision that other producers have by direct methods. These direct methods are not available to farmers because numerous independent individual farmers produce identical products. To have direct control would require grouping many producers of a particular commodity under a single supervision which is both infeasible and undesirable. After this plan is in effect some commodities may still feel a need for bargaining in which case this plan reduces the bargaining problem to manageable size where it can succeed much easier.

EQUITABLE FARM INCOME AT THE MARKETPLACE OR A CAPITALISTIC SOLUTION TO A CAPITALISTIC PROBLEM

(By J. J. Griffiths)

The farm problem is that the per capita farm income over the years has only been one-half to two-thirds that of the non-farm income.[1] Latest publications show[2] that farming is the largest and most important industry in the country, with an investment of $61,000 and an annual income of $5000 per individual employed. This was compared to the average of the eleven industries, in order of importance, with an investment of $25,400 and an annual income of $10,350 per individual. The $5000 income per individual obviously does not reward farming equitably for their investment and labors.

This farm income problem arises from the fact that the slight overproduction of agricultural products results in such unfavorable supply-demand balance that the farm produce cannot command its equitable share of the nation's income. Furthermore the basic mechanism of capitalistic economics does not function so as to reduce the supply to command an equitable price for these commodities. For capitalism to work, the supply must go down as a result of some natural signal to the individual farmer when the price is too low so that the price of agricultural products will increase again. Even under present conditions however, the individual farmers are not receiving such a signal and are therefore not voluntarily reducing production. It is desirable to solve this problem in a manner consistent with capitalistic principles and leave the farmer with freedom and flexibility rather than with controls in the hands of big government or big union-type farm organizations. To do this we must first diagnose capitalism for its problem.

Ideally if equitable income is defined as the level of income at which the farmer would receive returns from his capital, management, and labor equitable with the rest of the nation, then the capitalistic principles should encourage a supply cut-back when the income level drops below this, and a supply increase when the price increases to above. This is obviously not the case. The loudest signal the individual farmer hears is that if the price drops or the expenses go up he must increase his production in order to make a go of it though he may switch to a different crop. The collective results of all the individual decisions that the farmers are making will result in a decrease in supply of the least profitable crops only by switching to some competing crop resulting in no decrease in the overall supply even though every individual knows it is for the best.

The farmer is no different than any other producer. To produce at 100% capacity, 100% of the time, would be just as disastrous to other industries as to farming. In these other industries this is prevented because a single management controls a single exclusive product (such as Chevrolet and Coca-Cola) to manage the supply to the demand. Even where the product is not so exclusive (such as 1090 Carbon Steel produced by several different companies) the production is geared to demand and these companies retain the privilege of setting their own prices. It is true that if overall prices drop the overall supply may also drop but such a supply decrease would probably be due more to some economic failures than to management decision. The economic signal for a solvent individual to cut back his overall production just does not exist. His unit costs are always least at full capacity. Farming has untold thousands of independent producers of the various farm commodities resulting in no adjustment of overall supply to the demand. These thousands do not know what profit they will make, if any, but only if they make one penny on one unit they will make two pennies on two, as individuals, because as individuals, their contribution to the price depressing overall supply total is insignificant. This is the collective result of natural in-

---

[1] Handbook of Agriculture charts, 1966, USDA.

[2] U.S. News & World Report, March 18, 1968 "Why Farming is in Trouble".

dividual incentives and it cannot be expected to be otherwise. That this is the case, is evident by the fact that this is not a temporary ill or a feature peculiar to the 1960's. Reference to the parity level since its beginning over 50 years ago shows significant full parity income to agriculture only in a brief period associated with each of the two global wars when sudden great overseas needs developed temporarily. In all other periods slight over-supply has harmed agriculture and will continue to do so under most all conditions unless farm supply is brought into balance with demand and maintained that way as is necessary for all other producers.

The farmers need some perpetual positive way of gearing supply to demand to effect a production cut-back or increase to meet demand as it exists, as is done by other producers such as Ford, International Harvester, U.S. Steel, R.C.A., etc. With millions of individual farmers there is no way that this can be done directly without dictatorial regimentation. This, to say the least, is undesirable.

Since the desirable answer to this problem is not to turn to socialistic methods but rather to use some sort of a capitalistic solution to this capitalistic problem, and thus to preserve the freedom and efficiency of our free enterprise economic system, we must first understand capitalism. It works on the law of supply and demand, or in other words, free enterprise. A study will show that this law of supply and demand does a very good job of telling the farmer the proportional amount of each farm commodity the market needs through the price mechanism but fails entirely to tell him, in a voice he will hear and act upon, how much overall farm production to provide. He will shift from a less profitable crop to a more profitable one but has no incentive whatsoever, as an individual, to reduce his overall production. It is true that some commodities are in greater surplus than others but commodities where persistent surpluses are most evident are allotted crops. For the most part this is then due to the artificial signal of price supports and not due to the free market. Without these government programs, stock piled surpluses would not exist unless a strategic reserve were purchased on the free market.

The natural relative prices will tell the farmers which commodity to increase or decrease, therefore, commodity-by-commodity control is not necessary or desirable in most cases if the overall supply of agricultural produce is reduced to the amount which could command an average full equitable price at the market place for agriculture as a whole. Under such conditions many commodities may be under what the government now calls 100% parity. But there is no other way and certainly no better way to determine the proper relative price of commodities than the law of supply and demand which automatically calculates the needs and desires of the consumers, producers, and marketing mechanism.

Regulating overall supply can be done in an economically feasible manner by recognizing these basic concepts of the supply-demand formula as it applies to agriculture which are: (1) As the supply goes down, the prices goes up and vice versa. (2) The overall price change for all commodities is greater than the overall commodity supply, as measured by the inelasticity of demand. (3) The inelasticity of overall demand is much greater than it is for individual commodities or commodity groups. (Inelasticity is the ratio of the price change to the supply change that caused it.) This third item makes it feasible to influence farm income by overall supply change whereas individual or group commodities supply change can, in general, have no influence on overall farm income unless as a result thereof overall supply is reduced. If a commodity is decreased in supply simply by switching the land to another commodity use, the later will suffer and in general no net benefit would accrue to agriculture because no overall supply decrease has occurred.

To quote a standard college textbook [3] on agricultural marketing:

"The demand for any one food is more elastic than the demand for the food as a whole. It is easier to substitute one food for another than it is to substitute something else for food as a whole. The elasticity for demand for pork at retail in the United States is about −0.7 (i.e. if the supply of pork is reduced 0.7% the price will increase 1.0% of the retail level) and for beef about −0.9%. But for all meats together, it is about −0.6%. The elasticity for food as a whole in the United States is about −0.25 (i.e, if all food were reduced 0.25% the retail price would increase 1%).

"If we assume for the moment . . . that half of the consumer's food dollar gets back to the farmer . . . the percentage change in price at the farm is twice as great as retail." (Comments above in parentheses are mine.)

From this the logic of influencing farm income by the use of overall food supply instead of commodity-by-commodity supply is obvious. Using these facts, the inelasticity of overall food is that a 1% price increase results from a ¼% supply decrease on the retail level. Converting from retail to farm price elasticity as the textbook did, the farmers are currently receiving about one third of the retail food dollar. Then converting the one-fourth per cent from the retail level to the farm level shows that a one per cent overall price increase would result from a one-twelfth per cent overall supply decrease and vice versa (or an inelasticity of 12 to 1). (This overall inelasticity of 12 to 1 is not to be confused with the average of the inelasticities of the individual commodities which would probably be less than 3 to 1.) With overall inelasticity being 12 to 1 (i.e. an overall price increase of 12% will result from a 1% overall supply decrease or a 12% overall price decrease will result in a 1% supply increase) it is not only apparent that a small overall supply cut-back can aid the farmers greatly but it is also apparent why the slight surplus we have depresses prices so greatly and why it is so necessary to adjust overall supply rather closely. The inelasticity data mentioned above were derived from market statistics in the period of 1920 to 1950 when parity ratios were about as they are now. There are several influences that are predominate more at the present time than then in both directions but the basic principle is true, and will continue to be true. The overall inelasticity is not expected to be significantly different now than it was then.

The very slight amount of retail price increase needed to provide the farmer adequate income is not usually realized. Less than 18¢ of the consumer dollar goes for food and less than 6¢ is paid to the farmer and less than 2¢ of this is net income to the farmer. It is hard to imagine the average American eating many fewer calories to deny the farmer only another 1¢ or perhaps less from the consumer dollar (a smaller amount than increased inflation alone erodes away every year) or that increased farm efficiency is giving to the consumer every few years. As recently as 1960, the 18¢ he now spends for food was 20¢ and in 1952 it was 23¢. Many take the attitude that any increase in farm prices should be avoided because of the increase in retail food prices. It is hard to understand why much more significant food price increases are condoned in the other factors affecting retail food prices while denying this small necessary increase in farm income especially when a large portion of the poor people for whom concern is expressed are those on farms.

The best way to reduce production would be to retire whole farm units because (1) it would leave all operating units at their full capacity for best efficiency, (2) it would reduce overall production costs to agriculture by permitting the retired farms to disband and liquidate all chattels, (3) it would provide supplementary income for those who desired to retire from farming in this manner.

Following is an economic analysis of what would be gained and what it would cost to accomplish a supply decrease if it were done in this manner. As an example: assume conservatively an overall demand inelasticity of 8 to 1 (this is the value that was shown previously to be 12 to 1) and reduce supply 4% by land retirement. The price will then increase 8 x 4% or 32% with 96% of the production. Assume approximate conditions are that agriculture grosses approximately a 42 billion dollar return per year from the market place with a cost of 30 billion, leaving a 12 billion profit. (Another 2 to 3 billion comes from the government.) With this 4% supply reduction the 42 billion gross is reduced to 96% of the original production. With the 32% price increase the price is increased to 132% of the original price thus increasing the gross to 53.3 billion. The 30 billion costs of production for producing only 96% as much produce would be reduced to 28.8 billion. With this new gross and new cost the farmers would net 24.5 billion dollars from the market place instead of the 12 billions as they did originally (or about double).

Now what would it cost to accomplish this? Certainly the retired land must rightfully be rewarded for its fixed unavoidable costs and receive a resonable profit return on its invested capital. Retiring land indefinitely would permit liquidating all chattel leaving only taxes, depreciation, and upkeep on real estate building and fixtures, etc. as unavoidable expenses. These probably would not exceed one-third on an average of the original farm operating expenses of these retired farms (their share of the 30 billion total expense was 1.2 billion) or a total of 0.40 billion dollars for the 4% retirement. Now if these retired farms were permitted to receive about one-half of the net income they had received as a reasonable profit on investment, this for doing nothing but having their real estate invested, (their share of the new 25.4 billion net was 1.02 billion) it would cost an additional 0.51 billion or a total of 0.91 billion for both cost and profit. This amount which nearly doubles the farmers profit, is still less than half of what our Federal Government is now spending to give the lowest parity level ever.

The above illustrated values are not intended as exact numbers nor to necessarily represent the amount of productivity that should be retired, or the amount of profit the farmers should make. It is to illustrate a principle. However in this example the 0.91 billion is about 42% of the 2.13 billion new normal gross of the retired 4% of the farmer's production, or above the usual average rental value. In this case these costs would be more than adequate for this amount of retirement if the rentals were administered in a businesslike manner. If all present land retirement government programs were discontinued this 0.91 billion would need to be increased to cover that amount of supply reduction as well.

This land should be rented out by competitive bids and in *numbers as required to meet the objectives.* In this manner no one would be required to retire land unless they volunteered to do so. Naturally those who have the greatest desire to retire their land in this manner would tend to bid in for the least and win the bids, whether this be the small units, the inefficient units, those retiring for age, health, or other personal reasons, etc.

[3] Marketing Farm Products, Economic Analysis, by Geoffrey S. Shepherd, professor of economics, Iowa State College, Iowa State College Press, 1955.

The bids accepted for retirement would be those which are lowest compared to their gross primary output. In general it would be expected that farms with the lowest profit to gross ratio would tend to bid most competitively so that the percentage of land reduction would be considerably greater than the supply reduction. However gross output must be defined as the primary gross output or the primary production of the land and water. In other words the limiting factor is land and water. Any amount of capital can be pumped into agriculture to build feed lots, pig parlors, milking parlors, seed processing plants, etc., but the ingredient which adds gross sales value is nothing but pure capital and can easily be duplicated down the road merely by capital and/or labor. Basic land production cannot be duplicated. That is the limiting factor and must be the factor used for supply control. It is to be expected especially with a healthy agriculture of this type with more capital in the hands of the farmers, that primary production from the land would increase perhaps faster than otherwise. Therefore increasingly greater amounts of land might need to be retired. The cost of production has, in general, always decreased with increased unit capacity. Decreased costs would permit equitable farm income at lower commodity prices to the benefit of all.

Land that is taken out of production in this manner could be permitted to stay out of production and draw rental until the owner chooses to return it. Certainly if the supply became less than desired, farm commodity prices would rise to the level where a greater number would desire to come back into production. As farms are returned to production, for whatever reason, it merely would mean that a new contract with someone else would need to be let in order to retire an amount of production if still necessary. As the overall price increases to where they exceed 105% of target, then the land that comes back into production would not be replaced. When price falls below 95%, or is calculated to do so because of the amount of retired land returning, more land would be retired to provide the average farmer, on an average year, equitable income. The plus or minus price tolerance (about 100%) should be as small as practical but not so small that it must respond to short range natural phenomena such as weather, pests, etc. If national security cannot tolerate a food supply on hand that is low enough to give the supply-demand balance required for equitable income to the farmer from the market, it is perhaps the duty of the government to stock pile a vital food supply by free market purchases (with ample guarantees against dumping) as they have done with all vital industrial raw materials. Certainly food is no less vital than metals or other raw material of industry.

Concern over the adverse effect that such retirement would have on the economic and social problems of our country, particularly the urban area, is unjustified since most farmers would remain in their lifelong farm homes with rental and social security income. Those who move to other occupations and/or locations would do so with supplementary income from their rental. With the resulting healthy agriculture this plan would curtail the present mass desperation exodus of farmers from their farms due to economic pressure.

Certainly the few who leave their farms will be far less of a problem than the high percentage who are destined to be forced out with financial problems under the present circumstances. It is also certain that 96% (or perhaps more) of the farm production with over 50 billion dollars of total gross income from the market place are going to spend more money and therefore generate more business in the urban area than at present. It may, however, be desirable to include legislation that would define the maximum allowable participation in particular areas to prevent the possibility of local impact in some areas from excessive land retirement.

Another feature that could be adopted in a plan like this would be to divide the country into certain elemental producing units that consist of one county or possibly several counties, and let these units be administered locally. The farmers within these units could be taxed to retire the farms within these units. This would permit local management and local financing and thus close many of the loop holes found in retirement programs. It would also prevent some urban areas from receiving an adverse impact from excessive retirement.

Rental costs of retiring this land should be borne by the operating farmers with the Federal government involved only in the administration of the program. The tax farmers pay would be a direct percentage tax on gross primary income from his farming enterprise. Net income would therefore greatly exceed the individual farmer's share of financing the program. The rental cost would be a legitimate farming cost and therefore be considered in the equitable income calculation. This would result in retiring enough land to increase prices enough to cover these rental costs along with all other costs and still leave equitable income to the farmer. This is nothing more than passing on costs to the buyer as is done by all segments of the economy.

This self-finance feature eliminates or reduces many economic and/or political drawbacks of earlier programs. These are:

(1) It permits the program to be financed by the market place, the only businesslike way to do it.

(2) It eliminates the necessity of depending on Federal government to appropriate the funds.

(3) The consumer pays full price at the market place which is as it should be, thus removing the stigma of subsidizing the farmer through taxation.

(4) It would earmark the revenue (as does Social Security) eliminating continuous budget consideration by Congress.

(5) By placing the costs on the farmers themselves a more responsible administration of the program will result. More loop holes and oversights will be prevented, or exposed and corrected more quickly.

(6) Whether financed by the government or by the farmers, rental bids would have to be compared to the productivity of the farm. If the farmer has been taxed on that productivity over the years, an actual record of the farm productivity will automatically result. Anyone who will present an exaggerated or fraudulent claim on production will have paid a tax penalty to do so, greatly reducing the possibility that such will occur.

From the earlier example the 0.91 billion dollars to take this land out of production could be provided by a 1.7 percent tax on the gross income of the farmers, the Department of Agriculture to stand the administrative expenses only. The actual amount would be determined by the inelasticity of overall demand. The feasibility of this program is not based on the inelasticity being 12 to 1, 10 to 1, 5 to 1, or that it cannot cost over 2% of the farmer's primary gross. Its feasibility is based only on the fact that an overall supply change gives a proportionately greater overall price change an irrefutable fact.

Approximately 25 percent of our produce each year is exported and nearly a like amount is greater than our entire surplus so obviously competitively exporting and competing with imports have a great deal to do with American agriculture. To receive equitable income, farm commodity prices *must* rise. When this rise occurs, some export-import markets *will* be lost. To hold this loss to a minimum it is necessary to hold farm prices at a minimum which requires the farmers to be as efficient as possible. The plan proposed here leaves the individual farmer at his full capacity and operating with freedom and flexibility, items which are all important to his efficiency and costs. Also administration is simpler and consequently more economical than any other effective method. There is no better way that agriculture can possibly receive an equitable income leaving the farmer in the best possible competitive position and still provide adequate supplies of food at reasonable prices. Also considering only overall supply and not individual commodity supply will permit those commodities in which we have the greatest efficiency and the greatest desire to produce to be priced the lowest to compete the best in the export market.

To score this program negatively on the basis that export markets will be lost because of higher American prices, is to say purely and simply that either (1) farmers cannot receive equitable income from the market place (for no other method can produce commodities cheaper) or (2) the government must subsidize exports. To score it negatively because a price rise will bring a flood of imports, is likewise to say again (1) above or (2) that the government must control imports. The American farmer is the world's most efficient. If he cannot compete on the world market it is mainly because of the inflated dollar resulting from years of over-spending in government and industrial labor-management negotiations allowing unrealistic wages and price raises in excess of productivity growth. In spite of any export-import problem that may arise, the farmers alone cannot continue indefinitely to absorb the increased costs imposed on it by these inflationary forces without commensurate price rises. This is not expected of any other industry nor should it morally be so for farmers. Actually the export market prices are not just followed by U.S. markets but to a greater degree than any other country is determined by the U.S. For U.S. export commodities, crop forecasts always discuss prices acknowledging prospective U.S. production as a major factor. Its world market significance is apparent by the fact that while only 12 to 15% of its production is exported, it represents about ¼ of the total world competitive commodity export. For example the U.S. supplies far over half of the world's feed grain export, about 40% of its wheat export, 25% of its cotton export, 20% of its tobacco export, and 25% of its milling rice export.

There is nothing in this program that is incompatible with collective bargaining. In fact quite the opposite is true. It aids to where it becomes a manageable task and can succeed. By definition the average farmer would be receiving an equitable income. Then, in general, half of the commodities will be priced above equity and half will be below. Some commodities but especially those that fall significantly below, may desire bargaining aid. Under these conditions the two largest obstacles to successful bargaining will be removed, enhancing greatly the chances of successful bargaining (1) Competing commodities will already be more profitable and will not so readily switch to the bargained crop to take advantage of any success as is the case now under present desperate circumstances. (2) The membership strength will not need be nearly so great nor so broad. Under present circumstances successful bargaining is nearly impossible. Some success has been claimed by some groups but in spite of all the bargaining efforts that have been made in the past several years overall parity of agriculture is now the lowest it has been. Obviously any success that has occurred in one commodity must have been at the expense of another.

Many false hopes have been placed with collective bargaining. We have tried to thwart the law of supply and demand by organization strength while reserving the right to overproduce. But no amount of organization strength can thwart the law of supply and demand without destroying our sacred free enterprise system to the same degree. Remember, even General Motors who controls the production of over 50% of the nation's trucks and automobiles is prone to overproduce occasionally. In such cases they lower the unit price to encourage expanded sales. And a consumer will accept an extra car much more readily than he will an extra plate of food.

Actually there are apparent but three approaches to accomplish equitable income for the farmer or a combination and variation of these. This program is one. A second would be by government subsidies. A third would be by complete bargaining contracts. The first, this program, is completely compatible with our free enterprise capitalistic and political system. Since no special appropriation is required it could be put into effect as soon as enabling legislation is provided. Such legislation could probably come as soon as the majority of the farmers and farm organizations present a solid front on this program. Once enacted it becomes perpetual, providing its own funds from the market place, and thus insulating it from the annual government budgeting battle. Being the lowest production cost equitable income program possible, resulting in the lowest necessary market prices possible, it will preserve more of our markets (especially import-export markets) and thus support the greatest number of people in agriculture. While it provides for an initial retirement of a small proportion of the farmers, it will reduce a mass exodus from farming and in a short time hence, the number of people engaged in farming should actually be greater from then on than otherwise.

The second type program, government subsidies, is intolerable to the taxpayer, if indulged in to the extent necessary to provide equitable farm income, and is therefore completely without hope even if farmers may feel they have earned it and deserve it. However if it were achieved the necessity of periodic appropriations would jeopardize its future effectiveness.

The third, complete bargaining, would require a nationwide organization of all significant commodities with barganing power put into the hands of one organization, with those individual farmers that refuse to go along being liquidated. In the end it would not only be necessary to dictate price to the buyer but to determine who gets to sell and how much. This latter factor is not readily admitted by some would-be organizers. This would result in inflexibilities that would not permit the efficiency in farming that would otherwise be attainable. The result would be greater price increases and market losses than would otherwise be necessary. If such power would be permitted one organization under present laws, has not yet been tested by the courts. But in any event such great power has never been tolerated in the hands of one organization and it seems doubtful that the public would now tolerate such over their most vital and necessary industry. If it were accomplished protective legislation would undoubtedly be enacted in the public interest to create a counterpart of the I.C.C. or P.U.C. to control and regulate agriculture.

Solving the farm income problem by retiring productive capacity in the manner proposed herein is doing nothing more than is found to be necessary in all other producing segments of our economy. Full production one hundred per cent of the time would soon result in over-production in any other industry and rob it of the privilege of setting its price to cover cost and a reasonable profit. Consequently, a few idle blast furnaces, electrical generators, assembly lines, etc. are the rule, not the exception. Idle facilities must exist for peak demand occasions and they do incur fixed costs and must return to their owners, return on their investment.

By recognizing these basic truths of our capitalistic system as others do, and living by the natural laws that are associated therewith as others do, farmers can also have income equitable to what others receive.

THE CASE FOR MILITARY MANPOWER CEILINGS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1969, Prof. George Wald addressed a group of fellow scientists and students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Mr. Wald, a Nobel laureate, attempted to analyze the general malaise which pervades much of our society—especially the younger generation. Mr. Wold observed:

Part of my trouble with the students is that almost all the students I teach were born after World War II. Just after World War II, a series of new and abnormal procedures came into American life. We regarded them at the time as temporary aberrations. We thought we would get back to normal American life some day.

But those procedures have stayed with us now for more than twenty years, and those students of mine have never known anything else. They think those things are normal. They think that we have always had a Pentagon, that we have always had a big Army, and that we have always had a draft. But those are all new things in American life, and I think that they are incompatible with what America meant before.

Professor Wald went on to point out that just before World War II, the total strength of the American Army, including the Air Corps, was 139,000. He noted that even after the war, after the demobilization following 1945, we came down to 600,000 men. But then came the cold war, then came the increasing assertion of American strength abroad, then came the overburdening military commitments around the world. Today, America has 3.5 million men under arms—the largest standing Armed Force of any nation in the world. And this does not even include the Reserves, the National Guards, and the military academies and ROTC.

The following facts indicate where the United States stands militarily with respect to other nations of the world:

SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE MILITARY STATISTICS [1]

1. In 1968 the United States had the largest standing Armed Force in the world: 3.5 million as compared to 3.2 million for the Soviet Union and 2.8 million for Communist China.

2. In 1968 the United States had the highest percentage of military age men in the Armed Forces of any major power (U.S.—8.9%, U.S.S.R.—7.0%, Communist China—1.9%), and the highest percentage of any country in the world except Portugal.

3. In 1968 the United States spent more money than any country in the world on military programs, almost twice as much as the Soviet Union and ten times as much as Communist China. The U.S. military budget in 1968 was substantially more than the total military budgets of all the Warsaw Pact nations including the Soviet Union.

4. By the most recent figures, the United States, ostensibly at peace, with the highest G.N.P. of any country in the world, spends a larger percentage of that G.N.P. on military pursuits than does a country fighting for its very existence—the Republic of South Vietnam.

THE SIZE OF ACTIVE U.S. MILITARY FORCES

There has been talk in recent days of the potential threat to the United States from Soviet superiority in any number of military fields—ABM's, submarines, and conventional forces. One of the most frustrating aspects of the military priorities question is that precise figures are difficult to come by. The Pentagon and the national security community relay on classified figures—figures which, however, are selectively declassified when it serves a purpose. But from overt sources it is possible to draw some conclusions. The conclusions which emerge indicate that in one area at least—military manpower—the United States leads every nation in the world.

THE SPIRAL OF DEFENSE SPENDING

All of this might not seem so absurd if there were any end in sight, but there is not. Every year the Pentagon asks for more men, and more and bigger weapons systems, and more money—and every year Congress appropriates more. Certainly the staggering escalation in defense spending need not be chronicled here. In absolute terms the defense budget has risen billions of dollars in the last ten years—years when we have been legally at peace.

Again statistical comparisons are difficult, for both we and the Soviet Union disguise our military expenditures or designate many weapons-related expenditures under other budget headings. According to the Institute for Strategic Studies, however, the United States spends not only the most dollars of any country in the world on military programs, but also the highest percentage of its gross national product (the largest in the world) of any major power. Moreover, not only has the absolute amount of U.S. defense expenditures been steadily rising, but even military spending as a percentage of gross national product has gone up—8% in 1965, 9.2% in 1966 and 9.8% in 1967. As Professor Wald observed, "as long as we keep that big an Army, it will always find things to do."

Finally, U.S. defense expenditures per capita—another measure of proportional effort—is so far above any other country in the world that we are in a different league. In 1967 our per capita defense expenditure—$368—was more than 2½ times that of the Russians and more than 40 times that of the Chinese. And yet, as Professor Wald said with irony, "the Defense Department is always broke."

THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE

How has all this come about? Who is really responsible for this incredible escalation of the size of U.S. military forces?

[1] Based on estimates of the Institute of Strategic Studies, London, as of November–December 1968.

COMPARATIVE ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY STRENGTHS

Service	U.S. statutory ceiling	Actual strength of U.S. forces on Dec. 31, 1968	Actual strength as percent of statutory ceiling	U.S.S.R. forces	Communist Chinese forces
Army	[1] 837,000	1,454,000	174	2,000,000	2,500,000
Navy	[2] 601,850	764,357	127	465,000	141,000
Air Force	[3] 502,000	878,904	175	505,000	120,000
Marine and other	[4] 436,800	313,009	72	[5] 250,000	
Total	2,377,650	[6] 3,410,270	143	[7] 3,220,000	[8] 2,761,000

[1] 10 U.S.C.A. § 3201. This statutory ceiling, like those in footnotes 3, 4, and 6 below, has been suspended since 1950. Statutory ceilings were first suspended by the Act of August 3, 1950, Publ. L. No. 81-655, 64 Stat. 408. The suspension has been extended six times since 1950.
[2] 10 U.S.C.A. §§ 5401, 5403-04, and 5410-12.
[3] 10 U.S.C.A. § 8201.
[4] 10 U.S.C.A. §§ 5402, 5404, and 5410-11.
[5] Soviet Air Defense Forces.
[6] Excludes Reserves, academy cadets, National Guard; includes medical corps, Judge Advocate General personnel on active duty, and reservists on active duty. Figures were furnished by the legislative liaison offices of the respective services.
[7] Excludes reserves and so-called paramilitary forces (security and border guards). These figures are estimates as of November-December 1968, made by the Institute for Strategic Studies, London.
[8] Excludes reserves, border troops, and civilian militia. Estimates are by the Institute for Strategic Studies, London.

In 1968 the United States had more men under arms than any country in the world: 3.5 million men compared to 3.2 million for the Soviet Union and 2.8 for Communist China.[2] Moreover, the United States had the highest percentage of military age manpower in the Armed Forces of any major power (U.S.–8.9%, U.S.S.R.–7.0%, Communist China–1.9%), and the highest percentage of any country in the world except Portugal. As Professor Wald so aptly put it, "What happened under the pleas of the Cold War was not alone that we built up the first big peacetime Army in our history but that we institutionalized it."

DISPOSITION OF U.S. FORCES

More than half of U.S. active duty military forces serve outside the United States. One-third of these forces are permanently stationed outside the United States, and almost 20% are on U.S. Navy vessels in foreign parts of the world. The following table indicates in approximate figures the deployment of U.S. abroad in March, 1969:

Deployment of U.S. military forces outside the United States [1]

Asia:	
Korea	55,000
Okinawa	40,000
Japan	40,000
Philippines	30,000
South Vietnam	540,000
Thailand	45,000
Total	750,000
Latin America: Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Guantanamo	23,000
North America: Canada, Greenland, and Iceland	10,000
Western Europe:	
Western Germany	228,000
Other	92,000
Total	320,000
North Africa and Middle East: Total	10,000
Total permanently stationed outside United States (33 percent of all U.S. active duty forces)	1,113,000
Atlantic Fleet: 2d and 6th Fleets	254,000

Deployment of U.S. military forces outside United States—Continued

Pacific fleets: 1st and 7th Fleets (35,000 off the coast of South Vietnam)	389,000
Total seaborne U.S. forces outside United States (19 percent of all U.S. active duty forces)	634,000

[1] Figures based on official Department of Defense sources, furnished by the Legislative Reference Service.

[2] The estimates used hereafter are those made by the Institute for Strategic Studies, London, as of November–December 1968, unless otherwise indicated.

Again, one of the frustrating aspects of the problem is that responsibility seems to be so diffused. There seem to be so many to share the blame that there is hardly enough to go around. But is this really so?

Article I of the United States Constitution places the responsibility for the size of U.S. military forces squarely on Congress. "The Congress shall have Power . . . To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years." Just as Congress has the power to raise armies, it has the power not to raise them—or to limit them in whatever form they already exist. It has the power—indeed the responsibility—to cut back such armies as soon as possible. Our Constitutional fathers *required* a biennial review. What has happened to this power? What limits has Congress enacted to control the burgeoning Armed Forces? What limits have been enacted into law to control the level of U.S. active military forces?

There are now in the law comprehensive limitations on the total size of the Armed Forces, as well as specific limitations on the sizes of each of the individual services.[3] These limitations, first enacted in the Selective Service Act of 1948, were intended to carry out Congress' responsibility to supervise and control the size of the Armed Forces. The totals then enacted limited the total size of U.S. active military forces to slightly over 2 million men—in itself a higher number than ever sanctioned before in peacetime. As the Armed Services Committee said to the House in a 1967 report, "these maximums were intended to apply in peacetime." Since the end of World War II, this Nation has been at peace—at least legally. There has been no declaration of war by Congress, an action specifically required by the Constitution in order to insure that our military involvements had the full sanction of the people's representatives. No state of war exists today; we have not been legally at war since 1945, and yet the express statutory ceilings enacted by Congress are not in force. Why?

STATUTORY SUSPENSION OF CEILINGS

In August of 1950, with international tensions increasing and the shadow of Korea falling across the future, Congress suspended the statutory ceilings on active military force levels which had been enacted only two years before. The House Armed Services Committee reassured the House at the time of this original suspension that "the subject will come actively before the committee again, of course, . . . prior to July 9, 1951" (the renewal date for the Selective Service Act). House Report 2719, 81st Cong., 2d Sess. at 2 (1950). The Committee also said: "The committee reminds the House that, in his message of July 19, 1950, the President specifically requested that the present ceilings on the Armed Forces be *temporarily* suspended." Id. (Emphasis added.)

In 1951, however, the suspension of statutory ceilings did not come before the Armed Services as automatically as it had anticipated. In fact, the original House-passed bill to extend the Selective Service Act did not mention the statutory ceiling suspension at all. In the conference between House and Senate managers, the 1950 suspension was renewed with only this cryptic comment by way of justification: "The House and Senate managers agreed to continue the present statutory limit on the size of the Armed Forces, suspended until July 31, 1954 . . ." House Rept. 535, 82d Cong., 1st Sess. at 22 (1951).

Despite the fact that continued suspension of statutory military force ceilings received only cursory consideration by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, one new provision was added to the 1950 act: an overall force level limitation of five million. No mention of this new section was made in etiher the House Report or the Conference Report.

RENEWALS OF SUSPENSIONS

Since 1951 the suspension of statutory ceilings has been renewed by the Congress five times in 1954, 1957, 1959, 1963 and 1967. Despite the express Constitutional provision that no appropriation for the Armed Forces would be for a period of longer than two years (an indication that the Framers intended at least biennial review of military force levels and commitments), the suspensions of statutory ceilings were for four years each beginning in 1954. The justifications for continued suspensions in each year they were approved were hardly illuminating. In 1954 the House Armed Services Committee told the House: "It is obvious that the Armed Forces must be maintained at a strength in excess of 2 million persons in the foreseeable future." House Rep. 1104, 83rd Cong., 2d Sess. at 1 (1954). In 1957 the need for continued suspension was also "obvious." House Rep. 390, 85th Cong., 1st Sess. at 2 (1957). In 1959 continued suspension of force ceilings was termed "vital to the preservation of the American Way of life and to our national security." House Rep. 27, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. at 10 (1959). In 1963 the Committee told the House that "it is clear that this section of the law must be extended" and that its enactment "is essential to our national security." House Rep. 58, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. at 13, 14 (1963). In the 1967 extension of ceiling suspensions, the House Armed Services Committee did not even offer a justification for the continuation. After describing the effect of the statutory ceilings and noting that they were intended to apply "in peacetime", the Committee said simply: "The ceilings have been continuously suspended since the buildup of our Armed Forces following the hostilities in Korea." House Rep. 267, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. at 38 (1967). Thus has Congress discharged its heavy Constitutional responsibility to "raise and support Armies."

RESULTS OF CONGRESSIONAL INACTION

The effect of Congress' failure to review in a meaningful way the level of U.S. military forces has been that this level is set—for all intents and purposes—by military plan-

[3] 10 U.S.C.A. §§ 3201, 5401–5404, 5410–5412, 8201.

ners at the Pentagon. One finds it difficult to criticize the Joint Chiefs, military department heads, or the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower for seeking constantly increased force levels. Their job is defense, and in their view increasing military commitments required increased force levels. The Bureau of the Budget might have been expected to perform a more thorough and objective review of military manpower requirements. Unfortunately, as recent revelations in the press have shown, requests for Defense programs were reviewed on a wholly different basis than the requests of other Departments. Defense requests most often survived the gruelling budgetary review process (gruelling for other departments), without a scratch. Congress usually went along.

EFFECT ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

What has been the effect of these super-statutory force levels on U.S. foreign policy? Probably there is no simple answer to a question which involves so many subtle and difficult considerations. Who can doubt, however, that long and hard thought would have been given before undertaking the commitment of U.S. combat forces in South Vietnam if our troop levels had stood at their statutory level —just over 2 million? Who can believe that we would now have 45,000 men in Thailand, 40,000 in Okinawa, 30,000 in the Philippines— 750,000 total in Asia (not counting Seventh Fleet personnel)—if the statutory ceilings were being observed? Finally, who can believe that the United States government would agree to support 320,000 troops in Western Europe if the level of U.S. forces were limited to only six times that number?

EFFECT AT HOME

If the result of super-statutory military manpower levels has been serious overseas, it has been catastrophic at home. It was noted earlier that the United States has the highest percentage of military age manpower under arms of any major power in the world. Let us go behind the dry statistics; what does this mean in ratios of civilian to military population?

If we talk in terms of the entire American population in 1968, we had one out of sixty Americans on active military duty as of December 31, 1968. But this figure compares active military personnel to the entire population—men, women and children. If we limit our comparison to males alone, the ratio is one out of twenty-eight. If we further limit ourselves to only military-age males (to be generous, those between 18 and 65) the ratio becomes an incredible 1-out-of-16. *One American service-age male out of every sixteen is on active military duty.* And this does not count, of course, those service-age men who are not physically fit for service, who have completed their military obligation, or who have retired from the service. Truly, as George Wald said, these things "are incompatible with what America meant before."

But having this high percentage of our youth in active military service is not the end of effects at home. The tremendous size of the active military establishment has led to huge draft calls in which thousands of unwilling Americans every month are called to serve their country in uniform. In recent years, and largely because of the war in Vietnam (itself at least partially a result of high military strength levels), many young Americans have refused to serve—preferring prison or exile to what they consider ignoble service. The calls of conscience and revulsion which the enormous peacetime draft has led to in the U.S. have literally rent the fabric of this society.

A third tragic result of our massive military manpower levels has been the debasement of the military and its role in the eyes of Americans. I can remember when military service used to be considered an honor, a service worthy of respect and gratitude. Those of us who served during World War II were proud to have served, and the uniform was something to be worn with pride. Today we are destroying the traditional American respect for the military and its important but limited role in American life. Today the military is often an object of derision and contempt. The immediate reaction of many Americans to any statement by the Pentagon—whether it be Viet Cong casualty figures or Soviet missile strengths—is skepticism and suspicion. In short, we have created a military monster which much of the American population—especially the young, the future citizens—suspects and fears.

But the saddest result of having nearly 3.5 million American men in uniform is that it has made us into a different country—a warrior state, where casualty lists are an every day part of the society—a military society, where maintenance of the largest standing armed force in the world takes priority over every other need.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Clearly Congress has avoided its responsibility for too long and the results of that avoidance have been too serious for the situation to continue. We in the Congress must take action to show this Nation, and especially the young people of this Nation, that we have the will and the ability to limit the tremendous overcommitment of U.S. resources to military pursuits. We must, in short, return to some form of statutory limitation on the size of the military establishment.

The simplest solution—and simplicity has much to be said for it in the field of military appropriations—is for Congress to impose a ceiling on the strength of the military services. In the past such a solution (the return to existing statutory levels) has been rejected because of the discrepancy between present statutory ceilings and the actual strengths of the military services. At the present time only the Marine Corps is below its authorized statutory strength. As of the end of 1968, the Army was 174% of its authorized ceiling, the Navy was 127% and the Air Force was 175%. It is argued that an arbitrary return to present statutory ceilings would impose great hardships on the services, and would require precipitous withdrawal of American forces from standing commitments around the world without sufficient warning to host governments.

For this reason, a proposal to limit active U.S. military forces to 90% of their strength at the end of calendar year 1968 is a reasonable answer to Congress' need to begin planning some rational limitation on the size of the military establishment. Making this requirement effective as of the end of fiscal year 1970 would give the military services and military and foreign policy planners sufficient warning to adjust U.S. policies abroad. The cut is not so substantial that it would be impractical. Finally, such a 10% reduction in the active duty strength of U.S. forces would place Congress back in the role which the founders intended it should play—raiser, maintainer and limiter of U.S. military forces.

Such a 10% reduction could be enacted by Congress simply as an amendment to the overall strength limitation enacted in 1951. By reducing this level to 3,070,000, Congress would be cutting the statutorily authorized strength of the Armed Forces (as of June 30, 1970) to 90% of their strength as of the end of calendar 1968. Such action would restore Congress to its proper Constitutional role and would reassure the American people that someone is exerting some control over the proliferating military establishment.

LIMITATION ONLY A FIRST STEP

A 10% reduction is, of course, only a first step on the long road back to the existing statutory limits. With the Armed Forces presently 43% overstrength, it will take some time to reduce the level of active military forces to the 2 million plus presently prescribed by existing ceilings. But as President Kennedy often reminded us, a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.

RESULTS OF REDUCTION IN ACTIVE FORCES

The results of beginning to reduce the level of military manpower are many and tremendously important. All of the ramifications probably cannot be known at the present time, but some of the most obvious and beneficial results would be as follows:

1. Savings to the taxpayers: According to the average military personnel cost per military man on active duty which is used by the Pentagon, a 10% reduction would result in a savings on direct personnel costs alone of over 2 billion dollars. In truth, however, if the level of forces is reduced, operations and maintenance will also be reduced proportionally. Thus if the average cost of military personnel, operations and maintenance, and family housing per each active duty military man is used, the savings from a 10% reduction in active forces is almost 4.6 billion dollars.

2. Improved balance of payments position: Mention has already been made of the large commitment of U.S. active forces to overseas assignments. This overseas commitment has hurt the U.S. balance of payments position, and has caused, among other things, the Presidential decision to place direct controls on foreign direct investment overseas. In addition, the President placed into effect restrictions on foreign travel by U.S. citizens, and customs regulations to discourage foreign travel by Americans. These restrictions are an unnecessary result of U.S. over-commitment abroad, and have no place in a peace-time society. Reduction in U.S. force levels, which would be reflected in declining troop strengths overseas, would allow elimination of these foreign travel and foreign investment restrictions.

3. Realignment of U.S. foreign policy: One of the most beneficial results of the proposed 10% cut back would be that it would discourage the kind of over-reliance on military solutions which has characterized U.S. foreign policy since the Korean war. The simple fact is that if the Pentagon has fewer forces to play with, it will be far more careful about how they are deployed. It might even happen that U.S. troop deployments abroad would eventually come truly to reflect existence of important U.S. national security interests—a situation which most certainly does not obtain today.

4. Elimination of the draft and promotion of a volunteer army: One of the most obvious advantages of a reduction in the strength of active military forces would be an eventual end to the draft, the Selective Service System, prosecutions for draft evasion, and all the paraphenalia of military conscription. One of the Armed Services Committee reports said that it was necessary to continue suspension of strength ceilings to preserve "the American way of life." Nothing is more contrary to the American way of life than conscription and forced military service. Despite the fact that many of us take the draft for granted today, we should never forget that it was authorized by Congress after World War II only as a temporary measure, that it was not intended to be a permanent part of American life, that—in sum—it was not meant to become what it has become.

A reduction in the size of the active military force would improve prospects for a volunteer army. The prospects would be improved not only in the sense that costs would be lower and chances of finding adequate numbers of volunteers improved—although these are important benefits. But for those

of us who regard with horror the thought of a 3.5 million man permanent standing army, the reduction of professional military strength to a level more consistent with our real needs reduces the dangers and concerns about a permanent volunteer army.

5. A step toward world peace: For some years historians and students of world affairs have noted that the Cold War as we knew it during the 1950's was drawing to a close. Whatever the nature of world tensions, they are different than the tensions of the 1950's. But no reduction in U.S. force levels occurred which reflected these different tensions. In October 1967, the Soviet Union reduced the mandatory term of service for its draftees to two years. The overall strength of Soviet military forces is less than ours, and reflects reductions since 1950. It is time that we took some step toward American deescalation of military force levels. A 10% reduction in U.S. troop strength would be a significant move in this direction—a significant step toward peace.

ADVANTAGES OF THE STRENGTH-LIMIT APPROACH

The actual results of force reduction would be, as we have seen, very real and very advantageous. But aside from those beneficial results, what are the advantages of approaching military budget reduction from the point of view of manpower limitations?

Perhaps the greatest advantage to the Congress of a manpower-limitation approach is that it gives the people's representatives a way of proceeding, a "handle" some would call it, by which we can begin to manage our priorities. When Congress must pick and choose, must weigh and decide between strategic missile forces, polaris submarine forces, strategic bomber forces, fighter pilots, interceptor pilots, Special Forces units, Army infantry battalions—when all of these competing programs must be judged, with expert touting the value of each in grandiose terms, then Congress may have difficult choosing. Worst of all, it may not choose, it may just accept. But if an overall manpower limitation were placed on the strength of active military forces—with no specifications as to how the cuts were to be made—then the choice would be left to the experts. Congress was not intended to command the military, but it was intended to authorize it, to scrutinize it, and to cut it when it grew too large. By reducing the overall strength limitation of active forces, Congress can meet its responsibilities, and can start to assert the necessary leadership to restore a proper balance between our need to defend ourselves from foreign aggression and our need to preserve ourselves from internal decay.

REASSERTION OF THE POPULAR WILL

There are those in America today who truly believe that her democratic political institutions are no longer responsive to the demands and desires of the electorate. A new President is elected who promises to end the Vietnam war, but no troop withdrawals follow. While the cities of the Nation cry out for assistance and attention, America continues to devote 42% of its national Government's budget to direct military activities, and 5% to education, manpower, community development and housing.

This kind of imbalance in our domestic and military priorities cannot last. I truly believe that the people of this Nation will not stand for it. We are on the verge of a taxpayers' revolt, a students' revolt and a draft revolt. My own hope is that Congress, and specifically the House of Representatives, can lead America in its reorientation from Cold Warrior to Peacemaker, from keeper of the largest military establishment in the world to a leader in the cause of deescalation of the arms race. My hope is that the voices of the people will begin to get through.

U.S. DIPLOMATIC SIGNALS ON GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Greece observed the second anniversary of the military coup of April 21, 1967.

For 2 years the newspapers of the United States have been far more penetrating and accurate in their judgment of the Greek military junta than have American officials. Now, at last, there appears to be some deliberate movement by American officialdom away from the Greek dictatorship.

In my judgment there are three critical elements presently involved in the Greek political situation and American attitudes toward it.

First is the question of whether or not the United States gives a diplomatic signal which tells the Greek people that President Nixon disassociates himself from the Greek military regime. The psychological and practical impact of such a signal, once given and sustained, should not be underestimated.

A second important consideration is the expected joint statement from Greek political figures in exile. Prominent among these figures are former Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis, of the conservative ERE Party, Andreas Papandreou of the liberal Center Union Party, King Constantine, and Publisher Eleni Vlachou. Such a statement would indicate a unity of purpose among the democratic political leaders of Greece, particularly an agreement in favor of a "national government," made up of a coalition of the leading political parties, to serve in the transition until genuine elections can be held.

There has been some delay in the issuance of this statement, perhaps because political differences die hard, even in exile, and because the leaders in question are afraid that unsteady U.S. policymakers might change course again and pull the rug from under them.

Generally overlooked has been a third important point, and that is the selection of a U.S. Ambassador to Athens to fill a post left vacant for 3 months. Press reports of who the Ambassador may be should give the exile leaders pause. Mentioned frequently are a retired Army general, now a lobbyist for a big defense contractor, believed to be the candidate of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, and a Chicago businessman, one of a small number of junta propagandists among Greek-American businessmen, believed supported by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. Faced with such a prospect, the selection of a career diplomat would be not only a refreshing alternative but an imperative political decision.

Several significant articles and statements on Greece have appeared recently. The most important is a political analysis delivered by a Voice of America commentator and broadcast to the world. This broadcast is a departure from the previous caution of U.S. and VOA statements and seems meant to be a signal of change.

The Voice of America also broadcast excerpts from the Washington Post and New York Times editorials set forth below.

I also include for the RECORD a Christan Science Monitor article of April 10, 1969, which clarifies the American problem on Greece. Finally, I include an excellent column by Alfred Friendly, Jr., of the New York Times, surveying the scene from Athens on April 21, 1969:

[From Political Analysis No. 1–0186, Apr. 23, 1969]

GREECE: A U.S. PERSPECTIVE

(By David Roberts)

Announcer: On Tuesday (April 22) of this week the military government of Greece was two years old. VOA's David Roberts comments:

Voice: As the generals who run Greece mark their second anniversary in office they can look back on two years of unfulfilled promises and minimum achievement. Any effort to restore a civilian presence to the Greek Government remains unsuccessful. King Constantine continues his exile in Italy. Economic reform remains an unreality—performance of the economy has reportedly slowed. As for representative government, it still is merely a potential in Greece's future.

The United States has maintained a long and close relationship with various governments of Greece. Under the Truman Doctrine following World War Two, the U.S. was instrumental not only in assisting the Greek people in their struggle against a Communist take-over, but in re-building Greece from the shambles of war and the bitterness of civil strife. In this relationship, the U.S. has continued to be deeply concerned about Greek democracy.

When the then colonels assumed command in April of 1967, the United States suspended major military deliveries to Greece. Over the past two years, the U.S. has delivered only the major items of military equipment that were essential to NATO commitments. The concern for representative government goes on.

In March of this year, Secretary of State William P. Rogers appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Claiborne Pell took the occasion to express this concern, and asked the Secretary of State if he would seek assurances from the Greek Government that progress toward "democratic processes" was being made, and that "torture would not be used to terrify political prisoners."

Secretary Rogers told the Senator that indeed he shared this concern over the issue of torture, adding that he was disturbed also over the lack of civil liberties in Greece. Mister Rogers went on record as saying that the U.S. "is doing what it can," through diplomatic channels "in that direction" and that these points would be taken into consideration in subsequent negotiations.

United States concern is not difficult to express; it can be summarized quite briefly. The U.S. continues to hope for a return to representative government in Greece. Plus, a full restoration of civil liberties. The United States has expressed this hope on many occasions. On the most recent occasion the hope was expressed directly to high level Greek officials. These requisites for democracy—or the lack of them—remain as the bases for U.S.-Greek relations, and an essential element in NATO's objectives.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1969]

GREECE 2 YEARS LATER

The second anniversary of the Greek coup finds the regime bogged down and unsure of itself. Economic progress has trailed off. The Scandinavians and the European left are provoking the regime into an unseemingly defensiveness. The colonels have won neither the loyalty of the educated classes nor the enthusiasm of the citizenry. Greece remains a police state, a condition offensive to its own traditions and its traditional friends alike.

It is not surprising that many Greeks are "keeping the back door open," as the Greek saying goes. That is, they are prepared to accept, if not to seek, a change in leadership. The instant question has become how that change will come. Some on the left and some on the right may favor violence—insurrection or another coup. Responsible opinion leans towards efforts again to involve the civilian politicians, especially ex-premier Karamanlis, an exile in Paris, and the King, an exile in Rome. Whether the junta will have the wisdom and patriotism to ease the way for their return is problematical. There are practically as many views on it as there are Greeks.

For the United States, it should be realized that the junta's two-year record has greatly disappointed hopes that time and pressure would point Athens back towards democracy. That possibility cannot be dismissed, but it is too uncertain to remain the sole basis of policy. The guiding consideration for Washington should be not to identify itself so closely with the colonels that it would be compromised in the eyes of the Greek people and in the eyes of the next—hopefully, more representative—Greek government.

The few available signs are that Mr. Nixon is following that line. President Johnson had finally announced a "partial" resumption of military aid; it is still partial. Secretary of State Rogers, in an unusually candid statement to a concerned Senator, declared: "We share your concern not only for the torture but also for other civil liberties . . . And we will be conscious of the factors that you mentioned in our subsequent negotiations." American officials expressed the Administration's concern directly to the Greek Deputy Premier when he came for the Eisenhower funeral. President Nixon has not yet appointed a new ambassador to Athens. Vice President Agnew has been retrieved from the embrace of pro-junta Greek-Americans. These things are all token but, given the tension in Athens, they may be important.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1969]

TWO YEARS OF PAPADOPOULOS

On today's second anniversary of the putsch that swept out constitutional government, Greece remains a country under martial law. That is really commentary enough on the performance of Colonel Papadopoulos and his henchmen, who promised "a return to parliamentary rule on a wholesome basis."

It is also adequate commentary on the "liberalization" announced by the Premier recently on the eve of NATO's twentieth anniversary meeting in Washington. It is useless to proclaim restoration of the "inviolability of the home" when the continued suspension of habeas corpus makes any citizen liable to arbitrary arrest anywhere, anytime.

What political meaning has restoration of the "right of assembly" when a Greek using such a forum to criticize the junta can still be arrested and held indefinitely? And of what value is the "right of association" when martial law not only curbs free speech but specifically bans all strikes?

One thing above all is clear about the colonels on the second anniversary of their putsch: If they had the support they claim from the Greek people they would have lifted martial law long ago and taken their chances in a free election.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 10, 1969]

STRICT ALOOFNESS OR INTERVENTION? SUPPRESSION IN GREECE PUTS NIXON ON GRIDDLE

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The most serious and urgent problem of the NATO alliance has been deliberately ignored by the United States. The Nixon administration has not had time to decide what to do about it.

One of the NATO allies—Greece—has been under military dictatorship, martial law, and the denial of political liberties for two years. Elections have often been promised but are not in sight. Some political prisoners have been released from jail, but censorship is still tightly enforced.

Protest has boiled up periodically, the latest to denounce the regime being the leading poet of Greece George Seferis, who won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963.

A number of hearings on political prisoners have been held by the Council of Europe and an official inquiry is in progress by the European Commission on Human Rights. Charges of violation of the European Human Rights Convention were made by the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway. Italy has likewise had an open dispute on this subject with the Greek military regime in recent weeks.

Alfred Friendly, correspondent and former managing editor of the Washington Post, reported from Athens this week, ". . . The censorship here is no laughing matter. It is corrosive to a responsible political and national life; moreover it is probably doing the dictatorship more harm than good. Where there is a news vacuum, rumor fills it. Yet rumor is surely the most dangerous threat to the goal the junta most desires: public confidence in it, and governmental stability.

"The more insecure the colonel's [Col. George Papadopoulos] regime senses itself to be, the tighter and more frantic its censorship. A vicious circle comes into being." The censorship, Mr. Friendly reported, has become "counter-productive."

The Greek question, although it is considered the hottest political issue within the NATO alliance, was carefully bypassed by President Nixon and his party on his recent tour of Western Europe to visit a number of the NATO capitals.

Last week a similar avoidance of decision was shown at the Eisenhower funeral ceremonies. Both King Constantine, who supports free elections in Greece and remains the acknowledged Greek head of state although he is living in Rome in self-imposed exile, and a representative of the Athens regime, Deputy Premier Stylianos Patakos, were impartially greeted by President Nixon at a White House reception and seated with foreign notables at the cathedral service.

The issue confronting President Nixon is whether and how long he can continue to remain officially indifferent to a regime that denies elections and political liberties to a country that is a member of the central defense system of the self-styled free world.

PRECEDENT OPPOSED

Some of the President's foreign policy advisers argue that the United States should stay clear of the internal political affairs of Greece. Others contend that by financing and arming Greece as a NATO ally—an activity that was suspended and then partially resumed by President Johnson after the 1967 military coup—the United States is already intervening on the side of the military government.

The first group says that the United States cannot afford to establish a precedent that it intends to make and unmake regimes of other countries, using its financial and military power arbitrarily for this purpose.

The second group says that where dictatorships are already using American money and arms to support themselves against their domestic political opposition, the United States is already committed on the side of political oppression.

The first group argues that the overriding principle must be that of respect for the integrity of other countries, no matter how difficult it might be to let them work out their own destinies.

DIPLOMATIC SIGNALS?

The second group argues that the overriding principle of the free world must be that of support for liberty and at least a quiet disapproval of political oppression within its own ranks, if it is to win conflicts with Communist tyranny.

Finally, both groups recognize that practical issue is not the open use of American power for intervention or nonintervention. It is whether the United States does or does not give diplomatic signals which tell the Greek people that President Nixon disassociates himself from supporting the Greek military regime, while giving arms that are considered necessary for the NATO defenses.

One group of the President's advisers is concerned lest such a signal play into the hands of radical opponents of the Greek regime. The other argues that responsible alternatives to the military government are now available, but that the longer it lasts, the greater the danger to the NATO alliance of anarchy and radicals.

As the situation stands now, King Constantine is available as a symbol and advocate of constitutional democracy and free elections. Former moderate conservative Premier Constantine Karamanlis and the liberal Andreas Papandreou, son of former Premier George Papandreou, are among those available as premier for a return to democratic government.

The Greek dilemma weighs on the Nixon administration at a time when it has had to face a similar problem in South Vietnam. Technically the United States takes no part in internal South Vietnamese political affairs. In fact, however, President Johnson initiated its Constitution and elections, and repeatedly used pressure on the Saigon regime both to broaden its political base, and later to join the Paris peace talks.

President Nixon likewise has found it necessary to use his influence—which includes the fact that the Saigon regime is dependent on Washington for both money and arms—for the same two purposes.

In the case of South Vietnam, with a war and a peace settlement at stake, Mr. Nixon decided that he could not stand aloof and let political forces in Saigon take their course.

In the case of Greece, where civil war is potential rather than actual, and where the morale of the NATO alliance is concerned, he faces similar alternatives, but a decision has not yet been made.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 10, 1969]

THIS ANOMALY MUST STOP

(By a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The following statement by George Seferis, Greek poet who received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963, has been received in Washington from Athens. The Greek Government recently published an answer to Mr. Seferis but did not permit publication of his statement in Greece.

The text follows:

"It is now some time since I took the decision to stay out of my country's politics. I have tried in the past to explain my decision, but this does not mean that I am indifferent to our political life.

"From that time until now I have abstained from touching upon such matters.

In any case, from what I had published up to the beginning of 1967 and from my subsequent position (I have published nothing in Greece from the time liberty was silenced) I believe that I have clearly shown my thoughts.

"In spite of this, for some months I have felt within me and around me that more and more it is becoming imperative for me to speak out on our present situation. With all possible brevity, this is what I would say:

"It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us, utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last world war. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded in keeping alive with toil and effort are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. It would not be difficult for me to understand that such catastrophes do not count very much for some people. Unfortunately that is not the only danger.

"We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end inescapably. It is this tragic ending that consciously or unconsciously torments us in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus. As long as this anomalous situation continues, so long does evil progress.

"I am a person with absolutely no political bond and I can say that I speak without fear or passion. I see in front of me the abyss to which we are being led by the oppression which has engulfed our country. This anomaly must stop. It is a national demand.

"Now I resume my silence. I pray to God that never again may I find myself under such compulsion to speak.

"GEORGE SEFERIS."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1969]

AT SECOND ANNIVERSARY, GREEK RULERS STILL LOOK FOR SUPPORT

(By Alfred Friendly Jr.)

ATHENS, April 20.—On the second anniversary of their coup d'état, the military rulers of Greece and their domestic opponents are both looking outside the country for support. Neither group is receiving what it wants.

Even without fervent approval from abroad, however, the former colonels remain solidly in control. While restoring some semblance of civil liberty with one hand, they have been able with the other to tighten the social restrictions they have imposed since their tanks and troops moved into the streets on April 21, 1967, and ended 21 years of often chaotic constitutional government.

The anniversary was celebrated here tonight with a two-hour performance by marching bands, folk dances, singers, patriotic floats and fireworks before a crowd of some 60,000 Athenians, who almost filled the huge National Stadium.

The evening chill drove many from the stone stands early, but loudspeakers placed on nearby streets and in the city's central Constitution Square carried the sounds of the ceremony after them.

Although increasingly vocal in private, the regime's opponents at home are as disunited as they were the day the colonels moved in.

A recent effort to produce a joint statement of opposition from leaders of two center political parties from before the coup collapsed in bickering. The parties agreed that they would form a coalition government in a restored democracy, but could not agree that they would name former Premier Constantine Caramanlis, who has been in self-imposed exile in Paris since his electoral defeat in 1963, to head it.

Sypros Markezinis, head of his own small party and a respected political figure, has also failed to rally united support, as he failed during a prolonged parliamentary crisis in 1965.

U.S. PRESSURE FAVORED

"If the United States would understand and undertake its moral obligations to Greece," an unhappy former Center Union politician said, "we could end the dictatorship in a few months. Pressure from Washington could force them to compromise with King Constantine and restore the parliament.

"Even if they formed their own political party and rigged the elections, the democratic groups would regain the forum they have lost and be in a position to take full control quickly."

The Center Union, a coalition of center parties, was headed by Premier George Papandreou, who was dismissed from office in July, 1965, after differences with King Constantine. His dismissal resulted in a series of crises that brought the military coup two years ago.

Then, in December, 1967, the young King, a symbol of legality but not an overwhelmingly popular figure, fled to Italy after the failure of an attempted countercoup. A regent, Lieut. Gen. George Zoitakis, was named to serve in his absence.

KING REJECTS ADVICE

In exile in Rome, Constantine has refused the colonels' offers to return as a figurehead sovereign and has spurned the advice of others that he return on his own for a confrontation.

"All he has to do is fly into the airport at Athens," said a wealthy loyalist businessman who has offered such advice to the King. "There are no instructions to airport officials to oppose him and once he was back, he could win a restoration of Parliament.

"The trouble is, neither of the two Constantines has ever had courage when they needed it," he said, referring to the King and to Mr. Caramanlis. "With American support, though, they could be persuaded to act."

American military aid to Greece through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization runs to $30-million a year. Except for suspended deliveries of tanks and items related to them, it stands at about the same level now that it did two years ago.

Greeks who have influence with the Nixon Administration and American diplomats here see no prospect of its being curtailed or of the use of other leverage to push the military regime out.

"America is not going to pull the Greeks' chestnuts out of the fire," an influential Western observer said. "If there were some strong domestic movement for change, the United States would be delighted, but there is not such a force yet, and I do not see it developing."

Still, the prospect of losing United States or NATO support clearly makes the Government headed by Premier George Papadopoulos extremely edgy. Just before the ministerial meeting of the Atlantic Alliance this month in Washington, he announced that three of the 12 suspended articles of the new Constitution would be put into effect. The articles restored the rights of peaceful assembly, lawful association and the inviolability of the home.

According to an Athenian jurist, however, the restoration remains a legal fraud until the second major act of the regime—proclaiming a state of siege and imposing martial law—is rescinded.

Under the Constitution that won 92-percent approval in last September's referendum, that act is valid until specifically abolished. A recent Council of State ruling puts the act's provisions above the Constitution.

The apparent move toward restoration of democracy—articles establishing freedom of the press, freedom from arbitrary arrest, organization of political parties and parliamentary and local elections are still suspended—forestalled planned public attacks on Greece at the NATO session.

COUNCIL ACTION EXPECTED

The action may not, however, succeed in placating Italian, Dutch and Scandinavian representatives of the Council of Europe when they meet next month. Motions to censure Greece or expel her from the group are almost certain to be made.

"We are all now facing the future with self-confidence and optimism," Mr. Papadopoulos said last night on a radio broadcast. "The revolution of April 21 represents the greatest and most serious effort of rehabilitation, reorganization and cleansing made since the beginning of national independence."

"Our friends have convinced themselves that a great task of a broader nature is being accomplished here," the 50-year-old leader said. "And our enemies must come to realize that they labor against us but sadly in vain."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUSTICE—NO MARTINIS, NO CONVICTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the men who wrote our Constitution knew what they were doing. They had seen Congress, sitting where it did not rule, surrounded and beseiged by a mob demanding back military pay. They provided for a Federal district, and commanded that the Congress should "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over that district. In the very same sentence our Constitution requires us to "exercise like authority over all forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

The Framers of the Constitution recognized that the Nation's Capital belonged in the same category as these other essential properties. It serves the people of the Nation, is supported and maintained by the people of the Nation, and must be controlled and governed by the people of the Nation. The District of Columbia never has been self-supporting, it is not now able to pay its own way, and it never will be able to do so. It has no more entitlement in logic or in morality to "home rule" than do Fort Polk, Redstone Arsenal, the Brooklyn Navy Yard or the Chicago Post Office.

Learning nothing from the failures of the radicals who made the same mistakes a hundred years ago, we again experiment with "home rule"—and the result would have been censored from the beloved Amos and Andy series as totally unbelievable. As part of my remarks, I include an item from Saturday's Washington Post, relating to the administration of justice here in Washington. Surely Calhoun was there somewhere.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1969]

CONVICTION OVERTURNED IN WIFE'S DEATH—JUDGE NOT AMUSED AS JURY ORDERS MARTINIS

A Washington man who was sentenced to death in 1961 for killing his estranged wife was acquitted at his third trial yesterday by a jury that sent out a request for "12 martinis" in the midst of its deliberations.

Witnesses who were in the courtroom when Judge June L. Green received the penciled note on a scrap of paper said she was not amused. She responded, they said, with a

stiff lecture of the jurors on the seriousness of their obligation.

Judge Green refused to comment yesterday after the jury returned its verdict in the case of Emanuel Pea, 37. The note requesting the liquid refreshment was made part of the public record.

Pea was convicted in 1961 of first degree murder in the 1959 gunshot slaying of his wife Harriet. A major piece of evidence in that trial was his own signed confession.

He was awaiting execution when his lawyer, Daniel Jackson Oliver Wendell Holmes Morgan, was unmasked as an impostor. A new trial was ordered.

The retrial, held in 1963, resulted in a second-degree murder conviction, with a sentence of 15 years to life. Pea's confession again was used against him.

Five years of litigation followed on the issue of the voluntariness of the confession. Last year, the U.S. Court of Appeals threw it out and ordered the third trial. Pea testified that his wife pulled the gun on him first and was killed in a struggle over it.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing optimism among those interested in congressional reform. Chairman COLMER'S recent appointment of a subcommittee to work on reform legislation is most encouraging. A recent editorial in the Davenport-Times Democrat reflects this growing optimism:

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Apr. 14, 1969]

UPDATING THE CONGRESS

Bipartisan forces in Congress finally seem headed for at least modest success this year in improving congressional efficiency and in shifting some power from senior lawmakers to the rank and file.

The over-all targets are the deeply embedded congressional customs and rules that channel almost all power to veteran legislators and thus prevent Congress from responding effectively to many problems.

The efficiency effort aims at installing computers and other machines to help legislators with tasks ranging from answering their mail to analyzing the President's budget proposals.

A much more difficult reform goal is one to limit the power wielded by committee chairmen and other senior congressmen, while opening up more opportunities for rank-and-file legislators to make their influence felt.

Even here, indications of movement can be seen, particularly intraparty pressure that recently prompted the once-remote House Democratic leadership to begin holding monthly party caucuses for discussion of issues.

Reformers in both parties apparently are wearing down the opposition of congressional elders to a general reform bill—the first since 1946—which the House let die last year after it had passed the Senate.

It's difficult to determine just how much reform any legislation will provide. Some veteran legislators apparently hope that passage of a watered-down measure this year might sidetrack any effort for substantial change for many more years.

Senior congressmen in both parties—they include both liberals and conservatives—can be counted upon to try to weaken the pending reform proposals before they will assent to a bill.

On the other hand, elderly House Speaker John McCormack's desire to improve his standing with colleagues could serve to remove House roadblocks to a bill.

The reformers' demand for a committee "bill of rights" perhaps is the most controversial part of their legislative package. The seniority system of choosing chairmen would remain, but the power of committee chieftains would be curtailed. One revision would open committee meetings to the public, with few exceptions.

The House now generally forbids broadcasting, and its Appropriations Committee, for one, holds almost all its sessions behind closed doors. Merely curbing committee secrecy could produce important changes. People usually behave differently when they have to act in the open.

All in all, the reform forces' immediate goals are rather modest. They will be worthwhile, though, if the initial steps at least lead later to additional action. This is essential to curb the excessive power of a few committee chiefs and to get effective action on the great and growing number of problems facing the Congress, the nation and the world.

CONFLICTING APPRAISALS OF THE NATIONAL SQUARE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting critique of the National Square proposed by the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue as part of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan appeared in the April 29, 1969, issue of the Washington Post. The author, Mr. Wolf Von Eckhardt, provides a curiously negative assessment of the National Square idea—curious particularly in view of an earlier review of the National Square he wrote in the April 8, 1966, Washington Post which praised the plan in no uncertain terms. For the record, and for the many Members of Congress and others who have a continuing interest in the development of Pennsylvania Avenue, I wish to call attention to these two articles by Wolf Von Eckhardt:

NATIONAL SQUARE: "MYTHICAL COMPLEX"

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

We don't need that National Square.

The proposal for a paved expanse to terminate Pennsylvania Avenue at the White House end has always been as much of a theoretical abstraction as the rebuilding of the north side of the Avenue is a hard and practical economic, social and symbolic necessity.

We must rebuild Pennsylvania Avenue if downtown Washington is to be revitalized and if it is to be linked with and involved in its reason for being—the Federal Government.

To perform this function, the Avenue should, of course, have included the city's and Nation's foremost theater, opera and concert hall.

That would have attracted developers. But it is water over the dam. The Kennedy Center is rising down by the river.

But it is not too late to change the design of the National Square and remove the threat of destroying a whole viable and expensive city block for the sake of a theory.

The theory is, of course, that Pennsylvania Avenue should link the Capitol with the White House. Well, it doesn't. The choleric Andrew Jackson spoiled that notion in 1836 when he ordered the Treasury built right smack in between.

So the Pennsylvania Avenue designers decided we should at least see the Treasury as we come down the Avenue from the Capitol. So they propose tearing down all the buildings between 15th and 13th Streets. They originally wanted to tear down the Press Club, too, for the sake of their symbolic expanse.

But they eventually shrunk from that. Their now shrunken plan for a square, however, is still to make the Treasury part of a mythical "White House complex" that you enter through some sort of grandiose gate.

The architects themselves are not yet happy with this gate solution. And nobody knows for sure just what is supposed to be on that square except for the fountain and the pigeons.

This is not the way to design viable, livable cities. Yes, we need grandeur and symbolism.

But effective urban design reconciles grandeur and symbolism with living reality. It takes into account, as architect Louis Kahn has put it, "what the city wants to be."

But this is Washington. It is a city of ample open space, too much of it perhaps. And it is a city that seems to prefer trees over pavements and has had no trouble finding a setting for ceremony and confrontation.

NEW DESIGN RETAINS OBJECTIVES OF FIRST

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The revised National Square proposed yesterday by the Pennsylvania Avenue Council is half the size and thus at least twice better than the original Mussolini-type paved parade ground the Council first recommended.

It is, in fact, an appropriate and promising solution to a most vexing problem. The improvement vindicates those who have criticized the original plan.

We need public discussion and lively criticism on matters of urban design and planning as the only means of getting results we can all be proud of.

The new design retains all the original objectives of the first. But it does so less pompously. It is no longer a surrealist abstraction but rather a space that can somehow pull together all the various human activities around it.

The original objectives were, of course to give the proposed Grand Avenue a suitable terminal point. Pennsylvania Avenue now fizzles out in a messy mixture of traffic and haphazard greenery.

The focus of this terminal point is, unfortunately not the White House but the Treasury. But since the Treasury is a lovely old building, it is a suitable substitute. Particularly since the Pennsylvania Avenue planners intend to make it a part of the White House Complex.

But another objective was to tie the west end of the Avenue into the living and bustling downtown area. This the original wasteland could never do. It would have been a barrier rather than a link.

The smaller square provides a suitable transition between the essentially residential White House and its park and the big, monumental Federal and private office buildings.

Its greater intimacy also brings in Garfinckel's department store and the restaurants, bars, flower shops, nightclubs and other diversions the "belvedere" on the north side of the square is to provide on three levels.

The square thus now happily joins the dignity of the White House, the monumentality of the Federal bureaus and the bustle of downtown at a scale that is dignified without being overwhelming.

The designers have also dropped the rather affected idea of a White House gate. Instead of some laborious Brandenburger Tor we will now have charmingly designed little pavilions with a real function.

The function is to receive the tourists who visit the White House in such great numbers. They would enter under 15th Street and its traffic and come up in the pavilions.

This arrangement is also eminently suitable for the Presidential reviewing stand at inaugurations and other parades.

The Willard and Washington hotels will still have to go. But the National Press Club will stand. And Nathaniel A. Owings, chairman of the Temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Council, promises that it will be joined along the square by an elegant "new Willard," a new hotel that will also include luxury apartments.

Bravo!

UNITED STATES MUST ACT NOW TO RECOVER NAVAL STRENGTH

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner recently ran a very excellent editorial on the urgent need to rebuild our forces at sea. This is a timely and useful editorial and under unanimous consent I submit it for the RECORD:

UNITED STATES MUST ACT NOW TO RECOVER NAVAL STRENGTH

The nuclear age, with its accent of air power and kindred emphasis on intercontinental ballistic missiles, has not effected the pertinency of the late Vice Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan's warning a long time ago: That naval power second to none is essential to national security. As a biographer says of him, he was the first writer to demonstrate the determining force which maritime strength has exercised upon the fortunes of individual nations and the course of general history.

U.S. executive thinking is getting back to that. The Navy Department now has asked Congress for $2.7 billion to begin modernizing its fleets—too long neglected in the lapse of attention that, in spite of Naval warnings, ignored the build-up simultaneously of Soviet power on and under the high seas.

It has been a hazardous delay during which obsolescence has overtaken many components of the fleets. As the deputy chief of Naval Operations, Vice Adm. John B. Colwell, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, more than 500 of the 900 American Navy vessels now are more than 20 years old.

In the pattern of this modernization program—a start on bringing this vital facility up to requisite strength—the call is for 16 new ships, twice the number approved last year, and conversion of 17 existing vessels. Among the new ones sought would be a nuclear guided-missile frigate, five destroyers and two amphibious assault ships.

There is a big preparedness gap to fill in these key particulars—and time is of the essence. Neither new construction nor repair and reconversion can occur overnight.

Tennessee Sixth District Congressman William R. Anderson, former commander of the nuclear-powered submarine Nautilus, has strongly advocated adoption of "SABMIS"—a sea-based anti-ballistic missile system, and "ULMS" an undersea long-range missile system; together to augment the deterrent strength of Polaris and ABM deployment.

From the Mediterranean, where the Soviet is flexing new muscles of naval might, to the Atlantic and Pacific, Free World security responsibilities have been passed almost exclusively to the United States as Great Britain, for example, has shrunk both its own navy and the area of its traditional guardianship.

Token forces in being, on patrol of danger spots, are not enough to restrain an enemy that respects only superior retaliatory strength. Make no mistake about it, facts of declining strength—in terms of ships, manpower and striking power—are not secrets known only to the nation concerned. They are known to Soviet Russia as well—as is the present hazardous circumstance of a Mediterranean Fleet spread thin by the necessity of diverting components of it to the Asiatic war area.

In any widening emergency suddenly confronted, there must be sea power—the security factor that has provided a basic margin for victory in wars to date, and can be a war deterrent. For regardless of new development in the Nuclear Age—in technique and weaponry—there still are oceans and continents to guard at sea; attacks to intercept in event of an enemy's triggered conflict; and manpower, machinery and supplies to deliver for the related military services.

Naval authorities know the dimensions of that chore, and the dangerously declining resources of facilities for it.

They have stated the case for it, over and over again—emphatically restated, with administration backing, before Congress now. The estimate put on present need results from the years of neglect, and certainly is not beyond the capacity of a concerned nation to absorb. A nation that annually expends billions in handout to other lands, plus other billions in the same pattern at home, assuredly can invest whatever it takes to strengthen security against dedicated enemies.

It can afford to invest no less. Failure to build up a first line of defense as essential as naval power would advertise to that enemy a preference for weakness—inviting the very incidents of assault that could, make no mistake about it, trigger World War III.

DEWITT REDDICK RETIRES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. DeWitt C. Reddick is retiring as dean of the School of Communications of the University of Texas, but he is staying in the business of training young journalists.

At the end of this semester, he steps down as dean—only to become dean of the University of Tennessee's school of communications for a year. Then, Dr. Reddick will return to Austin to become a professor in the very school he helped to create.

Admittedly, this is an unusual method of retirement; but then, DeWitt Reddick is a rather unusual man. He has been a professor of journalism at the University of Texas since 1942 and dean of the school since 1966. Under his guidance, the departments of journalism, radio and television, and speech were combined into the present school of communications.

Over the years, Dr. Reddick has had a profound influence upon the national press—simply because he has trained so many of them in the doctrine of fairness and accuracy. Many of his former students now work in Washington. Many are famous, but almost all are just plain, good reporters. We owe him a great debt for this type of newsman.

Saturday, April 26, Dr. Reddick was honored with a dinner with 700 friends and former students present. More would have come had there been room.

I include in the RECORD the news story of this event, written by one of his students for the college paper, the Daily Texan:

(By Charlotte Smith)

Approximately 700 students, former students, and colleagues paid tribute Saturday night to Dr. DeWitt C. Reddick, retiring dean of the School of Communication, which he helped found in 1965.

Former President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson made a short visit before a testimonial dinner at the Villa Capri Motor Hotel to offer their congratulations to the veteran educator.

George Christian, former press secretary for Johnson, introduced the principal speaker, nationally-known CBS news broadcaster Walter Cronkite.

Dr. Reddick, who has been a teacher at the University for 42 years, became dean of the school in 1966.

After his retirement at the end of this semester, he will take a year's leave of absence from the University to become dean of the University of Tennessee's school of communications.

At the end of the year, he will return to Texas to assume the position of professor of journalism.

The dinner was sponsored by five journalism department student groups, Sigma Delta Chi, Theta Sigma Phi, Alpha Delta Sigma, Gamma Alpha Chi, and the Public Relations Student Society of America.

Cronkite, a former student of the dean, said the necessary training to produce accurate, objective newsmen must come from journalism schools such as the University's, "inspired by DeWitt C. Reddick."

Students must be taught not only the technicalities of journalism, but these must be "inculcated" with the principles of objectivity, accuracy, and integrity, the newscaster said.

PRESS HAS OBSTACLES

Cronkite cited two main obstacles to a free press and well-trained beginning newsmen. The growth of newspaper monopolies has increased so that now most cities have only one paper.

The CBS news broadcaster said he sees this development, even with increased circulation, as a "tendency and trend to constriction of communication."

With the increased number of one-paper cities, the "monitor . . . which is competitive journalism" is gone. Cronkite said, "A young man may work five years now and never get a fact right."

He said he was forced to be accurate when he worked on the Houston Post, because all information in the Post was checked against all stories in the Houston Chronicle. If any deviations were found, the differences had to be explained.

The second problem the former University student described is harassment. Radio and television are under limited government control now, but total government control is possible, he said. After the Democratic convention in Chicago in August, several investigations of the networks have been undertaken.

Although free from political pressures ("our bosses feel them, but we don't"), Cronkite said that "under threat of harass-

ment, a free press cannot exist. It is psychologically impossible if not physically impossible."

TRAINING NEEDED

Cronkite then questioned where well-trained journeyman newspapermen are going to come from with monopoly papers. He dismissed radio and television because "few are doing the sort of job that newspapers do in covering the news."

A young person in these two areas cannot thoroughly learn his beat, Cronkite said. And they "never write a story past three paragraphs."

The training must come from newspapers, but competitive journalism is gone, he added.

Therefore, the job is left to men like Dr. Reddick who "brought the business to a profession" and "created proof that good teachers and good schools of communication can do a good job of producing good journeyman newspapermen."

Dr. Reddick, classifying the dinner honoring him as an "evening of memories," said, "I'm deeply touched that you would take time out of a busy life to come here tonight."

"We have a team at work. Whatever we do, we all have a share in this . . . and a great part of this is in the students."

Dr. Reddick, professor of journalism at the University since 1942 and dean of the School since 1966, said he was "grateful to students for many things," one of them being ingenuity and the other "a quiet kind of courage."

"This kind of experience for a teacher to have is a tremendously rewarding experience for us as teachers. A little bit of you is left with us, and a little bit of us is left with you. In this sharing we both grow and profit a little bit."

AWARDS PRESENTED

Larry Upshaw, president of Sigma Delta Chi student chapter, announced the start of the DeWitt Reddick Book Collection in the Journalism Library.

Curtiss Bridges, president of Gamma Alpha Chi, presented Dr. and Mrs. Reddick with a gift for their trip to Tennessee.

Mike Cooper, president of Public Relations Student Society of America, presented a letter of appreciation to Dr. Reddick.

Gene Attal, president of Alpha Delta Sigma, awarded Dr. Reddick the Air to Advertising Education Awards.

Alpha Epsilon Rho, represented by Bob Estrada, also presented Dr. Reddick a gift.

Linda Adleman of the Communication Council presented Dr. Reddick with a letter for his service.

Jenny Haynes, president of Theta Sigma Phi, presented a letter of appreciation to Dr. Reddick as well as a gift to the Paul J. Thompson-DeWitt C. Reddick Foundation.

Stuart Long, state president of Sigma Delta Chi, presented a gift to the Thompson-Reddick Foundation.

Texas Student Publications, Inc., represented by Loyd Edmonds, general manager, honored Dr. Reddick with a special issue of The Daily Texan for the dinner. Edmonds presented Dr. Reddick with a copper plaque of the front page of the issue.

Griffin Singer, president of the Journalism Ex-Students' Association, presented Dr. Reddick with letters and telegrams from students and colleagues unable to attend the dinner.

Mrs. Reddick was presented a bouquet of roses.

Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the same edition, the following was written by one of his students:

DeWitt Reddick, dean of the School of Communication was honored at a dinner Saturday night. For those of us who know him, Dean Reddick is a tremendous human being, not just a scholar or just a dean but a warm human being. His sincere interest in students is almost amazing. He always has time to talk with any student. And he always takes a personal interest in the student. Rules and regulations are often insignificant. To Dean Reddick, it is the student and his problem that are more important. His kindness and gentle, human concern for the student will be missed.

DeWitt Reddick is my personal friend. Yes, thousands of his students consider him as a personal friend. That's the kind of teacher and professor and man we find in the person of DeWitt Reddick.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE POLICY BY DEFAULT

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important aspect of the U.S. policies and practices in the fields of chemical and biological warfare has been the imperceptable change in policy that has taken place during the last 6 or 7 years. From a traditional, and in my mind, correct policy, of no first use, we have begun to practice limited chemical warfare in the conflict now in process in Vietnam.

There has been no public or congressional debate concerning this change in policy. There has been apparently no top level administration consideration of all the ramifications of this new policy. It is apparently being made at the operating, rather than a decisionmaking level of the Government.

I believe that this change in policy should be thoroughly discussed by Congress and considered by the public. I have, therefore, written to President Nixon detailing the facts that led me to the conclusion that our policy has changed and have asked him to resubmit the Geneva protocol of 1925 manning the first use of gas and germ warfare to the Senate for ratification. Submission of the protocol would provide an opportunity for a national discussion of this issue. I am inserting the text of my letter to President Nixon in the RECORD at this point:

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Early in this session of Congress my attention was drawn to the chemical and biological warfare policies and practices of the United States. A number of questions had been raised regarding change in the long standing United States policy of no first-use of chemical and biological warfare, the safety of CBW research activities carried out by the Armed Forces, the possible dangers involved in transportation of chemical and biological weaponry, and the use of universities and other private non-profit institutions for direct or indirect research in this area.

At my request, the U.S. Army provided a briefing to members of Congress on the purposes, practices, and capabilities of the United States in the chemical and biological warfare area. Although the briefing was useful, it did not adequately cover the public policy aspects in which I was interested. I subsequently addressed a series of questions to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and a number of other Executive officials concerned with our chemical and biological warfare policies. I received replies to my questions that were both more illuminating than the material previously made available, and also disturbing.

The answers were disturbing because they revealed that the United States has imperceptably changed its practices in the field of chemical and biological warfare. The change has been from our traditional policy of no-first-use to one of practicing certain types of chemical warfare. Yet at the same time, I found no announced change in policy on the part of the Executive branch. I found no approval by the Congress of this change in policy. If anything, I found that the views of some of the Executive departments differed from those of others; in effect that although the Department of Defense is practicing chemical warfare, the Department of State is hard put to defend this practice. My question is then, who authorized this change in policy? Was it the President? Was it the Congress? Have the American people been made aware of this shift in our traditional policy?

It was with these questions in mind that I made a series of recommendations concerning chemical and biological warfare to the U.S. House of Representatives on April 21, 1969.

One of my suggestions was that you, Mr. President, resubmit the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting the use of gas and bacteriological warfare to the Senate for ratification.

As you know, although this Protocol was initiated by the United States shortly after World War I, it was not ratified by the Senate. Part of the failure to ratify the Protocol was the belief by its supporters that there was no question that it would be ratified easily. Their reason for thinking this was that the United States Senate had just completed ratifying the Washington Arms Conference of 1922 which banned gas and germ warfare. The Treaty is not binding today because the French objected to the limitations on submarines contained in the Treaty and failed to ratify it.

A short history of our policy regarding the use of chemical and biological warfare points up the shift in United States policy that has taken place.

Following the signing of the Treaty of the Washington Arms Conference of 1922, General John Pershing, famous World War I military leader of the American Expeditionary Force, commented that:

"It is inconceivable that the United States will initiate the use of gases . . . and by no means certain that it will use them even in retaliation."

When the 1925 Geneva Protocol was brought before the Senate for ratification, General Pershing testified for ratification of the Treaty.

Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover all were vigorously opposed to chemical warfare. President Coolidge supported the American position at the Geneva Conference of 1925 and also agreed to call a special conference in Washington to prohibit the use of poison gas.

President Roosevelt was adamantly opposed to the use of gas warfare. In 1937 he said:

"It has been and is the policy of this Government to do everything in its power to outlaw the use of chemicals in warfare. Such use is inhuman and contrary to what modern civilization should stand for.

"I am doing everything in my power to discourage the use of gases and other chemicals in any war between nations."

During World War II, with more than 12 million Americans under arms at one time, President Roosevelt said in 1943 following reports that Germany was contemplating use of gas warfare:

"Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of civilized mankind. This country has not used them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies."

Admiral Chester Nimitz, in discussing tough decisions in World War II, said:

"There were a lot of tough ones. I think when the War Department suggested the use of poison gas during the invasion of Iwo Jima that was a trying decision. I decided the United States should not be the first to violate the Geneva Convention. It cost many fine Marines."

Admiral Leahy, in response to a suggestion made in 1944 that biological agents be used to destroy the Japanese rice crop, he said such activity would ". . . violate every Christian ethic I have ever heard of and of all the known laws of war."

During the Korean War, the United Nations were accused of waging germ warfare by North Korea. The United Nations and the United States went to great lengths to refute these false charges, recognizing the impact on world opinion that any substantiation would have.

Following the Korean War, however, we find a gradual change beginning to take place. When Congressman Kastenmeier submitted his resolution to Congress in 1959 asking that the United States express its support for the Geneva Protocol both the Department of Defense and the Department of State opposed passage of the resolution.

A previously limited budget for chemical and biological warfare research, testing and procurement apparently was expanded in the early 1960's.

And in 1965, the American public learned that the United States was using gas in Vietnam. Following the public outcry, Secretary McNamara announced that South Vietnamese forces had been equipped with three gases which they had used, CN, CS and DM. Secretary McNamara said that these were essentially riot control agents not covered by the Geneva Protocol and were being used to reduce the amount of violence required.

Secretary of State Rusk said, when questioned about the use of gas in Vietnam said on March 24, 1965:

"We are not embarking upon gas warfare in Vietnam. There has been no policy decision to engage in gas warfare in Vietnam. We are not talking about agents or weapons that are associated with gas warfare, the military arsenals of many countries." "We are talking about a gas which has been commonly adopted by the police forces of the world as riot control agents."

"Now, why is tear gas a part of the equipment of police forces? It is because police forces would like to be able to use the minimum force that is required for the maintenance of law and order. It is a minimum instrument."

"Now these are the essential policy aspects of the problem. We do not expect that gas will be used in ordinary military operations."

Yet on February 22, 1966, we learned that helicopters dropped hundreds of tear-gas grenades to douse a small patch of jungle, believed to be a fortified Vietcong area, 265 miles northeast of Saigon in preparation for a bombing raid. The Defense Department explained the gas attack was designed to flush Vietcong troops out of bunkers and tunnels before the attack by B–52 bombers. Apparently this practice has become widespread, for the United States has budgeted $81 million for gases of this type in 1969, and a professional journal estimates that we will produce 2.16 million pounds of these gases during that time period.

What has happened? The United States is using gas in conjunction with lethal conventional weapons in Vietnam. This is clearly chemical warfare. And despite some ambiguity in the wording, the British, French, Spanish, and a number of other countries have all said that the Geneva Protocol covers tear gas—the same Geneva Protocol that we say we support fully in principle when the subject is raised at the United Nations.

We also find that we are using chemicals to attack food crops in Vietnam. Both State and Defense are quick to point out that the chemical defoliants and herbicides used are the same type employed in agriculture and industry at home and are not banned by the Geneva Protocol. They do not say that the use to which these chemicals are devoted in Vietnam is entirely different from that at home—namely, to destroy food and to open lanes of fire for our troops and aircraft. They don't say that biologists are seriously concerned about the long term effects of defoliants and herbicides on the Vietnamese countryside. They do not say that we are using chemicals here as a weapon against food.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that we have changed our policy without a conscious decision on the part of our elected officials and without the knowledge of the American people. If this new policy of use of chemical warfare is one that we wish to adopt—and I emphatically believe that it is not—then it should be done openly and with full debate and discussion.

I urge you, therefore, to resubmit the Geneva Protocol to the United States Senate so that the chemical and biological warfare policy of the United States can be clarified. Our long standing tradition of civilization calls for no less.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. MCCARTHY,
Member of Congress.

McKEESPORT SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Army Pfc. Tibor Sotak, a brave young man from McKeesport, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

CITY SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

A 22-year-old McKeesport soldier who came to this country from Czechoslovakia eight years ago has been killed in action in Vietnam.

Word of the death of Army PFC. Tibor Sotak was received yesterday by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Sotak, 413 Long Run Road.

LISTED AS MISSING

The family had been notified by the Army earlier this week that Pfc. Sotak was missing in action. A followup communication yesterday listed him as killed in action. It is believed the young GI died on April 20, five days after his 22nd birthday.

Drafted last Aug. 6, Pfc. Sotak took basic training at Ft. Gordon, Ga., and left for Vietnam Feb. 6. He was attached to Company C, Fifth Battalion, Seventh Cavalry Regiment.

Born in Czechoslovakia on April 15, 1947, Pfc. Sotak came to the United States in 1960 with his mother and a sister, joining Mr. Sotak who had arrived in the country earlier.

ATTENDED SCHOOL HERE

He attended McKeesport Vocational-Technical High School and was employed by McKeesport Coating Co. prior to entering the service. He was a member of the Free Hungarian Church of McKeesport and its Youth Fellowship Class.

In addition to his parents, Pfc. Sotak is survived by his sister, Mrs. Eva Suchant of North Huntingdon.

Funeral arrangements are being handled by Striffler's of White Oak.

TWO WAYS TO LOOK AT ABM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my Senate colleague from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN, has composed a revealing and thoughtful article on experiences of our Nation with the Soviet Union following resumption of diplomatic relationships 36 years ago.

As Senator DIRKSEN indicates, it is well to review this history in reaching a present decision on the issue of a proposed Safeguard Anti-Ballistic-Missile System—which has been recommended to the Congress and to the Nation by President Nixon.

This article which appeared in the April 30 issue of the Washington Daily News follows:

A SENATOR'S NOTEBOOK: TWO WAYS TO LOOK AT ABM

(By EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN)

There are two ways to look at the question of the antiballistic missile. A retired U.S. Marine Corps general gave them to me in very simple and forceful terms.

"If you have complete confidence in the integrity and peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union," he said, "you can forget the ABM. If not, you had better do something about it."

Well General, on those two points I am like Patrick Henry of pre-Revolutionary War fame. That great patriot said, "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past."

We don't need to go back too far in the past to learn something from history that is relative to the present. We need only go back to January, 1934, when the idea of recognition of the Soviet Union was discussed on the floor of the U.S. Senate in connection with the confirmation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's selection for ambassador to the Kremlin.

The most outspoken senators who were experts on foreign affairs were suspicious of Russia, and said so, even tho those statesmen fully subscribed to the fact that recognition of a foreign country was the prerogative of the President.

Recognition of the Soviet Union came about not because Moscow asked for such recognition, but because the President of the United States made an offer. On Oct. 10, 1933, President Roosevelt wrote to President Kalinin of Russia saying, "I should be glad to receive any representatives you may designate to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our two countries."

President Kalinin responded a week later, saying in his letter, "I gladly accept."

So Maxim Litvinov, the people's commissar for foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., came to Washington with his entourage. There fol-

lowed joint communiques, luncheons and the exchange of much memoranda.

On Nov. 16, Commissar Litvinov addressed a memorandum to Mr. Roosevelt stating that it would be the "sixth policy of the U.S.S.R. to respect scrupulously" the American right to order our own affairs without interference and "to refrain from and restrain all persons and organizations under the direct or indirect control of the U.S.S.R. from any act, overt or covert, liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of any change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions."

Now that covered a lot of ground. The exchanges went on and on, covering such points as religious worship, the rights of our nationals, the settlement of claims and many other things. And so the deed was done. Over and over again the assurance was emphasized to us that the Soviet Union would keep its hands off our affairs.

All that happened 36 years ago, 16 years after the bloody Bolshevik revolution. It was not long thereafter before the U.S. House of Representatives created a committee to investigate Communist subversion and infiltration. Later, the House approved creation of a standing committee on un-American activities. Still later, in the Internal Security Act, the Senate brought about the creation of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and ever since there has been an unrelenting effort to hamstring the operations of that board.

If further evidence is required, one may profitably read the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the committees of Congress, year after year. Even fresher evidence of Soviet intent is all around us—the invasion of Czchoslovakia, the recent stern warnings by Russia to Yugoslavia and then to Romania, the steady supply of weapons to Hanoi, the missile infiltration of Cuba, the encouragement of Red organizations and Red fronts in the United States. Are those the ads of a country with peaceful intentions?

How eloquent the past can be.

ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think that we in the United States take our survival too much for granted. In our own time, we have seen great nations disappear. Less than a year ago, Czechoslovakia was, for all practical purposes, swallowed up by aggression. That is why I believe it is so important that we pause a minute to take note, on the 21st anniversary of its independence, of the survival of the State of Israel.

It would be appropriate for us, in America, to give thanks for Israel's survival, because Israel's cause in the Middle East is our cause. I say that not so much in a political as in a spiritual sense. Israel represents freedom, opportunity for the individual, reason, humanism, the conquest of the elements, learning. If Israel is threatened by its neighbors, so are the values for which America stands. If Israel is attacked, the integrity of America is under assault. If Israel should somehow be engulfed, America will become a darker place.

So I congratulate Israel, Mr. Speaker, on its anniversary. I congratulate it for more than mere survival—for we know what the seige of hostile neighbors can do to a society. It can make a people grow narrow and surly and self-pitying and inbred. But Israel continues to proclaim defiantly the message of liberty of the body and of the spirit, and all over the world Israelis help others to achieve this end. Israel is a triumph of what is best in the will of man. I join my colleagues in wishing it continued survival into a future when all men will live with one another in peace.

TWO COLUMBIANS RECEIVE STATE STAR AWARDS

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out so often, the overwhelming majority of our students in this country are hardworking, dedicated, conscientious, and patriotic Americans. Unfortunately, however, seldom do these young Americans receive recognition in the news media. A handful of radical students can take over a college building and it is front page news, and yet after 4 years of hard work, hundreds of students at the same institution earn a degree and it is hardly mentioned in the same paper.

Recently, in my congressional district, a lovely young lady with an outstanding record of scholarship received plaudits for being named the STAR student for 1969 in South Carolina. STAR, which means student-teacher achievement recognition, is a project of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce. This year's student winner, Miss Anne Dantzler, who attends Dreher High School in Columbia, is to be commended. She certainly represents the lofty ideals and noble aspirations of youth at their finest.

At the same time, one of Anne's teachers, Mr. Harold L. Phillips, Jr., was named as the STAR teacher of 1969. Mr. Phillips was so chosen because of his contribution to the scholastic achievement of the student winner. I congratulate Mr. Phillips, and it is indeed heartening to see one of our dedicated teachers realize such a worthwhile goal.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I would like to include an article from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., concerning the awards as follows:

TWO COLUMBIANS NAMED TO STATE STAR AWARDS

Anne Ellsworth Dantzler of Columbia today was named South Carolina's STAR student for 1969.

Miss Dantzler, a 17-year old senior at Dreher High School, received a $500 scholarship from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation, a tour of Europe via Pan-American World Airways and the State Chamber's special STAR plaque.

Sharing the spotlight with Miss Dantzler was Harold L. Phillips Jr., the 1969 state STAR teacher. Phillips, who teaches Russian and German at Dreher High School, was named as the teacher "who contributed most" to the STAR student's scholastic achievement. He received a $500 cash award from the ITT Variable Annuity Company and the Chamber's STAR teacher plaque.

STAR (Student-Teacher Achievement Recognition) program is sponsored statewide by the S.C. State Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with local chambers of commerce, to develop public appreciation for scholastic achievement and for the teaching profession.

Designation of STAR students is based on top ranking scores made on the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test and scholastic averages during the first semester year.

Also honored at the STAR luncheon were the congressional district STAR students and teachers who each received $100 cash awards. These included, from the 1st District, Fred Thompson and Mrs. Louise Smith, St. Andrew's Parish High School of Charleston; 3rd District, William A. Gray and Mrs. Hilda Rutherford, North Augusta High School; 4th District, Albert A. Ramage III and Miss Frances Sheely, Clinton High School; 5th District, James R. Bourgeois and John Powers, Edmunds High School of Sumter; and 6th District, Richard Weintraub and Mrs. Shirley Willcox, McClemaghan High School of Florence.

District runners-up included David H. Middleman and Eugene Norris of Beaufort; Ginger Shuford and Mrs. Susan Fraley of Lexington; Glenola Williams and Mrs. Louise Hartzog of Greenwood; Chris Hoyle and Mrs. Laura Toms of Spartanburg; William T. Ross and Mrs. Eugenia Jackson of Rock Hill; and Randy K. Vereen and Mrs. Catherine Davidson of Marion.

Tomorrow the district winners and runners-up will begin a four-day educational tour of the state sponsored by the State Chamber of Commerce.

LAIRD SEEN WILLING TO DROP THICK ABM

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1969, the Washington Post ran an article entitled, "Laird Seen Willing To Drop Thick ABM."

The article reported:

The ABM Laird apparently favors is a "reconfigured" version of the sentinel system, which had been designed to protect about fifteen U.S. cities from the threat of Chinese missile assault. Laird is said to be leaning toward moving the sentinel into the countryside to provide protection for offensive missile sites.

On February 16, 1969, the Washington Post reported:

Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, proposed to his superiors in the Defense Department last Fall a massive public relations campaign to counteract scientific and political opposition to the controversial sentinel system for destroying enemy missiles. The Resor proposals, outlined in a classified five-page memorandum to then Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, were a follow-up to a major pro-sentinel campaign launched in March 1968 . . . The memorandum was ac-

companied by a much more detailed, seventeen-page "master plan" for a public relations/public affairs program on a country-wide basis. And this longer memorandum (was) signed by Lieutenant General Alfred D. Starbird, who manages the sentinel project.

Mr. Speaker, let us journey across the Potomac River and look in on a secret session at the Five-Sides Advertising Agency where marketing expert Dr. Strangebird is speaking with the Chief:

I'm sorry to have to say it, Chief, but we're having a little trouble with that new account for Missiles Unlimited.

Strangebird, if I've told you once, I've told you a billion times the advertising game goes a lot easier if the product will work. Who signed up that account anyway?

I'm not sure, Chief, but I think it was somebody else.

Well, how are we going to handle it?

Chief, I thought we might see if Mad Magazine will change its policy just this once and accept a series of ads on the mongoose missile.

O.K., but what would the ad say? It should have a lot of thrust.

Right! Well, since we were a little late getting off the ground with this one, those inferior scientists who don't work for us are convincing people not to buy—just because the product won't work. The old "don't-leave-your-family-defenseless" bit just isn't going to work. We'll have to go for some other mass motivational factor—say the profit motive. But we'll have to make a transition—bearing in mind that it doesn't make any difference what the mongoose is used for, so long as our clients sell it.

I think a series of three "Fool" Page Ads should do it:

ADVERTISEMENT NO. 1

"Are you a thinking American? Would you believe you'd be leaving your family defenseless if you don't let us install a brand new mongoose missile in your home town?"

ADVERTISEMENT NO. 2

"Are you a thinking American? Would you believe you'd be leaving your family defenseless if you don't let us install the '69 mongoose somewhere else instead of your home town—say out in the country?"

ADVERTISEMENT NO. 3

"Are you a thinking American? Would you believe you'd look ten billion dollars thinner if you helped send a poor Defenseless Contractor to camp at the door of the Treasury?"

Then, Chief, and this is the kicker, we'd have a neatly uniformed pretty girl saying, "Is this any way to run the National debt sky high? You bet it is."

What do you think, Chief?

Strangebird, it's just fair. This agency has always been capable of more imaginative work, though. After you've been in the advertising game for a while you'll realize that sometimes you can be too nice. You're trying to sell this system on its merits. And there aren't any. What we have to do is make it damned uncomfortable for anyone to ask any questions about the merits of the Mongoose.

Wait a minute, Chief! Maybe, just maybe . . . of course The Emperor's New Clothes were invisible. But the Mongoose Missile System is pretty thin. Remember how the salesman of the Emperor's New Clothes convinced everybody that it would be a sin if they couldn't see the clothes? Why don't we just develop a slogan like, "It's a sin if you just can't see the thin"?

Not sinful, Strangebird, "Unpatriotic."

One thing that's really giving us a lot of trouble, Chief, is the charge that since the Mongoose can serve no useful purpose in defending the country, it's not worth running the country into bankruptcy. Remember, we have a lot of friends who used to claim that Lenin said the Communists would fool the United States into spending itself into bankruptcy.

Strangebird, you just don't seem to understand anything. When our friends said Lenin said that, they were talking about wasting money on silly things like education, not such worthy projects as A.D.C. (aid to dependent contractors). It just gets you a lot of taxpayers who want to ". . . reason why . . ." And, believe me, that doesn't help much in the advertising game, especially when you're trying to sell this boon dog . . ., I mean grant this boon to these worthy contractors. And they are worthy, Strangebird. They advertise in our Service Association Magazines. And we're not going to be at Five-Sides all our lives. Remember, Strangebird, 'No greater love hath a contractor than to lay down a job application in front of a retired Five-Sider.' They stick with us. And we're going to stick with them through Thick and Thin. Strangebird, we've just got to come up with a successful advertising campaign on this one.

Well, Chief, since you put it that way, let's use the ultimate advertising weapon.

Strangebird, you mean?!

Exactly. Disloyalty. We could take the old "my contractor, right or wrong" and run it up the flag pole and see if we could get the House Minority Leader to call somebody un-American for not saluting it.

It's a great idea, Strangebird. But, believe me he'd never do it.

"Where are they going to stop?" (Minority Leader Gerald) Ford asked angrily. "Do they want to unilaterally disarm America when we face a serious threat from the Soviet Union?"

Ford said that putting all such Congressional opposition in a total package, there seemed to be a movement in concert aimed at seriously eroding the U.S. capability against attack.

LETTER TO STUDENTS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride in the young men and women who will graduate from high school in the First District of Tennessee that I am personally writing each of them, by way of an individual letter, as follows:

DEAR (name of graduate): It is my pleasure to congratulate you upon the accomplishment of your graduation.

May this day begin a further achievement in the ideals of citizenship in your community and for your country. I sincerely trust that you will continue your quest for increased knowledge.

I know this is a significant occasion . . . one which you will always remember with pride. May your diploma be the key that opens the door to a wonderful future.

As a memento of this milestone, I am enclosing The American's Creed which has a special message for all of us. I hope this creed will prove an inspiration and a guide as you start on a new journey in life.

As your Congressman, if I can ever be helpful to you in any way, please feel free to get in touch with me.

Best wishes for every success and all the good things that life can bring.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Also included in the mailing is a copy of The American's Creed for each student. Following is the wording of the creed:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Presented to (name of graduate) with congratulations upon High School graduation. May the future bring you success, happiness, and achievement in the highest ideals of American citizenship.

These young graduates will soon be accepting their places as responsible citizens and leaders of our community and Nation and it is my sincere hope that they seek the best that life has to offer and succeed in at least a small portion of their goals.

I wanted to make this information available to my colleagues and to the readers of the RECORD, as my letters will be going out in the mail within the next few days. It is my desire, as First District Congressman of Tennessee, to be of all the help possible to the graduate, and in my letter I state:

As your Congressman, if I can ever be helpful to you in any way, please feel free to get in touch with me.

It is my hope that the American's Creed will instill in each high school graduate the desire to stop the campus rioting when they enter college next year.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO RAISE OR LOWER INCOME TAX RATES BY 10 PERCENT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would authorize the President, subject to congressional disapproval, to raise or lower income tax rates by not more than 10 percent.

Enactment of this measure can assure that prompt action can be taken in the area of fiscal as well as monetary policy to combat cycles of inflation and deflation.

I think the need for this legislation is reflected by the efforts of President Johnson, and now President Nixon, to wind down our inflationary spiral.

President Johnson took an important step to slow down the economy by recommending legislation for a 10-percent surcharge in August of 1967. Had my bill been in effect at the time, the President could have immediately instituted this necessary measure. Instead, it took Congress almost 11 months to enact the pro-

posal into law. Now President Nixon is seeking to extend the surcharge and then gradually phase it out if the economy cools down. Under my bill, he would be able to follow such a plan and adjust it to meet any new situation that might arise without congressional approval; rather, the burden would be on the Congress to negate such action. This seems eminently reasonable in the light of the fact that control over the economy often requires continuous prompt and delicate tuning.

Our national economy is a delicate mechanism, Mr. Speaker, and the factors which cause it to run with efficiency and stability are difficult to predict in advance. For example, what individuals decide to do in a free society—and how they judge what other individuals are going to do—is one of the factors most important but also most difficult to measure in trying to anticipate the future course of the economy. Nevertheless, it does appear—particularly in light of our continuing involvement in Vietnam with its concomitant claim on expenditures—that increased defense spending will keep private demand, and thus the economy, also churning upward.

I am certain that the condition of our economy is a matter of very real concern to us all. Gross national product, the measure of Government purchases of goods and services, personal consumption, gross investment of businesses and net exports, is now running at a rate of $903.4 billion.

GNP had a gain of $16 billion during the first quarter of this year. Moreover, the consumer price index rose 4.7 percent between February of 1968 and February of 1969 and then took its highest jump in 18 years, 0.8 percent in March. All of this tells us that the economy has been growing at a breakneck, and reckless, pace.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and because I think we must face squarely the fact that the future will require constant rapid action to keep our economy in balance, that I have introduced my bill to give the President the temporary and limited authority to act by increasing or decreasing income taxes up to 10 percent of existing rates.

UNO TOLERATES SLAVERY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the report from the United Nations that some 10 million human beings are held in slavery or other form of bondage today in an estimated 30 countries reflects little sincerity from the leadership of the United Nations Organization in advancing individual liberty and human dignity.

This is amplified by the Anti-Slavery Society for the Protection of Human Rights which charges that many of these slave states are members of the United Nations Organization. The justification of the UNO inaction toward emancipation is the "sensitivity of some of the newly admitted U.N. member countries toward the issue."

A convenient legal position for the UNO intellectuals is that their articles prevent interference into the political and social affairs of a member state. An attitude which is appreciated by member states which continue the practice of slavery.

Apparently, the UNO accepts slavery as an internal matter in emerging nations; in contrast, separate development of the races in the civilized countries of Rhodesia and South Africa is condemned as a threat to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I include an AP release from the UNO as follows:

U.N. To Study Slavery

(By Milton Besser)

United Nations, N.Y.—The United Nations has decided to take another look at slavery—a problem that still plagues mankind despite international efforts to stamp it out.

Eighty nations, including the United States, have signed, acceded to or ratified a supplementary convention on slavery since it was adopted by the U.N. Economic and Social Council in Geneva in September 1956. The League of Nations approved the original convention in 1926.

But this has not eliminated the practice of slavery, which dates back to ancient times, and still affects the lives of thousands of people.

NEW STUDY STARTS

In recognition of this the U.N. Commission on Human Rights at its meeting in March in Geneva confirmed the appointment of Mohammed Awad, an Egyptian authority on the subject, to carry out a new study of slavery and the slave trade.

Awad will prepare the report for initial scrutiny by a subsidiary body of the Human Rights Commission—the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

That the institution of slavery still flourishes is a recognized fact. But there is controversy on the extent and the numbers of persons affected.

The Anti-Slavery Society for the Protection of Human Rights, a private organization with headquarters in London, estimates that 10 million humans still live in slavery or other forms of bondage.

Awad in a study released in 1966 put the figure at around one and a quarter million.

Col. Patrick Montgomery, executive secretary of the London-based society charges that the United Nations has brushed aside a direct confrontation over slavery. He says this is due in part to the sensitivity of some of the newly admitted U.N. member countries toward the issue.

THIRTY COUNTRIES WITH SLAVERY

While he did not name any specific countries, he said slavery is practiced in about 30 which lie in a belt "stretching all the way around the world between latitude 10 south and 30 north of the equator, starting in Polynesia, all the way through southern Asia, the Persian Gulf, southern Arabia, central and Saharan Africa, and the high Andes and Amazon forests of South America."

He says that in one African country between 300 and 400 women and girls live in one harem—sold to a chief by those seeking favor from him.

A woman member of the society reported that on a tour in the Middle East she found that young girls were being sold as slaves for 10-year periods at a price of $40 each.

They were regarded by their owner as fortunate to have escaped a future as prostitutes, and were being given excellent care as domestics. Some were sold as young as 8, and assigned immediately to household chores.

JACOBS FAVORS PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has recently undertaken a study to determine the reforms necessary to strengthen its ability to meet the problems facing our changing society.

My distinguished Indiana colleague, the Honorable Andrew Jacobs, Jr., testified last week before the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, chaired by Senator George McGovern, in favor of a direct presidential primary.

I insert at this point in the Record the text of Congressman Jacobs' thoughtful statement on this issue:

Testimony by Andrew Jacobs, Member of Congress, Before McGovern Commission Hearing, Washington, D.C., April 25, 1969

When asked if Harding really had a chance of gaining nomination of the Republican Convention, Harry Daugherty replied,

"Well boys, I'll tell ya what I think. The convention will be deadlocked. After the other candidates have failed, we'll get together in some hotel room, oh about 2:11 in the morning. And some 15 men, bleary eyed with lack of sleep will sit down around a big table. When that time comes, Senator Harding will be selected."

He was 11 minutes off.

Mr. Chairman, along with what I believe to be a vast majority of the people I represent, I favor direct primary nomination of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates.

"I don't care who does the electing, just so I can do the nominating."

Those words were spoken by Boss Tweed, himself.

As we near the two-hundredth year of the Republic we must sadly confess to history that the democratic aspect of our American dream has yet to come of age in America.

If this nation really wishes to be democratic in the selection of officials to carry out the representative work of our Republic, then the politicians, whether they call themselves electoral college electors or convention delegates, should step aside and allow the people to do their own choosing.

As a citizen whose very life on this planet could be snuffed out by a single Presidential decision, I resent the suggestion that some latter-day town voter must substitute his judgment for mine in the selection of my Party's nominee for President. To such a suggestion I can only reply, "thanks for the compliment."

Representation is necessary for the management of complicated public business. But representation is not necessary for the selection of elected officials to conduct that business, especially when a candidate attracts the prominence connected with the Presidency.

Any Democrat in Indiana last year could have told you who Branigan, Kennedy and McCarthy were. But hardly any could tell you the name of his town voter-delegate, much less which candidate that "town voter" supported.

No matter how democratic the selection of National Convention delegates might be made, the Convention system of Presidential nomination will remain an exercise in Government by guess who.

That which is inherently un-democratic cannot be made democratic by reform—only by replacement.

Every indication of public opinion makes clear that the people want to do their own

choosing of their own President. And if our Democratic Party will listen more closely to the people now, will the people not listen more closely to our Democratic Party in the future?

I hear it said there isn't enough money for a direct primary system. Yet, there is enough money for farmers who do not farm; for Subversive Control Boards that do not control; for defense systems that do not defend; and indeed for wars to protect freedom where there is no freedom to protect.

Mr. Chairman, a direct national primary is in the best interests of our country. The rank and file party voter has no political ax to grind; military equipment to sell or appointment to seek. In order to woo him, the candidate has no choice but to discuss the issues.

THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Ways and Means Committee continues its work on a tax bill, and recommendations from the White House include termination of the investment tax credit, I believe that an objective study of that item is necessary. I direct the attention of the Members to a thoughtful editorial commentary on the investment tax credit in the Sunday, April 27, Chicago Tribune.

THAT "PERMANENT" INVESTMENT CREDIT

President Nixon's tax program is admittedly an interim measure, something designed to bring quick action on a few inequities and to redeem, at least partially, his promise to end the income tax surcharge as soon as possible—and to do these things without any loss of revenue.

In order to achieve this balance, somebody obviously had to be called upon for higher taxes, and this is partly why Mr. Nixon linked his reduction in the surtax rate from 10 to 5 per cent, effective in January, to a repeal of the 7 per cent tax credit for business capital investment. This, the administration says, should yield the needed 1.9 billion dollars or so during the fiscal year 1970.

Another reason for advocating repeal of the tax credit is Mr. Nixon's fear that business expansion is getting out of hand, contributing to inflation and helping to push up interest rates. The administration estimates that spending on new plant and equipment will rise by 14 per cent this year, under present plans, to about 73 billion dollars. This is just about double what it was six years ago.

The tax credit may not have been the wisest way for Mr. Kennedy to "get the country moving again" back in 1961; but neither is repealing it likely to be as effective as Mr. Nixon hopes in slowing down the boom.

For one thing, big expansion programs are usually too unwieldy to be called off at the drop of a hat, or even of a tax credit. For another, business men have learned not to rely too heavily on the tax credit anyway. The Kennedy administration assured us that it would be a permanent fixture, never to be tinkered with to adjust the economy. Yet the Johnson administration tinkered it out of existence in 1966 and tinkered it back in again the following spring, both times for reasons which were as much political as economic.

Even if the tax credit were a reliable fixture in the tax laws, it is not a decisive factor in business planning except in marginal instances. Most business men base their decisions on other factors, and some of them predict that the repeal will not affect more than 5 per cent of present spending plans.

It would be more accurate to regard the present pace of business expansion as a result of inflation rather than as a cause, because the inflationary psychology tempts business men to spend today for fear of higher prices tomorrow. If Mr. Nixon can persuade the country that inflation is over, he will do more to stabilize business planning than he can possibly do by repealing the tax credit—and will solve a good many of his other problems as well.

THE VOTER'S STAKE IN PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the April 28, 1969, edition of the Oil and Gas Journal contains an open letter to the voters of the United States, written by the editors on the subject of oil taxes.

This open letter succinctly states an excellent case in support of percentage depletion. It discredits the unwarranted attacks that have been made on the vital tax incentives for petroleum exploration and production that have been provided in our Federal tax structure since the inception of the Federal income tax.

This open letter establishes the importance of an adequate petroleum supply to our national security and our economic well-being and advancement. It factually states that the petroleum industry does bear its fair share of the total tax burden and that oil industry profits are actually somewhat less than the return on net worth earned by manufacturing companies generally.

The Oil and Gas Journal editors conclude their open letter by observing:

Our reserves of oil and gas are dwindling at a time they should be rising twice as fast. Spending on exploration should be doubled. Oil and gas now furnish 75% of our nation's energy. We're using petroleum at such a clip that consumption is expected to double by 1980.

Tampering with any policy that encourages exploration for petroleum is courting disaster. The facts speak just as clearly and loudly as ever against changing either the rate or principle of percentage depletion. Congress will serve the nation best by again refusing to change this policy.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of my esteemed colleagues in the House, I would like to insert as a part of my remarks the full text of this open letter to the U.S. voter as set forth in the current issue of the Oil and Gas Journal.

The letter follows:

OPEN LETTER

Subject: Oil taxes.

To the U.S. voter:

Percentage depletion has been on the federal law books for 43 years. And for 36 of these years, it has been vociferously attacked as an unfair "loophole" for avoiding taxes. It's happening again.

The attackers have been highly placed: Former presidents, cabinet members, lawmakers, college professors. As well as unwashed radicals, uninformed housewives, and entertainers who make poor jokes.

Congress through it all has refused to junk the provision or even modify it.

Why have the attacks by so-called tax reformers failed?

Several reasons.

Opponents haven't advanced a single new argument that wasn't thoroughly considered prior to passage of the 1926 measure. Congress consistently has decided benefits outweigh costs.

Depletion also is tied closely to the basic concepts of our constitution. These are: Never tax capital. Tax only the income from capital. Taxing away capital is likened to killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Why then do the attacks persist?

Taxes are pinching everyone. They always go up. Never down. The bureaucratic taxer-spenders as well as tax-burdened companies and individuals are eager to shut off tax avoidance to ease the pinch. It's easy to level an emotional diatribe against depletion and then hoot down any reasoned explanation of the complex issue.

That's why we must examine the issue constantly.

Percentage depletion has two objects: Recover the producer's capital. And give him an incentive to drill more wells, find more oil.

How does it work?

Stripped of its emotional setting, percentage depletion is simply a deduction available to oil and gas producers—and producers of more than 100 other minerals—in figuring their taxes on income from wells.

The producer may deduct 27½% from the gross annual income of a lease or property. This is tax free. The figure, however, may not exceed 50% of the net income of the lease. This limitation actually prevents most producers from taking the full deduction. In practice, it averages only 23% and in many cases is much less than that.

This policy recognizes that oil in the ground is part of the producer's capital. It is like real estate. But this capital is used up—or depleted—by operation of an oil or gas well. The rate of deduction, when determined 43 years ago, was estimated as equal the capital value of oil in the ground. It's now probably less, and a higher rate would be more equitable.

Opponents, however, favor stripping depletion back until it assures the producer he will recover his actual investment or costs in a lease. After this amount is recovered over a period of time, deductions would end. The producer's income taxes would increase. Thus cost depletion would serve a function similar to depreciation.

This overlooks the unique position of oil as capital in the ground. It also ignores the unusual risks involved in finding replacement petroleum. Depletion encourages the producer to hunt new reserves—depreciation doesn't.

Say, for an example, an oil man recovered only his lease costs by deductions. He has no assurance he can take this fund, drill a single well and come up with any oil or gas. The odds are he will drill nine dry holes for every producing well. And what's more, he'll drill 46 marginal wells to every 1 that nets out a profit. Depreciation funds would melt quickly under these odds. But depletion funds from one good well give a producer the financial staying power to keep drilling.

What would happen if percentage depletion were ended?

It would drastically curtail the hunt for oil and gas. Our reserves would dwindle even more. Why? Because operators would become more selective and cautious in their drilling plans. They'd drill only the better prospects, shun the costly and high-risk ones.

Many producers would sell out and take advantage of the more favorable tax rates on capital gains from oil in the ground. They

would thus escape the high regular rates on production. The buyer, in turn, would set up to deplete at 100% of his cost. So, it's difficult to see how the government could reap a tax bonanza from this change.

Consumers of petroleum products would suffer, too. The cost of crude oil and natural gas would rise. This inevitably would be translated into higher product prices.

Why then disturb a policy that promises to cause such an upheaval when the benefits are so uncertain?

But the critics cry: "Some companies pay no income tax at all. That's unfair."

Let's examine this one carefully. It comes up every time taxes are mentioned. It's becoming cause celebre among oil-industry critics.

In the first place, any producer who completely escapes income taxes doesn't do so with percentage depletion alone. The "50%-of-net-income" limitation prevents that. So, he must use the benefits of other deductions—most likely the expensing of intangible drilling costs and write-offs for dry holes.

By way of explanation, drilling costs come in two kinds. Tangible drilling costs, such as cost of tanks, equipment, and structures, are depreciated over the years. No argument here. Intangible costs, such as expense for wages, fuel, repairs, and all services, may be recovered the same way or as an operating expense in the year incurred. Most oil men elect to expense the intangibles. This allows them to get their money back more quickly to use in further operations. Expensing of intangibles does reduce the net income of the lease, even may create a loss. All this reduces the total subject to income tax.

There are a few facts, however, to keep in mind. The producer can deduct intangible expenses only once. They tend to reduce benefits of percentage depletion. And the producer, in order to have intangible deductions, must keep on drilling. This is exactly what the tax policies are designed to do—keep oil men drilling.

What else do critics find wrong about percentage depletion? What do they suggest?

Here are a few, and the answers to them.

Depletion allows companies to offset income from other sources, escape more taxes.

Percentage depletion cannot reduce taxable income from any source except the one lease or property on which it is computed. Oil companies aren't escaping taxes even if the bite of the income tax is lighter on them. It may surprise many to know that the total tax burden of the petroleum industry actually is heavier than average. In 1966, oil paid $2.5 billion in direct taxes. This $2.5 billion amounted to 5.1% of gross revenue from all operations. The direct tax burden for all U.S. business corporations was only about 4.5% of gross revenue. This is about 10% less than the tax burden of petroleum. That plays hob with the contention that oil companies don't pay taxes.

Oil profits are exorbitant. Too many oil millionaires are created by percentage depletion.

The average profit of 99 oil companies in 1968 was equal to a 12.9% return on net worth. This is below the 13.1% return on net worth earned by 2,250 manufacturing companies. There's certainly nothing exorbitant about this. Percentage depletion hasn't made oil millionaires. Oil fortunes rise from the combination in an individual of ability, stubbornness, and luck in finding oil. Success in finding oil is the key—not percentage depletion.

Oil producers don't use tax savings to look for more oil and gas.

The figures show differently. Statistics indicate oil producers would pay $1.3 billion more annually in taxes if present policies were ended. In the last 10 years, they have spent this—plus an average $3.1 billion more on exploration and development.

The depletion rate of 27½% is too high. Cut it to 20, 15, or 10%.

This is begging the question. A lower rate won't satisfy the critics. They'd be back at the next session to whittle away at the lower rate. As we've noted, the present rate probably already is too low to achieve an adequate return of capital. If it were lower, percentage depletion also would lose effectiveness as an exploration incentive. It would give oil men too little money to finance new drilling. Outside investors would fear other cuts. Uncertainty of their return piled on the normal risk of exploration would cool them on oil ventures. Exploration needs to be made more attractive to risk capital—not less.

Eliminate all deductions and grant an outright federal subsidy to encourage exploration.

Can you imagine what kind of drilling program would emerge if it depended on annual appropriations from Congress? What a boondoggle this opens up! The drilling decision-makers would be bureaucrats who are subject to political pressure and not fitted by training or position to take risks involved. Where would the savings be in this approach?

There are other arguments. None really new. All have been refuted time and time again. The fact they are being taken seriously is the big surprise.

It is especially surprising in view of the present low state of petroleum exploration. That's the new circumstance in the whole fight.

Our reserves of oil and gas are dwindling at a time they should be rising twice as fast. Spending on exploration should be doubled. Oil and gas now furnish 75% of our nation's energy. We're using petroleum at such a clip that consumption is expected to double by 1980.

Tampering with any policy that encourages exploration for petroleum is courting disaster. The facts speak just as clearly and loudly as ever against changing either the rate or principle of percentage depletion. Congress will serve the nation best by again refusing to change this policy.

SPEECH OF IRVING KANE, OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the House a speech delivered by Mr. Irving Kane, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to its 10th annual national policy conference held recently in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Kane is a distinguished American who I am pleased to say is a constituent of the 22d District of Ohio which I am proud to represent.

Irving Kane has been devoted to the noble cause of assuring the survival and well-being of the State of Israel. He is well respected for his erudition and diplomacy. I am pleased to include the text of the speech which Mr. Kane delivered recently at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee:

SPEECH BY MR. IRVING KANE

Two years ago Israel won a war which she did not provoke and in the winning of which she had help from no one. Since then, Israel contemplates a world seemingly provoked because Israel refused to accept military defeat and diplomatic surrender. A wide variety of people have still not forgiven Israel for winning the Six Day War. Besides Arabs and Soviets, they include some Frenchmen, some United Nations diplomats, some members of the New Left, some of these Jewish children.

It might be appropriate for this Conference to take a closer look at this weird resentment, this buildup of antipathy towards Israel victorious. For it involves some basic misunderstandings about the responsibilities of sovereign states. And it has resulted in an effort to pressure Israel into retreating from her victory and from "the bargaining counters," as President Nixon has called them, which that victory has given her.

We have now in the Middle East a new kind of war—a war that the jargon of journalists calls "an uneasy peace." The *regular* Arab armies, having met with cataclysmic defeat two years ago, are resting—replacing their armor, replenishing their arsenals, retraining their big battalions and creating new generals to substitute for those who have been erased by purge or murder or suicide. While these regular armies are recuperating, their governments have set up little replacement armies to harass Israel, lest she too have an opportunity to recuperate. The little replacement armies are known as Arab *irregulars*—that gives them a big advantage, that name—for presumably *irregulars* can be excused if their behavior is irregular.

No one takes responsibility for these terrorists, whom the Arabs like to call "commandos." They grow, we are told, like palms in the dead heat of the desert—an accidental flourishing—what spring nourishes them, we can only guess. They have no special target and can switch from one to another, at the drop of a whim.

They blow up the marketplace in Jerusalem, full of Friday shoppers. They set bombs in supermarkets, in university cafeterias, in focal points of innocent commerce among civilians. While King Hussein is in Washington, they even jeopardize his favorite vacation retreat in Aqaba—and Jordan's only outlet to the sea—by sending rockets to the friendly port of Eilat. They hijacked one El Al plane to Algeria; they tried to destroy another at Athens, another at Zurich. So far since the Six Day War, many Israeli civilians have been maimed or murdered by Arab irregulars.

The world reacts with understanding. We are told—as we have been told after two other blessed victories before this—that the Arab personality cannot bear the humiliation of defeat. Self-styled scholars of Arab character tell us that the Arabs can be expected to strike out in a wild disorganized fashion to regain their self-respect. Certainly a few Israeli lives are not too high a price to pay to reinflate the Arab ego, thereby making the Arabs more calm, more pliable, more susceptible to the reason which they have heretofore rejected.

Well, say the Israelis, the Soviet Union may be willing to throw good billions after bad to reinflate the Arab ego. But Israel hasn't got a few lives to spare—the way Russia has billions—and Israel reacts differently.

Israel sends *regular* troops after the terrorists, and more importantly, after the not-so-secret spring that feeds them. After the Lebanon-based terrorists shot up the El Al plane in Athens, Israel attacked Beirut Airport. Not a hair on the head of one Lebanese was singed. This was the measured, bloodless answer to an attack which had clearly become part of a patterned attempt to destoy Israeli civil aviation. After all, an Israel which had fought a war to keep her ships on international waterways could not really be expected to sit silently while her planes were blown out of the sky.

The world reacted with outrage. Israel was condemned by the United Nations, by the

Vatican, by one world leader after another; thirteen planes was considered too high a price to ask the Lebanese to pay for murder. President De Gaulle, who probably would have done it anyway, issued a total, unilateral arms embargo against Israel—including the planes which Israel had already paid for!

Now here we have real pressure—France thought it was rude and dangerous of Israel to defend herself in 1967; De Gaulle thought the Jews were trying to be "domineering"—I believe that was the word. In 1969, he blew his stack. There had to be more to French reaction than just a tender Gaullist concern for thirteen Lebanese aircraft. Possibly, if Israel had been a former French colony—like Lebanon or Syria or Algeria, or Quebec—chained to the French language and susceptible to renewed French imperialism, De Gaulle would not have been so implacable.

Whatever his reasons—and French policy seems to be inseparable from De Gaulle's personal reasons—Israel's major source of arms has closed up like a clam. While the Russians, ever bountiful, continue to pour military hardware into Egypt.

Since Beirut, Israel has once again been condemned by the United Nations for a raid on a military installation—counter-action for a terrorist attack on her civilian population. The odd thing about these UN condemnations is that they do not mention the terrorism that created the response. One has to deduce that Arab irregulars are invisible men. We do see a lot of Arafat and his El Fatah on TV, and in our news magazines—the people he and his colleagues have murdered can only be visited in the graveyards of Israel. Yet somehow the terrorists are beyond the ken of UN diplomats, who find their crimes too "irregular" to mention.

We welcome, of course, a new development in American policy in the United Nations. In the most recent debate on a Jordanian complaint against Israel, the American Ambassador, Mr. Yost, insisted that the terrorism which gave rise to counteraction must be condemned. He stood firm against the Arabs, the Soviets, and their friends—and refused to vote for the final resolution which made no mention of the terrorists. Although again the United States declined to use its right of veto.

Here, too, we should remember that before Israel became a state there were irregular Jewish forces in Palestine. But when the Government of Israel was established, one of its first actions was to insist that these forces be disbanded and that all military activity be carried out by the regular defense forces of Israel. Israel considered the discipline of terrorists part of her responsibility as a sovereign state. But the Arab states are much more selective about their sovereignty.

Arab terrorism and Israel counter-action, and Egypt's repeated violations of the cease-fire, which the United Nations has not condemned in spite of reports from its own observers, have nevertheless disturbed the Great Powers, who have decided, as you know, to discuss the Middle East amongst themselves. They have met now for the fifth time in New York to find ways of halting the conflict lest it drag us all into a larger war which, thank God, no one seems to want. Since the talks began, however, the border hostilities have escalated.

Israel opposed these discussions. Israel, it seems, has the courage of her doubts. She cannot see how it would profit her, or the Arab nations, for that matter, to have a Soviet Czechoslovakia in the Near East. Unlike her neighbors, she does not choose to be seduced by the dubiously protective embrace of the Russian bear. She is apprehensive—she fears that these discussions may lead to an imposed settlement which would again prevent the direct face-to-face peace talks which Israel so eagerly seeks, a settlement which would permit the Arabs again to depend on "irregular" diplomacy as they have depended on irregular warfare.

If a settlement is imposed by the Great Powers, the Arabs will inevitably say—as they have done in war—that they are not responsible for it. They said it after 1957. No Israeli concession, submitted in the context of an imposed settlement, will satisfy the Arabs. For whatever Israel gives up, there will always be more for the Arabs to demand—right up to Jewish sovereignty in the Jewish state.

The world must understand—as the United Nations has not—that no sovereign state can be permitted to escape its responsibilities in war and in peace. Just as the Arab governments are responsible for the terrorists, so they must be made responsible for a peace settlement. Directly responsible, not indirectly through intermediaries. The war with Israel is their war, of their making. If they are sick of it, let them make their own peace.

That a new administration, certainly one of a different political party, should try new tactics, new tactical approaches for peace, is quite understandable. It has been said that President Nixon had little choice but to go along with the French-Soviet pressures for Four Power talks, at least in terms of the global interests of the United States.

Every President is under pressure to review and revise U.S. policy in the Near East, in the hope that he might achieve peace where others failed. It is natural and right that he should do so.

The advent of a new administration, of course, is exploited by pro-Arab forces which wage campaigns to win policy revisions favorable to the Arab cause. The Arab states themselves build up pressures by creating artificial war crises in the area. Even some members of the American Jewish community are partly responsible for a mood of hysteria which impels the United States to undertake new initiatives.

Any review of U.S. policy would reveal that the period of change is inevitably a period in which points of difference arise between Israel and the United States.

In 1953, the United States and Israel were involved in a stormy controversy over Israel's water program, over U.S. aid to Israel and over arms to Iraq.

In 1957, the Administration imposed a settlement in the aftermath of the Suez-Sinai war. (Here I would refer you to the elaborate study of the 1957 debacle which has been issued by the *Near East Report*, which should be widely circulated.)

The first eighteen months of the Kennedy Administration witnessed many differences between the United States and Israel—over such questions as water, refugees, U.S. aid to Egypt, Israel's plea for arms. Most of these differences, fortunately, were resolved by the summer of 1962.

The Arab states did not try very hard to influence President Johnson in 1965 when he assumed office in his own right. They attacked him as pro-Israel. In 1964, he had welcomed Mr. Eshkol to the White House, and had agreed to let Israel buy arms. Moreover, in 1957, he had been most vigorous in his criticism of Administration threats to impose sanctions to force Israel to withdraw from Sinai.

When the 1967 war broke out, President Johnson's policy was consistent with his 1957 stand. He insisted that the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. He resisted all Soviet attempts to compel Israel to withdraw from occupied territories without a genuine peace.

Now there has been a change in our government's tactics. This does not necessarily mean that there is a change in policy. There have, in fact, been repeated assurances that this is not the case.

We have no reason to question the good intentions or motives of our government. But a change in tactics *can* lead to a change in policy, and it is this *possibility* that is the basis of concern. Adherence to a particular method often leads to substantive change—sometimes even unwittingly.

Early this month, on the eve of the Big Four meetings, the *New York Times* attributed to "a neutral diplomat" the observation that the opening of these talks was like the start of a once-a-week poker game. "It will all be relaxed and informal as it should be between players who are personally friendly, and it may be a long time before it is clear that anyone is a winner," the diplomat said.

One wonders why it is that when Four Power talks were proposed *before* the Six Day War, both the Soviets and the Arabs vetoed it. Can it be that the Soviets—and the Arabs—having miscalculated and having bluffed and lost heavily in the poker game of 1967, now see this as their only chance to get even?

Most disquieting is that there is something about the procedure that smacks of the arrogance of power. Walter Lippmann observed, after the war:

"Neither Moscow nor Washington has been able to realize that their enormous superiority in weapons would not prevent the small nations from defying their superior power. Both have assumed that because they possessed absolute military superiority their political influence would be correspondingly great. The chief lesson of the 1960's is the startling paradox that supreme military power and political mastery do not necessarily go together. This is the cardinal fact of the modern age. The failure to appreciate it is why both Washington and Moscow have been the victims of such great miscalculations. Because of these miscalculations they have committed themselves to policies that they have been and probably will continue to be unable to carry out. Even in combination, great powers cannot govern the world."

It was in the same column that Mr. Lippmann said, "It was the Israelis, and the Israelis alone, who upset Moscow's calculation, who dashed Moscow's hopes and spared Washington the horrid dilemma of engaging in another dangerous Vietnamese war or of abandoning Israel." It was about the same time that James Reston observed that the United States won a major war in the Middle East without firing a single shot.

Peace in the Middle East has become a slogan in search of a definition. But it will be defined by those indigenous to an area which cries out for peace—not by those whose interests in the area are only part of their other and larger concerns.

I do not delude myself that it will be easy to get the Arab states to meet and negotiate with Israel—although there is always the remote possibility that the Arabs will yield to a sudden impulse of sanity.

We need not expect that all heads will be cool—but we can hope that enough cool heads will be found who will realize there is no acceptable alternative to peace.

Obviously, a settlement, a mere settlement, *can* be imposed—with or without guarantees. But *peace* can never be imposed, nor can it be guaranteed, except by the good faith of those who make it. *Peace can be imposed only by those prepared to impose it upon themselves.*

Throughout the past two years of bloody buck-passing in the Middle East, the government of the United States remained firm in its insistence that Israel use her victory to the fullest in bargaining for a just and lasting peace. Our government's attitude has been based on the principle that sovereign states have the right to control their own destinies. What our government should do in New York now is to convince the Soviet and French delegates that they must not continue to co-sign the loan on Arab intransi-

gence, that they must no longer cooperate in this selective sovereignty that the Arab states exercise in their dealings with Israel.

Sovereignty gives nations the right to exercise power, if they wish, and to suffer the consequences if that power proves insufficient to their adventures. The Arabs will have to learn to live with the consequences of their adventures. American youngsters whose hearts bleed for the battered Arab psyche will learn, when they have reached maturity themselves, that mature men usually blame themselves for their reversals, just as Japan and Germany did—with not such bad results.

Certainly we here should know that the victory two years ago is today Israel's most prized possession. It is the key to peace. Let us hope that our government has not ceased to recognize that Israel's victory is the key to peace.

Surely our government perceives the folly and futility of any course which could transform into a diplomatic disaster a military triumph in the Near East—not only for Israel but for the United States and for all the free world—a triumph which, if wisely used as the key to peace, will put an end to the Soviet dream of domination of the Near East.

Israel at 21 would not deserve her majority if she were so immature as to forsake her victory. It is a prize that she spent all her youth in winning. She must hang on to it until her enemies grow up.

OTTO OTEPKA: VICTIM OF THE NEW TEAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a long-suppressed report on the misuse of the CIA to establish an underground government within our Government has been exposed today in the Government Employees Exchange.

Reportedly the plan of the "new team" in controlling the CIA operation was to "reform" the U.S. domestic and foreign relations through the use of an "elite" who looked to the "spirit of the future" instead of the status quo.

Apparently anyone not on the "new team" who uncovered its sinister plans or interfered—knowingly or unknowingly—was considered a threat and a target for compromise or elimination.

The casualty list from the intermeddlers of the "new team" includes President Diem and his brother of South Vietnam, President Johnson, and Otto F. Otepka.

So that our colleagues may have the opportunity to study this unprecedented exposure in power and to ponder the question, "Who is running our country?" I include the Government Employees Exchange article of April 30 and two articles from the April 16 issue:

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Washington, D.C., Apr. 30, 1969]

CIA'S VIETNAM HIT L. B. J., OTEPKA

A highly secret and unknown American involvement in Yemen was the prelude to major actions by the Central Intelligence Agency's "New Team" in its November, 1963, offensive against President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam, against Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and against Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's former top Security Evaluator, a former Ambassador with close ties to CIA Director, Richard Helms, revealed to this newspaper on April 25.

As readers know, the CIA "New Team" was set up by former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy following the Bay of Pigs "fiasco" by the CIA "Old Team." Mr. Kennedy recruited into the "New Team" many officials not only from the CIA (such as Richard Helms) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (such as Cartha "Deke" De Loach) but also from the Internal Revenue Service and the National Security Agency. These agencies and their top members were "knowledgeable" in the exploitation of "wire taps" and secret informers, the former Ambassador said.

Allied with the "paragovernment" (see April 16 issue) of the "New Team" were secret "cooperating and liaison" groups in the large foundations, banks and newspapers, the source added. In that issue, readers will recall, this newspaper reported that the "coordinating role" at *The New York Times* was in the custody of Harding Bancroft, its Executive Vice President.

NEW TEAM READY

By August, 1963, the "New Team" was "ready" for action on a wide variety of fronts. These included international affairs, especially the Vietnam War; domestic affairs, especially preparation for the 1964 Presidential election; and the "final infiltration" by "New Team enthusiasts" of the State Department, Agency for International Development, the United States Information Agency and the Pentagon, the source said.

The basic purpose of the "New Team" was to "reform" United States domestic and foreign relations through the use of an "elite of committed, humanistic pragmatists" who looked at the "spirit of the future" instead of the status quo and the "dead letter of formal and literal law," the source continued.

"NEW TEAM" TARGETS

In the international field the main target for "reform" action was Ngo Dinh Nhu, the brother of President Diem, of South Vietnam. He had the source said, the same relationship to President Diem that Robert Kennedy had to President Kennedy.

President Diem had insisted in his dealings with the "New Team" that the war in Vietnam had to be "run by the Vietnamese." Even though he used CIA resources, he would not allow the CIA to become a "paragovernment" in Vietnam. The Diem and Nhu alliance in Vietnam thus stood in the way of "americanizing" the war there and using the war's opportunity to transform South Vietnam along the lines of the "New Team" program, the source said.

ROBERT WILLIAM KOMER

While relations between President Diem and the "New Team" were disintegrating, a final thrust for "americanizing" the Vietnam War was supplied by Robert William Komer, a career CIA intelligence officer who, from 1947 through 1960, had won the confidence of such top CIA officials as William Langer, Sherman Kent, Robert Amory and William Bundy.

In February, 1961, Mr. Komer was "transformed" from an "Intelligence" into an "Operations Officer" when he joined the National Security Council Staff at the request of McGeorge Bundy, the brother of William Bundy.

Following the "Bay of Pigs," the United States engaged in a series of "guerilla wars" throughout the world, including Vietnam, Laos, Thailand. Most of them were secret CIA operations, especially of the "counter-insurgency" type.

"MR. KOMER'S WAR"

The most secret, however, of these CIA wars was "Mr. Komer's war" in Yemen which was a testing ground for the CIA in the use of "paramilitary and paradiplomatic techniques, "the former Ambassador revealed.

Mr. Komer resorted to a major transformation of power especially at the Agency for International Development in applying "paradiplomatic" techniques, the source said. Because the United States and AID could not intervene directly in Yemen, Mr. Komer set up "dummy companies" in Europe, the Middle East and in India which "bought" AID goods, "repaired" them, and sold them either back to AID or to other governments. The transactions provided not only "revenues", but most of all "cover" for CIA agents, many of whom were foreign nationals.

To conceal these operations and "protect" them from bona fide AID or other U.S. inspectors, the CIA "New Team" infiltrated the AID security offices, as well as its personnel, operations and inspections divisions, the former Ambassador revealed.

Mr. Komer's other great innovation was to develop and deepen the covert collaboration between the CIA "New Team" and Harding Bancroft, the Executive Vice President of *The New York Times*, the source revealed.

THE NOVEMBER "STRIKES"

The CIA war in counter-insurgency in Yemen had convinced the "New Team" that to carry-out its program before the 1964 Presidential election, it must gain control of the actions of the South Vietnamese government in 1963. Thus, the New Team, largely on the basis of Mr. Komer's views on the reasons for both successes and failures in the Yemen, decided to move against President Diem in Vietnam. The New Team also moved against Vice-President Johnson and Otto F. Otepka.

On November 1, 1963, the New Team destroyed President Diem and his brother who were "assassinated"; on November 5, 1963 the "New Team" moved against Otto F. Otepka who was informed that day that he was dismissed as a security officer; and on November 22, 1963, largely on the urging of Robert F. Kennedy, Don B. Reynolds was appearing before a Senate Committee to supply evidence which was expected to cast a "deep shadow" on Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson, because of his relationships to Robert "Bobby" Baker, and through Baker, to James H. Hoffa, the Teamster President whom Robert Kennedy was prosecuting.

While Don Reynolds was still in the first phase of his testimony, news was flashed to the Senate Committee that President John Kennedy had been assassinated and Vice President Johnson was now President. Mr. Reynolds never finished his testimony.

Although one of the "targets" of the New Team, Lyndon B. Johnson thus escaped immediate destruction, his Presidency was eventually "captured" by such New Team members as Walt Whitman Rostow, William Bundy and Robert William Komer, the source added.

Thus, the "momentum of the November 1963 strike" of the New Team carried on through the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson, including the "Americanization of the Vietnam War" and the "dismissal" of Otto F. Otepka, the source concluded.

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Apr. 16, 1969]

OTEPKA WAS MAJOR ROADBLOCK IN TAKEOVER BY A "NEW TEAM": NEW YORK TIMES LINKED TO CIA PLOT ON OFFL.

The Central Intelligence Agency's "New Team," including such "outsiders" as Harding A. Bancroft, now the Executive Vice President of *The New York Times*, played a critical role in the final decision of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to press Secretary of State Dean Rusk to proceed with the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka as the State Department's top Security Evaluator, a former Ambassador associated with CIA Director Richard Helms informed this newspaper on April 11.

According to the source, Mr. Bancroft played a role because of his liaison and co-

ordinating work involving the use of the organization and facilities of *The New York Times* on behalf of the CIA and the "New Team."

Other persons who had a role included William H. Brubeck who had been the recipient of the 1960 "leak" of Top Secret information from the State Department to the campaign headquarters of John Kennedy which contributed significantly to Mr. Kennedy's narrow victory at the election polls. After Mr. Kennedy's victory, Mr. Brubeck received complete information about Mr. Otepka's role in tracing this "leak", the former Ambassador revealed.

Other members of the "New Team" were McGeorge Bundy and his brother William Bundy, who had moved from the Central Intelligence Agency to become the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, including Vietnam.

"THE NEW TEAM"

The "New Team" at the Central Intelligence Agency was being planned by Attorney General Robert Kennedy even before the Bay of Pigs "fiasco" in 1961. In fact, the former Ambassador said, the Attorney General had a special group of his own "monitoring" the Bay of Pigs operation to determine which persons, not yet projected for the "New Team", would "pass the test".

Although the "Bay of Pigs" was a national disaster, the source said, Robert Kennedy exploited it within the Government to accelerate building the "New Team."

NEW TEAM GOALS

The "New Team" goals were set by the "personality" of Robert Kennedy and the "philosophy" of President John Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the source revealed. The main exponent of this "philosophy" was Major General Maxwell Taylor, assisted by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Whitman Rostow, the former Ambassador said.

The mission of the "New Team" was to contest the Soviet penetration of the "Third World," the so-called nonaligned countries through "paramilitary, parapolitical and paradiplomatic" means. To do this, the "New Team" was to be a "paragovernment", performing for the United States "the same kind of functions" which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union performed for the Soviet Union, the former Ambassador revealed.

This required the "New Team" to penetrate every department and agency of the Executive Branch dealing with foreign policy by inserting "trusted members" of the "New Team" into key positions. Among these were the Offices of Security of the State Department, the military services departments, the United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development, the source added.

"NEW TEAM" MEMBERS

Besides Robert Kennedy and Maxwell Taylor, other members of the "New Team" were General Marshall S. Carter, who replaced General Charles B. Cabell as Deputy Director of the CIA. Very early "recruits" to the "New Team" were Richard Helms, today the Director of the CIA, and Cartha "Deke" Deloach, the second man in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Together with Robert McNamara and Dean Rusk, the "New Team" acting under the control of Robert Kennedy began the "infiltration" of the State Department and the Defense Departments with Central Intelligence Agency personnel. "Counterinsurgency" projects sprung up in every agency dealing with foreign affairs.

OUTSIDE "INSIDERS"

Besides key persons officially already in the Government, the "New Team" selected persons in leading banks, law firms and foundations for the penetration of the "non-governmental" apparatus of the United States, the former Ambassador revealed. Because of the paramount role of *The New York Times* in American life and because of the "black" assignments which it might be asked to perform for the CIA, great care was taken to select a person who had full access to every office in *The New York Times* and yet could conceal his own operations. This was especially important because "gray" operations, involving special background briefings for such top *New York Times* representatives as James Reston and Tom Wicker were already going on, and top *New York Times* reporters were in an especially good position to "uncover" the "black" operations.

BANCROFT'S PAST

Harding Bancroft had been originally introduced into the State Department by Alger Hiss, and, after Mr. Hiss became the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Mr. Bancroft served under Dean Rusk as a member of the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, renamed the Office of United Nations Affairs. Subsequently, he took the post of General Counsel to the International Labor Organization in Geneva and then went to *The New York Times*, eventually to be named Executive Vice President.

During the Eisenhower administration, Harding Bancroft worked closely with Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, maintaining close liaison with John Foster Dulles and with Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligency Agency.

BANCROFT'S COVER

Because Mr. Bancroft's liaison role at *The New York Times* required meeting with top CIA and State Department officials, especially on matters of "Personnel", it was decided to provide him with "cover" by designating him a "member" of the newly created State Department Advisory Committee on International Organization Affairs, whose task was to recommend the "best qualified Americans" for those international organization positions in which they could make important contributions.

Although the Advisory Committee eventually prepared a "Report", which was itself controversial in its original draft form, the basic role of the Committee was to provide a "cover" for the "New Team," the source revealed.

"ROADBLOCK" OTEPKA

One of the major "roadblocks" to the "infiltration" of the State Department by the Central Intelligence Agency New Team was Otto F. Otepka, its top Security Evaluator. Mr. Otepka had already "annoyed" the Central Intelligence Agency by his "uncovering" the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in using "double agents" in the Warsaw "sex and spy" scandals. Subsequently, Mr. Otepka "annoyed" Robert Kennedy and Dean Rusk by insisting, in December 1960, that Walt Whitman Rostow would need a "full field FBI investigation" before he could be "cleared" for employment in the State Department. Mr. Rostow had just completed in December a "secret" mission in Moscow for President-elect John Kennedy. The mission was "cleared" by CIA Director Allen Dulles. Previously, Mr. Rostow had established the CIA channels at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University professors maintained their own CIA "black" ties with Washington through the Institute, the former Ambassador asserted.

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Apr. 16, 1969]

AID MANIPULATED JOB RECORDS AND RATINGS

Following the revelations in this newspaper on February 21, 1968 about the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" and the resignation of five officials of the Agency for International Development, this newspaper received documentary evidence on April 11 of this year that three senior A.I.D. officials have since then been engaged in selectivity manipulating the personnel records of foreign service employees of that Agency. The records involved affect the promotion and "selection out" of foreign service personnel.

As readers will recall, the revelations about the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" were widely publicized a year ago by Senators and Congressmen. According to the accounts, a top A.I.D. official, having a "sexual affair" with a "seductive secretary" of the Belgian firm of J & M Andriaenessens, allowed the foreign company to overcharge the U.S. government by more than $250,000 for repairs on excess property.

Subsequently, this top official and a top A.I.D. inspector became involved in "rivalry for the sexual lures of the secretary", the press reported. Trips were taken by the young lady, with other beauties, and the A.I.D. staff to Rome, Paris, Nice, where the "sweet life" of France and Italy was fully enjoyed. The case, uncovered in the end by Congressional staff investigators, finally involved the Belgian police and prosecutor's office.

The five A.I.D. officials who resigned because of the embarrassment of the scandal included Herbert J. Waters, who prior to his employment at A.I.D. had served as the Senatorial election campaign manager in 1954 and 1960 of Hubert H. Humphrey. Others who resigned included Paul H. Scordas, a career Army Colonel hired after retirement as a Foreign Service Reserve Officer, Class 2; and Jack K. Wall, who was the Director of the Excess Property program for A.I.D. in Europe. Mr. Wall was indicted on December 9, 1968 and is awaiting trial.

The three A.I.D. officers now revealed by documentary evidence as having carried out a selective alteration of the restricted files and folders of foreign service personnel are H. Rex Lee, formerly the Governor of American Samoa and currently a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, who was the Assistant Administrator for Administration of A.I.D. during the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal"; Edward F. Tennant, currently the Acting Assistant Administrator for Administration and Governor Lee's successor at A.I.D.; and Joseph S. Toner, who was the Director of Personnel Administration for A.I.D. when the "Antwerp sex and kickback scandal" developed. Mr. Toner is still in the same job.

According to information received by this newspaper, one of the persons rated by Paul Scordas wrote to Governor Lee personally complaining about the rating he had received. The complaining employee, James A. Gibson, was on very good personal terms with persons associated with supporters of Hubert H. Humphrey, especially Herbert J. Waters, this newspaper was informed.

At the end of this article there is published the complete text of a memorandum, dated November 12, 1968, from Mr. Toner to Mr. Tennant concerning the disposition of the Performance Evaluation Report and the Development Appraisal Report written by Paul Scordas on James Gibson. Information available to this newspaper indicates that no other employee rated by Paul Scordas had his reports reviewed by Governor Lee.

In his memorandum of November 12 to Mr. Tennant, Mr. Toner refers to a letter of October 12, 1968 written by Governor Lee. Readers of *The Exchange* will be interested to note that the Congressional Record reveals that fully one month earlier, on September 13, Governor Lee had already been confirmed by the Senate for his new post as a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission. Governor Lee took the oath of his new office on October 24, 1968.

In addition to receiving documentary evidence of selective treatment given to certain A.I.D. persons with good connections, this newspaper was further informed that James

M. Kearns, a Schedule C political appointee and currently the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Administration, is being sharply criticized by A.I.D. personnel allegedly for permitting the re-writing and re-defining of job descriptions and titles to permit the "mass hiring" of retired military personnel who will be employed in the near future as "Foreign Service Reserve Officers", displacing the career civil service and career foreign service personnel entitled to first consideration under a Reduction in Force program.

According to the reports, Mr. Kearns is being assisted in this project by Lester T. David, a Colonel on active duty with the Air Force who is nominally a consultant with A.I.D. but is actually in charge of the Agency's Government Property Resources Office. Retired military personnel already promised positions by Colonel David and Mr. Kearns include former A.I.D. personnel recently dismissed in the Reduction in Force program because they did not have sufficient seniority. They would return to these positions as new employees following "re-organization" of the Government Property Resources Office, this newspaper was informed.

Included among those for whom positions will be created in the "re-organization" are persons who were returned from Frankfurt and Antwerp after being "relieved" of duty in connection with the "sex and kickback" scandals there.

There follows below the full verbatim text of the memorandum of November 12, from Mr. Toner to Mr. Tennant:

"NOVEMBER 12, 1968.

"To: AA/A, Mr. Edward F. Tennant.
"From: A/PM, Joseph S. Toner.
"Subject: Performance Evaluation.
"Report: James A. Gibson.

"Pursuant to instruction in Mr. Lee's memorandum of October 12, 1968, we are taking the following action:

"1. The Performance Evaluation Report prepared by Mr. Scordas will be removed from Mr. Gibson's restricted file and will be placed in a newly created folder which will not be for relase under any circumstances.

"2. The memorandum from Mr. Lee to me dated October 12, 1968, will be placed in Mr. Gibson's restricted file as it spells out the circumstances surrounding the preparation of the Scordas Performance Evaluation Report.

"3. The Development Appraisal Report prepared by Mr. Scordas has been reviewed also and found to be equally damaging and thus has been removed from Mr. Gibson's restricted file.

"(cc: Mr. J. A. Gibson, Transportation Officer, Antwerp, Belg.; Mr. J. J. Jacobson, OIC, AID/EPRO-4 Frankfurt. Restricted file of Mr. J. A. Gibson.)"

UNWANTED BIRTHS AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, pity the poor unwanted child. Pity any unwanted child. Pity the unwanted poor child.

It is abundantly clear that the child born into poverty circumstances has several strikes against him at the outset. His chances for success in life are much lower than the chances for the middle- or upper-class child.

It is encouraging to see the tremendous interest shown in recent years in helping the underprivileged child and his family overcome these odds. The new Federal programs confirm the desire of this Nation to give everyone an opportunity to raise himself from poverty situations.

In most deliberations of solutions to the poverty problem, very little attention has been given to family size and its relation to poverty. Dr. E. Sherman Adams, senior vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, has written an article on this subject for the Conference Board Record, in which he presents some statistics on poverty and family size. He dispels the impression that poor families are large because of choice. He refers to a study of married women in 1960 which showed that lower income families wanted smaller families than higher income couples.

Mr. Speaker, the article treats a subject which should be given greater attention in our efforts to solve the poverty problem. I commend it to my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

UNWANTED BIRTHS AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By E. Sherman Adams)

(NOTE.—Dr. Adams has had a varied career as an economist, educator, writer, lecturer, and banker. He is presently a senior vice president at First National City Bank, New York. The views expressed by the author are his own, and are based on his independent research.)

"A vicious circle of poverty and fertility is at work . . . Because they [the poor] do not limit the size of their families, the expense of raising unwanted children on inadequate incomes drives them deeper into poverty. The results are families without hope and children without future." (National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.)[1]

Most Americans are not yet aware that unwanted births are a major factor perpetuating poverty in this country. Moreover, this is an evil which, if we decide to, we can cure—and at small cost.

Reports, speeches, books, articles and TV panels discuss at length other aspects of poverty—squalid housing, decayed neighborhoods, hunger and disease, unemployment, social barriers, and inferior schools. And many billions of dollars are expended annually on programs to alleviate these problems.

In sharp contrast, you rarely hear any reference to the high birth rate among the poor. Seldom does a writer or speaker mention that this intensifies and prolongs poverty in both urban and rural America. And the government spends the merest pittance on family planning services.

One recently published book includes 19 essays on various aspects of poverty in this country. You would search in vain to find a single reference to the birth rate or birth control. This is not unusual; it is typical.

Even the voluminous report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders contains only one brief paragraph on the subject. One of the three sentences in that paragraph does state that broader provision of family planning services could make "a significant contribution" to breaking the cycle of want and dependency, but the rest of this 174,000-word report deals with other matters.

IN THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES—AND HERE

Considerable attention has been given in recent years to the alarming implications of the population explosion in underdeveloped nations, and there is increasing recognition that rapid population growth breeds destitution, disease and ignorance in those countries. But few realize that the same process is at work in our own disadvantaged areas.

Footnotes at end of article.

Not long ago, an assemblage of distinguished intellectuals gathered at Arden House, New York, and spent four days discussing "The Population Dilemma" both in the U.S. and elsewhere. But the published report on this convocation hardly even hints that unwanted births among the needy are one of the basic causes of chronic poverty in this country.

Actually, the linkages between fertility and want in the United States are very much the same as in Latin American, Asian and African countries. They are more obvious in those nations primarily because a much larger proportion of the people are poor, their deprivation is greater, and large numbers of poverty-stricken children are much more in evidence than in this country.

In South American cities, for example, the visitor is always conscious of the surrounding *barrios* swarming with ragged waifs. But in the United States, poverty is less visible. Many of us rarely see the squalor of slum areas; we keep to the superhighways that bypass them. Most Americans have never visited any of the South's miserable Tobacco Roads.

And there are some who, in their concern about the underdeveloped countries, completely dismiss the problem in this country. An eminent Stanford professor of demography recently cited the overall population growth rate of about 1.2% in the U.S. and observed: "Surely our affluent society has the resources to cope with this level of growth."[2] The critical problem however, is not among the affluent, but among the poor. This is not a question of the overall growth rate for the nation as a whole; it is a problem of literally hundreds of thousands of unwanted babies born each year to poor families who become trapped in a subculture of despair.

Economists see plainly that in other parts of the world the disastrous famines predicted by Malthus may materialize, but they are confident that in this country, population will not outrun the food supply—at least not in the immediate future. The urgent problem here is admittedly not famine; it is the role of the high birth rate in perpetuating poverty. And this is something which is not discussed at all in economics textbooks.

AND THE POOR GET CHILDREN

There can be no doubt about the seriousness of this poverty-fertility circle. In the first place, there is ample data to document the saying that the rich get richer and the poor get children. Chicago's poor, for instance, have a birth rate on a par with India's. For the nation, the fertility rate—defined as the number of children born per 1,000 women in the 15–44 age group—is 55% greater among the poor than among the nonpoor. It inevitably follows that there is a much higher proportion of large families among the poor.

A recent Census Bureau report shows that 38% of all poor families with children, white and nonwhite, have four or more children, contrasted with only 17% of all nonpoor families. Indeed, among the poor, 24% have five or more children contrasted with only 7% of all nonpoor families.

And, of course, in a high percentage of needy families, the mother today is still of child-bearing age and will have more children. Many of the poverty-stricken families which presently have fewer than four children will eventually have four or five or six or more, unless they receive family planning assistance.

To put it somewhat differently, less than 10% of all families with only one or two children are poor, whereas 35% of all families with five or more children are poor. And again, the prospect today is that many of the poor families who now have only one or two children will eventually be in the five-or-more category.

According to Census Bureau statistics based on criteria established by the Social Security Administration, approximately 26 million persons in the United States today subsist in poverty. This figure is calculated on the basis of minimum nutritional standards and estimated minimum incomes required by various-sized families.

Some contend that this formula exaggerates the number of persons who really should be classed as being poor, and there would seem to be some validity in certain of these criticisms. On the other hand, one can hardly shrug off Census Bureau figures which show that the 26 million persons classified as poor have an average of only 70 cents per day for food for each member of the family. Moreover, there are almost a million more persons whose incomes would be below the poverty line if they were not receiving welfare.

In any event, the Census Bureau data are the best available, and even though the 26 million figure is debatable, percentage breakdowns based on these data are undoubtedly representative for very low-income families and individuals, however defined.

One such breakdown shows that of the 26 million poor persons in this country, 10½ million, or 41%, are children under 18, and most of these poor children are in large families. Of all children who are poor, 63% are in families which already have four or more children, and 45% are in families with five or more. And the plight of many of these children will become progressively worse as more unwanted babies arrive.

It is clear that a very high proportion of all poor persons are poor primarily because they were born to poverty. This obviously applies to virtually all of the 41% who are children. It also applies to millions of poor adults who were reared in poverty. Millions who are born poor are doomed to life-long poverty.

To be sure, some who are born to poverty are eventually able to improve their economic status. But many do not, and this is particularly true for those who grow up in large families. These account for a large percentage of the 15½ million adults who are poor. In their case, poverty and unwanted births have led to continuing poverty.

It is plain that if the birth rate were no higher among the poor than among the nonpoor, there would be far fewer poor persons. For one thing, of course, this high natality is responsible for the fact that so many of these persons were born. But there is much more to it than that. Children in large poor families have far less chance of ever escaping from the cycle of want than those in smaller families.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Research shows conclusively that children in large poor families receive less attention from their parents, are less healthy, and are relatively less stable and confident than children in smaller families. In school, they show appreciably lower levels of mental development and therefore have less chance of ever raising themselves from poverty. A higher percentage of them become school dropouts, and some who do sit through high school receive, not diplomas, but "certificates" which are evidence that the recipients never attained eighth grade reading level.

In many instances, truancy and juvenile delinquency are side effects which further reduce the child's chances for economic betterment. All of these factors have psychological consequences which increase the odds that by the time the child reaches adulthood, he will be virtually beyond redemption.

A high percentage of these children will eventually join the ranks of the unemployed. Many will have no qualifications for holding a job. A substantial proportion will go on relief, which has become an inherited way of life in an increasing number of localities—a family tradition. Among their number will be some alcoholics, dope addicts, and criminals.

Planned Parenthood Federation tells a case in point. A court in Brooklyn sent for the father of three juvenile delinquents in trouble with the law. The father told the policeman he could not come; he was too busy taking care of his eight other small children—and his wife was in the hospital giving birth to their 12th. The family was on relief.

Many unwanted children suffer from deep emotional problems. A prominent child psychiatrist writes that a deficiency in maternal care can lead to serious disturbances in mental health and development; unwanted children are subject to such a deficiency. He feels more planned parenthood is needed to prevent this emotional crippling. Unwanted births are, in this sense, a public health hazard of the over-population problem.

And as these children in large families grow up, the vicious cycle of fertility and poverty is repeated. Most of them marry young and immediately start having offspring at a rapid rate, thus insuring a large new generation of seriously disadvantaged children.

The more children poor families have, the poorer many of them become and the less chance they have of escaping from the bondage of poverty. One obvious reason is because each additional child means another mouth to feed and another body to clothe. Resources per child are reduced by every birth even if the family's income does not decline.

But in many cases, income actually declines. In 1966, 35% of all poor children were in households headed by women, the poorest of all the groups among the poor. The main source of income of most of these families is what the mother can earn and the more children she has, the less chance she has to work. Census data show that the average income of female-headed households is highest for those with only one child and that it declines sharply in direct proportion to the number of additional children.

A major reason why so many women and children are in this trap is desertion by the father, and a principal reason why many husbands abandon their families is because they have so many unwanted children. Census data indicate that poor female-headed households contain more children, on the average, than male-headed families. The Commission on Rural Poverty asserts:

"Unwanted pregnancies can, and often do, wreck any chance for a better life for either parents or children . . . The resulting stress and disorganization of family life are often too much for the father. In thousands of cases he gives up and deserts the family." [3]

A report by a member of a team of doctors who conducted a study in the Delta counties of Mississippi states:

"The homes visited were usually occupied by mothers, worn and tired and looking much older than their actual ages. Their children would range in number from four to ten. Most often there was no father. Questioned as to his absence the responses would be 'we are separated' or, simply, 'I don't know where he is.'" [4]

FERTILITY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The high birth rate among the poor is also a major cause of their high rate of unemployment and underemployment. The great majority of disadvantaged youths cannot find employment except in unskilled jobs. Progress in industrial technology has been rapidly reducing the percentage of unskilled jobs in the U.S. economy. This is as true on the farm as in the city. In the span of only seven years, 1959–1966, unskilled jobs as a percentage of total civilian jobs declined from 30% to 23%. The lower rungs of the economic ladder are being lopped off.

Meanwhile, because of the high birth rate among the poor, there has been a correspondingly rapid increase in the number of unskilled youths.

This imbalance between supply and demand in this part of the labor market is a basic reason for the high rate of subemployment among disadvantaged youths. In all probability, it has also tended to hold down wages in unskilled occupations.

This situation will become progressively worse over the years ahead, even under conditions of sustained general prosperity. In New York City, for instance, over half the ghetto unemployed were formerly employed, if at all, as laborers, but less than 1% of the new job openings expected to become available in the city between 1965 and 1975 will fall into this nonskilled classification.

The underprivileged are being left ever farther behind by rising national educational norms. It is estimated that during the 1960's alone, about 7½ million youngsters will have left school without a high school diploma. In a study on *Effects of Family Planning on Poverty in the United States*, Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, an authority in the field of industrial sociology, states:

"One of the results of continued high fertility rates among impoverished families is that a disproportionate number of youths entering the labor force from such families cannot be adequately employed in an economy such as that in the United States of the 1970's and beyond." [5]

Increased efforts will undoubtedly be made to improve the education and training of the disadvantaged, but this is a herculean task that will require many years to accomplish. If natality among the poor remains as high as it is now, the efforts of educators, business and government to alleviate poverty will continue to be largely cancelled out by unwanted births.

A HALF MILLION UNWANTED BIRTHS A YEAR

The number of unwanted births among the poor and near-poor is much larger than is generally supposed. Even if one were to assume that the poor want as many offspring as the nonpoor—which they do not—then the number of unwanted births among the poor would be the number in excess of what would have been produced at the fertility rate desired by the nonpoor. On this basis, it has been calculated by the Natality Statistics Branch of the U.S. Public Health Service that in 1966, the 8.2 million poor and near poor women of reproductive age had 451,000 unwanted births which might have been avoided. Another estimate places the number of unwanted births at 545,000.

One reason for the lack of public concern about this whole problem is the widespread assumption that the poor have large families because they want them, or perhaps do not care how many children they have. This upper-class notion is utter nonsense. Its falsity has been repeatedly proven by careful research.

One authoritative report prepared by three eminent experts in this field was based on interviews with a representative national sample of married women in 1960. The study showed that lower-income couples wanted somewhat *smaller* families than higher-income couples. On the average, nonwhite poor couples wanted even fewer children than whites.

Similarly, a study in 1961 by a Princeton research team showed that most blue collar wives want *fewer* children than white collar wives. A survey by a prominent sociologist among Chicago families substantiated the preference of nonwhites for smaller families than whites. Further corroboration was provided in a 1965 survey by the Florida State Health Department.

An official of the Southern Regional Council who surveyed conditions in Mississippi reports:

Footnotes at end of article.

"No program of birth control is available to the poor, although every mother with whom I talked expressed a desire for help in limiting her family. A few who did know about 'the pill' had not been able to afford it." [6]

The place of family planning in the hierarchy of needs of the poor is indicated by a survey among 2,081 very low-income families in Detroit, about half of whom were white and half nonwhite. Interviewers found that birth control ranked sixth among the myriad services required by these families, ranking below only such pressing needs as financial assistance and job training.

FAMILY PLANNING DOES WORK

Another common misconception is the belief that little or nothing can be done about the high natality of the poor. Talk with a few doctors, social workers or Planned Parenthood volunteers and you will hear a different story. These people know at first hand that the availability of birth control facilities makes a tremendous difference in the lives of low-income families.

A number of other countries, including some which, ironically, Americans sometimes refer to as being "backward," are more advanced than the U.S. in providing subsidized family planning services. A number of them can already present impressive evidence of the effectiveness of these programs.

For example, South Korea succeeded in reducing its growth rate from 3% per year in 1962 to 2.5% in 1966. Taiwan has seen its annual growth rate drop from 4.5% in 1955 to 2.3% at the end of 1967. In Singapore, the birth rate declined 39% in the decade from 1957 to 1967. In Puerto Rico, natality was reduced nearly 20% from 1956 to 1966.

Official birth control programs are also being developed in India, Egypt, Kenya, Pakistan, Tunisia and Turkey. Some of these have so far been handicapped by the lack of trained personnel. Also, in some of these countries, many of the poor apparently *want* large families—partly from fear that some of their children will not survive—and birth control programs are viewed with deep suspicion.

In the United States, however, it is certain that unwanted births among the poor could be substantially reduced by an adequately funded family planning program. The evidence is overwhelming that in this country, the poor do want help and that they do respond effectively to family planning services.

For instance, analysis of results of Planned Parenthood and Health Department programs in Baltimore, New Orleans and Washington, D.C., as well as in rural areas from Kentucky to Texas, showed significant declines in the birth rates among the poor—in one case, as much as 36%. And comparable results are reported elsewhere.

In a low-income section of Chicago, the birth rate declined more than 20% within four years after the introduction of a planned parenthood program. A program in a rural county in Louisiana resulted in a 32% drop in the birth rate in one year's time, compared with a 6% decrease in the four surrounding counties which lacked a program.

In Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, the health and welfare departments have combined to make birth control services available to the needy. In the first year of this program, 732 women enrolled and no pregnancies were reported. These same women previously had a total of 3,440 pregnancies. The cost of welfare in the county has been sharply reduced. In human terms, the savings are far greater.

A doctor who initiated a family planning program among the rural poor in Appalachia reports that the response has been "overwhelming." One of the public health nurses there wrote: "Words cannot express the joy and pleasure these women show on being offered this help." [7]

Footnotes at end of article.

The fact is that millions of poor and near-poor in this country have for generations desperately needed family planning services. According to the Commission on Rural Poverty: "Because these people are poor, they do not know how to plan their families nor do they know where to turn for help in planning." [8] It is a shocking commentary on our affluent and supposedly humanitarian society that we permit this situation to continue to contribute to the perpetuation of poverty in the midst of plenty.

FAMILY PLANNING VERSUS ILLEGAL ABORTIONS

Contrary to the popular notion that abortion involves mostly illegitimate pregnancies, it is actually more a problem of married women who have several children. The present dearth of family planning services is a major reason for the large number of illegal abortions in this country, estimated to be around 1,000,000 a year—one for every four live births.

Most state abortion laws are severely restrictive and so is their application by hospital boards. In Colorado, the first state to liberalize the law, boards approved only 398 hospital abortions between January 1 and October 31, 1968. Nineteen out of 20 requests were turned down. A "liberalized" California law has not worked any better.

A large percentage of these 1,000,000 illegal abortions are performed under unsanitary, unsafe conditions. The great majority of women must seek "underworld" abortions from hacks, medical butchers or midwives with little or no gynecological training. No one knows how much harm is caused to the women forced to resort to this dangerous expedient. Nor is it known how many women die each year from self-induced abortions.

One approach to this problem would be to make abortions safe by giving them official sanction. Japan did this primarily as a means of population control and with spectacular success. Its birth rate was cut in half between 1947 and 1958.

In the United States, however, attempts at reform meet strong opposition. In most states, truly liberal abortion laws appear to be many years away. The obvious alternative, and one which is far more easily attainable in the near future, is Federal action to reduce unwanted pregnancies by making family planning services more accessible. This would not solve the problem completely, but it would go a long way toward it.

A BASIC HUMAN RIGHT

Some persons apparently assume that family planning programs might involve coercion and feel that this would violate human rights. However, the Planned Parenthood Federation has always emphasized the voluntary character of its programs. It seeks only to make family planning services accessible to those who need and want them.

At the annual convention of Planned Parenthood-World Population last November, delegates adopted a resolution stating: "No one should be forced to use birth control . . . We must be especially vigilant to preserve freedom of choice about family size for welfare recipients and other Americans dependent on public assistance." Actually, in the case of most of the poor, it is really not a matter of *preserving* freedom of choice about family size, but a matter of *giving* them that freedom of which they are presently deprived because they are not receiving the assistance they need.

Indeed, it is a fundamental right of all parents to plan their families. The International Conference on Human Rights which met last year in Teheran adopted the following resolution with no "nay" votes: "Parents have a basic right to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children."

Family planning is now practiced by an overwhelming majority of middle- and upper-income couples in this country, whites and nonwhites as well. Among the poor, however, it is estimated that 36% of all births are unwanted. Unless we make family planning services available to these people, we will continue to deny them one of the most important human rights. This right is particularly vital to them because its denial condemns many of them to unending poverty.

Moreover, voluntary limitation of family size carries a strong moral sanction. Parents have responsibilities to the children they bring into the world. In the case of parents who are poor, the most urgent of these responsibilities is to see to it that their youngsters have the best opportunity they can give them someday to escape from poverty.

THE FINANCIAL COSTS

We have been discussing mostly the human costs of unwanted births among the poor, the costs in terms of misery, deprivation and degradation. Let us look at the financial, social and economic costs. They are enormous.

One of the more obvious effects is on the cost of public assistance. Despite the biggest business boom in history, welfare rolls have been expanding and relief costs soaring in recent years. One of the largest and fastest growing segments of the welfare program is known as Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Between 1955 and 1968, the number of AFDC recipients skyrocketed by 3.4 million persons, more than 150%. Today the number on AFDC—over 5.6 million—is more than twice the combined total of all others on relief, such as the old, the blind and the disabled. Half of the children receiving this aid were the result of unwanted pregnancies.

But unwanted births have a far greater impact on relief costs and on other public expenditures than just on the AFDC program, because they are partially responsible for the continuing existence of poverty. In 1968, total outlays for public assistance by all levels of government—Federal, state and local—amounted to $10 billion, an increase since 1960 of almost $6 billion, about 150%. In New York City alone, welfare expenditures now exceed $1 billion annually and are burgeoning at the fantastic rate of 20% per year.

And there are other expensive Federal programs which constitute aid to the poor, such as public housing, education, employment and health services, and other forms of income maintenance assistance. In 1968, expenditures for programs of this type totaled $17 billion.

Since unwanted births among the poor are a major reason for the perpetuation of poverty, they must also be a major reason for the magnitude of total welfare payments and other outlays for the poor and for their continuing growth.

By the same token, the high birth rate among the poor contributes to many other costs of government, especially at the local level. It increases the demand for all municipal services—sanitation, health facilities, law enforcement, programs to combat delinquency, alcoholism and addiction, and so on. It adds enormously to the cost of public education, the largest item in all city budgets. At the state level, it means need for more mental, penal and health institutions, and for more thruways to enable suburbanites to flee the city at the end of the day.

THE SOCIAL COSTS

It is impossible even to estimate some of the social costs involved, such as the extent to which the rapid growth of population in the ghetto exacerbates racial tensions and social unrest. Many observers believe that continuing poverty constitutes a very real and growing threat to our social order.

The overcrowding of central city schools by an influx of children from deprived backgrounds has been causing a sharp deterioration in the quality of public education in these areas. This has accelerated the migration of middle-class families to the suburbs to find better schools for their children, thereby widening the gulf between the central cities and the suburbs.

Over the years ahead, most of these many costs, both financial and social, will in all probability incerase substantially. Take welfare. The great majority of those in want are presently either receiving no public assistance whatever or allowances which are utterly inadequate—$34.55 per month for the average family in Mississippi, for example. More than three-fourths of all poor children are in families who are not yet on AFDC. This situation is not likely to continue indefinitely.

Moreover, the income of most families on relief is still below the poverty level, and increasing attention is being given to various plans of income maintenance, such as the negative income tax, to bring all Americans up at least to the poverty line. In addition, there is the possibility of a system of wage supplements for low-paid workers.

It is clear that the Federal government will also greatly expand its outlays on urban housing. The Housing Act of 1968 calls for the rehabilitation or construction of six million shelter units for the needy over the next ten years. And construction costs, already rising at the rate of 5% a year, will be under increased pressure in coming years. Rent supplements and interest subsidies are scheduled to increase sharply.

Similarly, expenditures on public education have been mounting rapidly in recent years and there is every indication that this will continue. Indeed, they are likely to accelerate wherever serious efforts are made to provide disadvantaged children with the quality of education they need. And so it is with many other governmental programs.

THE ECONOMIC COSTS

From the standpoint of the economist, one of the big costs of poverty is that the poor are a drain on the economy. Many produce nothing whatever, except children they cannot provide for, and the productivity of those who do work is very low. Most of them pay no taxes and never will.

During the Industrial Revolution, many of the well-to-do owed their affluence in part to the exploitation of the productive labor of the poor—the "downtrodden masses." But in our era, most of those who are productive are comparatively well off. And the poor, instead of being a source of wealth, are mostly unproductive and are a heavy burden to society.

In fact, the high natality among the poor results in a large-scale diversion of resources to support children who were unwanted in the first place and who are fettered with great handicaps. These offspring constitute new, continuing claims on the meager incomes of their unfortunate parents and on the funds of the community available for social betterment.

At birth control clinics, the cost of providing family planning services averages only $20 to $25 per patient per year. The saving to society from not having to support unwanted children and provide them with all kinds of public services would be far in excess of the negligible cost of helping the parents to avoid births they do not want. Estimates of the benefit-cost ratio of family planning programs range from 50-to-1 up to 100-to-1.

Indeed, no other program that is politically feasible would even begin to compare with family planning in effectiveness in reducing poverty and the costs related to poverty. Until we make an adequate investment of this kind, the unfettered stork will continue to frustrate increasingly expensive programs to alleviate poverty. And the greatest return on such an investment would be not in dollars but in human terms.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

How much is being done in the United States at the present time to help the poor in limiting the size of their families? The answer, in general, is: Nowhere near enough compared with the need.

It is estimated that about 800,000 medically dependent women are presently being served by family planning facilities, public and private, and that there are almost four and a half million others who still need to be reached, about two-thirds of whom are white, one-third nonwhite. And there are many more families hovering above the poverty line who urgently need these services too.

Planned Parenthood groups sponsor some 470 birth control clinics throughout the U.S. These centers certainly deserve merit badges for dedication and quality of service, but most of them are small, understaffed, and lacking in adequate funds.

In relation to the need, governmental action to date has been far from adequate. Although, at long last, the Federal government has recognized that it has some responsibility for the problem and has from time to time acknowledged its seriousness, actual progress has been slow and cautious. Money and staff committed to deal with it still rank below a hundred less urgent projects.

Six Federal agencies are involved in one way or another in family planning. Of these, Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity are the most active. Some agencies which should be leaders in this field, such as the Public Health Service, have done comparatively little.

Although in the past the total amount expended by the government was almost negligible, $31.5 million has been earmarked for fiscal year 1969 and President Johnson's budget calls for a token increase in 1970. To be sure, this represents some improvement over previous years, but it can easily be put into perspective. For instance, HEW's 1969 budget is about $14½ billion, and the birth control/planning part represents only one-eighth of 1%. Professor Paul R. Ehrlich, professor of biology at Stanford University, calls this "less than a drop in the bucket, not even a good micro-drop."[9] In comparison with the immense costs of poverty—human, financial, social and economic—it is indeed a paltry sum.

Moreover, the Federal agencies involved have not yet adopted formal decisions to initiate programs as a matter of policy. Except for a recent requirement that family planning services must be made available to AFDC recipients, the government leaves the initiation of programs to state and local agencies and many of these are doing little or nothing about the problem. Many hospital boards are still indifferent or even hostile toward family planning. Only about one-fifth of the hospitals with large maternity services operate clinics where birth control services are available for needy patients. If state and local agencies entitled to Federal assistance happen to have such programs and request funds for them, HEW does not object, provided funds are available.

But available funds are inadequate, and some of the local programs that do exist need more money. The director of the Georgia Department of Public Health states: "There needs to be a great increase in the level of support from the Federal government for this very necessary activity."

Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of Planned Parenthood-World Federation, in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty in 1967, stated:

"The question that faces us today is *not* whether or not family planning services are needed; it is *not* a question of beneficial results; it is not even a question of individual or societal acceptance—rather it is a question of the degree of priority we are willing to place on family planning services for the medically impoverished and how far we are willing to go to implement that priority."[10]

The President's Committee on Population and Family Planning, whose report was issued in November, 1968, concluded that "the Federal government must undertake a much larger effort if this nation hopes to play its proper role in attaining a better life for its people."[11]

FOOTNOTES

[1] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind*, Washington, D.C., September, 1967, p. 75.

[2] Dudley Kirk, *World Population: Hope Ahead;* based on a paper prepared for a conference on fertility and population planning held at the University of Michigan, November, 1967.

[3] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *loc. cit.*

[4] Southern Regional Council, *Hungry Children*, Atlanta, Georgia, *ca.* 1968, p. 13.

[5] Harold L. Sheppard, *Effects of Family Planning on Poverty in the United States*, W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1967, p. V.

[6] Southern Regional Council, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

[7] Frederick S. Jaffe (ed.), *Rural Family Planning Programs*, papers prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Planned Parenthood-World Population, New York, December 1967, p. 53.

[8] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *loc. cit.*

[9] Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, Sierra Club-Ballantine Books, New York, 1968, p. 89.

[10] Examination of War on Poverty," hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Part 7, June 8, 1967.

[11] President's Committee on Population and Family Planning, *Population and Family Planning*, Washington, D.C., November 1968, p. 43.

PROF. MARVIN KALKSTEIN'S STATEMENT ON THE ABM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 I participated in an informal congressional hearing on the anti-ballistic-missile system which was sponsored by the New York Council for a Sane Nuclear Policy—SANE—at the Ethical Cultural Society in New York City. During the hearing testimony was presented by several expert witnesses familiar with the technical aspects of the anti-ballistic-missile system, all of whom opposed the development and the deployment of any ABM system, whether it be the Johnson administration's Sentinel or the Safeguard program proposed by President Nixon.

Since that hearing more and more Representatives and Senators have begun to question the need and wisdom of developing an ABM system. In order that my colleagues may have access to some of the testimony which we received at our New York hearing, I am today inserting in the RECORD the text of the statement by Prof. Marvin Kalkstein, associate professor in the Earth and Space Sciences Department of the State University of New York at Stony Brook—who is also chairman of the Federation of American Scientists Committee on

ABM. On April 14, 1969, I included in the RECORD a statement by Prof. John E. Ullmann, chairman of the Department of Management, Marketing and Business Statistics of Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y.

I commend the views expressed by these two professors to my colleagues:

CONGRESSIONAL HEARING ON THE ABM

(Marvin Kalkstein, associate professor, Earth and Space Sciences Department, Stony Brook, chairman, Federation of American Scientists Committee on ABM)

There are 4 basic concerns with regard to the ABM issue. These are:

1. Siting, in connection with the most recent proposals for deployment of the Sentinel ABM system.

2. Effectiveness of proposed, or any other, ABM system.

3. The arms race.

4. Economics.

The proposed Sentinel defense system is meant to provide an area defense and as such each Sentinel site is supposed to afford protection to an egg-shaped area, which is roughly 1,000–1,200 miles long and 700–800 miles across at its widest portion. Obviously, with this area of coverage it would not be necessary to locate the Sentinel site near a particular point (city) in order to protect that point (city). By proposing to locate most of the Sentinel sites in close proximity to major urban centers, a number of serious questions are raised. The first is the possibility of accidental explosion of the nuclear warhead on the Spartan missile. While the possibility of an accident may be very small, the possibility cannot be ruled out; and if such an accident were to occur near a city, the result would be catastrophic. The explosion of the Spartan's 2-megaton warhead would cause almost complete destruction of buildings by blast out to a distance of about 3 miles, extensive fires out to a distance of about 8 miles, and second-degree body burns to those caught in the open to a distance of about 12 miles. If such an explosion were centered at Tenafly, New Jersey, large portions of Manhattan and the Bronx would suffer these effects. In addition, lethal levels of radioactive fallout could blanket portions of Brooklyn, Queens, and Long Island.

The second question pertains to an enemy's targeting doctrine in the event of an attack upon the United States. The effect would be to make those cities that are in close proximity to Sentinel sites possible targets for an enemy's first strike, in addition to being targets for an enemy's second strike, which they already are likely to be. This is of particular concern since this country has some control with respect to a second strike (there would be no enemy second strike without a first strike by us) but obviously has little control with respect to an enemy's first strike.

The third, and in some respects most serious, question is why the Army has proposed to install the Sentinel system sites close to cities. There is good reason to question the credibility and intention of the Army since the Sentinel system as proposed by Secretary McNamara was to remain a thin system and since the understanding given to Congress last year was that it would not be located in heavily populated areas. The only logical reason for the Army attempting to locate the sites near cities was to get a foot in the door toward building a thicker missile defense system.

The Sentinel system as proposed by Secretary McNamara was intended to provide an area defense against a small, simple, first generation ICBM threat, such as the Chinese might have in the 1970's. There are many ways of overcoming such a defense. The Sentinel system would be ineffective against attack by means other than ICBM's; for example, low-flying aircraft, cruise missiles, missiles launched from offshore submarine, and warheads smuggled into ports and other locations and then detonated. In addition, there are a number of easy and inexpensive means by which an ICBM can penetrate an area defense. These penetration aids include fragmentation of the missile's booster rocket, chaff, decoys, electronic jamming, and radar blackout produced by the pre-detonation at high altitude of an incoming missile. All of these are relatively simple and at least some would be likely to be incorporated by an enemy whose initial ICBM deployment would be faced with an ABM. Finally, the defense can also be overwhelmed by numbers. An enemy can be successful by concentrating the attack so that it targets more missiles upon a given city than there are defensive missiles to protect it. It must also be realized that an ABM system to be truly effective must work close to perfection. Past experience with major weapons systems involving complicated electronic components give little reason for confidence that the highly complicated ABM system would be effective.

The third concern is that the deployment of an ABM system would lead to a greatly accelerated and heightened arms race; the end result of which would be a decrease in our security and in the stability of the present world situation. Since the basis of the present strategic deterrent stability is the assured destruction that each country is well aware that it can deliver and receive, any move by one side to reduce this level of destruction to itself would call for a compensating increase in offense by the other side. Since the improvements in offense necessary to offset any defensive effort are relatively inexpensive and easy to accomplish, it can be expected that this reaction will take place. Thus, there is the danger of a continuing action-reaction, offensive-defensive race leading to higher levels of arms. The consequences of this will be greater uncertainty and less stability with regard to mutual deterrence, and a greater risk of nuclear war possibly accompanied by even higher levels of damage than previously would have been the case.

An arms race such as that suggested would obviously be a very costly business. The initial proposed deployment estimated originally at 4–5 billion dollars now appears likely to cost about 10 billion dollars and this is only for a thin system. A thick system, which is likely to follow, has been estimated at 40–50 billion dollars and could quite possibly cost many times that much. In addition, once one engages in defense against missile attack, one must strengthen the other components of one's defense system. Within one week of Secretary McNamara's September 17, 1967, announcement of the decision to deploy the Sentinel system, a plan was announced for a new 4 billion dollar air defense system. An ABM defense would also necessitate a fallout shelter program. It is thus easy to contemplate the expenditure of 100 billion dollars or more just on defense if we should embark upon an ABM program. And that money is only the money that would be spent on defense. Added to this would be the tens of billions of dollars spent on upgrading the offense with such systems as the Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicle (MIRV), and the Sub-sonic Cruise Armed decoy (SCAD).

As in the case of the Vietnam war, ABM clearly raises the question of American priorities. It represents another clear example of enormous unwarranted defense expenditures at a time when many pressing domestic needs go unheeded. The danger to this country is not from Soviet or Chinese missiles, but from the deterioration of our cities and a continuing inflationary trend and heavy tax burden.

The most crucial foreign policy issue facing the United States is the question of the missile talks with the Soviet Union. If we are to put a real halt to the arms race, it is necessary that we get on with these talks as soon as possible. While it may be that Congress will withhold the money for ABM this year, ABM can come up again and again in the defense budget in future years. Furthermore, even if the ABM is halted, the arms race can continue and escalate by the deployment of offensive systems such as MIRV and SCAD. The only sure way to stop all of this is by negotiating an agreement with the Soviet Union to prohibit the further procurement and deployment of new strategic weapons systems. Until an effort to achieve this goal is made, the United States itself should hold off on the further procurement and deployment of such systems. Also, unless the United States and the Soviet Union proceed along these lines, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which calls for such negotiations under Article VI, is likely to remain unsigned by a number of important non-nuclear weapon nations.

RED CHINESE VOTE BY FOOT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those who have lived under Communist tyranny are best qualified to judge its merits and faults. East or West, all who have suffered persecution under communism always continue heroic efforts for a chance at liberty—even at the risk of their lives in escaping from the Communist system.

Yet, there are those in our free country, with no personal experience under communism, who would use their freedom to attack free institutions and, yes, even some who would overthrow our constitutional Government in a frenzied move to establish a Communist United States of America.

The constant reports of refugees fleeing Red China should discourage any thinking man from suggesting that we recognize Mao, and legitimate the political system which enslaves 800 million Chinese on the mainland.

I include a special report from Hong Kong, by Allan Castro, as follows:

GUNS HALT A FLIGHT TO HONG KONG

(By Alan Castro)

HONG KONG, April 29.—The Hong Kong-China border erupted to gunfire today when Chinese Communists gunned down a flock of refugees trying to steal across wire fences into this British colony before dawn.

Villagers at Linmahang in the Takuling border area said there were at least 20 people in the group that made the bid to flee. They said they saw six refugees felled by gunfire, although apparently none of them were critically hurt. They were rounded up by border guards.

There has been increasing activity lately involving people on the Chinese side trying to escape into Hong Kong. Two days ago, a group of 10, including four women and children, reached here by the flimsy sampan. They were detained by British police for "illegal entry." Informants said at least four were militiamen.

THE 27.5-PERCENT DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives the following statement which I submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, to express my views on "a very special tax benefit," the 27.5-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas:

There are numerous inequities or loopholes in the present tax structure, but the worst of all, in my opinion, is the 27.5-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas. This allowance enables the taxpayer to deduct each year 27.5 percent of the gross income from the sale of oil and gas from a producing property up to 50 percent of net income. The justification is that oil and gas companies are entitled to an allowance for exhaustion of this natural resource in computing their taxable income, just as other firms are entitled to a depreciation allowance for wear and tear on the capital they use. With respect to most expenditures for fixed capital, the tax law limits total deductions for capital recovery to the amount actually invested by the taxpayer and requires that these deductions be spread over the useful life of the property. By using the percentage depletion allowance, the oil and gas company may recover its capital costs several times over.

By the use of the percentage depletion allowance primarily, as well as other special tax benefits, the oil and gas industry pays a lower rate of tax than that borne by other industries, and the Federal Government suffers a serious revenue loss. The Treasury Department estimates that in fiscal year 1968 for all extractive industries $1.3 billion in revenue was lost because of the excess of percentage depletion over what cost depletion (deductions equaling actual cost or investment) would have totaled. Most of that dollar benefit went to the very large oil companies.

Figures published in the August 5, 1968 issue of Oil Week for 23 of the largest oil refiners in the United States show that from 1962 through 1967 the average Federal tax payment in every one of the 6 years for these companies was less than 10 percent. In 1967 Standard Oil of New Jersey, the largest of them all, paid $166 million in Federal taxes on net income before taxes of $2,098 million, or 7.9 percent. The Atlantic Refining Company, now known as Atlantic-Richfield, had a net profit in 1967 of $130 million and paid no Federal income tax at all. Most corporations in other industries paid Federal taxes at a rate of 48 percent, and even the individual taxpayer in the lowest bracket paid at the rate of 14 percent.

The Treasury Department under the previous Administration estimated that 2.2 million families in poverty are subject to income tax. I think it is an outrage that they as well as the heavily burdened middle income taxpayer should be required to subsidize oil and gas interests.

Therefore, I recommend most strongly that the percentage depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry be eliminated. The claims that the industry is unusually risky and costly do not warrant such a bonanza. There are other industries which must risk large sums without any special tax deductions. It is also argued that the percentage depletion allowance is necessary because of the strategic importance of oil and gas to our national security. There are many other industries of equal importance to our security which receive no special benefits. I do not believe it is in our national interest to continue this special privilege to the oil and gas industry.

The President has asked Congress to extend the surcharge for another year in order to raise the revenue this country needs for the Vietnamese conflict as well as the pressing problems here at home. Quite frankly I have difficulty justifying the extension of this tax when a "loophole" such as the oil depletion allowance remains in our tax structure.

If we are to restore the faith of the American people in their tax system, we cannot continue to allow these special interests to benefit at the expense of the majority. The elimination of the 27.5 percent oil depletion allowance would be a giant step toward achieving greater equity and fairness in our tax system which are the ultimate goals of tax reform.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, another area which relates to this matter is the need for immediate action by the Internal Revenue Service, to rescind their administrative ruling which provides an additional tax advantage enjoyed by American oil companies which deprives our national treasury of an estimated hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

For many years the entire sum of the royalties which United States companies pay foreign governments for oil produced abroad is deducted from gross income for tax purposes—dollar for dollar. In addition to the oil depletion allowance enjoyed by oil companies, this ruling makes it a fact that the oil companies have "struck it rich."

If the "equal taxation" policy is to be adopted, then it is necessary that we must enact proper amendments to the Internal Revenue Act—and to eliminate highly inequitable administrative rulings of the Internal Revenue Service.

SENATE—*Thursday, May 1, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Dr. George Othell Hand, pastor, the First Baptist Church, Columbus, Ga., offered the following prayer:

From a New England rope factory of colonial days has come a brief poem entitled "The Ropes of Gold":

"Our lives must be anchored with golden ropes,
Which give us purpose, meaning, hopes.
Know the ropes and you will be free,
To know them not means slavery.
What are these precious golden strands,
Holding freedoms unknown in other lands?
These, Friend, are the ropes of gold,
Which all our priceless treasures hold . . .

"To look ahead, at horizons far . . .
To look around, at a distant star . . .
To look upward, to the coming dawn . . .
To trust in God and carry on!"

Let us pray:

Eternal God, in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee—

"Thy glory which surrounds us,
Thy grace which sustains us."

For ourselves and our fellow men we ask for the enlightenment of divine direction.

In gratitude for the dedication of these distinguished statesmen, we simply ask that they may be daily endowed with responsible judgment in their resourceful pursuit of the common good for America and the world. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 29, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

PROPOSED GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 91–112)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States received on April 30, 1969, under the authority of the Senate of April 29, 1969, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the administration of Federal programs, one of the principal needs today is to improve the delivery systems: to ensure that the intended services actually reach the intended recipients, and that they do so in an efficient, economical and effective manner.

As grant-in-aid programs have proliferated, the problems of delivery have grown more acute. States, cities, and other recipients find themselves increasingly faced with a welter of overlapping programs, often involving multiple agencies and diverse criteria. This results in confusion at the local level, in the waste of time, energy and resources, and often in frustration of the intent of Congress.

As a major step toward improved administration of these programs, I urge