enemy to negotiate. The situation has never been exactly what it is today. The enemy has never tried to fight major simultaneous actions in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. He has never faced the problem of supply that now exists, with the port of Sihanoukville closed to him and the long overland routes from the North under heavy bombardment. He has never been as tired as he is today.

The enemy's extraordinary resourcefulness, stamina and recuperative powers are well established. But they are not limitless. The President's military advisers have convinced him that the limit has been reached, that the enemy is vulnerable and that his ability to continue a major war in South Vietnam can be crippled.

If this advice is wrong, the effect on domestic morale—and on Mr. Nixon's political future—will be devastating. If it is right, the timetable for orderly withdrawal will be measurably shortened.

Those who have been quick to condemn the offensive as a foregone failure should hold their fire. They might better spend the next six to eight weeks joining in the prayerful hope that, this time, they are wrong.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 1, 1970]

NIXON WARNS THE COMMUNIST WORLD

President Nixon has made an impressive defense of his decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia to destroy Communist bases and headquarters for their attack on South Vietnam.

Altho the decision seems to be militarily sound, it is also clearly loaded with danger. It runs the risk of unexpected and unpleasant reactions by North Vietnam, China and Russia.

Nevertheless, the President—and this may be the most important part of his address last night—served notice on the Communist world that America is not "a pitiful helpless giant" that will tolerate "humiliation and defeat" or will fail to "meet a direct challenge."

In this way Mr. Nixon was looking past Vietnam to other areas of danger, like the tinderbox Middle East and Berlin, and warning the Kremlin not to test us. He has concluded that a policy of firmness is better than appeasement in warding off collision between the two superpowers.

Historically, such a policy is often the best one, and we hope the Soviet Union gets the President's message, avoids miscalculation, and does not press on toward confrontation.

In Vietnam itself, the situation during the past weeks has grown even more perilous than the President said. White House officials disclosed that the North Vietnamese have been pushing out from their separate border sanctuaries in Cambodia, trying to link them up into an area of free movement, and attempting to connnect this zone with the South China Sea

If this strategic move had succeeded, the enemy could move unlimited supplies by sea from North Vietnam and China and, as Mr. Nixon said, "launch massive attacks on our forces and those of South Vietnam."

Mr. Nixon declared, and most people in this country will agree: "We will not alow American men by the thousands to be killed by an enemy from privileged sanctuaries."

The President's plans are that our soldiers will withdraw from Cambodia in six weeks to two months after destroying so much of the enemy's supplies that he will be set back for several months. During that time, Mr. Nixon hopes Hanoi will realize it cannot win militarily and that it will start serious peace negotiations.

The North Vietnamese, however, are a tenacious foe and withstood fearsome bombing. We fear that Hanoi will find some way out of its military predicament. One way would be to ignore the sanctuaries, march on Cambodia's capital of Pnom Penh, rout the weak government of Lon Nol, reinstall the leftist Prince Norodom Sihanouk in "power" and have him demand that we cease our "invasion" of "his" country.

We cite this bleak scenario only to point out that our military action in Cambodia may not, as the President said, shorten the war and get U.S. troops home quicker. We hope it does, but there are so many complications in sight that the public should not expect an easy or decisive victory.

Mr. Nixon is already coming under attack for "invading" Cambodia and "widening the war." These are specious charges. He sent troops into areas in Cambodia invaded by the North Vietnamese five years ago and occupied by them since then.

By using those areas as a staging ground for attack, it was Hanoi—not us—who made Cambodia part of the Vietnam War. And Cambodia is being attacked today only because its government had the outrageous nerve to ask the North Vietnamese to go home.

We don't know whether Mr. Nixon will succeed in eliminating Hanoi's invasion bases and saving the Cambodian government. But he is not wrong to try.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1970, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday, May 5, 1970, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, 1970, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REAL MEANING OF E-DAY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout our land last week, literally millions of Americans paused to learn more about the fragile web of ecology upon which our lives depend and many demonstrated their concern over the plight of the world whose continued existence is threatened by environmental pollution. The full ramifications of the event of Earth Day can probably never be measured accurately, but at least this much is certain: A large number of Americans seem determined to begin the long hard fight of changing our accustomed style of life because they are more concerned now about life than the suicidal path that our present consumer-oriented, throw-away economic structure is leading us down.

I am sure that many of those who participated in Earth-Day activities, and indeed many of those who did not partcipate but who watch sympathically, did not get the full impact of the message. I am sure that many think that cleaning up the environment is a simple matter of picking up litter, but most realize that the fight is a much more fundamental one. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, the founder and organizer of Earth Day, has rightfully said:

Putting a halt to the destruction of our environment is going to be as tough a challenge as this country has ever faced.

This same point is made eloquently by recent editorial in the Green Bay Press-Gazette. In order that it may be read by my colleagues in the Congress, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Apr. 19, 1970]

THE REAL MEANING OF E-DAY

The challenge of Earth Day next Wednesday, growing from the sponsorship of Wisconsin's Sen. Gaylord Nelson and Rep. Paul McCloskey of California is not merely to attend teach-ins and find out about the vast problems of pollution, over-population and the deteriorating quality of life throughout most of the world. It is to do something about the problems in the years ahead when the issue may not be especially popular or in the headlines. Dedication to finding solutions must weather the dull times.

The threats to the quality of life are many and varied. They also sometimes involve a paradox.

The automobile makes it simpler to get to employment and recreational areas but, at the same time, it spoils the atmosphere with air pollution that is a serious threat to health. Better nutrition, maternity care and improved health care in general make for better living. But they also mean that more children are conceived and more survive infancy and make demands upon our resources. Vast industries pay ample wages to millions but they pollute our air and streams. In seeking more sources of protein food in the oceans, we may be eventually destroying the source itself. The convenience of throw-away bottles and cans and the packaging of foods build up the trash heaps. The interstate highway system may reduce the dangers of driving—although this is doubtful—but it also leads to more cars, the possibilities of more accidents, and the ruination of land. These contradictory situations are not going to be easy to merge.

What we do have to come to accept is that more and more and bigger and bigger are no longer valid measurements of the nation's health or of the people that live here. A new car every year, another snowmobile or boat, a second color television set, are not in the long run the answers to the increased leisure time so many Americans are experiencing.

But decisions along these lines are bound to affect our economy. If we ever revert to the old New England standard of "make it do, do without," the Gross National Product will falter. We must re-evaluate our priorities. It won't be easy.

Ideologically, Americans differ emphatically with Communist societies. But our nation's values have come to be essentially material, which is what the Communists have

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

always charged. This we must change if life is to be worth living—or even livable.

As the executive director of the Environment Defense Fund, Roderick Cameron, puts it, "Being militant about environmental degradation does not indicate one's politics. It only indicates one's desire to survive."

"NEW CHALLENGE FOR BUSINESS LEADERSHIP" URGED BY AUGUSTINE MARUSI OF BORDEN, INC.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the condition of our environment is of great concern to many millions of citizens. The recent Earth Day programs, organized in large part by responsible young people on college and university campuses, served as a catalyst for demonstrating the extent and depth of this concern.

There is no question that American industry plays a pivotal role in questions of the environment. Its potential for contributing to a clean environment is just as great as its ability to befoul the world in which we live.

I am gratified that many business leaders in this country are seriously concerned about the environment. They recognize the problems, and they are aware of the role industry must play if these problems are to be solved. They likewise are willing to commit the time, talent and resources of their industries to creating and maintaining a clean world.

Augustine R. Marusi, chairman and president of Borden, Inc., is an able and articulate spokesman for the kind of enlightened industrial management that we find in this country today. In an address before the Washington Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America on April 21, he forthrightly discussed the role of business in answering environmental questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Marusi's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CHALLENGE FOR BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

(By Augustine R. Marusi)

As a people we have tended to run away, to put off, to ignore, to defend against, even to deny the existence of unpleasant issues.

In many ways, we, as a people, have painted ourselves into a corner.

Now there is no running away. Our problems are all too evident. And the mounting pressures of an unhappy society are keenly felt—in the Congress, in state capitals, in city halls, among student organizations, civic groups and consumer associations. And among astute businessmen too.

An increasing number of citizens are seeking answers rather than villains. This is refreshing and significant progress.

I've heard various spokesmen plead with business to drop its adversary approach in dealing with government. I agreed that someday, indeed, we all must do something about it.

I'm now convinced that a change in business attitudes towards government must be more than a pious, indefinite hope.

Business leaders must change in quite specific ways. That we have to change for business reasons as well as in the national interest, and that we had better start right now.

There have always been industrial statesmen who have worked closely with government on large, public issues, such as a national health policy, the future of education and the like.

There is tradition among many businessmen for carrying public leadership roles in local communities.

All of this is encouraging and laudable. But when business deals with government on business issues the picture tends to change.

When we talk of precise issues of manufacturing or trade practice . . . then we tend to withdraw well beyond arms length and send our lawyers and our trade associations in to do battle.

This kind of outdated behavior does a disservice to industry, to its legal counsel, to its public affairs efforts, and surely to its trade associations who are fully capable of playing a more creative and effective role.

We businessmen have led two lives: One for the broad public issues and quite another for gut questions that went to the heart of our businesses and their profitability.

That separation is no longer possible, if only because two of the large public issues of our time—consumerism and the quality of our environment—directly involve specific business practices and the day-to-day profitability of our enterprises.

How is business to cope with this charge?

First, and obviously, old procedures and old attitudes won't do.

We have the opportunity to form a new and constructive working relationship with government, the kind of relationship that has clearly eluded us in recent times.

Second, playing it safe is out of the question.

If business leaders surface only to defend threatened points here or litigate there, we forfeit any chance for leadership or serious participation in the change that is upon us all.

Collective action in the common good, with no particular concern for who gets the credit, should result in substantial improvement in the quality of life, in improved rapport between business and government, and in the human condition of all our people.

Enlarging the businessman's perspective about social issues and his role in them is not easy. He must somehow get involved in order to realize that national goals and corporate goals can be merged.

We in business are in trouble if we wait, like so many wallflowers, for someone to invite us to the next conference so we can resume a dialogue with government.

That is no dialogue at all. White House Conferences are not all that common, and not very long-lived. And the real work comes after the conference, when the television lights are turned off.

There is other machinery available to us, if we will use it to form a constant, less formal dialogue with government.

Our industry groups and our trade associations could play an even more creative role if we let them.

Trade associations have been defending, protecting and debating issues on a single industry basis. They have been alerting us to potential injury, and advising us in times of crisis. That has been their mission. It is the role we expected, indeed, demanded they play.

But now we must ask even more of them. The rules of our society have changed, and trade associations must help their members to respond on a multiple industry basis.

Tomorrow, for example, hundreds upon hundreds of earnest, intelligent young people across our fifty states will reflect in their demonstrations and seminars the growing public disgust for the way we—all of us—have fouled our air and our water, piled junk along our highways, and ignored the deterioration of our cities.

If "Earth Day" intensifies general concern and speeds action for effective environmental controls, for practical voluntary action, then it will have accomplished a great deal.

I for one applaud the effort. I think most industry leaders feel the same.

The majority of industrial firms, like Borden, are taking comprehensive environmental inventories to make absolutely certain that everything that can be done is being done to curb pollution.

Industry leaders have come to understand that pollution control is not a legal debate but rather a human crisis in which all of us are the victims.

We have also come to realize that multidisciplinary involvement of the professions and collective action are sorely needed if we are to ease this crisis.

One of the positive products of national unrest, in my view, is that a growing number of concerned citizens in every walk of life are now diligently seeking answers to common problems rather than villains to blame for past sins. That's very real progress.

It is progress that demands something new of us in terms of communications machinery to pull things together.

Perhaps executives of diverse trade organizations should be working together to assure that industry's response to common problems like environmental health is positive, constructive and cooperative.

The objective, as I see it, is to move industry and government closer together in a mutual effort to meet national needs.

The objective should not be to defend or debate the past, or to tell the world that we were really doing lots of great things to cure pollution back in the fifties, but no one knew about them. That sort of talk counts for nothing today.

In addition to a new and more imaginative role for trade associations, I think we need to invent additional ways to coordinate our efforts.

The new challenge for business is to erase the adversary atmosphere altogether and replace it with genuine dialogue and bold industry leadership in the common interest.

What we businessmen have come to understand is that the common interest is clearly the business interest as well.

Like it or not, all of us are working on the frontiers of human experience. We are working with products, materials and processes unknown before this time, and we are changing the human environment on a scale without precedent.

We are also discovering that the full effects of technological change are difficult to know or predict in advance.

Because science cannot keep up with technology, all of us in industry—chemicals, drugs, power, automobiles, space—cannot be absolutely sure of the consequences of new technologies and new products. I do not make this statement to put fear in your hearts, but simply to point up the facts of life, and to suggest some of the things I believe must be done.

Both regulatory agencies and citizen groups are finding that standard-setting has become a very complex business.

The level of what is safe or acceptable is constantly changing as our technology improves, as our laboratories find ways to isolate and identify problems that were unknown a few years ago, as our environment shows changes that no one could have anticipated.

This situation demands a degree of cooperation and communication between business and government that is without precedent.

There is going to have to be a much broader sharing of research among scientists in business, government and the universities.

Business will have to accept modification of products and processes in response to experience and evaluation.

Business must abandon a bygone certitude in the enduring safety of its products.

Businessmen must understand that the only safe course is coming out in the open, conceding that no one can have all the answers in this age, and joining the common search—indeed, leading the search for the most sensible action based on current knowledge.

Business should encourage the formation of strong independent standards and guidelines to help industry evaluate new products, processes, additives and ingredients before they enter the marketplace.

These standards should be developed in close cooperation with the appropriate government agencies. Here again is an opportunity for leadership by industry trade associations.

Only by having agreed upon standards—standards established by independent scientific authority—standards approved by business, government and consumer groups—will minimize adversary proceedings and speed new products to the marketplace.

It would be foolishness not to have industry and government working closely together with independent scientific authority and citizen groups to deal sensibly with the technological revolution and its consequences.

Whatever plans are actually formed, I have no question that business leadership is fully capable of offering a better alternative than closer, increasingly detailed government intervention in the American economy. Such intervention would not exist today if there had not been a void and a need.

There are sound business reasons for assuming leadership today. I am encouraged to see an increasing number of businessmen take up the challenge, willingly, enthusiastically, and without reservation.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for stepped-up efforts to improve our environment is a topic of nationwide interest and concern. People everywhere are committing themselves to programs of making the best long term use of our natural resources of air, water, and soil while providing our Nation continued opportunity to enjoy these resources in their work, in their homes, in the great outdoors in their time of relaxation.

Soil and water conservation districts throughout the Nation have been doing a fine job of preserving and improving the natural resources of soil and water. These conservation-minded citizens are actively working in programs designed to make the best use of their soil and water. They have been working for several years with measurable success in improving the quality of their environment, but they recognize much more needs to be done. While much discussion is currently heard regarding the need for environmental improvement, these hard-working citizens have already created monuments to their efforts in the form of retained precious top soil and cleaner, prettier streams.

Once each year during Soil Stewardship Week we are honored to pay tribute to these earnest, forward-looking individuals who contribute their money and manpower toward genuine environmental improvement. May 3–10 has been designated Soil Stewardship Week which is a time when we are all called upon to join with our clergy in their churches in giving special recognition to man's obligation as stewards of the soil and other natural resources. Some 3,000 soil and water conservation districts throughout the Nation will be observing this event in 1970.

I take this opportunity today to pay tribute to the hardworking men and women engaged in preserving, protecting, and using most wisely the natural resources given all of us and to call attention to this commemoration of a most noteworthy effort.

THINK IT THROUGH

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the "Notable and Quotable" column of the Wall Street Journal of April 27 had excerpts of an excellent speech of Lt. Gen. F. J. Clarke, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, entitled "Think It Through," which he delivered on March 1970, at the River and Harbor Congress, Washington, D.C. I was very much impressed by the general's statement which dealt with the relationship of man to nature and nature to man.

I have stated on numerous occasions that the Public Works Committee is basically concerned with environment and development. In the minds of some people these two areas are diametrically opposed. We know, however, that to provide the food, water, transportation, and economic well-being necessary for our growing population that development is necessary. We take as our approach that reasoned development is essential—development which considers environmental values in relationship with public need.

I recommend to your attention the entire statement which I am placing in the RECORD at this point:

THINK IT THROUGH

(By Lt. Gen. F. J. Clarke)

I want to use this occasion to urge that we all treat the very complex, very vital question of the relation of man to nature, and nature to man, with the respect it deserves. For it is not a proper subject for rabble-rousing techniques—for the quick angry retort, the sarcastic personal slur, the glib misuse of statements far detached from their contexts and too often from reality.

We are all here because we are concerned with the wise management of natural resources. We are all contributors to environmental problems—not one of us is in a position to cast the first stone. We all use, and add to the pollution of, the environment. And much of the pollution and exploitation done by others is done by them in the course of meeting our indirect demands. Because we know this, we are all searching for solutions to our environmental problems that are sound, viable, reliable. The situation calls for the best that is in us—the best of our thought and determination.

Today's renewed concern over the natural environment can be a tremendous force for good, but it could also, through its very power, cause tremendous harm if misdirected. The uncritical enthusiasms it generates make it fertile ground for the propagation of sweeping, off-the-cuff ideas which in the aggregate can be a serious handicap to the formation of sound resource-management policies.

Take, for example, the denunciation of hydroelectric plants and pumped storage as sources of power, because they involve dams and reservoirs. We are often told that it is criminal folly to build dams for power now that we have secured use of the energy in the atom. But atomic powerplants involve severe cooling problems, and create fears of radio-active wastes. And the generation of power in plants that burn coal and oil helps pollute the atmosphere. Now it is becoming apparent to some of the zealots that hydroelectric and pumped-storage plants have real merit as the cleanest, least environmentally disruptive sources of power. But how can they admit this, with the echoes of the Storm King and Colorado River controversies still ringing in the air? So, today we face the imminent possibility of brownouts on both the East and West coasts—largely because a great many people failed to think their proposals through.

In the same vein, urgently needed projects to provide water for municipal supply have been opposed and delayed by people who fiercely point out that we now can desalt the seas for the great coastal metropoli. How many of them have considered where the energy for the desalting is to come from? It can come only from hydrocarbon fuels, or from nuclear fuels. Our children may very well pay dearly for the failure of their parents to think this matter through.

A good many people—and I am one of them—believe that one long-range approach to the problems of our big cities is a greater dispersal of population into the less settled and less developed parts of the country. But we who hold this view should also realize its implications. These under-populated areas will need water-resource and other developments of considerable scope—the conversion of fields and prairies into townsites, with all that that implies—the dispersion of industry and commerce, and their supporting works and services, to provide jobs and sustenance for the dispersed population. When we have a population that is growing at the rate of a town of 7,500 every day—a city of 50,000 every week—a city of a quarter of a million every month—we must accept a continuing adaptation of the environment wherever those people may live. If we locate them in new areas, the adaptation may have to be more widespread but less intense than if they continue to crowd into the metropolises. I personally think it will be worth it. But those who simply, sweepingly demand an end to further public works in support of great cities, while simultaneously opposing public works developments outside the cities have not thought their proposals through. To accept their rationale would lead only to chaos and disaster.

Many proposals for flood-control reservoirs are opposed on the vague ground that now we have more modern and up-to-date methods of curbing floods. On examination, these new methods generally turn out to be either a reliance on groundcover vegetation, or a demand to stop the habitation and use of flood plains. But if you think it through, you will realize that vegetation never has prevented major floods. Great floods occurred before white men came, when the whole con-

tinent was under natural vegetation—the entire Mississippi Valley up beyond the mouth of the Ohio, for example, consists of the alluvial deposit from prehistoric floods. As for flood plain occupancy, we all advocate its regulation, and support programs for such regulation. But we also realize that any simplistic effort to move and keep people and cities out of our valleys would involve far more disruption of the natural environment than any number of storage works would—and we would still need the structures both to protect the facilities that would have to remain at the water's edge, and to serve the relocated community elements that would be separated from it. Meanwhile, wishful thinking instead of sound approaches continues to leave scores of communities exposed to flood disaster, with incalculable risk to human life and property damage. This is not conservation; it is what comes from not thinking things through.

Consider the question of outdoor recreation. A decade ago this subject was high in the public mind, and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was created to help form programs that could make it available to every American. It showed that outdoor recreation was heavily water-based recreation, and that among the most popular outdoor recreation facilities were lakes. We began hearing more of the doctrine of quality of recreation under which popular recreation at lakes is a low-quality, low-value type, while use of a primitive wilderness by a smaller elite group is a much higher type that deserves priority. Indeed there are some who say the general public derives its satisfaction from knowing that the wilderness is there, even though they are not able to see it. Very well; but where now does that leave us with respect to our goal of making outdoor recreation available to every family, for their health and enjoyment? It seems to me that somebody is not thinking things through. Meanwhile, in the midst of our great cities, children must continue to seek their recreation at overcrowded inadequate swimming pools and parks and playgrounds provided at enormous cost.

And so on and on. We find people denouncing papermills while consuming ever-increasing quantities of paper; driving their cars all over the country to berate the petroleum industry; burning electricity at meetings to upbraid the power industry; getting up in the morning, drinking a glass of Florida orange juice, and denouncing the conversion of swamplands into orchards. They keep demanding more and more uses of their natural resources while demanding that they be left untouched. And your political leaders and public agencies are put in the intolerable position of being asked to heed simultaneously the demands expressed by the public in meeting halls and indignation meetings on the one hand, and the largely contradictory demands made by that same public in the market-place and the employment bureau and the obstetrical ward on the other hand—because too many of our people have not considered the full implications of the courses they endorse.

We should, indeed, we must, take measures to correct abuses of the natural environment and to improve it as we can. But they must be sound measures that are the products of thought and serious study based on reliable facts and forecasts. And they must be measures that are valid for the whole community—not just one group or segment of it.

The government's basic policy document in the water resource field is Senate Document 97. The key sentence in that document reads: "Well-being of *all* the people shall be the overriding determinant in considering the best use of water and related land resources." And the next following paragraph begins: "*All* viewpoints . . . shall be fully considered and taken into account in planning resource use and development."

In both these fundamental statements, note the use of the word "all." It means that national well-being is not anybody's special cause, not any one ideal or purpose or benefit. I think that most people concerned with conservation and the environment are sincerely concerned with the "well-being of all the people." But there are nevertheless a great many different conceptions among them as to what such well-being should consist of. I don't think anyone's views can really claim to be definitive. Yet all should have some weight in the application of the democratic process. Senate Document 97 does not attach any qualifications to its use of the word "all." So we of the agencies who must apply the policies enunciated in that document must do our best to hear and consider *all* views. This too is part of "thinking it through."

Careful, comprehensive thinking is more than a way of avoiding harmful mistakes; it's the only real way to success in finding solutions to our resource problems. It has been a conspicuous feature of the solution of similar problems in the past.

The best example is probably the conservation movement itself. Gifford Pinchot has told us, in his book "Breaking New Ground," how in 1907, he and his associates in Theodore Roosevelt's circle—were struggling with a multiplicity of confusing, conflicting resource problems, just as we are doing today. Gradually they hammered out the unifying concept that enabled them to deal with all problems at once—as we seek to do today with our comprehensive river-basin plans. As their concept took shape, these Founding Fathers of the Conservation movement found that—and I am now quoting from the book—

". . . Here were no longer a lot of different, independent, and often antagonistic questions each on its own separate little island, as we had been in the habit of thinking. In place of them, here was one single question with many parts. Seen in this new light, all these separate questions fitted into and made up the one great central problem of the use of earth for the good of man. . . .

"But, you may say, hadn't plenty of people before that day seen the value of forestry, of irrigation, of developing our streams, and much besides? Hadn't plenty pointed out the threat of erosion, the shame and pity of the destruction of wild life, and the reasons against vandalism of many kinds? . . .

"Certainly they had. But . . . it had occurred to nobody . . . that here was one question instead of many, one gigantic single problem that must be solved . . . When the use of all the natural resources for the general good is seen to be a common policy with a common purpose, the chance for the wise use of each of them becomes infinitely greater than it had ever been before."

End of quote. There's much more in the same vein, all pointing out the lesson to think broadly, in comprehensive terms about comprehensive plans in which all water-related problems are considered together.

The law-books of the 1890's are full of attempts to deal with resource problems on a piece-meal basis. Some of them were good laws that we are still applying. But not until Pinchot and the others thought their problems through to the basic essentials could the Nation finally obtain a workable grasp of those problems. This could be the most important lesson of all from those days.

I could cite other examples. For generations, floods were considered acts of God, and it was up to each household or community to protect itself as best it could. Up to 1890 our rivers-and-harbors appropriation acts specifically forbade the construction of levees or other works to prevent injury to lands or private properties by overflows, unless such levees were also needed for navigation. But gradually people got to thinking through their flood problems. They realized that denunciation, prohibition, and dynamiting one anothers' levees was no solution to anything. After much trying and hassling and several great disasters, they finally came to realize the necessity for cooperation on practical, realistic valley-wide action programs.

So in our time too our environmental problems will be solved, and sound policies and practices devised, only as we find in ourselves the patience and workmanship and mutual goodwill to think through in terms—to quote McGee—of "the use of natural resources for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time."

Can we find such solutions? Of course we can, if we don't knock each others' heads off arguing about it. The Corps of Engineers is absolutely convinced of, and thoroughly committed to, the belief that we can meet the colossal material needs of our exponentially expanding society, and also conserve and even improve our natural environment, both together and both at once, provided—and this is crucial—that neither the material nor the intangible interest is allowed to annihilate the other. They've got to work together, otherwise both will suffer; and if it comes to a crunch, it is the intangible interest that will suffer first and worst. That is why the Corps of Engineers, which has been grappling that the best way to secure reliable protection of the intangible values, is to incorporate such protection into plans that will also make adequate provision for the material needs of future generations. As Theodore Roosevelt said, "Conservation means development as much as it does protection."

Your government agencies have been responsive to the aspirations and wishes of each generation, each in its turn. By and large, I think they have served you well. Today we still stand ready to serve the people in the ways that they may choose. We can today, as always, help you plan developments that will serve both your material needs and your non-material wishes—provided you do not ask us to do the one at the expense or disregard of the other; for we must serve *all* the people. And is not this what you really want? Think it through.

We of the Government are public servants, and we don't want to be anything else. Especially we of the Army. All aspects of the military in our community are directed by civilian authority, and this applies in civil works as in other fields. We can provide expertise; we offer our experience and training and ingenuity in helping devise solutions to problems. We can, in our role of expert consultants, point out things we see that a layman might overlook. But to use us best, you must function as one community, with some unity and some consensus. Groups cannot come to us in fragments, each one demanding that we heed it alone. They cannot come to us with half-thought-out proposals and expect us to add our expert endorsement to them; we would not be good advisors or consultants if we did not exercise professional integrity.

In times of community disunity and strife, each turns his hand against his neighbor, and those who seek to serve all are denounced by all. But such are not the time, and this is not the way, to promote the well-being of *all* the people. *This* is the cause to which the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Government are devoted. And so, I believe, are all of you. Think it through.

RETIREMENT OF DR. J. ELMER O'BRIEN, ERIE, PA.

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Dr. J. Elmer O'Brien, of Erie, Pa., retired last

year after 50 years of service. A graduate of Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia, Dr. O'Brien served his internship at St. Vincent's Hospital in Erie.

The Erie Daily Times recently published a story in which Dr. O'Brien looked back over his 50 years as a practicing physician. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

RETIRING DR. O'BRIEN LOOKS BACK OVER 50 YEARS OF WORK, CHANGE

(By Kathy Nikolishen)

"If you want to be wealthy, don't study medicine."

This warning, written about 50 years ago, is not all that's changed since Dr. J. Elmer O'Brien began practicing medicine in Erie after World War I.

Many diseases have been all but eliminated: Tetanus, whooping cough ("That was the greatest cause of death in children under one those days"), polio, scarlet fever and diphtheria ("Interns today have never seen these diseases"), and measles.

Tuberculosis has practically disappeared. "Perhaps this is due to better sanitation and more general health care."

New drugs have been developed: Insulin, sulfa, penicillin, tetracycline. "These have saved a great many lives."

Women had their babies at home then. "It's amazing how few complications we had in home deliveries."

In those days, a woman paid a visiting nurse $5 to assist the doctor with the delivery, they would bring the money from the sugar bowl."

"One woman paid me in gold," the doctor recalled recently.

Dr. O'Brien, a surgeon, began his medical practice as most doctors did—as a general practitioner.

"There were no residencies then," he said. "A doctor received training in his special field after he began practicing."

An older doctor, a "preceptor," trained younger doctors in special fields.

After being graduated from Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, in April 1920, Dr. O'Brien served his internship at St. Vincent Hospital, Erie, from 1920 to 1921. "For this, I received the huge sum of $35 per month," he chuckled.

Medical school tuition was $100 to $200 per year then. This compared to the $2,500 or more it costs today.

Living expenses too were minimal: $3.25 a week for 21 meals and $3 a week for a room. A good suit cost between $25 and $30, he recalled.

In order to come home for Christmas, Dr. O'Brien said he worked in the Philadelphia Post Office until Christmas eve, got on a train and arrived home for the holiday. The round-trip ticket cost $50.

To pay his tuition for a year, he would work summers.

There was no medical insurance when Dr. O'Brien first began practicing. People paid cash—beds ran from $3 in a ward to $8 in private rooms.

During the Depression years, the doctor said he performed as many as 100 free operations per month.

Dr. O'Brien lists two most memorable events in his career: admission to the American College of Surgeons, Oct. 1936, and service as chief of surgery at St. Vincent Hospital, 1935 to 1939.

To be admitted to the American College of Surgeons, Dr. O'Brien had to be accepted by local members and, later, submit a written report of 100 surgical operations he had performed.

Until his retirement last year, the Erie doctor had served for 35 years as chief of the medical department at St. Joseph's Home.

Dr. Joseph Silliman, also a Jefferson graduate, was Erie's "last horse and buggy doctor," Dr. O'Brien recalled. "He hitched his horse at a post in front of St. Vincent Hospital."

Among the other older doctors, "Chiefs . . . well thought of," he recalled were: Roth, Bell, McCallum, Lick, Hess, Eastman, Treadway, Walsh, Schilling, McCarthy, Goldman, Schlindwein, Washabaugh, Luke and Gannon.

Now, after 50 years in medicine, Dr. J. Elmer O'Brien is retiring.

"I used to see 20 to 50 people in this office each day," he said, "now, they're suddenly taken away . . ."

The office he plans to close is located in his home at 302 E. 10th St. "This house is 150 years old. My father was born here . . . I was born here," he said looking around.

Dr. O'Brien plans to attend his 50th class reunion at Jefferson April 29. "Of 150 graduates, 70 are living," he reported.

Total retirement? Dr. O'Brien says, "Yes." But, we wonder, is that possible for one so involved, so practiced, so young after only 50 years?

CAMBODIA RESOLUTION

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution that would forbid the President from sending U.S. troops into Cambodia. I cannot find the words to express my outrage that the President would commit American personnel into Cambodia, without the formal consent of the Congress. Indeed, Congress was not even informed of this decision. As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I was not even informed that such preparations were being considered, much less implemented.

President Nixon's actions have the all-too-familiar ring of our past rationales for escalation. Instead of shortening conflicts and bringing our troops home, the result has always been to drag the United States further into the Vietnam "quagmire."

I have on other occasions pointed out that in the Nixon "Vietnamization" plan, there seems to be the assumption that a large U.S. support force—advisers, logistics, and air support—would be required even when our ground combat troops come home. I have taken a strong position against this view. I feel that our troops—all our troops—should be withdrawn on an orderly and fixed schedule. The events yesterday have adequately demonstrated the risks of a large U.S. advisory force—continued manpower and material commitment on an ever-expanding geographic scale.

We must get out of this quagmire now. I hope this House will act quickly on this legislation. The American people have suffered for too long a time the privation caused by this Southeast Asian conflict. It is time that the elected representatives of the American people—those closest to the electorate—are asked to approve or disapprove this far-reaching decision.

"TERRACIDE"

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Nation last week discussed many vital questions involving our environment during Earth Day. It is fitting that this effort to enlarge our knowledge of the planet on which we live should occur shortly after the publication of a book dealing with the threats to the earth.

The book, fittingly, is called "Terracide." It should be of interest to my colleagues that the author is Ron M. Linton, former staff director of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, and later chairman of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems.

Already, the book has received broad attention. In a letter to Little, Brown & Co., publishers of "Terracide," the eminent environmental scientist, Dr. Rene Dubos of Rockefeller University in New York City, wrote:

For thousands of years, nature had the ability to absorb the environmental insults of the human population. Those who believe that nature will continue to be able to do so will be brought to their senses by Ron M. Linton's *Terracide*. This book shows in lucid and simple language that the ecologic crisis will reach its acute phase within our lifetime, and that action should be taken now if we want the earth to be still a suitable place for human life by the year 2000.

To give Senators a flavor of the book, I ask unanimous consent that two excerpts from "Terracide" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(P. 33 . . . chapter title "Life in a Crowd"). . . . Man suffers indirect as well as direct results from polluting living space with excess population. Too many people living inappropriately in a given space produce social pathology. Too many people coming into contact inappropriately within a given space produces a health pathology. Likewise, too many people using a space inappropriately produces an economic pathology that results in the degradation of the other resources or habitats of man: air, water, and soil. The concentration of man in an urban area requires an increasing degree of economic activity.

The industrialization process requires the generation of power. The power produced has a side effect of dispensing into air the effluence from the combustion of fuel used to produce the power. Thus the more people that jam into a space, the more power required; the more power required, the more effluence is spewed into the air, polluting it and harming the health of the people living in the area.

The same thing can be said of the use of the water resources in an area. People consume, in the consuming there is waste and the waste must be disposed of. We dispose of liquid wastes by discharging them into surrounding bodies of water. Even with advanced treatment methods now available to society, the volume of effluence being discharged into the waters surrounding limited geographical areas is such as to lower the quality of that water for any future use.

A third problem caused by crowding is the disposal of solid wastes; wastes which cannot be carried away by water or be burned and discharged as an effluence into the air. As the number of people in an area multiplies, the waste of this nature increases. And as it increases, its disposal must be handled in one of several not always satisfactory ways: either by landfill in existing water areas (which reduces the amount of water available and increases the amount of land upon which people can settle, further increasing the density or population growth); by burial (which can increase the nitrogen and phosphate compounds in the soil and thus change the nature of the soil and its runoff into waters, further aggravating water pollution); or by piling it up in composts (further reducing the amount of space available to people already crowded).

Our cities are great cities. The incidence of disease is low, and the standard of living is the highest in history. Culture and commerce bloom in the cities. They provide unprecedented opportunities for education and entertainment; millions find they offer new ways of life, far more attractive than the ones from which they escaped. Certainly the city has problems. Its economic problems are enormous and its harsh and often confusing physical environment aggravates social and personal problems. Much of this is from the stress imposed by the city; it's the noise and polluted air, the rush and the push, the irritations that go beyond the limits of comfort or even of tolerance. But the problems of the physical environment of the cities can be controlled.

Technology can be used to affect pollution of air, water and land. Technology and public policy combined can affect the pollution of space and bring about relief from the stresses imposed by the crowding and congestion of the city.

It will be difficult to define when and where over-population exists. It will also be difficult to develop and implement a rational plan of population and space control. But over-population must be adjusted by relating the use of space to human needs. If this is done, rush-hour driving in the morning, and rush-hour driving in the evening, which now result in long lines of cars bumper-to-bumper, may possibly be eliminated. If this is done perhaps the freeways, now the major means of egress from downtown to the suburban areas, may be able to move cars at generally planned paces. Even auto lines may then be able to move at fifty to sixty miles an hour, with movement in and out of lanes and the proximities of one car to another automatically controlled so as not to leave the driver extremely tense, angry, and frustrated.

Maybe in the city which provides the proper relationship between man and space, public transportation will be on time and there will be enough clean and comfortable room to eliminate the frustrations which now accompany riding public transit systems. Maybe uncongested city office buildings can be designed to reduce the tension of waiting for elevators and jamming into them and fighting out of them. Maybe then it will also be possible to be waited on in a store or restaurant without the pressure of "hurry, the next person's waiting."

In the city which provides for the control of space pollution, maybe the houses will be built, the streets laid out, parks created and commerce and industry conducted with concern for the effects of demographic intensity.

Maybe the lakes will then be worth living beside.

(P. 332 . . . chapter title "The Challenge") . . . Man can avoid a tomorrow of environmental crises. He will have to work at it, for it is easy to accept the conditions we live in as an inevitable concomitant of life. That is what we are doing now. We live with air and water pollution; we tolerate increasing annoyance from noise; with a slight murmur we suffer crowding and congestion; we hardly pay any attention to a host of other environmental abuses that can injure man mentally and physically. We learn little from our past. We do those things that are easiest, and it is easy to ignore environmental pollution. Most Americans have to be reminded continually that there is something wrong with their environment. It's not every day that we come into contact with water pollution. We are not continuously aware of air pollution. Some of the more subtle forms of environmental contamination escape easy detection. The food we eat, the water we drink, the household products which we use most often never appear to be related to problems of health or injury that occur. No one seems to be dying from an attack of the environment. Nor do most people associate any disease with it. If man doesn't like his environment, at least he lives with it. But is no one dying?

Certainly man adapts. This history has proved. He emerged in greater numbers than ever before after more than a century of being scourged by infectious disease. The death rate used to be atrocious, but it was ascribed to the disease and not to the environmental conditions that bred the disease. Death today is even less closely related to the environmental conditions that breed disease. Is no one dying? It only seems that way.

What about the future? It appears now that man is creating more environmental problems for himself than he will be able to solve. But he doesn't have to. He doesn't have to adapt and die in the process.

The challenge to man will not be whether he knows what to do but whether he is able to do what he knows must be done. And before anything he does has any real effect on the quality of air and water or the proper handling of waste, he will have to commit himself to three things:

Establishment of a population policy.

Creation of new towns with built-in standards and safeguards against environmental deterioration.

Spending of substantial public funds to rectify the deterioration that has taken place in our major urban areas.

Imposing a population policy does not mean limiting the number of children any married couple may have; certainly American attitudes will not accept this kind of governmental regulation, nor would they accept limitations on where individuals could live; the idea that we can establish arbitrary population limits for communities is ludicrous. But certainly population policy must include making family planning information and services available to all Americans. It also means providing options so that those who prefer rural or small-town life will not be forced to tear up roots and move to large urban centers.

A population policy will have to build upon the knowledge of what effect varying levels of density and congregation have upon the physical and social environment; based on this knowledge, there could be incentives for dispersal and alternatives to the current urban centers including the redesigning of these centers. Such information is not now available.

New towns must be established so that those who prefer the modern and the planned community can choose that alternative. But new towns must be managed so that those at every economic level can select that option if they so desire.

Existing urban centers cannot be abandoned in a fit of hopefulness, nor should they be left as rotten boroughs for the poor alone to wallow in. City centers in particular must be restored to satisfactory living levels. This will cost much, but the failure to do this will be far costlier in terms of human conflict and despair.

The new towns, the population policy, the massive spending for corrective purposes—all must be followed by a determined government effort at federal, state and local levels to set standards and enforce them so that environmental improvements will not subsequently be broken down.

In making the decision to do these three things we will have to accept the fact that subsidies and financial advantage to private industry are a cost of the political systems we have, which must be paid if we are to improve our present condition. Such subsidies are not new; they are rooted in our history. But in spending this money, we shall have to place in proper perspective the use of tools with fancy labels such as cost-benefit ratio, systems analysis, and program planning and budgeting. These are the technician's tools. These tools can tell us what, from a technical standpoint, can or cannot be done. They can tell how much it costs to do it. But they can only guess at the value of alternatives, because the environment is of importance only as it relates to people. Dealing with the wants and desires of peoples is subjective.

We will also have to destroy the national security mystique that causes us to siphon off the vast majority of the federal budget to perpetuate economic waste in the guise of national defense. It's easier politically to spend money in the interest of protecting the American people from death and destruction at the hands of some human enemy outside our national boundaries than for those goals just outlined. How hollow indeed will be the success of that spending when death and destruction within our boundaries at our own hands leave little worthwhile to be defended. The American people had better come to understand that our national security is threatened rather by a failure to provide the social and physical environment necessary to maintain a strong, growing, independent and thinking population.

THE PLIGHT OF PRIVATE COLLEGES

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, many of the Nation's private colleges are in serious financial trouble. Some will find it necessary to close unless the Federal Government helps keep them open. It will be less expensive in the long run to do so than it would be to build new facilities and faculties for the students they now serve.

There are three ways in which a private college can obtain money. The first way is to raise tuition. Tuition is already so high that this is no longer a realistic option if the college hopes to attract a broadly representative student body. The second way is to seek greater contributions. Private contributions to private colleges have consistently increased, but not nearly at the rate necessary to keep pace with rising costs. The third way is to obtain increased funds from the State and Federal levels. In some instances, such public support has become the last hope of saving these colleges .

On March 24, 1970, I introduced the "Higher Education General Assistance Act of 1970" (H.R. 16622) which would provide needed assistance to public and private institutions of higher learning in such a way that will not disadvantage the

small institution. Since most of the private institutions are relatively small, this bill would give many of our private institutions the shot in the arm they so desperately need. We read occasionally in our newspapers about the plight of the private college. But it is often hard to get specific information on just how bad off they are. The Special Subcommittee on Education is in the midst of hearings on proposed higher education legislation. We have heard and will continue to hear testimony from representatives of private institutions.

Knowing of my interest in learning more about the needs of private institutions, Dr. Frederick W. Ness, president of the Association of American Colleges, forwarded a few letters he has received from private colleges outlining their financial needs. Because I feel all Members of Congress should be well informed about the needs of private colleges, I insert in the RECORD nine letters forwarded to me by Dr. Ness.

Following them, I insert some of the letters which I have received in response to H.R. 16622 from leading educators of private higher education in my own State of Minnesota:

AQUINAS COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Mich., January 23, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: As I promised you in Houston earlier this month, I now send you this letter to set out clearly and concisely the precarious financial condition in which my college finds itself.

During the current academic year of 1969–1970 Aquinas College has an enrollment of 1015 regular full-time resident and commuter students. In addition, in the course of the year, we have 940 part-time students, most of them in such community-oriented programs as Career Action (a degree completion program for young adults in business), Encore (a degree completion program for housewives), and DCPV, our special program for Vietnam War veterans. Our total count of full-time equivalent students is over 1400.

During the fiscal year (July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970) our operating deficit is $432,599. Meanwhile our capital indebtedness is $1,230,679.72. Our cash endowment is $8,492. The only way in which we can survive is through the so-called "contributed services" of the thirty-five members of the faculty who are Dominican Sisters of Grand Rapids and through a line of credit from the motherhouse of that community. Clearly, Dr. Ness, the religious community cannot possibly carry our kind of deficit for very long: the Grand Rapids Dominicans have no sources of income outside the earning capacity of their 800 or so sister-members, almost all of whom are grade and high school teachers in this area and work for compensation far below that of lay teachers. This is a case of the underpaid subsidizing the destitute.

You said in your presidential address at Houston that you and your staff are planning to go on retreat in March to take stock of the future of the AAC and its headquarters functions. Please accept this letter as evidence of the desperate situation in which my kind of college stands. We need help. We need your help to plead our case to the Congress and the foundations. We need the help now. (If a higher budget through increased Association dues is the needed element, I for one am more than willing to make this investment.)

We want to work within the framework of your organization, but one way or the other we must have results soon, or we shall perish. Our record of service does not warrant that fate!

Sincerely yours,

NORBERT J. HRUBY,
President.

JANUARY 28, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: Norbert Hruby of Acquinas College forwarded a copy of his recent letter to you to Sister Burke, and she has asked me to respond in terms of the situation at Barat.

This college's position would not appear so precarious as that of Acquinas, though we certainly have cause for concern. This current year, with a combined institutional budget of just under $2 million, we are running a deficit of some $170,000. This is the first year in which we are in this position. The deficit will be met out of our endowment of under $500,000, a step which, quite obviously, we can take only once or twice more. A good part of the current deficit is attributable to the implementation of far-reaching curricular reforms this year, and we are still hopeful that part of it will be met by a foundation grant this spring. Much of the remainder is attributable to cut-backs in federal funds; Barat is very heavily committed to the education of low-income and minority-group students, and has, therefore, been especially hard hit by reduced federal allocations.

In the years immediately ahead, we hope to meet our financial situation in a number of ways. Tuition will be raised (again), and enrollment will be increased. Over the long run, however, I doubt Barat and similar colleges can continue to operate without increased monies from federal and state sources. This will particularly be the case with colleges such as Barat which have the ability and inclination to re-do curricular structures and innovate with more individual and participative approaches to the higher learning. Almost any of the recommended changes and innovations so frequently called for today (for example, by the Office of Education's own recent internal staff study) have a dollar tag on them, a tag most often beyond the ability of the private liberal arts college.

For years, I know, a couple of things have been said of the private liberal arts college: that financially it was in trouble and that ideologically it had lost its way. The irony of the present situation is that the second part of the statement is no longer the case just as the first part has actually become the case. A great many of these colleges now do clearly see their role, namely that of fashioning newer, innovative, and more responsive modes of higher education. The backlog of needed reform is there, so is the research and access to the experience of others, and most of these colleges can move quickly and effectively to demonstrate what can be done. The fact most of them face, however, is that the *status quo*, for all its faults, is really the most economical and easy to administer of all possible modes of providing a degree. Change—be it independent study in place of large lecture sections, individual program planning to replace requirements, new systems of faculty feedback to replace grades, or special course modules to provide a more meaningful freshman experience—costs money. Several of the colleges I know which are in financial difficulty are there as the result of attempts to mount more ambitious and innovative programs.

You will remember the *Fortune* article of a couple of years ago on the financial status (plight) of the independent college. At that time, there was a good deal of head-nodding and feeling that it was the other guy's problem. No more. I think I know the situation in Illinois fairly well, and the consensus is that the financial problem has really arrived this year. Institutional deficits of from $50,000 to $450,000 are known to me, and in most of the cases at institutions with minimal reserves. Enrollments are levelling off and not infrequently declining; applications at a majority of Illinois colleges are down, both in numbers and quality. The aggressive growth of public higher education in the state (and elsewhere) is often cited as a cause; the state system has the added effect of constraining tuition at unrealistic levels, lest differential costs move too far apart. I could, were I at liberty to do so, cite a good number of examples on both the budgetary and enrollment score.

Having worked at the American Council myself, I have no illusions that national organizations will be in a position to save individual colleges. Nor do I have any immediate expectation of federal help in a financial sense. But one or two things might be considered by AAC. For one, there exists incomplete public realization of the worth and immediate difficulty of the independent college; the situation could stand dramatization at this point. On another score, the relationship between public and private in state systems needs explication. In Illinois, for one, the state board often acts as though private colleges did not exist; in its defense no one seems to be very clear what relationship there should be. Assuming some relational definition were developed it would be possible for a concerned federal government to put some teeth into it. USOE has so many "hooks" into the conduct of state boards that one new one could easily be entered as a condition for aid: manifest concern for private higher education in the state. For example, a state plan designed with reference to the status and health of public *and private* institutions might be demanded, plus yearly, publically issued updates of same, or reports to the Commissioner and/or the state legislature on recommended steps to assure well being in all sectors.

I hope these few suggestions prove helpful. Feel free to call upon me for any additional information which may be of help to the Association.

Sincerely,

THEODORE J. MARCHESE,
Director of Planning & Program Development.

LUTHER COLLEGE,
Decorah, Iowa, January 27, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: It becomes increasingly obvious that private higher education is in serious financial difficulty. Over a period of years we have sought to improve the efficiency of this college and believed we had achieved the maximum efficiency in terms of administration and campus services so that we were able to operate in the black for a period of two years and present a balanced budget for this current year. However, so many unforeseen financial obligations have developed that we are now facing the possibility of a $100,000 deficit and at the present time we are trying to determine how we may reduce a proposed $370,000 deficit for 1970–71. Certainly we cannot operate by deficit budgeting as we have no source to pick up the deficit. I was pleased that Clark Kerr had stated his opinion that there must be a change in public policy toward tuition at public institutions as I believe that institutional charges to the student must more closely approximate the current operating costs of the institution and that public funds must then provide financial aid for the economically disadvantaged students to equalize the opportunity to share in higher education. I would hope that the Association would move in this direction. We must have a dependable long-range Federal policy if we are to do the kind of financial

and educational planning which is essential to higher education.

I appreciate the concerns you have expressed and wish you to know that you have our support. After having spent most of my life in public higher education, I am pleased to serve a private undergraduate college and believe that this two-tract system is vital to the quality of higher education in the U.S.

Sincerely,

E. D. FAEWELL,
President.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE,
Racine, Wis., January 28, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: I would like to take this opportunity to go on record in support of the philosophy and ideas proposed to you by Dr. Norbert J. Hruby, President of Aquinas College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. As President of Dominican College, Racine, Wisconsin, I voice a loud second to all of Dr. Hruby's remarks. Although our college is only half as large as Aquinas, we find ourselves in an identical picture.

Currently the Sisters of St. Dominic located in Racine, Wisconsin contribute $271,000 in teaching services. Even with these contributed services, our deficit for the current academic year will be approximately $250,000. With increased costs, we are forced to raise tuition and our room and board charges. Due to the tremendous tax subsidization of the state university and college system in Wisconsin, it is difficult for us to compete unless we cater our services to only the wealthy, or subsidize students through scholarship aid from our own operating budget.

As a Protestant president of a Catholic college, I view the financial situation of Dominican College on the basis of a continuation of the private sector of higher education. If we are to believe in the free enterprise system, and in freedom, we must also believe in a freedom of choice. If private colleges and universities are forced out of existence by the tremendous tax subsidization and inequality of competition, then the possibilities of freedom to choose a private education will disappear. I am positive that the case for Dominican College and Aquinas College are not the exception to the rule, but the rule that will be found in much of private education today. Your assistance in your office as President of the Association of American Colleges will be truly appreciated.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. STEVENS.

MARYGROVE COLLEGE,
Detroit, Mich., January 28, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: Dr. Norbert Hruby of Aquinas College has suggested that I write you regarding the financial problems of our College and urge you to use the resources of the AAC to plead our case before Congress and other groups that can help us to survive.

Marygrove's situation is not unlike Dr. Hruby's own institution. The I.H.M. Order last year turned over control of the College to a lay board of trustees, whose first action was to appoint me as president. I accepted the position knowing full well the magnitude of the job that confronts any private college today and in particular private women's colleges.

For the first time in the sixty-year history of Marygrove College, there is an operating deficit. In a budget that totals $2,500,000, the deficit amounts to $300,000. Since the College is establishing a much-needed retirement program with the usual fringe benefits, effective July, 1970, the prospect for the 1970–71 budget is another staggering deficit of better than $300,000 in a budget of approximately $2,750,000. Our endowment is for the most part restricted and amounts to slightly over $2,000,000. Annual gifts and income from investments amount to a little over $100,000 with the prospect of a gradual increase in alumnae giving and a sharp decrease in investment returns as stocks and bonds are liquidated to offset the annual operating deficit.

The handwriting is clearly on the wall unless new sources of income are found to supplement the income from tuition and fees, which is increasing every year only because tuition is being raised. In 1962, Marygrove charged $600 for tuition; in 1970, it will charge $1,200, and annual increases are planned during the next three or four years. Seventy-five percent of our freshman class this year are receiving some kind of financial aid. Overall, one out of two students at the College is receiving help. Rapid increases in tuition can cut us off from the kind of students that we are most desirous of serving; in any case they necessitate substantial increases in financial aid to our students.

Like Aquinas College, Marygrove is able to function because the contributed services of some seventy members of the I.H.M. Community amount to nearly twenty-five percent of the total budget. Since the Motherhouse no longer has any control over the affairs of the College, there is no possibility of establishing a line of credit there, and besides the College wishes to maintain its independence from the religious authorities both academically and financially.

I know that you need no convincing about the importance of preserving our dual system of higher education and of giving our young people freedom of choice. The time is past, however, when individual institutions can fight alone to maintain this privilege; your support is needed and now.

Marygrove's dues to the Association were mailed yesterday. Best of luck to you in your new position. It must seem a far cry from Long Island and Hofstra.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR W. BROWN.

MOUNT SAINT MARY COLLEGE,
Emmitsburg, Md., January 30, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: I have just returned from a four weeks begging tour throughout the country on behalf of Mount Saint Mary's College and find a letter from Dr. Hruby, President of Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, explaining the financial plight of his college. Dr. Hruby also enclosed a xerox copy of a letter he addressed to you under date of January 23rd.

I can say that the financial conditions existing at Aquinas College are the same as those at Mount Saint Mary's. Mount Saint Mary's is a private independent liberal arts college. It received its charter from the State Legislature in 1829. Mount Saint Mary's is not owned, operated or financed by the Catholic Church. It receives no financial assistance from the Archdiocese of Baltimore. It depends solely for its income from gifts, from alumni, friends and the income from a modest endowment ($26,712.00 for 1968–69). Mount Saint Mary's receives no aid from the State of Maryland. Our deficit at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1969, was $454,607.00. We raised our fees $300 for 1969–70. In making out our budget for 1970–71 we were forced to again increase our fees to $180 per student. We simply cannot continue increasing our fees for we would be pricing ourselves out of business. The only solution is Federal assistance.

During the current fiscal year July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970, our capital indebtedness is $1,443,607.00.

Of the 80 members of our faculty 22 are clergymen whose contributed services amount to $75,522.00.

One of the particular difficulties private colleges are now having, especially in this area, is that sources primarily approached by private colleges are now being deluged with requests for financial assistance from the State Community Colleges whose budgets have been drastically cut.

Sincerely and cordially,

Rt. Rev. HUGH J. PHILLIPS,
President.

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE,
Winona, Minn., January 30, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: Like you, I am a new president; I was installed as the 10th president of Saint Mary's College in October. Prior to my present position, I taught biology and chaired the Department of Biology here for several years.

My new job has made me acutely aware of the real survival threats that plague most small private colleges like Saint Mary's. We have a present enrollment of approximately 1,000 but are planning to increase that to 1,500 in the next few years, since that is a far more realistic break-even figure economically speaking. We have approximately 7,000 degreed alumni, the majority being graduates of the past 20 years. Since both the college and most of its alumni are rather young, alumni support has always remained "modest"; it has nevertheless, been one of the important means of partially covering our operational deficits each year.

In past years, the cost of operating Saint Mary's College has been somewhat set off by the contributed services of the Christian Brothers who administer and partially staff the school. In 1967–68, services contributed by the religious and clerical staff amounted to $242,000.00. Because of the rise in the cost of living for that staff and their decrease in numbers, their contributed services in 1968–69 amounted to $215,000. It is estimated that the value of their contribution this year will be $175,000.00.

In 1968–69, the college's net operational deficit was $162,100.00. The same operational deficit estimated for this year is $402,500, and for 1970–71, $350,000.00. The reason for the smaller projected deficit next year is the $200 rise in tuition which will be effective next year. But obviously, even that tuition increase will not solve the financial problems facing our college—any more than it has solved the problems of countless colleges like ours. Therefore, we have within the past four months announced an ambitious capital gifts campaign which will, during the next few years, largely determine the future viability of Saint Mary's—barring, of course, increased public support of private higher education.

It is in the last mentioned area that I hope you, as the new president of the American Association of Colleges, will be able to work effectively for private education. There are very few in our country who think that private education, on whatever level, is not good, even essential, to our democratic society. But it is becoming more and more apparent that that belief must be increasingly backed up by financial support. I hope you will use the authority of your office and the influence of the AAC to tell the story of colleges like Saint Mary's to leaders in public and private positions who are able to alleviate the financial problems we face. If I can be of assistance in that work, please let me know.

Needless to say, I wish you every success in your new position and you have my personal best wishes.

Sincerely,

Brother GEORGE PAHL, F.S.C.,
President.

AURORA COLLEGE,
Aurora, Ill., February 2, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: This letter is prompted by the recent proposal from Dr. Norbert Hruby, President of Aquinas College.

It is appropriate to tell you that I am writing this letter because President Crimi has been absent from the campus for five months with a coronary attack. I am glad to be able to report that he is recovering and we anticipate that he will be back in the office sometime late in the spring or early summer.

Very briefly, the financial situation at Aurora College is serious. This year we have an operating deficit of over $100,000 in spite of stringent budget cuts. Our capital indebtedness is $1,240,000. We have very little endowment. Consequently, we can only meet the operating deficit by transferring undesignated bequests of one kind or another to our operating budget. We are currently making a strenuous effort to improve our enrollment by an additional one hundred students for next year. This, along with cutbacks in our program, will enable us to at least approach a balanced budget.

I will not fill in additional financial details, but would suggest the desirability of some kind of a study by the Association of American Colleges that would develop a composite picture of the magnitude and extent of the financial problem facing private higher education in the United States today.

If we can be of any further help in your presentation of this situation to Congress, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely,

MARK H. TRUMBO,
Vice President and Dean.

SAINT MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE,
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind., January 27, 1970.

Dr. FREDERIC W. NESS,
President, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NESS: I am happy to add my plea as the president of a small, private institution to that of many others so that our problems may be represented through the Association of American Colleges, since I so firmly believe that without the private sector in American education, a great richness would be lost.

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College is a small college for women with a fulltime enrollment of under 500. Because of the nature of our student body and our geographical location, we have been able to build a kind of community relationship among the various segments of this campus which is somewhat unique, I believe, and because of our size we are able to experiment readily with innovative programs, several of which we have introduced during this academic year.

One of the most exciting of these is the integrated Science-Mathematics Course, which approaches topically and in an interdisciplinary way some of the most relevant present day problems, relating them to a basic background and understanding of these academic areas. Examples: "Communicating with Intelligent Life Elsewhere," "The Probability of Human Survival," "The Culture of Poverty and Abortion." While we have as yet done no research on the effectiveness of this program and another inter-disciplinary one in Humanities, we plan to do so, and I am confident that some of our experiments will be valuable to higher education in general. Such experiments would be much more difficult, I believe on a larger and more structured campus.

We have inaugurated a consortium program with Indiana State University and Rose Polytechnic Institute, all of which are in Terre Haute. But as you know consortia rarely save money. They simply improve programs, and we hope that ours will do this also.

However, as you no doubt know, we are in trouble financially, a problem we share, I believe, with all similar colleges. Our capital indebtedness is over $2,500,000. Our operating deficit for the past year, 1968–69, was close to $600,000, and for this coming year will be almost double that. As we project our budget ahead, we come very soon to a deficit so high that neither tuition raise, nor endowment (which in our case is only about $40,000 income per year), nor amount of contributed services of the sister-faculty, which number about 40% of our total faculty, will be able to fill in the gap.

We are the oldest woman's college in Indiana. We feel that with the development of a renewed emphasis upon the place of women, it is possible that the woman's college, like the black college, may be coming into a new kind of relevance. We would like to contribute creatively and vigorously to that movement in the future. We would like to continue to contribute a sense of Christian decision in a too often undecided world. But we see that without some assistance either through the federal government or through foundations we can do none of these things for very long. We encourage you, and indeed beg you, to plead the cause of the small, private college in whatever way possible.

Sincerely,

Sister JEANNE KNOERLE, S.P.,
President.

CARLETON COLLEGE,
Northfield, Minn., April 1, 1970.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I was away last week when the newspapers reported your Bill proposing a "Higher Educational General Assistance Act", and so I am slow in sending you my enthusiastic support. Your Bill would make a world of difference to higher education in general and to private education in particular. It is precisely the kind of proposal which may well spell the difference between life and death for some of the private colleges of Minnesota and elsewhere.

Don't let the big boys chew it all to pieces, and more power to you in getting the support of the Education and Labor Committee and of the Congress. Let me know how I can help.

Cordially yours,

JOHN W. NASON.

ST. OLAF COLLEGE,
Northfield, Minn., April 3, 1970.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: I have noted with interest the proposals you have made in H.R. 16222 and want to commend you especially on the proposal regarding grants to institutions on the basis of the number of graduates.

It seems to me this is a valid concept and without trying to judge the exact formula which you have suggested, I would say that the principle is excellent. I hope your bill gets favorable hearings and some time sees the light of day.

It seems to me that it is a completely reliable approach to consider colleges as having served society by providing education for society's youth. In undergraduate colleges a measure of this service can be found in the number of graduates. It would therefore be quite legitimate and proper, as far as I can see, to gear a formula such as yours to the number of persons granted degrees.

As you are well aware, the cost of education is not represented totally by the charges made of students. I guess higher education in the United States has never been offered on the assumption that the person who receives the direct benefit from it immediately pays the total bill. This principle is sound because it is based on the assumption that society as a whole gains from the education of young people.

I wish you well in your attempts to find a logical and positive way through the many difficult areas of legislation that face Congress these days. Thank you for what you are doing as an important member of the Congressional committees helping us solve the problems of education.

Yours sincerely,

SIDNEY A. RAND,
President.

MINNESOTA PRIVATE COLLEGE COUNCIL,
St. Paul, Minn., March 30, 1970.

Congressman ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: Congratulations on your proposed "Higher Education General Assistance Act". It is by all odds the best news to come out of Washington for a long time. You can depend on unanimous support from the private college sector and I see no reason why the public sector should not also endorse it. There will, of course, be pressure to change the formula in the interests of the larger institutions. It will be overlooked that virtually every government program has favored that sector. Surely the Miller bill with its emphasis on science would not help all institutions equally. Tying the grants to the number of graduates seems to be an excellent idea and provides the most solid basis for computing "services rendered."

Thank you again for the time which you gave me in Washington and for your response to my letter. I appreciate having the percentage of expenditures carried by the federal government but I am sure these figures could be misleading. If you take out the major universities, particularly in the private sector, I am quite sure the figure would be greatly diminished.

Be assured that we will do everything that we can to develop support for the program which you have proposed.

Sincerely,

EDGAR M. CARLSON,
Executive Director.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. CATHERINE,
St. Paul, Minn., April 1, 1970.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: As president of a college in Minnesota, I want to tell you that I am proud of you and your recent proposal for support of higher education by reimbursement per graduate. It's a brilliant plan and I hope you will have much support for it.

Furthermore, it is encouraging to us in higher education to know that our Congressmen are so strongly interested in education. Thank you for that interest.

Sincerely yours,

Sister ALBERTA HUBER,
President.

COLLEGE OF SAINT BENEDICT,
Saint Joseph, Minn., March 27, 1970.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: I noted in the March 26th issue of the Saint Paul Pioneer Press that you had proposed a program of general aid to colleges in the form of direct grants to four year institutions, based upon the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded.

Naturally I am pleased to see your interest in such a program because it may be one of the ways that the government can assure that the small, liberal arts college will continue to make its own unique contribution to our society. I am sure that the faculty and staff in the other 15 private colleges

in Minnesota would join me in applauding your initiative in this matter.

Sincerely,

STANLEY J. IDZERDA,
President.

COLLEGE OF SAINT TERESA,
Winona, Minn., April 1, 1970.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
2334 Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I have received word about the bill which you sent to Congress entitled "The Higher Education General Assistance Act." I want to congratulate you, first of all, for introducing this bill and second, to express my warm gratitude since the bill manifests concern for the smaller institutions of higher education.

Thank you for the thought that you give to us and for your fine work.

Very sincerely yours,
Sister M. JOYCE ROWLAND, O.S.F.

NO-KNOCK RAIDERS HIT WRONG TARGET

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, we must all try to resist the very human impulse to say, "I told you so." But sometimes the course of events provides such a clear temptation that it is impossible to resist. This morning's Washington Post contained such a temptation.

The Post article indicates that earlier this week at 1 a.m. a local woman was awakened when deputy sheriffs mistakenly broke into her apartment using a sledge hammer while serving a "no-knock" warrant. In a sense, I suppose, those who supported the no-knock provision in the D.C. crime bill were right when they said "it cannot happen here." It did not happen here; it happened just across the Maryland line in Prince Georges County. I suppose we may also count it fortunate that Margaret O. Malloy was not the owner of one of those 96 million firearms now in private hands in America. If she or her son had been, we might have had a few dead Prince Georges County deputies.

Supporters of no-knock warrants will point out that later the sheriff's deputies did find $2,000 worth of illegal drugs and arrested eight people—when they served the warrant at the proper address. But, of course, there is nothing in the article to indicate that they would not have recovered the contraband and made the arrests anyway, even without using the infamous no-knock procedure.

Obviously, it is too late to move to reconsider the vote on no-knock provisions in the D.C. crime bill. It is not too late, however, for the conferees to take note of this event. Nor is it too late to ponder this lesson before we vote on the drug control bill which will soon be before the House. I hope that every Member will try to put himself in Mrs. Malloy's position. The next time such mistaken service of a no-knock warrant occurs, it might be any one of us.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1970]

NO-KNOCK RAIDERS: ARMED PRINCE GEORGES' DEPUTIES SMASH INTO WRONG HOME

(By Gerald E. Bunker)

A Prince George's County woman was awakened about 1 a.m. yesterday by a crew of armed county deputy sheriffs who had broken into her apartment with a sledge hammer.

Maj. Daniel D. Ballard of the Prince George's County sheriff's office yesterday confirmed the incident but said it was all a mistake.

He said that a squad from the sheriff's office conducting a drug raid had divided into three sections in order to assure surprise and to cover all entrances to a nearby apartment that was the actual target of the raid.

Ballard said that one section blundered into the apartment of Margaret O. Malloy. That section had been assigned to enter through the rear of the apartment that was to be raided and erred because there were no numeral markers there, Ballard said.

Mrs. Malloy, 58, who lives at 7308 Forest Rd. with her son John, 23, came into the living room to find a half-dozen men armed with pistols and with blackjacks protruding from their rear pockets. They were wearing civilian clothes, not uniforms.

As Mrs. Malloy recounted the incident yesterday, she said she found herself starring down the barrel of a rifle held by a crouching man who wore a bandolier across his sports shirt.

"My God, what's happened?" asked Mrs. Malloy, shaking, as she later said, "like a leaf."

"This is a raid. We're Prince George's County Sheriffs," a spokesman for the group told her, she said.

"Isn't this 7302 Forest Rd.? he asked.

"No," answered Mrs. Malloy's son. "This is 7308," she recounted.

'We've got the wrong apartment. I'll be right back and explain," the spokesman told her.

Mrs. Malloy and her thoroughly awakened neighbors then watched the group make its way to the nearby apartment.

The saw the search party go to 7302 Forest Rd. to a third floor apartment similar to Mrs. Malloy's.

Mrs. Malloy and her neighbors said they could hear screams and an unexplained shot as they saw pictures being removed from the walls and vases smashed, she said.

Ballard said that at the second address eight arrests were made and that $2,500 worth of heroin and other illegal drugs were seized.

After the raid, a deputy returned to apologize to Mrs. Malloy, she said.

Mrs. Malloy said she believes in upholding the law but that she hopes the sheriff will be more careful next time.

"I have high blood pressure," she said.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE NEW "LOW PROFILE" APPROACH IN CAMBODIA

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere I have spoken on the resolution that I have introduced forbidding the introduction of U.S. troops in Cambodia. The Washington Post of April 30, 1970, contained an excellent editorial on the administration's decision to expand the Vietnam conflict into Cambodia.

I recommend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD and I insert it at this point:

THE NEW "LOW PROFILE" APPROACH IN CAMBODIA

From the very beginning of our effort in Vietnam we have rested our case on the sanctity of frontiers; North Vietnam had *invaded* South Vietnam, we argued, so it was aggression pure and simple. From this flowed our right to come to Saigon's aid, and bomb the North and all the rest. When North Vietnamese troops began in recent weeks to menace the new government in Cambodia, the refrain was the same; the White House wasted no time calling it "a foreign invasion" and never mind that the presence of large numbers of North Vietnamese troops in Cambodia had been a fact of life which we had accepted, without doing anything about it, for several years.

So now, because we don't like the turn of events in Cambodia, we have lent ourselves, with combat support and moral backing, to a *South Vietnamese* invasion of that country, without the slightest evidence that this support has been requested by Pnom Penh.

This is a stupefying development, which makes you wonder where in the world this Nixon crowd was when we were working our way insidiously into the Vietnam War? Does nobody in this administration remember how that scenario went: first, try it with the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN), with American advisers and American equipment and American encouragement, and then if it doesn't do it, throw in air support, and then, if that doesn't work, American combat troops. Call it temporary, of course, something quick and surgical to buy time until our allies can pull themselves together and go it alone. If this administration can't remember how it went before, it ought to consider the possibility that a lot of people do—that we have been conned, once, by experts and that there are a lot of people, as the reaction in the Senate yesterday plainly suggests, who are in no mood to be conned again.

It may be, of course, that there is something to this that we haven't been told in the communique from the Saigon government, announcing the ARVN drive into Cambodia, and also the American collaboration in it, with military advisers, helicopters and air support. The President will have an opportunity to explain tonight in his television address just what there is about this adventure which distinguishes it from the follies of the past. For it is difficult, on the basis of what Saigon has said, and what the Pentagon has confirmed, to find any quarrel with Senator Mansfield's assessment: "Cambodia is a whole new ball game. If we become involved directly or indirectly, it becomes a general Indochina war."

Since we obviously *have* become involved, not only indirectly but directly, it certainly gives every appearance of being a step toward a "general Indochina war." And the

hard questions come immediately to mind. Why, and why now, of all times, when we are supposed to be paring commitments and scaling down involvements and concentrating on Vietnamizing Vietnam? The obvious argument is that this will remove a great thorn in our Vietnam effort and thereby hasten our exit from the scene—or at least prevent it from being delayed. That is what we were told about the bombing of North Vietnam, and it is no more believable in this instance. For one thing, we would need far better evidence than anybody has offered in advance of this decision that the South Vietnamese can clear out the Cambodian sanctuary; still less is there any evidence that they can keep it cleared out. Even if they could, what is to stop the North Vietnamese, in the meantime, from turning around and giving their full attention to the subjugation of Cambodia? And where does this end, if not in an ever-increasing effort to make good on Mr. Ronald Ziegler's ambiguous implication that we suddenly have an obligation to keep Cambodia neutral and out of Communist control?

Frankly it did not occur to us, when the President first announced his new, "low profile" approach to foreign policy that its first real application would come in the form of active American collaboration in a South Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia. But we are, perhaps, getting ahead of things; we await the President's explanation tonight of what is new, let alone even remotely promising, about this policy.

NEOSHO, MO.: INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I took a special order to commend the work of the Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense.

The Director of the OEA, Donald F. Bradford, at my request had journeyed to the city of Neosho, Mo., on two occasions, and sent members of his staff on numerous other trips in order to prepare an industrial profile and district plan for that city. The reason for the project was the loss, some years ago, of Neosho's major industry the Rocketdyne Plant of North American Rockwell. The plant was closed following the phasing out of its liquid propelled rocket engines.

The industrial profile developed for Neosho contained a detailed charting of the course for that city's best industrial development strategy based on the economic activities and locational factors in today's national economy. Needless to say, the suggestions proposed by the OEA are being implemented.

Prior to that, Neosho, realizing the need to go ahead on its own, had made a remarkable effort to acquire new business and industry. An effort, I might add that has paid handsome dividends.

An in-depth look at the industrial development of the city of Neosho, Mo., its problems and its progress, was recently put together by Paul Tuomala, a reporter for the Joplin, Mo. Globe newspaper.

To those of you who might be interested in learning what one Missouri city of 7,500 hard working citizens can accomplish, I offer the following article:

VARIETY OF INDUSTRIES, SCHOOLS HAVE REPLACED FORT CROWDER AS BIG ECONOMIC FACTOR FOR AREA

(By Paul Tuomala)

The headline almost 18 years ago was big and bold: "Crowder is Made A Permanent Camp" . . . $1,980,000 outlay anticipated for new construction . . ."

On May 30, 1952, this announcement was big news, and meant a possible economic breakthrough for the area around Camp Crowder, just a few miles south of Neosho.

A big army camp during World War II, Crowder had sunk to enonomic lows around 1950. The news of a general buildup on the Southwest Missouri military reservation, named after Gen. Enos Crowder, a Missouri native, breathed new life into the speculation that someday Crowder would become a permanent, full-scale military operation.

For almost another six years after the big news break, Crowder struggled along, first as a processing post for inductees, then as a prison site, a so-called disciplinary barracks, for as many as 1,300 soldiers and airmen convicted of crimes from desertion to manslaughter to rape.

OLD HOPES

In mid-1956, old hopes were revived when the Department of the Army announced that Crowder no longer was a camp, but a fort. "Fort" Crowder had a definite ring of permanency and speculation was high that a big change was in the wind for the installation born out of the start of World War II.

Later in 1956, Representative Dewey Short was on hand for groundbreaking ceremonies for two new, permanent barracks that would be erected at a cost of approximately $1 million. Those buildings form the nucleus of the present Crowder College.

The bombshell exploded in Southwest Missouri late in 1957. when rumors were confirmed that the "permanent" Fort Crowder, with its "permanent" barracks, was to be closed early the next year. Closing the installation, the government said, would save U.S. taxpayers approximately $1 million per year . . . money that was needed for the country's young space program.

What it all boiled down to was that the area around Fort Crowder would lose approximately $1 million per year when the post closed. But that closing, with its damaging economic impact, has led to bigger and better things, and that $1 million spent each year then is a fraction of what Fort Crowder means to Southwest Missouri now.

In addition to a two-county supported junior college, which is doubling its physical plan this year with the addition of two new buildings, Crowder is home to as varied a group of businesses and industries as can be found in this area, ranging from eggs to airplane engines, from barbecue stands to mobile home frames. What closed in 1958 as a $1 million operation now represents jobs for hundreds of area residents, education for hundreds of area youngsters, as much as $13 million annually for the economy of the area.

Crowder College, a two-year school supported by patrons in Newton and McDonald Counties, was opened in 1964 in the two, three-story permanent barracks that housed Army troops for only a short time. Now, two new buildings, a vocational-technical area and a gymnasium-auditorium, are being constructed at an approximate cost of $800,000.

More than 500 students presently are enrolled at Crowder College, many of them preparing to go on for degrees at four-year institutions.

In addition to the funds spent by the college locally for supplies, food and equipment the salaries for teachers and other personnel provides a boost for the local economy.

The roar of rocket engines being tested by the old Rocketdyne plant at Crowder, a roar that could be heard for miles as a cloud of steam from the rocket blast rose hundreds of feet into the air, is no longer a part of the Crowder scene. But the plant that once housed Rocketdyne remains, occupied by a firm that not only means millions each year for the area's economy but also means added posture to the defense of the country.

Continental Motors now occupied the old Rocketdyne plant, and the facility, with a primary mission of overhauling and repairing engines for jet aircraft, means jobs for approximately 300 area residents and a boost to the area's economy in wages alone amounting to some $2.5 million each year.

Not far from the Continental plant is a recent comer to Crowder, the Buddy-L plant, where modern barbecue grills and toys are manufactured for sale across the country. The spacious, contemporary facility provides, employment for nearly 200 employes, who earn wages nearing the $2 million per year mark.

Buddy-L's newest industrial neighbor, soon to get underway as a full-fledged business on Crowder, is the La-Z-Boy Midwest chair manufacturing firm. The modern office building and plant is located just south of the Buddy-L facility.

An official of the La-Z-Boy estimates that the annual payroll of the company once it is in full swing will be approximately $1.2 million. The firm presently is hiring employes.

There is another school at Fort Crowder, and a traveler would have to cover many miles to find another like it. It's the Crowder Water and Wastewater Technical School, and in this age of emphasis on clean water and cleaner wastewater, the school is filling a requirement of society.

Approximately 50 students from across the country and some foreign lands are enrolled in the school's new 36-week program which just began this winter. Also each year, up to 10 short (two-week) courses are conducted as refreshers for personnel already in the field.

Also provided by the non-profit school is a 16-week "graduate" course for water and wastewater specialists. R. J. Benton, president of the school, says the school pumps an estimated $300,000 annually into the local economy, mostly through salaries. The school ordinarily has a staff of seven instructors and 20 administrative personnel.

The school is just completing a $100,000, locally-financed project of moving and setting up 25 mobile homes as housing for students and has renovated 16 buildings in the old bachelor officers quarters area by the golf course for dormitories.

One of the most far-reaching businesses on Fort Crowder is Mo-Ark Hatcheries, located by the south gate and the Neosho Memorial Airport, another big business.

The hatchery is a big part of the $10 million annual egg and poultry business of Southwest Missouri and is in business with more than 50 area family poultry farms. The number of employes and the amount of wages said fluctuates and is difficult to determine, according to a company official. But the annual contribution to the local economy is substantial.

EGG BROKER

In connection with area poultry business, Ray Bowers runs an egg "brokerage" at the former Fancy Fresh Egg Co. plant on the old reservation, and according to his figures, the brokerage processes an estimated $1.1 million in ungraded eggs annually. He said all of the eggs are purchased within a 50-mile radius of Crowder, with the largest amount resold in Texas. The brokerage has three regular employes in addition to Bowers.

Poultry and eggs are definitely big business in Southwest Missouri, and in addition to the MoArk firm on Crowder, there is also the

Murphy Hatchery, located near the south gate.

A real lifeline to the Neosho area and nearby points is the airport constructed near the south gate, in the old prison area, in 1965. Presently being run by Mr. and Mrs. Jim Bell, the airport has 22 planes based at the facility, including three twin-engined corporation airplanes. The airport operates a charter flight service and an air taxi business.

According to Mrs. Bell, who handles the books, the airport invests an estimated $40,000 annually into the local economy through the purchase of supplies, including flight fuel.

Big Smith is a widely-known name in Southwest Missouri, and at Fort Crowder the company maintains a cutting service with a staff of 12 persons. The facility pays approximately $65,000 in salaries annually.

Mobile homes are big business in the Four-State Area, and as in many other businesses component parts for mobile homes come from various industries and are assembled at a central plant. The Holden Frame Co. at Crowder provides one of these services to the mobile home industry.

The plant opened for business in late 1968 with three employes, and now employs an average of 12 persons. It builds frames and wheels as the undercarriage for mobile homes and produces an average of 125 per month in various sizes. Cost of the frames runs from $100 to $700 depending on the size and 80–90 per cent of the frames manufactured at the plant are marketed within a 20-mile radius of Crowder.

The plant provides an annual income into the area through wages of $75,000–$80,000, according to Bill Brock, plant manager.

Since 1961, the Linde plant, located on land purchased from the Neosho Industrial Company in the northwest corner of Fort Crowder, has been extracting hydrogen and nitrogen gases from oxygen for industrial use. The plant presently employs an average of 30 persons who draw wages nearing the $200,000 mark.

Also located at Fort Crowder is Empire District Electric Company's construction headquarters for the Crowder area, and the Central States Walnut Log Processing Co., which receives black walnut logs cut in the Crowder area and ships them to foreign ports for the manufacture of walnut veneer.

WORKSHOP

Other establishments on the post contributing to the area economy include the Neosho Area Sheltered Workshop, the Southwest Missouri Vocational-Technical School and the Newton County Rural Fire Department.

Contributions from these departments are largely intangible. The fire department, for example, is a volunteer organization with no wages paid. Its monetary contributions stem from the local purchase of fuel and equipment for the department's use. The unit also contributes to the general well-being of the rural community by virtue of its existence and mission of fighting rural fires.

The sheltered workshop is an employment haven for a number of "unemployable" persons, handicapped either physically or mentally. The workshop subcontracts from local industries, involving services that normally would cost too much for the industry to pursue on its own. There is a monetary value to the community through the sheltered workshop, but its effect socially is rated of equal importance.

Students from several high schools in Southwest Missouri are taking advantage of the courses offered by the vocational-technical school located on the grounds of the old engineer area of the post. Included in the school's curricula are secretarial courses, electronics, woodworking, and air conditioning and refrigeration. In addition to the money spent locally by the school for material and supplies, the school is contributing to the social structure of the area's economy by training young persons in important skills.

There remain signs of the military at Fort Crowder, for it is here where some of the heavy equipment of the local Missouri National Guard units is stored and maintained. Old ranges and bivouac areas on the post's fringes are still being used for the training of National Guard troops.

Many years will pass before residents of Southern Missouri no longer will refer to the military installation in Newton County as Camp or Fort Crowder, although, in fact, it no longer is either. It holds a lot of memories of the past for many area residents, but it also holds the main key to the future for many others.

FATHER HILDNER—"MR. SOIL CONSERVATION"

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at St. John's Church near Villa Ridge, Mo., on April 26, 1970, an impressive ceremony was held in honor of the late Monsignor George J. Hildner. Father Hildner had a great and distinguished career, perhaps well summarized in his epitaph: "Savior of Souls and Savior of Soils."

The ceremony was particularly honored by the attendance of the Archbishop of St. Louis, His Eminence, John Joseph Carberry. Among those paying tribute were Mr. John Wilder of Tennessee, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and Mr. W. L. Reavley, representing the National Wildlife Federation.

The principal address was given by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, and its text follows:

FATHER HILDNER—"MR. SOIL CONSERVATION"

(Address by Senator SYMINGTON)

It is a pleasure indeed to be with you today in this great county, famous for its fine crops, livestock and communities, and also for its outstanding conservation leaders. Experience has taught us it is no coincidence to note that where good conservation methods are practiced, there is also prosperity.

Today we gather together to pay tribute to a remarkable man; one who was the "savior of both souls and soil," and who over the years consistently preached the value of soil and water conservation.

Perhaps nothing better can be said of a man than that his actions lived up to his words. Those of us who knew Father Hildner were familiar with his good words, but those words were always reinforced by his actions; and it is those actions which live as his monument.

Franklin County is today one of the most productive dairy and beef sections in Missouri. It produces some of the finest crops in our State. But things were not always that way.

When Father Hildner was transferred to St. John's Church at Gildehaus in 1934, he found his region still suffering from the Great Depression. All along the rutted county roads were small ramshackle farms—grey buildings with peeling paint, no plumbing and few livestock. The farmers were deeply in debt because it seemed that one bad crop would only follow another. We all know that when there is poverty in the hinterland, there is poverty in the towns and cities; and vice versa.

Father Hildner knew in his deep and compassionate mind that there had to be an answer, so he began to study modern farm methods to find out what could be done to repair the worn-out soil.

Although originally there was much opposition to his so-called "new fangled" ideas on terracing and contouring the land in order to keep the topsoil from washing away, planting trees to keep the rain water where it fell, gradually these ideas won acceptance. Through his vigorous leadership, many farmers abandoned the growing of wheat and other small grains, relatively ill-suited for hill-country, and began to convert to dairy farming and livestock feeding. The hillsides were seeded with grasses such as timothy and clover, and there was planting of corn and barley in the bottom lands.

Father Hildner's pioneer soil conservation efforts have had a very great deal to do with better economic conditions, both in this area, and over the years, in Missouri as a whole.

Throughout his life the good Father was a tireless champion of soil and water conservation, and it is significant to note that he was the first chairman of the Franklin County Soil Conservation District—the second district in the State of Missouri—a post which he held for seven years.

Missouri has been slow in forming conservation districts. In the last fifteen years, however, we have come a long way.

In 1955, there were only 32 districts in all of Missouri; but now, with the addition of Dallas, St. Francois, Greene, Hickory, and Camden Counties in 1969, there are 92 Soil and Water Conservation Districts, covering over 80 percent of the land area of the state. And I predict that before the end of the next decade there will be no more blank areas on the County map of Missouri. Every county will be in the conservation district column.

Today the role of soil and water conservation districts has never been more important. Ten years ago I read in a book entitled "Land, Wood and Water," written by the late Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma; and I later asked Senator Kerr, perhaps the last Senator to be born in a log cabin, "Why did you give it that title?" He replied, "Because my father once told me that if you took care of the land, and the wood, and the water, the rest would take care of itself."

Despite that implied warning, in many respects we have so far failed in that effort.

This is important, because by the end of the century, the population of the United States will require twice as much production from agricultural lands as is needed today, twice the wood from our forests, three times the water. Incident to the latter, the demand for recreation will triple.

Today, however, we are rapidly becoming a "have-not" nation with respect to many of our important natural resources.

At a time when our water needs have never been greater, pollution leaves increasingly large amounts of water unsuitable for either consumption or industrial needs. Water shortages, once largely confined to semi-arid regions, are now beginning to occur in the humid regions of the United States.

This is widespread misuse of our forest lands; and although we have more extensive reforestation programs than ever before, timber shortages occurred in many parts of the country last year; and this despite the construction slow-down.

Likewise, the "wrecking" of the land continues. This nation is being urbanized at a rate of 3000 acres a day—more than a million acres every year succumb to bulldozers, pavement, and buildings. Over one percent of the land area of the United States is now covered by roads and highways, creating gigantic new drainage and land use problems everywhere.

Fortunately, during the past few years there has also been a great awakening in

America. Today the problem of our deteriorating environment and our diminishing natural resources has jumped almost to the top of the agenda of public concern; and I am truly confident that America's conservation districts will play a major role in the fight to preserve resources and restore the quality of our environment.

Since the beginning of time the brown waters of the Missouri River has rolled along on their southward journey to the Gulf of Mexico. Long before the first white man ever set eyes on the Missouri it was called in Indian dialect "the Big Muddy." Today, however, that Big Muddy, running through our State's heart and right along the border of Franklin County, is not nearly as muddy or sluggish as it once was.

The remaining discoloration of the water is caused by the heavy load of silt and sediment washed into the river along its winding course—priceless topsoil from farms in North Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, as well as a dozen other states.

Only recently have we started calling sediment "pollution," and although it is not as toxic or as unattractive as some pollutants, nevertheless it is still the largest single actual pollutant in the rivers and streams of this country.

Muddy water is mighty expensive. It costs over $250 million annually for the United States to dredge its harbors, rivers, and lakes. Silt fills in over a million acre feet of storage space in reservoirs every year—space constructed at an average cost of over $100 per acre-foot. It costs additional tens of millions to remove silt from water destined for municipal and industrial use, and the bill is footed by the taxpayer and the consumer.

In addition, eroded soil often contains pesticide residues which today we know can affect profound changes on cell metabolism and which have already done incalculable damage to fish and wildlife.

Modern soil conservation methods and orderly drainage schemes reduce run-off, and thereby, prevent erosion. This not only protects our water from pollution and spares our citizens millions of dollars in annual expense, but it keeps the soil healthy and productive. By reducing run-off, we also protect our crops and our communities from the ravages of disastrous flooding. This is of no small consequence since last year in the U.S. flood damages totaled more than a billion dollars.

The watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service is also an integral part of soil and water conservation efforts and is often indispensable to rural growth. Take the case of one rural county in nearby Arkansas which was about to lose its largest industry—a poultry processing plant—because much of the time there was not enough water to satisfy its needs. The situation was quickly remedied when a multiple-purpose lake was built as a part of a local watershed project.

Watersheds help to prevent both drought and flooding, and not only enhance the attractiveness of living in rural areas, but provide recreation for millions who would otherwise never have the opportunity.

Those of us here know that soil and water conservation "makes good sense"; but unfortunately at a time when Soil Conservation Service programs have never been more vital, they are being frustrated by inadequate funding.

The Administration's Budget request for fiscal year 1971 calls for 267.5 million dollars for the Soil Conservation Service, an increase of only 21 million dollars at a time of spiraling inflation and escalating costs. Put into perspective, the entire SCS budget for the coming year is equivalent to less than four days cost of the war in Vietnam.

As a result, the Soil Conservation Service's essential flood prevention activities have been cut by almost $3 million, and watershed planning monies have been reduced by $775,000. Most important, expansion of the soil and water conservation program in Missouri has been crippled by the absence of funds for new planning starts.

I can think of no finer programs which yield more for every Federal dollar invested than those of the Soil Conservation Service. Be assured, therefore, that I will continue my efforts to obtain more realistic funding for this agency. As a start, surely we can afford at least $500 million a year to support the good work of the SCS.

The elimination this year of the Agricultural Conservation Practices Program, administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, was another blow to American agriculture and resource conservation efforts. In 1969, one half of all the low-income farmers in the United States receiving help from this program were in Missouri, and nearly one-third of all the funds appropriated for this program went to Missouri. Its elimination has brought great hardship to thousands of Missouri farmers and it is my firm and earnest hope that it will be restored to the Federal budget.

In conclusion, one of the lessons of history is that a nation is only as strong as its natural resources or its access to them.

When our natural resources—our land, our wood, and our water—are strong, then agriculture will be strong. When agriculture is strong, this nation is strong . . . and a strong America is the best hope for peace in this world.

Men like Father Hildner contributed much to the strength of America, both spiritually and economically, and we will not forget them.

America is certainly less for Father Hildner's passing; and as one man said shortly after his death:

"They say every man can be replaced, but this is one man that can't be replaced."

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO THE SITKA NATIONAL MONUMENT IN ALASKA

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize certain additions to the Sitka National Monument in the State of Alaska.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation, purchase, or exchange, lands and interests therein on which the Sitka Russian Mission, the Blockhouse Hill Complex, and Old Sitka are situated. In addition, the bill redesignates the Sitka National Monument as the "Sitka National Historical Park" and directs that the park be administered in accordance with certain existing laws. The final section of the measure that I am introducing authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my bill has a dual purpose. First, it is designed to preserve one of the last vestiges of the Imperial Russian presence in Alaska. During the Russian period, the city of Sitka was the largest and most important community in Alaska. The Russian-American Co. was located in Sitka for over 60 years, and the city was the focal point of the cultural clash between the Russians and Alaska's native inhabitants.

The second purpose of my bill is to promote Sitka's tourist industry, which is of great economic importance to the city. Located in a picturesque setting, Sitka is already one of the great tourist attractions in Alaska. If the expansion plan contained in my bill is implemented, it is very likely that many more people from all over the country will come to view Sitka's historical landmarks. Such an influx would be of great economic benefit to Sitka and to the entire State of Alaska. Moreover, those who come to the city will leave with an increased awareness and understanding of our Nation's history and the history of the great State of Alaska.

My distinguished colleagues, for the reasons that I have outlined above, I respectfully request your careful consideration of the legislation that I introduced today. Sitka is not a very large city by "lower 48" standards, but its historical treasures loom very large in the history of the dynamic and independent people of my State.

GOVERNOR EVANS KEYNOTES AIR FORCE ACADEMY ASSEMBLY

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Governor of the State of Washington, Dan Evans, delivered the keynote address at the annual Air Force Academy assembly in Colorado Springs, Colo. The topic of this year's assembly was "The States and the Urban Crisis."

Governor Evans not only covered the subject well, but his address, in my estimation, was truly outstanding. The Governor's message, moreover, is a compelling one which deserves widespread attention.

I include the address of Governor Evans to the Annual Air Force Academy assembly at Colorado Springs, Colo., on April 8, 1970, at this point in the RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY GOV. DANIEL J. EVANS

I come here today, prepared to address this impressive assembly on the urban crisis, in the full knowledge that my generation is the generation who thought the "Bronx Bomber's" was another name for the New York Yankees.

The task of urban government is not an easy one today. Take for example the telegram which my sometimes fellow Republican John Lindsay received from the New York city council during an illness that confined him in bed at Gracie Mansion:

"The city council sends its condolences and wishes you a speedy recovery—by a vote of 19 to 17."

Not more than two weeks ago, a young radical interviewed in Life magazine made this point with disturbing clarity. "We are not," he said, "reformists. We are revolutionaries. We are not out to frighten the establishment; we are out to destroy it."

Even without the bomb-throwers and the black flag anarchists, we have before us in this nation today, the visible evidence that some very important parts of our system are simply not working. The true lesson of the

postal strike is not contained in arguments about its legality; it was patently and inexcusably a defiance of the law—the true lesson is contained in the deplorable condition of the postal system itself, this vital link of a modern society about to self destruct like the tapes in "Mission Impossible."

Tragically, the postal system is but one example. And—tragically—too many of the parts which are coming unglued are bound up in what we call the urban crisis—a term loosely used to describe the physical conflict of concentrating too many human beings in too small an area, with too many problems and too few services, at increasingly higher costs with increasingly lower standards.

These problems, however, are not new—listen to an account of London in 1858:

The climax came in June 1858, when an exceptionally hot summer and unusually low rainfall combined to produce what all London knew as "The Great Stink". Parliament was in a good position to appreciate the nuisance, for the windows at Westminster had to be draped with curtains soaked in chloride of lime so that members could breathe. To cross Westminster Bridge it was necessary to hold a handkerchief firmly over one's nose and mouth and those who travelled on the river steamers suffered greatly when the paddles churned the water into stinking eddies. No one could face the refreshments offered on board, and few dared to travel at all in this way, so that the owners of these pleasure-craft found they were running at a loss, and laid most of them up. There was talk of moving the Law Courts to Oxford or St. Albans, and a Select Committee was set up to report on the Stink and to find means of its abatement. One ingenious witness, a Mr. Gurney, wanted to seal the ends of the sewers—there were 369 of them between Putney and Blackwell—and to lead the gas by means of pipes to chosen high points and then fire it so that it would burn away—he said—harmlessly. Gurney was particularly anxious to carry a pipe from the huge new Victoria sewer through New Palace Yard to the Clock Tower; this he was allowed to do, although a more practical engineer was able to prevent the subsequent explosion from utterly destroying the Clock Tower (and perhaps completing Guy Fawkes's plan). A more conventional remedy, the use of slaked lime in large quantities, and the coming of the rain cured the Great Stink, but it had served its purpose in awakening Londoners to the realities of their position and had even ousted the Indian Mutiny as the chief topic of conversation.

Dr. Alfred Carpenter, who read a paper to the Society of Arts on this subject . . . advocated a tax on all fireplaces that did not effectively consume their own smoke.

For the last 30 years, we have systematically engaged in the non-productive exercise of trying to spend our way out of urban problems. We have authorized massive infusions of public capital—accompanied by equally massive levies of administrative expertise.

Yet, by any standard of welfare or by any measurement of poverty; by any standard of health care or by any measurement of pollution; by any standard of service or by any measurement of crime statistics—by *any* standard or measure we have turned our cities into a monstrous mess, a failure of gigantic proportions, a tragic fall from grace of one of the great hopes of American civilization.

It is easy to cast about for scapegoats—to engage in the great bureaucratic exercise known as "fixing the blame." We can blame the massive in-migration of the minorities and the massive flight of the affluent whites to the suburbs.

We can blame inadequate tax bases and inept administrations, constitutional impediments and vested political interests. We can blame rigid layers of bureaucracy, insensitive businessmen, super-sensitive social workers and oversensitive public officials.

In short, there is much to blame and many people to blame it on. And much of it is true.

But the problem is more than simply defining it. The problem is what do we do differently from what we have done so dismally in the past. How do we learn from history; how do we truly resolve the central dilemma of our cities—the focal point of our self-admitted "urban crisis."

To begin with, I think we have to accept some basic truths. The first of these is that you cannot draw arbitrary boundaries around the urban crisis. Urban problems are not an island of discontent in a sea of suburban tranquillity. Urban city and suburban city are tightly tied together; they are economically interdependent and socially related, and they exist as mutual tenants in a common metropolitan phenomena.

The second truth is that the present *system* of servicing the urban center—the core area—does not work. Not just the individual components, but the system itself—the organization and division of responsibility within the urban area.

We have proved—if sometimes to everyone's satisfaction except the government's—that large transfusions of Federal money and large drafts of government workers do not work.

The third basic truth is, hopefully, self-evident. Namely, that government, by and large, should confine itself to "governing" and not be involved so deeply and so completely in the task of "doing."

Government is ideally suited for the role of catalyst, and to carry out its mandate as the central political institution in our society. But at the risk of heresy—and very much related to the question of whether the state or any other government can resolve the urban crisis—government is not a good manager.

As Peter Drucker points out, it may be debatable whether we are a government of laws or a government of men—but we are most assuredly a "government of forms."

Government, almost by definition, is procedural; it dwells in mammoth exercises of accountability as the trustee of public funds. As a result, in accounting for every penny of taxpayer's dollar while synthesizing every shade of the taxpayer's opinion, government becomes large and cumbersome and addicted too often to bureaucratic form.

At least one public official who served the Kennedy and Johnson administrations used to pray that national crises would occur on Saturdays, so that the administration could manage them without benefit of the normal, weekday bureaucratic entanglements.

And Arthur Schlesinger, who once addressed this forum, has written of President Kennedy's semi-serious daydreams of establishing a secret office of 30 people to run foreign policy while "maintaining the State Department as a facade in which people might contentedly carry papers from bureau to bureau."

The point of all of this is simply that management of the urban crisis by government at any level—or at least by government alone—is something of a contradiction in terms. Government in our modern society—in a pluralist society of highly complex institutions should not administer; it should not "do"—it should govern, and govern well.

The solution to the urban crisis, I believe, rests largely outside the resources of government. It may even rest outside of the present institutional forms we now have at our command.

We have at least one isolated example of innovation outside present form which carries a spark of hope. Wesleyan University in Connecticut poured endowment funds into its own Hilltop Development Corporation, purchased land, built low cost housing as a private venture.

Now the Wesleyan experiment is hardly sufficient evidence to create a national mandate. But it does do this much—it suggests that if we can rid ourselves of some long standing myths about what business can do and what government can do and what universities can do—we may be on the track of a whole new concept of public enterprise. I believe it is in this direction—the direction of innovation and new ideas—that the ultimate solution to our urban dilemma lies. And it is precisely in this direction that we are beginning to move in the State of Washington.

It is not an easy task, because we are treading on tender feet and monolithic tradition. But if we do not pursue the difficult—we may yet strangle in our self-inflicted web of restrictive laws, hopeless finances and helpless bureaucracy.

Our first step at the state level was to draw together the best minds of government, business and the academic community and form them into an Urban Affairs Council. This council is primarily a research task force, funded and staffed to seek out and identify the root problems facing Washington in its urban areas.

The Council has done an admirable job—and a controversial one—and that makes it all the more admirable because when someone hollers "ouch" we know we are cutting close to the heart of the matter.

The second step, was the creation of a Rural Affairs Council. This group represents recognition of the principle that you cannot draw arbitrary boundaries around urban problems. Our rural areas are either the next areas to be engulfed by the urban revolution, or they constitute the geography for a new solution.

It is painfully evident that we cannot continue to coerce increasing numbers of people into urban concentrations—we cannot compress human beings, with all their frailties and frustrations, like sardines in a can without lighting the fires of violence and social disruption.

And so we must begin to look outward to the rural areas, the areas which offer the space to create new cities—cities which are planned and cities which are limited in size.

We have spent the last one hundred years in achieving remarkable economic progress by taking people off the farm and putting them into the factories. And for all that is wrong there is much that is good. We *have* succeeded in breaking many of the bonds of rural poverty; we *have* brought increasing affluence to tens of millions of people, including millions of our minority citizens.

But in the process of doing this we have come dangerously close to causing a malfunction of the social and economic system. We have threatened to sacrifice our cities as the heavy price of a magnificent but too often material progress.

What good is affluence if it magnifies prejudice; what good is it if we foul the air we breathe and the water we drink; if we immobilize our transportation systems and watch old buildings crumble from neglect and decay; if crime and drugs erode human behavior and institutions grow so large and dehumanized that they shatter man's respect for the individuality of his fellow man.

The great cities of the ancient world were small by today's standards. There are disturbing signs that the monstrous urban centers of today, like the dinosaur may be headed toward extinction because they could not cope with a changing environment.

These are the questions that face us all—the crisis not just of urban areas, but the crisis of modern American civilization. It is not a municipal solution alone, or a state

solution alone, or a federal solution. It is not a government solution or a business solution; an urban solution or a rural solution. It is all of these together, but none of these apart.

And in accepting the indivisibility of the problem, we must begin to accept the inevitability of a total response—a response which does not perpetuate the concentration of people and does not perpetuate the concentration of power. A response which breaks down the emotional barrier between big business and big government, between organized labor and organized industry, between state governments and local governments. Until we reorganize our methods of attack—and unless we recognize that it is the *system* which is failing—we are going to spend a lot of long hot summers and chilling years waiting for the impossible to happen.

In King County, which is the largest in Washington, we have over 1,000 units of local government—second only to that of Cook County, Illinois. It seems incredible that in this modern age a situation like this could exist—a situation which some still call bringing government close to the people, but which, in fact, is an ill-disguised form of government by legal anarchy.

The state has a unique opportunity to play a role in resolving the urban crisis. Chief among these would be the impetus for merging local governments or providing for greater intergovernmental cooperation or, at the very least, for broader planning efforts. Specifically states should be considering implementation of regional or state-wide planning efforts and, perhaps, zoning as well, especially for unique or unusual geographic areas.

State-wide building codes should be implemented in order to provide standard and adequate approaches to new construction. County-wide or preferably regional sewer and water plans ought to be implemented which could supersede the individual efforts of small and unresponsive special unit districts.

Better area-wide cooperation of police agencies could be implemented as has been done in some areas of the nation. Better efforts could be implemented at the state level to bring together through proper planning and incentive, the working, living and recreational areas, thus minimizing the need for massive transportation facilities. Massive urban areas could be personalized by the implementation of community based organizations within each city that had a certain amount of authority but which worked as part of a larger whole.

Transportation systems, devised at the state levels, should be utilized as a major form of area-wide planning and community building rather than as an afterthought to serve traffic already generated.

The question is—do we have time in a superheated age of rebellion and frustration; do we have time to reassemble this colossal humpty-dumpty into a more effective system of fewer governments with broader powers.

But the second question is—do we want to? Or do we instead want to establish a new system by creating whole new institutions equipped to resolve the problems of this age. Not *that* age, but *this* age. Not *their* problems, but *our* problems.

Many of you have heard the term "reprivatization"—the restoration of private enterprise into the mainstream of public business; the turning over of the "doing," but not the "governing"—of public business to the one sector of our society that can be discharged if it fails.

Pete Drucker draws this sharp contrast:

"It takes a major catastrophe, a war, or a great revolution, to allow the disappearance of a university or of a hospital, no matter how superfluous they might have become. Again and again, for instance, the Catholic Church in the United States attempts to close down hospitals that have ceased to be useful. In almost every case a storm of community nostalgia forces the supposedly absolute bishop to retract his decision.

"But when one of the best known airplane manufacturers in the United States, the Douglas Company, was in difficulty in 1967, neither the American public or the American government rushed to its rescue. If a competitor had not bought out the company and merged it into his operations, we would have accepted the disappearance of Douglas—with regret, to be sure, and with a good deal of nostalgic rhetoric, but also with the feeling "It's their own fault, after all."

The point I think is clear—that business, precisely because it does make a profit *must* run the risk of a loss. It alone among institutions has a test of performance, and if it fails to meet that test, it can be discharged.

Reprivatization is hardly a popular doctrine in this country, for we have virtually two generations teaching the gospel of the public agency. The Communications Satellite Corporations are few, and the U.S. Post Offices are many.

But I believe we may be approaching the time when the doctrines of the past must be reexamined; when we must separate the emotional rhetoric of public responsibility from the desperate need for public performance.

The reinvolvement of the private sector will not weaken government. It should, instead, restore strength and performance capacity to what has become sick and incapacitated government.

In Washington, on a state level, we are taking the third step—the step beyond defining the urban problem and its rural complement. We are now beginning to examine seriously with business how industry, the universities and government can unite their resources for a combined attack on contemporary problems. The first manifestation of this is likely to be a multiple-discipline "think tank" organization—a public affairs institute which offers its joint resources to the public.

But I can foresee the time—and very shortly—when public corporations emerge from this experiment, corporations subscribed to by private business and public institutions. And I can see, through them, a whole new perspective on the resolution of our urban problems.

It *is* heretical doctrine, but I think it is high time that we did some heretical thinking in this country. Too often we have become enslaved by what John Kenneth Galbraith called the "conventional wisdom"—a propensity to worship the forms of our ancestors, and to believe in systems not because they work but because they exist.

I hope that this assembly does not bind itself with the bonds of precedent, that it does not become fascinated by the details at the expense of the principle. The cities of this nation are in trouble; they are being whipsawed by a conglomerate of problems, by a rising tide of frustration and by the over-burdened, under financed but somehow sacred anachronisms of government.

We cannot purchase the future of the American city. We cannot beg it. But we can, if we will, find a new way.

There is no better time, no better place, no surer road, no greater task, no greater goal.

We will either reorganize the failure of the past or we will build for the success of the future. I know where I stand. I think I know where you stand, too. Thank you.

RUSSIAN MILITARY STRENGTH

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there are some in this country who would deny everything to the military forces, I think it is imperative that we examine the military strength of Russia. It is one thing to base decisions on facts; it is another to base decisions on wishful thinking. I believe the article which appeared on page 36 of Time magazine of May 4, 1970, is so important that I commend its reading to every Member of this body. For this reason, I am inserting this article in the RECORD:

MOSCOW'S MILITARY MACHINE: THE BEST OF EVERYTHING

While Moscow was celebrating Lenin's centennial with pomp and rhetoric, the Soviet military marked the occasion in a more dramatic way. Fanning out across three oceans and nine seas, more than 200 Soviet warships staged the greatest naval maneuvers in the world's history. At the same time, hundreds of medium- and long-range Russian bombers ventured far beyond the borders of the Soviet Union. The U.S. reported 500 separate sightings as far apart at Japan and Iceland.

It was an impressive display. As part of Operation *Okean* (for ocean), an attack force of eight vessels built around the new 18,000-ton helicopter carrier *Leningrad* moved through the North Atlantic toward the Norwegian Sea. There, two larger Soviet task forces lay in wait to conduct a mock defense near the straits of Skagerrak and Kattegat, the approaches to the Baltic. In the Mediterranean, 45 ships conducted antisubmarine exercises. From the icy Barents and Okhotsk seas to the warmer reaches of the Indian and Pacific oceans, sleek Russian cruisers and black-hulled submarines carried out simultaneous exercises.

During the past eight years, the Soviets have been engaged in a massive and costly military buildup. They have been motivated both by a desire to overtake the U.S. and by deep fear of a possible war with China, an anxiety that is certain to intensify with the launching of Peking's first satellite. At home and abroad, the Russian military has become an increasingly important factor. In foreign policy, the Soviets are relying ever more on military presence and displays of armed might to tighten their control over East Europe or to influence uncommitted countries farther afield. Within Russia, the military's immense influence has been greatly enhanced by the threat of war with China and the Czechoslovak invasion. The importance of the military was only underscored when Communist Party Boss Leonid Brezhnev flew to Minsk recently for the massive Dvina maneuvers, and stood on the reviewing stand alongside Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko, 66. The unmistakable message for Soviet televiewers was that all was harmonious between the chiefs of the Communist Party and the military establishment.

GUARANTEEING ALLEGIANCE

An austere, erect, onetime cavalry commander, Grechko has become the Kremlin's most effective enforcer. As Soviet commander in East Germany in 1953, he put down the first East bloc revolt against Communism. In 1968 his forces put an end to Czechoslovakia's "Springtime of Freedom," and he

personally visited Prague the following year to oversee the removal of Reformer Alexander Dubcek from the leadership of the party. Czechoslovaks bitterly refer to the bullet-pocked facade of Prague's National Museum as "a fresco a la Grechko."

From his office in the former Czarist Cadets College just off Moscow's broad Kalinin Prospect, Grechko directs a mammoth military machine that employs 3,220,000 people, commands the talent of the Soviet Union's best technical brains, and annually spends an estimated $70 billion. Thus, even though the Soviet gross national product is only two-thirds as large as the U.S.'s, Russia virtually matches the U.S. ruble for dollar in defense outlays. Through a network of some 15,300 advisers, Soviet military influence reaches directly into many countries far beyond the East bloc, including the two main U.S. trouble spots, North Viet Nam and Cuba. Under the Warsaw Pact, Soviet troops are stationed in four Eastern European countries to guarantee their allegiance to Moscow.

Within the Soviet hierarchy, Grechko speaks directly to the political leaders without any civilian intermediaries to challenge his recommendations. At least once a month, he meets with the Politburo's defense subcommittee headed by Brezhnev. Their relationship is believed to be extremely cordial, if not close.

DUTY AND SACRIFICE

Brezhnev's concern with the military is understandable, because the Soviet military establishment exerts a far greater influence on Russian life and on the formation of Soviet public opinion than is generally realized in the West. The Soviet Defense Ministry runs one of Russia's largest publishing houses, which turns out 15 million copies of pamphlets and books each year. In Moscow alone, the Defense Ministry publishes no fewer than 40 periodicals and newspapers. *Red Star*, the official army newspaper, trails only *Pravda*, *Izvestia* and the trade union paper *Trud* in circulation in the entire Soviet Union.

From his earliest years, a Soviet child is exposed to the influence of the military. Soviet schoolchildren are raised on films that glorify the concepts of duty and sacrifice for the homeland. Sample: During World War II, a 13-year-old boy runs away to the front, and by the time his age is discovered, he has become a hero by spying behind German lines. His reward? Despite his tender years, he is allowed to remain at the front. Schoolchildren are regularly escorted by military guides on tours of World War II battlefields.

PARTY CONTROLS

The 1967 draft reform, which reduced the length of service by one year, expanded compulsory military training for teen-agers. During the last four years in high school, Soviet officers and reservists teach Russian youngsters how to put on a gas mask, attack a bridge and kill a sentry. The students also learn how to fire automatic rifles and perform basic infantry tactics. In addition, they master at least one handy military skill, such as operating a radio or riding a motorcycle. Some boys even learn how to parachute, fly aircraft and use scuba diving gear.

With its vast organization and rigid hierarchy, the Soviet military is a glaring contradiction of the early Communist belief that armies, like the state, would soon wither and die. When Lenin founded the Red Army of Workers and Peasants in 1918 under the command of Leon Trotsky, the force reflected its revolution origins. Rank was abolished, leaders were elected, recruitment was voluntary and orders could be questioned. Even so, as Washington Sovietologist Roman Kolkowicz points out in *The Soviet Military and the Communist Party*, some military characteristics asserted themselves, and all clashed sharply with Communist doctrine: the army's elitism *v.* the party's egalitarianism, professional autonomy *v.* subordination to idealogy, nationalism *v.* proletarian internationalism, heroic symbolism *v.* annoymity.

From the first, the Communist Party regarded the army as both a vital necessity—and a potential rival. During the civil war, political commissars had the power to countermand orders made by the military commanders, a practice that was not completely abolished until 1943. Grechko was chosen largely because he showed no signs of political ambition. In fact, Marshal Georgy Zhukov is the only general who ever openly expressed political ambitions—and the only military professional who ever served on the Politburo. He lasted a bare four months as full member of the Politburo before Khruschev fired him for "Bonapartism" in 1957.

Today, 90% of the officers are members either of the party or of the Communist youth organization. Grechko and 22 other top commanders serve on the party's Central Committee as well. In the outlying military districts, the commanders almost always participate in the top party leadership of those areas.

Every company size unit of 150 or so men has its own political officer, who reports through a separate chain of command to General Aleksei Yepishev, the party watchdog. Each week the political officer conducts at least four hours of indoctrination for both officers and men. The KGB (secret police) also keeps a close watch on the military.

AN ELITIST ELEMENT

Within Soviet society, the army remains a distinct and elitist element (*see box, page 46*). Its role is greatly augmented because of the public's overriding preoccupation with security. Of course the Russians, who lost 20 million people in World War II, have a legitimate concern about defense. But the Soviet government and especially the military publications have intensified Russian fears by purposefully keeping alive the memories of World War II and the specter of a rearmed, vengeful West Germany. The Russians still regard themselves as endangered by enemies, notably China. Given such a national psychology, the military understandably gets largely what it wants for the country's defense.

One look at the shape of the Soviet military machine shows that Grechko and his colleagues get quite a lot, indeed. The line-up:

The strategic missile force, an independent branch in the Soviet setup, has grown dramatically. In 1965, the Soviets had only 220 ICBMs and were outnumbered more than 4 to 1 by the U.S. While the number of U.S. intercontinental missiles has grown only slightly to 1,054, the Soviet total is now roughly 1,350 and is still increasing by about 250 a year. The workhorse is the 1-megaton SS–11 (800 operational or under construction). But the Soviet missile that most alarms U.S. defense planners is the awesome SS–9 (220 operational, 60 launch sites under construction). The SS–9 is so powerful that it can carry a single 25-megaton warhead or three separate 5-megaton warheads, each capable of knocking out a hardened American underground silo. Thus U.S. Defense Secretary Melvin Laird warns that 450 SS–9s with triplet warheads could knock out 90% of the U.S.'s ICBM force. However, though the Soviets lead in the number and megatonnage of ICBMs, the U.S., with its larger fleets of H-bombers and Polaris subs, retains a substantial edge in the overall number of deliverable warheads.

The U.S. holds an even greater edge in the latest breakthrough in missile weaponry. That is the development of multiple warheads that are carried by a single missile. There are two types. The simpler ones are called MRVs (for multiple re-entry vehicles). They land in a pre-planned pattern, but they cannot be steered to widely separated targets. The SS–9 is of this type, carrying three warheads designed to land in a "footprint" similar to the layout of U.S. Minuteman silos. But the U.S. is already installing a much more advanced version of these weapons called MIRVs (for multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles). Since each MIRV warhead has its own guidance system, a cluster of the weapons carried by one missile can hit an array of targets scattered over a wide area. While the Pentagon has evidence that the Soviets are testing MIRVs, it will probably take Moscow at least two or three years to perfect and install the devices. If the U.S. speeds up the conversion of its land-based ICBM and Polaris force to MIRVs, it can virtually triple its offensive capacity, but such action is certain to evoke a Soviet countermove, thus adding more momentum to the arms spiral.

The Navy, the world's second largest, has 465,000 men sailing 25 cruisers, 77 destroyers, 400 seagoing and coastal vessels, 280 minesweepers, 150 Osa- and Komar-class boats, and 350 patrol craft. In addition, the navy has two new helicopter carriers, the *Moskva* and *Leningrad*. The Soviets also possess by far the world's largest undersea force—350 submarines, 80 of which are nuclear-powered. At the present rate of construction, the Soviet fleet of twelve missile-bearing nuclear subs could outnumber the U.S. fleet of 41 Polaris subs by 1973–74. The Soviet navy's ships are newer and often faster than the U.S. navy's; only 1% of Russian naval ships are 20 years old, while 60% of American vessels have been in service for two decades or more. Nonetheless, U.S. craft have superior electronic devices to detect and destroy enemy ships and planes. The Soviet navy's air arm, operating from land bases, includes 300 TU–16 Badger medium bombers and 50 TU–20 Bear reconnaissance planes.

The army, which was neglected by Khrushchev, has climbed back to 1,500,000, partly because of the China border dispute. Khrushchev's successors, who reversed his one-sided reliance on rocketry, have placed great emphasis on the modernization of the army. Now a mobile, fast-striking force, the army is fully motorized and possesses the world's largest array of tanks—about 40,000. Geared to fighting over vast continental masses laced by countless rivers, the Russians have far better mobile bridge-building equipment than the U.S., and many of the tanks are equipped with six-foot snorkels for fording rivers.

The air force is composed of 9,900 planes and 400,000 people. The Soviets have 200 strategic bombers that can make round trips to the U.S. There are some 700 medium bombers (range: 3,000 miles); the U.S. has had none since the B–47 was phased out. The Soviet tactical air force includes 4,800 planes, mainly attack bombers such as the YAK–28 and fighters (MIG–21s and SU–7s), which can be used for low-level bombing and strafing missions. There are also some 1,700 transport aircraft, including an estimated 20 of the monstrous Antonov–22s, which can carry 720 troops. Despite the Soviet advantage in numbers, most experts rate the U.S. Air Force superior to the Russian in every important category because of superior U.S. equipment and pilot combat experience.

The air defense command, also a separate branch, has 500,000 men. It has 3,400 interceptor aircraft, mostly MIG–19s and MIG–21s, and a number of giant TU–114s, which patrol Soviet borders as early-warning radar aircraft. Long-range antiaircraft SA–5 missiles are installed on the Tallinn Line along the Gulf of Finland. Around Moscow the Soviets have deployed the world's first ABM system, consisting of 64 Galosh missiles, which carry a 1- or 2-megaton warhead and

have a range of several hundred miles. Because the Soviets halted deployment of the Galoshes three years ago, many Americans felt that the system was being abandoned as technically unfeasible. The Pentagon maintains, however, that the Soviets have developed an improved version. In addition, the Russians have embarked on the nationwide installation of their Hen House radar stations (so called because they look like large rectangular cages), designed to track incoming missiles for the Soviet ABM system. The Pentagon cites the Soviet developments as a reason for pressing ahead with the next phase of the U.S.'s Safeguard program. Should one side develop an effective ABM system first, it would upset the balance of nuclear terror. In the dreadful scenario of nuclear war, the country that first has ABMs might be tempted to launch a nuclear attack against the other side, since it would itself be protected from the stricken foe's retaliatory strike.

FILCHING APPLES

In research and development, the Soviets now spend $16 billion v. the U.S.'s $13 billion. Much of this effort is defensive. To blind American radar, the Soviets have developed a metallic radar chaff that forms an impenetrable curtain in the air. When the invasion of Czechoslovakia began, the Russians used this "metallic mist" to blind Western radar while Soviet transports swept into Prague airport. The Soviets are working on an anti-satellite that can examine U.S. spies-in-the-sky and knock them down. They are putting into service a Mach 3 twin-finned MIG-23, primarily a bomber killer, and are developing three classes of quieter and faster attack submarines whose mission will be to seek out and destroy submarines. Also under development: a second-generation "coasting" or "loitering" ABM, which would linger in the anticipated flight path of an incoming enemy missile and pounce on it from above.

But the Soviet R&D effort is not all defense-oriented. The Russians have developed a swing-wing bomber and a fractional orbital bombing system (FOBS), using ICBMs that are fired on a low trajectory and would approach the U.S. from its blind side: the Southwest, whose American radar coverage is still scant. At the Sary-Shagan test site in Kazakhstan, the world's largest missile impact range, the Russians are also developing a longer-range sub-fired missile for its new Yankee class submarines; one of them is already on patrol off the U.S.'s Atlantic coast.

Impressive as it is, the Soviet military has serious deficiencies. It lacks an efficient logistics system, as Czechoslovakia proved when Moscow had to press civilian trucks into service and when Soviet soldiers ran out of rations and water after a few days. Russian soldiers are trained, however, to live off the land; some did so in Prague by trying to filch apples from the garden at the American embassy.

Despite improvements, Soviet submarines do not run as deeply and quietly as U.S. subs and are thus easier to detect and catch. Soviet surface ships lack air cover when they venture outside Russian waters. The Soviet navy is now trying to remedy that failing through the installation of shipboard anti-aircraft missiles.

The Soviets have two other severe handicaps. One is the questionable reliability of their Warsaw Pact allies, who in the event of an emergency might not prove too helpful to the Communist cause. An even more serious failing is lack of experience. For better or worse, the U.S. has fought two major wars in the past two decades. An entire generation of Soviet officers and N.C.O.'s, however, have never been subjected to the crucible of combat.

For all its ominous overtones, the Soviet military buildup has had one positive result. If the Soviets had not gained parity with their old rival, they undoubtedly would have refused to participate in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), which started in Vienna two weeks ago. For the U.S. however, the question is when—or whether—the Soviets will halt their missile momentum. In his speech last week, Laird emphasized that if Soviet strength were to level off, Washington would not be alarmed. But if the Kremlin sought to move from parity to superiority, the Secretary of Defense added, the U.S. would have to launch its own buildup. It is no secret that Gerard Smith, the chief U.S. negotiator at SALT, and Secretary of State William Rogers would have preferred not to draw public attention to the Soviet buildup. But President Nixon felt otherwise and, as Laird explained privately, "if I don't give this speech, the President will have to."

Critics of the Pentagon, who recall past U.S. overreaction to a supposed Soviet bomber threat in the late '50s and an imaginary "missile gap" in the early '60s, fear that Laird is overdramatizing the Soviet menace. Senator William Proxmire, for example, accuses the Defense Department of resorting to scare tactics to coax more funds out of Congress. Many critics regret that the Nixon Administration refused to heed the Senate's advice to propose to the Soviets an immediate mutual moratorium on the deployment of defensive and offensive strategic weapons, including MIRV and ABM. As these critics see it, this approach would have involved no serious risks for U.S. security. Their argument is that the U.S. deterrent is capable of dealing with any contingency and that the Polaris fleet remains invulnerable to Soviet countermeasures. Thus, Moscow's missile buildup has not yet approached the point where it could alter the nuclear balance.

Yet, if a new action-reaction cycle is set in motion with the deployment of ABMs and MIRVs, the present balance of terror could be upset. Warns M.I.T.'s George Rathjens: "The American deployment of the MIRVs is not in our own national interest and is a threat to both countries." His point is that, as a countermeasure, the Soviets may feel compelled to link the firing of their own ICBMs to a radar warning system. That would leave the decision to launch with a machine, which could suffer a short circuit and set off World War III. Rathjens and many other American intellectuals, notably Columbia's Marshall Shulman, feel that U.S. security would be better served by holding off on MIRV deployments while trying to seek a mutual ban on the weapons with the Soviets at SALT.

Aside from SALT, the Soviet military surge worries U.S. and NATO defense planners because of the new flexibility it gives the Kremlin. Present Soviet military doctrine warns that the imperialists are plotting to unleash a nuclear war and stresses that the Russians must be ready to deliver "a timely rebuff to the aggressors." Despite this purposely vague formula, the Russians reject the idea of starting an unprovoked nuclear war themselves. As Sovietologist Raymond L. Garthoff, now an adviser to the U.S. delegation at SALT, pointed out in his 1966 book, *Soviet Military Policy:* "Communist doctrine *does* inject unusually strong hostility and suspicion into Soviet policymaking, but Marxism-Leninism does not propel the Soviet Union blindly toward war or the witting assumption of great risks." Communist doctrine does, however, impel them toward a global competition short of direct U.S.-Soviet warfare.

ECONOMIC DILEMMA

What will the Russians do with their power? For one thing, they may be emboldened to become less wary about facing down the U.S. in isolated instances abroad. Equally important, the U.S. may become more cautious about situations that could lead to a Mediterranean, a U.S. landing in Lebanon of confrontation. With Soviet ships all over the the 1958 variety would be virtually out of the question today. The main thrust of Soviet power, however, is almost certain to be toward undermining the confidence of U.S. allies in the value of American protection and to move into areas where the West's influence is either marginal or declining.

In Western Europe, the Soviets are attempting to capitalize on fears about the declining effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear umbrella and the likely departure of large numbers of U.S. troops. In this anxious situation, the Soviets obviously hope that their own growing power will persuade the Western Europeans to be less closely aligned with the U.S.

In the Middle East, the Russians now have some 12,000 advisers, and they have supplied the Arabs with at least $3 billion in arms aid since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Earlier this month, Soviet landing craft loaded with Egyptian and perhaps Syrian troops simulated a landing south of Tel Aviv, while some 50 Soviet warships were strung out across the Mediterranean from Libya to Greece as a blocking force against NATO fleets. A Soviet flotilla regularly patrols the Indian Ocean, until recently a British and American preserve, and Soviet naval activity in the Pacific has doubled in the past few years. Along the Sino-Soviet border, the Russians have doubled their troops to 300,000, brought up medium-range missiles (MRMs), and established a new area command to coordinate the defense efforts.

The Soviets have paid a high price for their military buildup. Though they have assembled an impressive array of military might, they have done so at the cost of neglecting important sectors of their economy. The heavy emphasis on defense spending is one main reason why large sectors of Soviet industry have lagged so far behind in modernization. The Soviets have given up a whole array of consumer goods that other people in other countries, even within Eastern Europe, take for granted.

In the coming months, Russia's military machine may well pose a crucial dilemma for Leonid Brezhnev. If he does indeed depend on the generals for vital support, he will naturally be extremely wary of cutting into military expenditures. On the other hand, since he has staked his political reputation on his ability to improve the Soviet economy, he will be under increasing pressure to carry out a reordering of Soviet priorities.

KEEP KITTERY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, one of Maine's best-known journalists, Mr. William Caldwell, recently completed a three-part series of articles regarding the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. These articles, which appeared in the Maine Sunday Telegram, April 12, 19, and 26, describe fully the historic and economic significance of this major shipbuilding facility. Most important, however, they also describe the strategic importance of this vital shipyard. With special thanks to Bill Caldwell for providing so much information in such a readable manner, I hereby insert this series of articles in the RECORD, in order that they may come to the attention of other indi-

viduals who share my concern regarding naval strength and the national security:

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 12, 1970]

KEEP KITTERY! HOME TO 134 SUBMARINES

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—The skilled welder shielded behind his welding mask; the pretty girl in personnel; the merchant in downtown Portsmouth; the technician working in a nuclear submarine hull who wears a film badge to measure the radiation he may absorb; the apprentice starting out—almost 8,000 persons inside Kittery Navy Yard, and thousands more outside the security gates, are all seeking answers to the same plaguing question;

"Will Kittery be closed in 1974? Or will President Nixon countermand the standing order to close Kittery, issued by McNamara six years ago?"

This question looms larger every day. It looms large not only in Maine and New Hampshire, but also in the White House and in the National Security Council, in the Pentagon, in the Congress—and inside Soviet Russia.

For upon the answer hinges not only our burning local issue of some 7,500 jobs and some $80 million a year in local payrolls and procurement. Upon the answer also hinges the greatest question of our time—"Is American nuclear strategy about to get a far-reaching overhaul? Is President Nixon soon to make a massive shift from land-based nuclear missiles to a sea-based deterrent?"

The Telegram will focus three successive articles upon first hand reports from the Navy Shipyard at Kittery. This first article deals with the yard's economic impact upon the people of Maine and New Hampshire; another will recount the illustrious 170 year history of Kittery Shipyard; and the third will deal with the role of submarines in nuclear war, and the imminent possibility of a major shift to maritime missiles.

That human model of machine management, Robert Strange McNamara, sometimes called "Mac the Knife", issued six years ago, in November 1964, a Defense Department order to close out the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard by 1974.

McNamara resigned as Secretary of Defense some two years ago. And the Presidency has since changed. But that Order still stands today. And unless the Nixon administration soon rescinds the McNamara order, Kittery will close in 1974.

That, at least, is official navy doctrine. However, well informed sources close to the highest levels of official Washington are now beginning to lay small side bets that Kittery will be in the nuclear submarine business for many years to come.

Here at Kittery in April 1970, there is very little sign in material matters that Kittery is "phasing out", or that the McNamara order has been much implemented since he issued it almost six years ago. But there is human nervousness among the 7,600 people who work here.

Some of Kittery's highly skilled technicians have left already to work in other yards, where no impending ax may fall. Thousands of other workers are worried about their jobs. For in addition to the worry caused by the McNamara order to close Kittery by '74, the Nixon administration has recently ordered a 20 per cent cutback in Kittery's work force by July 1971. This order is indeed being carried out now.

But this "reduction in force" is an economy measure applying to all naval shipyards everywhere and is unrelated to McNamara's order to close Kittery. Nevertheless it is adding to the job jitters, since 1500 jobs must be abolished by next July.

The average hourly rate at Kittery is $4.05. The average yearly wage at Kittery is $9000; the average industrial wage in Maine as a whole is $6000. So it may not be easy to find as good a job nearby.

But the job-jitters are by no means at a panic stage here. Far from being "phased-out", Kittery is busy today. Her three dry docks are jam full. Five nuclear submarines are at Kittery now, undergoing overhaul, conversion, construction or refueling with nuclear energy.

Kittery is finishing the 292 feet, 4,600 tons submerged "Sand Lance", a $100 million plus nuclear submarine, the 134th submarine built at Kittery. Kittery is converting the Sam Rayburn from Polaris to newer Poseidon missiles, and overhauling the Kittery-built nuclear submarines Timaro, Dolphin and Albacore. Furthermore, the Navy recently announced that still another major overhaul and still another major conversion job are being scheduled for Kittery.

Such jobs can take up to 24 months, cost more than $30 million each. So there is plenty of life and work at Kittery now.

Last year Kittery did more than $100 million worth of submarine work. The volume booked for 1970 may be just as big.

None of these indicators point toward the closing of Kittery, the only Navy yard specializing 100 percent in nuclear submarines. And there are 87 nuclear powered submarines in the U.S. fleet now, with 6 more to be launched in 1970.

However because Kittery is officially under orders to be closed by 1974, Navy funds for needed maintenance of the Yard have been meager.

Nevertheless close to $3 million are now being spent on giving Kittery a new sewer plant; another million has been recently spent for a Radiological Control Facility, directly related to handling nuclear submarines; a further $1.3 million has been spent on steam lines and electric power distribution. All these funds have been spent in the past 36 months.

Training programs, which cost about $2 million a year, are continuing, future needs for submarine technicians is increasing; and it takes four years to train an apprentice.

In the Commandant's office, Capt. D. M. Kearns, who has worked in submarines for 15 years, parries questions about the closing of his yard. "Look," he says. "I am a naval officer. My job is to carry out whatever orders the Navy Department gives me. And the order which stands now is that Kittery closes in 1974. So I cannot discuss anything else."

Among civilians in Portsmouth's business section, the attitude is radically different. Banker Arthur N. Berry, president of the Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Forces Committee, is eager to spell out how the citizens and the businesses of the area are fighting hard to keep Kittery open and to get the McNamara order to close the Yard rescinded.

This committee has some 4,000 individual members, is supported by contributions from shipyard workers, from businesses in 40 towns of the area, and from communities. From the $50,000 or so raised each year, the Committee maintains lobbying offices in Portsmouth and Washington, D.C.

The Washington office is headed by Rear Admiral Joshua W. Cooper, USN (Ret) who receives $20,000 for salary and expenses. An additional $25,000 taken from reserves, was spent in the past 12 months for public relations. Other operating expenses last year included $2200 of stationery and postage, $1250 for meals and travel and telephone, $10,000 for secretarial and administrative costs, $2500 for staging a membership drive.

In the past five years, the Committee has received $104,115 from business firms in 16 towns, $121,768 from shipyard workers and $40,770 from nearby municipalities. "We are fighting hard and well in a cause we know is right . . . right not just for this area, but for the defense of all the United States", says Arthur Berry.

Maine supplies about 42 per cent of the entire Kittery work force. There were 3200 Maine-held jobs out of the 7650 total in December 1969.

The Maine payroll at Kittery totalled $30,735,000 in 1969. A town by town analysis shows that the following Maine towns benefitted principally from employment at Kittery.

Maine	Workers in Kittery yard	Payroll
Town:		
Berwick	82	[1] $738,000
Biddeford	457	4,113,000
Eliot	277	2,493,000
Kennebunk-West Kennebunk	105	945,000
Kennebunkport	45	405,000
Kittery-Kittery Point	896	8,864,000
Lebanon-E. Lebanon	28	252,000
North Berwick	52	468,000
Old Orchard Beach	63	567,000
Portland-South Portland	70	630,000
Saco	187	1,683,000
Sanford-Springvale	306	2,754,000
South Berwick	183	1,647,000
Wells-Ogunquit	132	1,188,000
The Yorks	361	3,249,000
All other	171	1,539,000
Totals	3,415	30,735,000

[1] Based on average $9,000 annual wage.

Note: Actual average is $9,351 in 1969.

In addition, navy personnel residents in Maine received pay totalling another $600,000, and the Kittery Yard made local purchases in Maine amounting to a further $700,000. Thus the Kittery Yard funneled $30 millions into the Maine economy directly.

By comparison, New Hampshire received a total of $39.3 million, and Massachusetts $8.9 million.

Because of federal operations at the Naval Shipyard, school districts in the area received substantial federal aid in 1968 to impacted school districts.

York County, Maine, received over half a million dollars, with Kittery getting $190,000, Eliot and So. Berwick getting $83,000 and York getting $75,000.

Rockingham County, N.H. received in all $1½ millions, and Strafford County $350,000.

Portsmouth itself was the largest single beneficiary, getting $975,000 of federal aid to its schools.

Outside the shipyard itself, the Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee estimates Kittery Yard generates 5000 jobs in the area. This Committee also estimates that the taxable property owned by shipyard employees has a value of $75 million.

For 170 years, from the War of 1812 to the Nuclear contest today, Kittery has been a vital source of American naval strength. "The Yard" and Maine and New Hampshire are bred into each other's bloodstreams for seven generations. "Keep Kittery!" is the slogan here.

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 19, 1970]

"KEEP KITTERY!" A VITAL YARD FOR OUR NUCLEAR NAVY!

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—The bad old news is that Kittery—Portsmouth Naval Shipyard—where 7500 Maine and New Hampshire people earn $70 million a year in paychecks—is under orders from former Secretary of Defense McNamara to close down in 1974.

But the good new news is that Kittery, far from closing down may surge into a new span of vigorous life. Kittery—170 years old, first shipyard of the U.S. Navy—may become a vital pivot point if a new American nuclear strategy now being weighed in the White House, is adopted by President Nixon.

The heart of the proposed new nuclear strategy is a plan to shift the United States

from a land-based to a sea-based missile defense.

Under this plan President Nixon would disperse American's present land-based, fixed-site nuclear missiles to submarines, and would dispense America's land-based nuclear bomber force to mobile carriers at sea.

Reason for this proposed overhaul in strategy is that fixed-based Minutemen missiles and fixed-based bombers, once the keys of U.S. defense, are today becoming more and more vulnerable to destruction by new Soviet weapons, as documented later in this report.

In contrast to this growing vulnerability of land based missiles, new developments in American submarine design, submarine capability and weaponry, make U.S. nuclear submarines almost immune to detection. New emphasis on submarines is part of the new concept in nuclear strategy.

Since Kittery is the only U.S. naval shipyard on the Atlantic coast which specializes 100 per cent in nuclear submarines, these new developments may place Kittery in a wholly new light compared to the light in which McNamara viewed Kittery six years ago, back in 1964, and ordered the yard closed by 1974.

Since changes in strategy are made to meet changes in challenge, let us return to the documentation of the developing Soviet challenge. The challenge just ahead lies in the new ability of Soviet weapons to destroy America's land-based nuclear missiles and nuclear bombers located in known, fixed bases inside the United States.

This is the major reason for a proposed change-over by the United States to maritime nuclear missiles instead of land based Minutemen. Specifically, Pentagon planners cite the fact that the Soviet is expected to have 420 of its mammoth SS–9 missiles on the launch pads by 1975.

These SS–9 missiles, each capable of carrying at least three 5-megation warheads, are designed to destroy U.S. land-based Minutemen missiles sitting in their silos. Advanced Soviet missiles have a range of 6000 miles and an accuracy of hitting within three-tenths of a mile of their targets. Even a "thick" multibillion dollar ABM defense network to protect our Minutemen in their silos is likely to be inefficient and obsolete by the time the A.B.M. defenses are operational.

Hence the "old" strategy of reliance on 1,054 land-based missiles is becoming shaky. Hence the arguments for a shift to sea-based missiles are gaining supporters. Hence the logic of keeping Kittery, the U.S. Navy's most experienced nuclear submarine yard.

Another reason for shifting the emphasis of U.S. strategy to sea-based nuclear power is that new Soviet weapons may soon be capable of destroying many of our 450 long-range nuclear bombers on the ground at their airfields. This is because by 1975, Russia is expected to have a submarine fleet armed with missiles capable of annihilating U.S. bombers on the ground in a surprise attack.

The source for both these predictions is Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

In recent testimony to Congress this February Laird stated that the Soviets will be able to destroy 95 per cent of America's land-based missile force by 1975.

Thus the "old" strategy of reliance on land based, long-range nuclear bombers may be shifting to a new strategy of emphasing seaborne nuclear bombers aboard mobile carriers, as well as Polaris, Poseidon and ULMs missiles abroad submarines.

Nuclear-bomber carriers in turn would require nuclear attack submarines to protect them against Soviet attack submarines, a fast growing force in the Russian navy.

Kittery is experienced in building these types of underwater attack craft too, as well as building ballistic missile submarines.

In addition to Sec. Laird, another high Pentagon official has further documented in public the Nixon administration's awareness that new Soviet weapons endanger the "old" American strategy of relying on land-based missiles for defense.

He is Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Engineering and Research.

In a statement to the Joint Armed Services Committee on February 26, Dr. Foster said: "We are not sure that the problems of land-based-missile survivability can be solved permanently. In the unfortunate case that they cannot, a backup is to place greater emphasis and independence on our sea-based missile forces . . . A major restructuring of the strategic forces may be necessary to insure survivability if the Soviet threat continues to grow along present trends."

This kind of "restructuring of the strategic forces" points directly to a larger, better armed nuclear submarine fleet. This is turn points favorably to Kittery.

No naval shipyard in the United States has so long and so concentrated experience in submarines as Kittery. Kittery has built 134 submarines, from the first in any U.S. Navy yard to the most-modern nuclear research submarines.

Briefly, here is an abbreviated history of Kittery "firsts" in submarines.

Kittery built the first submarine ever launched from a navy shipyard. This was back in 1917. And Kittery went on to build eight more submarines in World War I.

Kittery designed half of the entire U.S. submarine fleet in World War II. On a single day in 1944, Kittery launched four new submarines. Kittery had a work force of over 20,000 people at the peak of World War II. and produced 75 submarines.

Since World War II, Kittery has designed and launched the first nuclear submarine in any navy shipyard; has designed and built the world's fastest submarine (Albacore); has designed and built the world's deepest-diving submarine (Dolphin).

Kittery is now completing SandLance, the Navy's newest nuclear submarine to join the fleet, and is converting the Sam Rayburn from Polaris to Poseidon missiles.

Kittery has built 134 submarines; has 7,500 skilled submarine technicians; has drydock facilities for five submarines; has the only "Sound Detection" basin for submarines in any U.S. Navy shipyard; and has direct unobstructed swift access to the open sea. Kittery is one of only three U.S. navy shipyards on the East coast which is licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission to handle contaminated nuclear material. Kittery alone of all U.S. yards is the only yard 100 percent specialist in nuclear submarines. Kittery is also the spare parts and procurement center for the entire Atlantic submarine fleet, with an inventory of $45 million worth of submarine gear.

Two other important aspects of national defense strategy are hammered at in the position papers given to the National Security Council by the experts who advocate a new nuclear strategy based on maritime instead of land-based missiles and bombers.

One involves the future U.S. ability to deliver a devastating retaliation in case of attack.

Military sources in Washington estimate that only about 50 out of 1000 Minuteman fixed-base missiles might survive a Soviet attack on the U.S. silos. They go on to predict that these 50 surviving missiles will have less and less chance of reaching the Soviet targets at which they are pre-aimed since the Soviets are saturating with ABM defenses the perimeter through which such missiles must fly.

These sources say that U.S. land-based missiles targeted for the Soviet would have to travel through a global arc of only 32 degrees, and that this line of attack narrows down to only nine per cent of the Soviet defense perimeters. These corridors could feasibly bristle with anti-missile missiles. And shoot down our pre-tracked missiles fired from fixed bases in the U.S. But, say these experts, if U.S. missiles were perpetually travelling on or under the sea, the Soviets could not guard so effectively against this far wider arc of attack. The Russians would not know in advance the track such dispersed missiles would travel.

The other argument put forward by advocates more reliance on mobile maritime nuclear strategy involves the safety of the U.S. civilian population.

They argue that fixed-base Minuteman missiles within the U.S. automatically means that any Soviet or Chinese attack upon our missile force must also be an attack upon the continental United States, which means millions of civilian casualties.

The Soviet development of nuclear warheads with a 6000 mile range and with accuracy to within three tenths of a mile, has led Secretary of Defense Laird to tell Congress just two months ago:

"Should the Soviets follow a 'high-force, high-technology' approach during the next several years, they could pose not only an overwhelming threat to our cities, but also a very formidable threat to our land-base missiles and bombers."

Most of the vital considerations outlined in this article either did not prevail or were less pressing when McNamara issued his order to close Kittery back in 1964. Now the strategic situation has changed, the McNamara order may be rescinded.

If President Nixon decides in favor of the new nuclear maritime strategy being proposed at the highest levels in Washington, then the Kittery Yard, outstanding specialist in nuclear submarines may be far from closing in 1974. It may be surging forward as one of America's major bulwarks in a new nuclear policy.

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 26, 1970]

CLOSE KITTERY? NOT ON YOUR LIFE!

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—"Would YOU close Kittery, today?" I put the question to a Navy officer who, until recent retirement, ranked high in the Pentagon's Intelligence hierarchy.

"Close Kittery today?" he replied "Not on your life! . . . Some years back, maybe. But not today—not on your life!"

Today . . . when the expanding Soviet fleet embarks upon the first global maneuvers in history.

Today . . . when the U.S. may be switching its whole nuclear shield from fixed bases on land to mobile ships at sea.

Today . . . when submarines, deep, silent, hard to detect, may be the only U.S. weapons not constantly targeted into Soviet weaponry.

Today . . . when a $44 million research program for Underwater Longer Range Missiles is before Congress.

Today . . . when the Chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee insists upon a $300 million addition to the Navy's $2.7 billion ship building program.

Today . . . when Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense says that 95 per cent of our land based missiles might be wiped out in an attack by Soviet SS–9's.

Today it is President Nixon and Defense Secretary Laird, and Navy Secretary Chaffe (formerly Governor of Rhode Island) however—and not President Johnson and Secretary McNamara—who will decide whether Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is to close in 1974 or to stay open.

How differently will they see Kittery in the light of today's facts of Soviet and American nuclear capabilities? Six long years ago LBJ and McNamara, with different facts to go by, ordered that Kittery be closed by 1974.

The first article of this series told how the closing of Kittery could throw 7,500 Maine and New Hampshire people out of work in the yard; how they would lose $80 millions a year; how 35,000 men, women and children

would be affected in the area by any shutdown at Kittery.

The second article in the series spelt out how much nuclear and submarine know—how the Navy would lose if Kittery-Portsmouth, the foremost nuclear naval yard in the nation, were closed down.

This third and last article is totally different, unconcerned with strategy and economics.

Close Kittery?

The man who locks the gates on Kittery will lock the gates on the first and oldest shipyard in the United States Navy.

Kittery (or Portsmouth as they call it everywhere but Maine) has been a U.S. Navy Yard for 170 years.

On June 12 back in 1800, in the term of John Adams, second President of the United States, the government paid the sum of $5,500 to William Dennett for a 58 acres island in the Piscataqua River on which was established the first shipyard in the history of the United States Navy.

"See, here is the original map", says Captain Donald H. Kern, USN, the Commandant of the Yard in 1970. The brown parchment hangs on the paneled wall of Kern's big, barren office (one sheet of paper, one sharp pencil on a vast desk). "Note the handwritting in the bottom left corner" says Capt. Kern 15 year a submarine expert.

Under the heading of "A Plan of an Island in the Piscataqua River as a Navy Yard" is the hand-drawn map, and the hand-written notes "Mr. Humphries will mark such places as he thinks proper for a Stone Store, a House, and Rope Walks" signed Jacob Sheafe, Navy Agent.

Now, 170 years later the Stone House and the Rope Walks have become $100 million of buildings, drydocks, and millions more of submarine and nuclear technology.

Close Kittery?

The man who closes Kittery closes the Yard which built the 74 gun ship - of - the - line "Washington" back in 1815, a year after the British burned the White House, five years before Maine got statehood. He closes the Yard where 2455 men worked at shipbuilding in the thick of the Civil War and launched 26 ships, including two iron-clads and 18 steam sloops. Among those Kittery ships was "Kearsage", who defeated the confederate raider "Alabama" in a most memorable sea battle.

Close Kittery?

The man who closes Kittery closes the Yard which was home to the U.S.S. Constitution, most famous ship in all the U.S. Navy. "Old Ironsides" became Kittery's own Receiving Ship. "Don't give up the ship" has been in Kittery's bloodstream most of 100 years. And the man who closes Kittery will close the door on Admiral Farragut, the most famous sailor in the U.S. Navy. Farragut died at Kittery in 1870, in the same house where Kittery's commandant lives in 1970.

War ended at Kittery too. At 3:47 p.m. on 5 September 1905, in the Administration Building at Kittery, the envoys of Japan and Russia signed the peace treaty ending the Russo-Japanese war.

Close Kittery?

This is the Yard where the first submarine the U.S. Navy ever built was launched in 1917. And let today's Congress relish the fact that Kittery delivered that submarine for less than the price forecast.

Between 1917, in World War I, and 1941, before America got into World War II, Kittery built 33 new submarines, repaired scores of old ones, including Free French and British.

In World War II, Kittery designed more than half the whole U.S. submarine fleet. In three years, 1941–45, with 20,466 men in her Yards, Kittery produced 75 new subs, repaired or remodelled more. On a single day, January 27, 1944, Kittery launched four submarines. Kittery skills cut production time from 469 calendar days per submarine in 1941 down to just 173 days in 1944.

Close Kittery today? At the moment nuclear subs are becoming the first line of defense.

The man who closes Kittery closes the first naval yard to build a nuclear submarine, the Swordfish, in 1958.

Kittery also built Sea Dragon, the first submarine to sail under the polar ice cap.

Kittery also built the world's fastest submarine (Albacore) and the world's deepest diving submarine (Dolphin).

Today Kittery is building Sandlance, newest of nuclear subs. More than 134 submarines have been built at Kittery; and today Kittery is the "home base" for repair, overhauls, spare parts, maintenance scheduling for the entire Atlantic submarine fleet. In her supply shops over $43 million worth of spares stand ready for submarines in trouble.

If Kittery is closed, where could her facilities, her know-how ever be duplicated? And at what astronomical cost in dollars? At what perilous risk in time spent?

Kittery is the only Navy yard in the nation which is a 100 per cent specialist in nuclear submarines; it is the only navy yard with its own Sound Basin—an essential; it is one of only three navy yards on the Atlantic coast which has full licenses from the Atomic Energy Commission for handling nuclear cores.

Close Kittery? Since McNamara issued the closing order six years ago, the cost efficiency of Kittery has improved, and the need for Kittery has increased. Hear the testimony of the Navy's top submariners:—

The Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet wrote: "Completion of Sam Houston overhaul (cost $30 million) noted as shortest overhaul achieved to date in any shipyard . . . cost of overhaul will be lowest of class . . . the results of quality, timeliness and cost are tributes to command, management, technical and craft skills of shipyard."

Rear Admiral Edward J. Fay says, after tests of deep diving by Kittery-built Dolphin "Kittery Naval Shipyard has been the bastion of 'deep capability' . . . every successful major increase in depth incorporated into an operational submarine . . . has been attained first in a Kittery Naval shipyard product."

Close Kittery?

"Not today . . . Not on your life!" said the Intelligence authority quoted in the first sentence of this report.

Yet today Kittery is still under McNamara's order to be closed in 1974.

But Kittery, being a Navy Yard, is owned and operated by the citizens of America, and not by any private corporation.

Therefore if you believe Kittery should stay in operation—for your life or your livelihood—let your voice be heard. Write to Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. She is the ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, she holds seniority on the Appropriations Committee and Space Committee. Or write to Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, at the Pentagon. Or to President Nixon at the White House. These are the men who will soon be deciding whether your Yard will be shut down after 170 years service, or will continue as a bastion in America's nuclear defense.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1970

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Sfc. Robert D. Hanks of Pitkin, La., now serving at the U.S. Army Garrison in Carlisle Barracks, Pa., supplied me with a copy of a letter he has written to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, in which Sergeant Hanks reviews his Army career. This letter I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress, and I offer it for insertion at this point in the RECORD. The letter follows:

Hon. MELVIN LAIRD,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In a few months I shall be leaving the United States Army, retiring as a Sergeant First Class after 20 years of active service. It is with mixed emotions that I do this, especially since I did not particularly wish to retire. The change of attitude came with the realization that reality in the Department of Defense lies a considerable distance from the fine ideals you set forth in your declaration of Human Goals. I, like many others in the service, saw it everyday on the back of the Department of Defense telephone directory for the Winter 1969–1970. Unlike many others, I finally read it. But please indulge me a few minutes from your pressing schedule to explain. I feel that what I have to say is something that needs to be said. Perhaps because of the saying, some measure of good toward the attainment of your goals will derive to the Department.

After completing high school in 1948, I set out to earn my living. My family was in rather straitened circumstances and higher education was not even a dream to me. Then came the Korean War and as a citizen I volunteered for the Army and for duty in Korea. I served under fine officers who, even in the hectic press of preparing us young recruits for the task at hand, took time to preach that education was the path to success.

When more peaceful time returned I remembered their urgings and began taking college courses during my off-duty time. Through my own efforts I became qualified as a translator/interpreter. This was my first success and my first lesson that such success could hinder my rise to a higher level of responsibility.

The success was the award of proficiency pay for working in a critical skill for the Army. The lesson I learned was that promotions were blocked to me because some of my superiors were concerned that they should have good reports for ensuring that work they supervised was done efficiently and well. Because of grade and space authorizations in that unit, my promotion would have meant a change in jobs. This they were unwilling to do.

Still, I continued with my schooling (and got married, too!). Finally I received the Bachelor's degree with honors. Chief Justice Warren presented me an autographed copy of his book in recognition of this achievement. I began immediately to work for the Master's degree (a son now). Finally, a Warrant Officer was assigned to the unit. He decided the Army should live up to its promises of rewards through hard work and study and I got promoted. The unit was still able to use my skill as a linguist while I performed my regular duties as an intelligence analyst.

Boston University awarded me the Master's degree, my wife presented me a daughter, and the Army—well Vietnam was beckoning and I left for the Delta (for the second time) as an analyst. That tour completed I was assigned to Carlisle Barracks as the Chief (and only) Intelligence NCO. As such it became my special duty to advise and assist the other personnel engaged in security and intelligence work.

In August 1969 the Army started a Warrant Officer program for intelligence analysts and interrogators. Applicants were to be able to begin work without further schooling. Having gained considerable experience as an inter-

rogator on my last tour in the Delta, I applied for both, the Order of Battle Technician being my first choice.

A board was formed here at Carlisle Barracks to pass on my qualification. All the members knew me; still, they were considering an applicant for a higher level of responsibility in the Army and they tested me thoroughly—one of the officers even tested my linguistic ability. They recommended me highly for an appointment as Warrant Officer and the application was duly forwarded. They, and I, felt certain I should receive the appointment.

To prepare myself, I began taking correspondence courses with the Army Intelligence School so that I could review the principles of intelligence and catch up on new trends and developments in the field. I have completed 75 credit hours so far and another 12 hour course exam is in the mail. In addition, I began teaching American History to a group of young soldiers who were trying to complete their high school education.

My application was returned with some vague wording about intense competition, etc., to the effect that I was not chosen for appointment. Now really, Mr. Secretary, how many enlisted intelligence analysts or interrogators who applied for a Warrant have a Master's degree and qualified in two foreign languages (read, write and speak!)? Experience? I worked at both in combat with little or no supervision. I realize the Army is not obliged to appoint me. I wonder, however, if this is how they attain your goals of striving to:

"Attract to the defense service people with ability, dedication, and capacity for growth;" and to

"provide opportunity for everyone, military and civilian, to rise to as high a level of responsibility as his talent and diligence will take him;".

I am now seeking a position as an Instructor in Political Science (yes, the Ph.D. will come too, after a while). When I begin my duties as an Instructor, I sincerely hope to be able to instill your goals in the minds of my students without lingering over the unpleasant reality I so recently met.

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT D. HANKS.

MAYOR LINDSAY'S BEEF LETTER

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I called to the attention of my colleagues in the House a letter from the mayor of New York City, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, to the members of the New York City congressional delegation.

In his letter, the mayor charged that:

The price of meat is kept artifically high because of a restrictive meat import formula which guarantees that demand will outstrip supply and which insures inflated profits for the nation's ranchers exacted at the expense of the nation's consumers.

I take strong exception to Mayor Lindsay's allegations, as I pointed out Tuesday, and I would at this time like to bring to the attention of the House a carefully researched and well documented response to the mayor's letter from Mr. Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary-treasurer of the National Livestock Feeders Association. I am certain that Mr. Magdanz' comments will be of interest to everyone.

At this point I also include in the RECORD an excellent statement prepared by the National Livestock Feeders Association entitled "The Truth About Processed Beef Supplies and Prices." This, too, will be of interest to my colleagues, I am sure.

The items follow:

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,

April 24, 1970.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor of New York,
New York City Hall,
New York, N Y.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: As representatives of cattle feeders in the Nation—those who supply the bulk of the beef available to the Nation's consumers—we are literally shocked at the letter you wrote to the New York City Congressional Delegation and released on April 19. While we can appreciate your concern for citizens in the City of New York, we cannot understand why anyone in such a prominent position would make as many false charges as your letter contained, or show evidence of such a complete lack of understanding of meat supplies and prices.

When you refer to, "The highly inflated price of meat, particularly manufactured meat such as hamburger and frankfurters," you demonstrated conclusively that you have not researched the situation. In fact, you have made a completely inaccurate reference. The price of meat, (though it does vary from city to city, as well as supermarket to supermarket) and prices of live cattle have in no sense of the word gone up as much in the past ten years as costs of living in New York City, nor as much as hourly wages or incomes of your residents there.

In a later paragraph you admit to these "Substantial increases in necessary expenditures which are borne by the average citizen regardless of how much he wishes to economize or how carefully his wife shops in her local supermarket." Under these circumstances, Mr. Mayor, how can you justifiably reason that meat prices should not go up accordingly and consumers should balance off their other increased living costs with savings at the meat counter?

You mention the price of meat, fish and poultry in New York City has risen 18% in the past year. If this has occurred, let me remind you of the fact that the prices of live cattle from which beef is derived, have only belatedly been catching up with the price of everything else consumers buy including taxes you levy on your good people in New York for the cost of public services. Compared to 1960, the Government records show that by February, 1970, the average price per pound of choice beef at retail rose from 80.7¢ to 97.4¢ or 20.7%. In the same period, the average price of choice steers (based on Chicago) rose from $26.24 cwt. to $30.27 cwt., or an increase of 15.3%.

Meanwhile, the Nation's average cost of all consumer services (less rent), from 1960 to February, 1970, rose 46.3%, average non-agricultural hourly earnings rose 50.7%, average hourly earnings in construction rose 63%, and per capita disposable income went from $1,937 to $3,172, a whopping increase of 63.8%.

Still covering a ten year period, the per capita disposable income spent for food declined from 20% to 16.4%. With this lower percentage of income spent for food, consumers have been able to buy 110.7 pounds of beef per capita compared to 85 pounds in 1960, an increase of 30.2%. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Mayor, that beef has been a bargain for consumers compared to practically everything else they buy or the costs they must sustain.

You mention that "Meat is kept artificially high because of a restricted meat import formula which guarantees that demand will outstrip supply and which insures inflated profits for the Nation's ranchers at the expense of the Nation's consumers." The 1964 Meat Import Law was passed for the sole purpose of preventing foreign nations from carving up the domestic beef market and from flooding the domestic market with excessive quantities of cheap beef that would bankrupt the Nation's cattle feeders and ranchers. Their costs have gone up too, Mr. Mayor; up tremendously, just as acknowledged substantial increases in necessary expenditures which are borne by the average citizen in New York. Meat prices are not artificially high, as we have already demonstrated, and the demand has not outstripped supply as you contend. The nation's cattle industry has been increasing production consistently since 1964, not only in absolute volume, but also in per capita supplies from 99.8 pounds to 110.6 pounds. With the increase, the formula to which you refer allows a corresponding increase in imports making up a portion of the total supply.

You mention that this restricted meat import formula "Insures inflated profits for the nation's ranchers exacted at the expense of the nation's consumers." We challenge you, Mr. Mayor, to show us where these inflated profits among ranchers and cattle feeders of the nation do exist. The truth of the matter is, they do not, since their costs of production have risen far more than prices they receive and net returns they might realize. Frankly, you need to look elsewhere for inflated profits which may be improperly extracting income from the consumers of New York.

Yes, Mr. Mayor, it would be a gross exaggeration to suggest that the price of hamburger may some day be as high as a cut of Porterhouse, and frankfurters may become so expensive they will be considered a luxury unless something is done to relax or eliminate the Meat Import Quota Law. While supplying the Nation with an increased per capita supply of total beef since 1964, contained in that supply is an increased volume of processing type meat, such as that used for hamburgers, amounting to 49 pounds per capita in 1969 and compared to 44.3 pounds in 1964. Such a suggestion as you make could in no way occur by the most irresponsible stretch of the imagination and, despite the statement you wrote, I would be sure you realize this.

The contents of your letter, Mr. Mayor, which have received certain publicity throughout the country, have rendered a great disservice to the Nation's cattle industry, the largest single segment of the overall agricultural industry and one on whom millions of persons—not only operators, but processors, suppliers, financiers, transporters, distributors, etc.—depend on for a living. Not to be ignored also, are over 200 million consumers who rely on this industry for the finest food that is available to them.

Most consumers realize, we are sure, that under inflated circumstances existing today, they cannot expect to buy beef or any other meat products at lower prices while costs of all other items have risen substantially. I hope that upon examination of the facts, you will realize the incredibility of the charges and statements you have distributed.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROCESSED BEEF SUPPLIES AND PRICES
(By Don F. Magdanz)

This document is a sequel to that prepared by this Association on April 8, 1970, entitled, "The Truth About Beef Supplies and Beef Prices". Our statement of April 8 referred primarily to total beef supplies and over-all

prices as well as the prospect for future production through 1975. This document is directed toward the production and availability of processing beef about which numerous inaccurate statements have been made recently both as to price and volume available.

OBVIOUS DISTORTION OF SUPPLY AND PRICE SITUATION

It is obvious that a determined effort is being made by the Meat Importers Council and by agents for foreign nations to distort the supply and price situation of processing beef in the U.S. In so doing, they are deliberately propagandizing the American consumer for the sole purpose of doing away with the modest import restrictions we now have. If these restrictions are relaxed, supplying nations could then load our market with frozen boneless beef and a relatively few local importers would benefit personally by handling a substantial increase in volume of product.

They obviously have no concern for our domestic beef industry and, while posing as great benefactors to American consumers, they have no concern for the future welfare of consumers. Should the domestic beef industry be crippled to the extent it cannot fulfill future requirements of this Nation as a result of expanded competition from foreign production, the beef supply would be in serious jeopardy since foreign nations could supply neither the quantity nor quality of beef desired by the growing and affluent population in the U.S.

In September of 1969 the Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., circulated a booklet entitled, "The Case Against Restrictions on Meat Imports." The booklet is full of misleading statements, twisted analyses and inaccurate conclusions, designed to propagandize the consumers of the U.S. The introduction contains the argument that, "The U.S. needs to supplement a diminishing domestic production of manufacturing-grade meats." The facts and records show that since 1964 we have had an increasing amount of processing meat available to consumers both in absolute quantities and per capita supply.

Seizing upon a short-lived bulge in cattle prices during mid-1969, the booklet refers to, "The highest cattle prices in U.S. history." This rise in price which did occur was of short duration beginning in April and ending the second week in June. Prices then receded to levels that prevailed in the first three months of 1969. Even at the highest point, however, live cattle prices had not reached levels that prevailed in 1952, eighteen years before.

Be that as it may, we wonder what is so wrong about beef cattle prices reaching their highest point in history in 1969. Certainly cattle were not the only commodity that attained highest prices in history during that year, since everything else also set record prices as the general price level climbed. By 1969 we had record hourly wage rates, record disposable income, record prices for consumer services, record payments of Social Security benefits, record welfare payments and the highest figures for practically everything that can be mentioned. How can anyone justify picking out cattle prices and condemn them for reaching the highest level in history, particularly when it was not true.

At another point, the booklet states, "It (imported fresh-frozen beef) is definitely not comparable to or competitive with American meats of higher grade which are used as table beef and classified as 'Prime', 'Choice' and 'Good'. While not necessarily being comparable to the better grades of beef being produced in the U.S., foreign beef is directly competitive with domestic supply because a great deal of processing beef is derived from our better grade animals. Furthermore, not all fed animals are finished to the choice grade and some of them do not even reach good grade. Moreover, processed meat products in the retail counters, such as hamburger or frankfurters, are definitely competitive with steak, ribs and roasts as consumers make their selection according to price as well as their particular needs and desires at the momen".

The argument that imports do not affect fed beef (and thus fed cattle prices) to any degree because such imported products are used primarily in the manufacture of processed products is ridiculous.

Also, the contention imports do not affect fed prices overlooks the very important fact that over one-half of the domestically produced processing meat comes from fed carcasses (See Table 2). This portion of beef available for processing has been steadily increasing, not only because larger numbers of cattle are being fed, but also because the grade standards were relaxed a few years ago requiring less finish for an animal to reach the Good, Choice and even Prime grades.

Beef is its own closest competitor regardless of the form in which it's marketed. Attempts are often made to draw a fine line between the factors which affect the fed market and the so-called cow or processing type market, and to treat these as two separate and distinct markets as far as price is concerned.

Such an analysis is not valid because there is a very definite and intertwined relationship among the various segments of the cattle and beef market. Any factor which affects one class of cattle or beef very definitely does not do so at the exclusion of the other classes. The above conclusion is logical in view of the very real competition between various cuts and/or products in the retail counter and the substitutability among classes of beef.

The unfair competition of foreign beef, however, does not stop with its infringement on the domestic cattle industry. It also competes unfairly in the market for other domestic meat animals and products such as hogs, pork, lamb, as well as domestic poultry and fish.

At another point the booklet argues, "It is largely the drying up of this domestic source of manufacturing meat and the soaring demand for convenience low cost meats which has made the importation of meat necessary." Again the record shows that the supply of manufacturing and processing meat in the U.S. is not drying up, but, as mentioned before, has actually increased. We could go on and on with refutation of statements contained in the booklet; however, that appears unnecessary. Let's examine the facts.

THE ACTUAL SUPPLY OF PROCESSING BEEF

Manufactured or processed beef from domestic production comes largely from two sources. First, there is the production of cow and bull beef, much of which is extremely lean because the animals slaughtered have been produced on grass and not in the feedlot. The other source is that portion of steers and heifers, both fed and non-fed, which is not sold as fresh beef cuts in the retail counter as table beef. Fresh beef cuts largely come from the loins, rounds, ribs and chucks. Much of the remaining parts of the carcass, including the plates, shanks, brisket and trimmings, wind up as ground fresh beef which may be sold as hamburger or is used in other processed products. Even part of the chuck may find its way into hamburger instead of being sold as chuck roasts, since prices of this particular cut are often comparable or close to prices received for hamburger.

Table I contains the figures to show the processing beef produced domestically from 1964 through 1969, which volume, when added to imported beef, gives the total supply of processing beef available to U.S. consumers.

The information in Table I clearly shows the increasing volume of processing beef from steers and heifers in the domestic slaughter from 1964 through 1969. In addition, cow and bull beef have been increasing since 1967, although by 1969 had not quite reached the highest figure in 1965. The last column in the Table adds the processing beef from steers and heifers, domestic cow and bull meat production, and the volume of imported beef (carcass weight equivalent) to show the total volume of processing beef that has been available to consumers in each of the six years. Note the steady increase from 8,519 million pounds in 1964 to 9,953 million pounds in 1969, an increase of 1,434 million pounds or 16.8%.

Table II below uses some of the same figures to show the per capita supply of beef in the United States as well as the per capita supply of processing beef, including that which is imported.

TABLE I.—COMMERCIAL DOMESTIC BEEF PRODUCTION—STEER AND HEIFER BEEF PRODUCTION—COW AND BULL BEEF PRODUCTION—DOMESTIC PROCESSING BEEF PRODUCTION—IMPORTS

[In millions of pounds]

	Total beef production [1]	Steer and heifer beef production [2]	Processing beef from steers and heifers [3]	Cow and bull beef production [2]	Imported beef carcass weight equivalent [1]	Total processing beef
1964	18,456	15,023	3,906	3,433	1,180	8,519
1965	18,693	14,457	3,759	4,270	923	8,952
1966	19,726	15,662	4,072	4,064	1,182	9,318
1967	20,212	16,478	4,284	3,741	1,313	9,338
1968	20,875	17,034	4,429	3,841	1,500	9,770
1969	20,953	17,150	4,459	3,880	1,614	9,953

[1] Livestock and Meat Statistics, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 333.
[2] Computed from total domestic beef production, steer and heifer slaughter, and cow and bull slaughter.
[3] Computed from domestic production of steer and heifer beef using accepted fact that 26 percent of all steer and heifer beef is used in processing and manufacturing.

TABLE II.—PER CAPITA SUPPLY OF DOMESTIC BEEF AND IMPORTED BEEF—PER CAPITA SUPPLY OF PROCESSING BEEF

[In millions of pounds]

	Total beef production [1]	Imported beef carcass weight equivalent	Total supply (—exports)	Per capita supply [2]	Total processing beef [3]	Per capita supply processing beef
1964	18,456	1,180	19,545	99.8	8,519	44.3
1965	18,693	923	19,525	99.3	8,952	46.0
1966	19,726	1,182	20,908	104.0	9,318	47.3
1967	20,212	1,313	21,437	105.9	9,338	46.9
1968	20,875	1,500	22,267	109.4	9,770	48.6
1969	20,953	1,614	22,485	110.6	9,953	49.0

[1] Livestock and Meat Statistics, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 333.
[2] National Food Situation, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 1970—Page 15.
[3] From table I.

Note that since 1964 per capita supply of all beef has risen from 99.8 pounds to 110.6 pounds. At the same time, the per capita supply of processing beef has gone up a like percentage from 44.3 pounds to 49 pounds. The contention there is a gap in the supply of processing beef in the United States is an absolute myth and cannot be supported or substantiated.

PROCESSED BEEF DEMAND IS "CREATED"

It has sometimes been stated that the principal reason for substantial increases in meat imports in the United States is the increased demand in this country for processed products. It must be realized that this so-called demand is a "created demand" and a larger tonnage which has moved from foreign nations is prompted as the result of offering a vast array of processed products to consumers, rather than any specific "call" from consumers for this type of product.

Instead, foreign nations desiring to export beef products have poured them into the United States and, along with the importers of these products, are now trying to convince United States consumers that they need more processed meat. They are also encouraging consumers to insist on the relaxation or elimination of import restraints.

SHORTAGE DOES NOT EXIST

If there is or has been a serious shortage of processing beef in the United States, why has not the retail price of hamburger, for instance, changed much more than prices of table cuts such as sirloin steak or beef ribs. According to Bureau of Labor Statistics the average price of hamburger, in the United States during 1968 was 56.1¢ per pound. In August, 1969, when hamburger reached its peak price, the average was 65.6¢ per pound, an increase of 9.5¢ or 16.9%.

The average price of sirloin steak in 1968 was 119.5¢ per pound. During the highest month in 1969, which happened to be July, the average price of sirloin steak in the United States was 141.9¢, an increase of 22.4¢ per pound or 18.8%. If there was such a shortage of processing beef, as has been alleged, why is it that hamburger did not rise much more in price on the average than the example of sirloin steak that has been used.

By February, 1970, the average price of sirloin steak in the United States did come down to 130.9¢ which was 11.4¢ per pound over the average in 1968 or 9.5% higher. The average price of hamburger did hold fairly steady at 65.3¢ per pound or 9.2¢ per pound over 1968, which was 16.4%. It's true that the price of hamburger did not decline as much as certain fresh table cuts, but neither did the price increase as much during the temporary price bulge in 1969.

If there is any validity to the allegation made by proponents for increased imports, why has not the price of hamburger gone up materially to reflect this contended shortage of processing meat? The truth of the matter is the shortage does not exist.

So far we've demonstrated there is no shortage in the normal sources of the supply of processing beef. There is still another source of beef available for sale as hamburger which tends to provide a ceiling on the price of hamburger. We refer to chucks from both steers and heifers.

For quite a number of years, the price of chuck roasts at retail has closely paralleled the retail price of hamburger at figures from 4¢ to 10¢ above. Furthermore, most of the time domestic boneless chuck is sold in the wholesale market for less than domestic boneless bull beef and at times is sold for less than imported boneless bull beef.

For example, on August 4, 1969, domestic boneless bull sold at $63.75 per cwt; imported bull beef was $62.50 and domestic boneless chuck was $62.75. On November 3, domestic bull beef was $60.00, imported bull beef was $58.00, and boneless chuck $57.50.

Continuing with examples, on February 2, 1970, domestic bull beef was $65.50, imported bull beef was $61.75, and boneless chuck was $63.50. On April 16, domestic bull beef sold at $68.00; imported bull beef brought $63.75, and domestic boneless chuck sold at $67.00.

CONSUMER DECEPTION

The National Livestock Feeders Association contends that those who are insidiously attempting to bring about relaxation of import restrictions and open the door for increased volume of foreign beef, are perpetrating a hoax on consumers of the United States, and are using it as a device to bring pressure on the Administration. This is a highly organized and carefully planned maneuver that should be stopped cold by complete exposure of the facts.

Table III (see Page 8) containing the record of frozen beef in cold storage at the first of each month since January 1968 vividly exposes the deliberate attempt to falsify the supply situation.

In 1970 foreign nations have been shipping us products (covered by the 1964 Meat Import Law) at the unprecedented annual rate of 1.3 billion pounds. This annual rate contains an estimated volume for March, 1970, of about 100 million pounds.

In so doing, an attempt is being made to show that this high rate of imports has little or no effect on our domestic market. There is more to the situation than meets the eye.

Column 4 of Table III shows the increased volume of frozen beef in cold storage as of the first of each month compared to the same month a year earlier. Note that on January 1, 1970, frozen beef in cold storage was 90.680 million pounds above January 1, 1969. February, 1970, was 121.321 million pounds above a year earlier, and March was 101.356 million pounds higher. Cold storage holdings of frozen beef in the last nine months of 1969 were only modestly above a year earlier with the exception of October which was 70.113 million pounds above 1968.

If there is such a terrific demand for processed beef, why is this much greater volume of frozen beef being held? We submit that frozen beef is being deliberately held out of market channels after it has been recorded as imported, in an attempt to force prices of manufactured products to go up, thus providing more ammunition to use in an effort to repeal the 1964 Act or prevail for the suspension of quotas once they might be put into effect.

TABLE III.—FROZEN BEEF IN COLD STORAGE[1]

[As of the first of each month in millions of pounds]

	1968	1969	1970	Change from previous year
January	261.369	265.860	356.540	90.680
February	239.542	256.979	378.300	121.321
March	211.145	261.656	363.012	101.356
April	202.376	254.428	.....	52.052
May	182.325	234.055	.....	51.730
June	186.769	218.614	.....	31.845
July	200.923	227.203	.....	26.280
August	218.268	254.255	.....	35.987
September	227.454	292.862	.....	65.408
October	251.775	321.888	.....	70.113
November	282.255	320.938	.....	38.683
December	281.549	340.515	.....	58.966

[1] Cold Storage Reports, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Feb. 1, 1969, through Apr. 1, 1970.

In the opinion of this Association, those who are attempting to hoodwink the consumers of our Nation need to be told bluntly that it is not going to work. Not only are they advancing arguments that do not hold water, there is evidence of a deliberate attempt to force a situation on American consumers that is contrary to actual circumstances. To be equitable to American consumers and the domestic cattle industry, the facts must prevail.

DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a source of reference for our debates on military appropriations, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a list of the 100 largest defense contractors during 1969:

THE 100 BIGGEST PENTAGON CONTRACTORS—COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969 (ENDING JUNE 30, 1969)

[Dollars in millions]

Name	Fiscal 1969 sales total[1]	Fiscal 1969 Pentagon total	Percent of Pentagon total	High ranking retired officers employed
1. Lockheed	$2,085	$2,040.2	5.53	[2]210
2. Gen. Elec	6,214	1,620.8	4.39	89
3. Gen. Dynamics	1,797	1,243.1	3.37	113
4. McDonnell-D	3,000	1,069.7	2.90	206
5. United Aircr	[3]10	997.4	2.70	48
6. A.T. & T	13,009	914.6	2.48	9
7. L. T. Vought	1,459	914.1	2.48	69
8. N. Am. Rock	2,438	674.2	1.83	104
9. Boeing	2,880	653.6	1.77	169
10. Gen. Motors	20,209	584.4	1.58	17
11. Raytheon	1,106	546.8	1.48	37
12. Sperry-Rand	1,562	467.9	1.27	36
13. Avco Corp	783	456.1	1.24	23
14. Hughes Air	(4)	439.0	1.19	55
15. Westinghouse	2,901	429.6	1.16	59
16. Textron	1,132	428.3	1.16	28
17. Grumman Air	$969	$417.1	1.13	31
18. Honeywell	900	405.6	1.10	26
19. Ford Motors	10,516	396.3	1.07	43
20. Olin Math	901	354.4	.96	3
21. Litton Ind	1,600	317.1	.86	49
22. Teledyne	750	308.5	.84	8
23. R.C.A	2,561	299.0	.81	35
24. Stand. Oil (N.J.)	[4]14,109	291.1	.79	2
25. Mar. Marietta	696	264.3	.72	40
26. Gen. Tire	1,000	263.5	.71	32
27. I.B.M	5,345	256.6	.70	35
28. Morr.-Knud	300	254.0	.69	6
29. I.T. & T	2,761	238.3	.65	34
30. Tenneco	1,777	236.7	.64	6
31. Dupont	3,078	212.0	.57	3
32. FMC	1,312	195.6	.53	6

Footnotes at end of table.

THE 100 BIGGEST PENTAGON CONTRACTORS—COMPANIES AND THEIR SUBSIDIARIES LISTED ACCORDING TO NET VALUE OF MILITARY PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969 (ENDING JUNE 30, 1969)—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

Name	Fiscal 1969 sales total [1]	Fiscal 1969 Pentagon total	Percent of Pentagon total	High ranking retired officers employed
33. Norris Ind	$190	$187.6	0.51	2
34. Bendix	754	184.4	.50	25
35. Hercules	642	179.6	.49	13
36. Northrop Corp	340	178.9	.48	48
37. Uniroyal	1,260	174.1	.47	6
38. TRW	863	170.4	.46	56
39. Pan. Am	669	167.4	.45	24
40. Asiatic Petrol	346	155.6	.42	0
41. Mobil Oil	5,772	151.5	.41	2
42. St. Oil (Calif)	3,298	148.8	.40	6
43. Fairchild-Hil	268	148.6	.40	7
44. Collins Radio	440	145.8	.40	3
45. Kaiser Ind	609	142.4	.39	11
46. G. Tel. & El	2,622	140.5	.38	35
47. Day & Zimm	87	137.8	.37	1
48. Texas Instr	508	132.5	.36	7
49. Fed. Cartridge	(4)	131.9	.36	1
50. Magnavox	464	130.3	.35	3
51. Thiokol Chem	235	128.1	.35	3
52. Texaco	4,427	124.0	.34	4
53. Chrysler	6,200	121.8	.33	11
54. Pac. Arch	(4)	121.0	.33	16
55. Sanders Assoc	130	118.5	.32	17
56. U.S. Steel	4,067	117.8	.32	2
57. Goodyear	2,226	116.5	.32	6
58. Singer Co	1,137	116.2	.32	(4)
59. Chamberlain	(4)	115.9	.31	3
60. Lear Siegler	402	115.8	.31	4
61 Am. Machine	467	115.3	.31	7
62 Colt Ind	340	114.4	.31	4
63 East.-Kodak	2,392	109.8	.30	15
64 City Invest	112	109.2	.30	4
65 Whittaker Co	225	107.7	.29	(4)
66 Am. Mfg.-Tex	3	106.7	.29	0
67 M.I.T	(4)	100.5	.27	5
68 Gulf Oil	$3,384	$95.9	0.26	1
69 Natl. Presto	113	94.9	.26	0
70 Kidde-Walter	423	91.9	.25	(4)
71. Signal Co	1,515	91.3	.25	9
72. Curtiss-Wright	173	91.2	.25	1
73. Harvey Alum	79	90.5	.25	4
74. States Marine	126	87.1	.24	0
75. Reynolds Ind	(4)	84.9	.23	(4)
76. Aerospace Corp	75	76.2	.21	6
77. Motorola	682	73.2	.20	3
78. Automa. Ind	55	73.1	.20	52
79. Talley Ind	25	72.5	.20	(4)
80. Harris Inter	275	71.6	.19	4
81. Firestone	1,875	66.7	.18	(4)
82. Seatrain Lines	88	64.6	.18	4
83. Alum. Co. of Am	1,171	64.5	.17	(4)
84. Hughes Tool	(4)	63.7	.17	13
85. Natl. Gypsum	254	63.2	.17	(4)
86. Hazeltine Corp	55	60.6	.16	7
87. Western Union	[5] 775	57.7	.16	5
88. Control Data	165	56.9	.15	14
89. White Motor	778	56.3	.15	0
90. Cont. Airlines	[5] 208	55.2	.15	4
91. World Airways	50	54.9	.15	4
92. Atlan.-Rich	1,559	54.3	.15	(4)
93. Tumpane	23	54.0	.15	(4)
94. Cessna	200	53.4	.14	0
95. Smith Invest	(4)	51.7	.14	0
96. Sverdrup & Par	12	50.2	.14	9
97. Dynalectron	50	50.0	.14	(4)
98. Letourneau	68	49.9	.14	(4)
99. Flying Tger L	86	48.3	.13	(4)
100. Southern Air	24	48.3	.13	(4)
Total (incl. 10,850 others)	[6] 36.9	----	----	2,100

[1] Fiscal year 1969 figures from Dun and Bradstreet's "Million Dollar Business."
[2] Includes colonels, navy captains or higher. Figures are for fiscal 1968.
[3] Sales figures may be lower than Pentagon contract because contracts awarded in any 1 year often are drawn out over a period of several years.
[4] 1969 figures not available.
[5] 1968 sales figures.
[6] Billion.

UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH FIRM INVOLVEMENT WITH PENTAGON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contracts for research, development, test, and evaluation work.]

NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Rank	Name of contractor	Amount	Percent total
1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	$97.8	15.3
2	Aerospace Corp	76.2	11.9
3	Johns Hopkins University	48.0	7.5
4	Mitre Corp	32.1	5.0
5	Stanford Research Institute	24.8	3.9
6	Rand Corp	19.1	3.0
7	System Development Corp	19.1	3.0
8	Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory	17.1	2.7
9	California, University of	15.0	2.3
10	Institute for Defense Analysis	12.3	1.9
11	IIT Research	11.9	1.9
12	Illinois, University of	11.6	1.8
13	Michigan, University of	11.4	1.8
14	Stanford University	10.1	1.6
15	Pennsylvania State University	10.0	1.6
16	Research Analysis Corp	9.9	1.5
17	Rochester, University of	9.9	1.5
18	Battelle Memorial Institute	8.5	1.3
19	Columbia University	8.2	1.3
20	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	6.8	1.1
21	Washington, University of	5.6	.9
22	Riverside Research Institute	5.2	.8
23	Texas, University of	5.2	.8
24	Southwest Research Institute	4.9	.8
25	Cornell University	4.8	.8
26	George Washington University	4.8	.8
27	Ohio State University research	4.5	.7
28	New Mexico State University	4.3	.7
29	Syracuse University research	4.1	.6
30	Utah, University of	3.9	.6
31	American University	3.5	.5
32	Duke University	3.4	.5
33	Alaska, University of	3.2	.5
34	Harvard University	3.1	.5
35	Dayton, University of	3.1	.5
36	Pennsylvania, University of	3.0	.5
37	Washington University	3.0	.5
38	Princeton University	2.8	.4
39	California Institute of Technology	2.6	.4
40	Arizona, University of	2.5	.4
41	Miami University	2.4	.4
42	Minnesota, University of	2.3	.4
43	Maryland, University of	2.3	.4
44	Hawaii, University of	2.2	.3
45	Purdue Research	2.2	.3
46	Midwest Research Institute	$2.2	0.3
47	Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	2.1	.3
48	New York University	2.1	.3
49	Wisconsin, University of	2.1	.3
50	Texas A. & M. Research	2.0	.3
51	Florida State University	1.9	.3
52	Iowa, University of	1.8	.3
53	Lehigh University	1.8	.3
54	New Mexico University	1.7	.3
55	Denver, University of	1.7	.3
56	Rensselaer Polytechnic	1.7	.3
57	Purdue University	1.6	.3
58	Cincinnati, University of	1.6	.3
59	Illinois Institute of Technology	1.6	.3
60	Rice University	1.6	.3
61	Syracuse University	1.6	.3
62	Brown University	1.5	.2
63	Research Triangle Institute	1.5	.2
64	Tennessee, University of	1.5	.2
65	Rhode Island, University of	1.5	.2
66	Missouri, University of	1.4	.2
67	Kentucky, University of	1.3	.2
68	Chicago, University of	1.3	.2
69	Oregon State University	1.3	.2
70	Virginia, University of	1.3	.2
71	Northwestern University	1.3	.2
72	Southern Methodist, University of	1.2	.2
73	Catholic University of America	1.2	.2
74	Franklin Institute	1.2	.2
75	Analytic Services	1.2	.2
76	Stevens Institute of Technology	1.2	.2
77	Western Reserve	1.1	.2
78	Drexel Institute	1.1	.2
79	Northeastern University	1.1	.2
80	Yale University	1.1	.2
81	Hudson Institute	1.1	.2
82	American Institute for Research	1.1	.2
83	Alabama, University of	1.1	.2
84	Georgia Tech	1.1	.2
85	Boston College	1.0	.2
86	Colorado University	1.0	.2
87	Georgia Technical Research	1.0	.2
88	Florida University	1.0	.2
89	Southern California, University of	1.0	.2
90	Pittsburgh, University of	.9	.1

Footnotes at end of table.

UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH FIRM INVOLVEMENT WITH PENTAGON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

[Excerpt from Department of Defense listing of 500 contractors according to net value of military prime contracts for research, development, test, and evaluation work.]

NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Rank	Name of contractor	Amount	Percent total	Rank	Name of contractor	Amount	Percent total
91	North Carolina, University of	$0.9	$0.1	97	Colorado State University	$0.8	$0.1
92	North Carolina State University	.9	.1	98	North Dakota, University of	.8	.1
93	New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	.9	.1	99	Oregon, University of	.8	.1
94	Delaware, University of	.9	.1	100	Michigan State University	.8	.1
95	Southern Research Institute	.9	.1		Total (including $19,400,000 other)	639.8	
96	New York State, University of	.8	.1				

Note: Percentage listed is percent of the total of the 500 contractors of more than $10,000.

Source: Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d St. NE, Washington, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, NASA, AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION COSTS BY GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS, GIVING ALLOCATIONS AND RANK FOR EACH

[Dollar amounts in millions]

States	Population rank	DOD, fiscal year 1969 Total	DOD Rank	NASA, fiscal year 1969 Total	NASA Rank	AEC, fiscal year 1969 Total	AEC Rank
Total	1	$35,248.8		$3,065.9		$2,640.4	
Alabama	21	407.7	21	139.2	5	.07	46
Alaska	50	90.8	38	.8	35	48.6	16
Arizona	34	343.7	25	4.5	25	.4	39
Arkansas	31	117.2	33	.2	44	.2	42
California	1	6,824.5	1	1,045.9	1	339.8	2
Colorado	30	243.2	26	68.7	9	90.1	12
Connecticut	24	1,715.1	4	29.6	14	7.0	24
Delaware	46	46.8	44	12.6	19	.07	48
Florida	9	964.5	11	403.6	2	20.9	21
Georgia	15	932.9	12	2.0	32	1.3	32
Hawaii	40	114.6	34	3.8	27	3.5	28
Idaho	42	16.1	48			95.1	11
Illinois	5	932.5	13	8.6	23	132.7	7
Indiana	12	1,058.6	10	3.2	28	3.3	29
Iowa	25	202.1	28	5.1	24	20.8	22
Kansas	29	349.7	24	.9	34	1.0	34
Kentucky	22	59.5	42	.4	39	60.6	15
Louisiana	19	389.9	23	136.6	6	.3	40
Maine	38	53.4	43	8.7	22	.2	43
Maryland	18	731.3	15	134.5	7	64.5	14
Massachusetts	10	1,549.8	7	74.9	8	32.2	17
Michigan	7	683.2	17	19.0	17	6.3	25
Minnesota	20	741.2	14	15.2	18	4.3	27
Mississippi	28	218.3	27	2.7	29	.05	50
Missouri	13	1,095.4	9	26.6	16	87.9	13
Montana	41	$322.0	47	$0.02	46	$0.09	45
Nebraska	35	101.7	36			.8	35
Nevada	47	27.1	46	.2	43	202.6	4
New Hampshire	44	102.4	35	4.0	26	.4	38
New Jersey	8	1,270.5	8	67.7	10	20.9	20
New Mexico	36	96.1	37	11.4	20	374.8	1
New York	2	3,074.3	3	376.4	3	166.5	5
North Carolina	11	514.7	19	2.4	31	2.8	31
North Dakota	45	35.8	45	.004	48	.06	49
Ohio	6	1,533.0	7	30.3	13	104.1	8
Oklahoma	27	173.4	30	.6	36	.4	37
Oregon	32	85.9	39	.5	37	1.3	33
Pennsylvania	3	1,700.4	5	66.1	11	100.0	10
Rhode Island	39	119.3	32	.5	38	.6	36
South Carolina	26	172.5	29	.60	45	102.1	9
South Dakota	43	3.4	50	.008	47	.3	41
Tennessee	17	485.6	20	1.6	33	303.5	3
Texas	4	3,525.2	2	246.3	4	23.3	13
Utah	37	157.2	31	2.7	30	7.6	23
Vermont	48	85.4	40	.2	42	.08	47
Virginia	14	711.2	16	27.9	15	2.4	30
Washington	23	574.8	18	9.1	21	153.0	6
West Virginia	33	66.9	41	.2	41	.1	44
Wisconsin	16	393.6	22	34.3	12	4.6	26
Wyoming	49	13.2	49	.3	40	22.3	19
District of Columbia		321.0		36.6		16.0	

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION COSTS BY PRIME INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTORS

[For fiscal year ending June 30, 1969]

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Company	Total contract awarded	Cumulative percent of total	Company	Total contract awarded	Cumulative percent of total
Union Carbide	$317,384		Monsanto Research	$30,446	77.5 percent (top 15).
Sandia	214,290		Rust Engineering	28,276	
Reynolds Electric	106,519		Aerojet-Gen	25,930	
duPont	99,085		Swinerton & Walburg	24,962	
General Electric	95,098	47.9 percent (top 5).	Manson & Hangar-Silas & Mason	24,100	
Bendix	85,021		North American Rockwell	23,223	
Holmes & Narver	77,188		Kerr McGee	20,867	
Westinghouse	75,923		National Lead Co	20,623	
Idaho Nuclear	48,438		United Nuclear	15,885	
Douglas United	44,822	67.1 percent (top 10).	United Nuclear Home	14,943	
Dow Chemical	42,813		Gulf Gen. Atomic	14,620	
E. G. & G., Inc	41,217				
Goodyear Atomic	35,327		Total including 513 other industries	1,735,446	100 percent.
Atlantic-Rich	31,588				

NASA COSTS BY PRIME INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTORS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Company	Total contract awarded	Cumulative percent of total	Company	Total contract awarded	Cumulative percent of total
North American Rockwell	$680,862		Sperry Rand	$34,057	74.5 percent (top 15).
Grumman Aerospace	369,168		General Dynamics	34,003	
Boeing	228,689		General Motors	30,856	
McDonnell-Douglas	207,496		Federal Electric Corp	27,014	
General Electric	150,094	54.1 percent (top 5).	United Aircraft	26,214	
Bendix	127,635		Service Tech	26,180	
IBM	112,526		Philco-Ford	22,388	
Aerojet Gen	64,857		Catalytic-Dow	19,428	
Martin-Marietta	56,037		Ling-Temco-Vought-Aerospace	18,265	
RCA	51,643	67.8 percent (top 10).	Brown/Northrop	12,679	
TRW	49,974		Northrop	12,360	
Chrysler Corp	42,454				
Lockheed	39,763		Total including all other industries	3,022,333	100 percent.
TWA	35,363				

ATOMIC ENERGY COSTS—COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Institution	Total	Cumulative percent	Institution	Total	Cumulative percent
Princeton University	$17,517		Illinois University	$4,492	
M.I.T.	9,042		Yale University	3,762	50.4 percent (top 10).
Harvard	7,333		Maryland University	3,744	
California University	7,106		California Tech	3,484	
Chicago, University of	5,130	33.7 percent (top 5).	Wisconsin University	3,325	
Rochester University	5,122		Michigan University	2,995	
Columbia University	4,886		Washington, University of	2,677	62.3 percent (top 15).
UCLA	4,697		Total (including 207 others)	137,015	100.0 percent.

NASA COSTS BY NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Institution	Total	Cumulative percent	Institution	Total	Cumulative percent
M.I.T.	$27,462		California Institute of Technology	$2,461	49.4 percent (top 10).
University of California (all campuses)	14,916		Battelle Memorial Institute	2,460	
Harvard	10,356		Stanford Research	2,375	
Smithsonian Institute	7,098		Minnesota University	2,352	
Stanford University	4,910	39.6 percent (top 5).	Maryland University	2,321	
National Academy of Science	3,823		Chicago University	2,276	56.6 percent (top 15).
Princeton University	3,503		Total (including at least 100 others)	163,590	100.0 percent.
University Corporation Atmospheric Research	3,161				
Michigan University	3,150				

Source: Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d St. NE., Washington, D.C.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, millions of Poles throughout the free world will gather to commemorate Polish Constitution Day. May 3 not only marks the anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution in 1791, but also is a day on which to give recognition to the undying spirit of a freedom-loving people. The Polish people have suffered much in their quest for freedom, but I believe few Americans realize how long this suffering has been endured.

Eleven months after passage of the Polish Constitution in 1791, Russian troops marched into the country to stamp out the Polish Constitution and the air of freedom which had briefly swept the land. Poland was divided between Russia and Prussia in September 1793, but the cynical invaders, rather than destroying the spirit of freedom of the Polish people merely tempered it in the fire of oppression.

Although the country was virtually partitioned out of existence, the response of the Poles was characteristic—"Jeszcze Polska nie zgineta kiedy my zyjemy . . ."

Polish legions were formed within the French revolutionary armies, particularly in Italy, and the strains of "Jeszcze Polska" were heard for the first time. And so the fight for freedom continued, as if nature could dictate no other course.

Poles will fight for freedom, as surely as the falcon will soar. This fact, unfortunately, has not been learned by the Russians, either in the distant past or at present; but the future remains, as do millions of Poles thirsting for freedom.

On this day, therefore, let us pay tribute to the Polish people who have shed much blood at the altar of freedom, and not in vain. For though their country is again stifled with oppression, their courage and dedication to freedom continue to be an example for all mankind.

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD NEUTRA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, during recent hearings before the Select Education Subcommittee, members of the subcommittee were privileged to hear the views of one of the most gifted architects of our time, Dr. Richard A. Neutra, of California.

Dr. Neutra spoke with great wisdom and eloquence about the need for preschool and child day-care programs, and he did so from the perspective of one of the seminal architectural minds of this century.

I was most sorry to learn that on April 16, 1970, while in Germany, Dr. Neutra suffered a heart attack and passed away.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to him and to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Mrs. Dione Neutra, and her two sons, Dion Neutra, an architect in Los Angeles, and Raymond Neutra, a physician in Boston.

I also note that a memorial service will be held honoring Dr. Neutra in the Indoor-Outdoor Church in Garden Grove, Calif., on Saturday, May 2, 1970.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I insert a tribute to Richard Neutra from his wife and two sons:

THE PASSING OF RICHARD NEUTRA . . . END OR BEGINNING

On April 16, 1970 after a strenuous day of photography of two of his projects in Wuppertal, Germany, Richard Neutra was stricken by a heart attack (his third) and passed quietly away without suffering in the midst of the environment he and his son had created for clients far away from sunny California. He and I, his lifelong companion, had been on the final days of a lecture trip in Germany.

Richard Neutra's death marks, nearly to the day, a fifty year milestone in a professional career which already in 1920 had turned its eyes from Europe to America, more particularly Southern California with its mild climate which seemed to Richard Neutra to offer the opportunity to create enclosures for man closest to the nature in which our species evolved.

In the half century since, Neutra has traveled the five continents, covering millions of miles of air space, lecturing, working, planning for man's survival under many difficult and disparate situations and climates. Countless young men and women have been his companions and collaborators and my grateful memory is with many of them.

During the past thirty years of this career, he has been joined by his architect son, Dion Neutra, who has participated in most of the major projects and who has shared his father's concern for "man in the middle."

For as long as his wife and sons can remember, Richard Neutra's greatest desire was to develop a heritage which could be passed on to his son and faithful collaborators in the form of a humanistic approach to the planning of the environment and managing of the ecology in the hope that these pioneering ideas would carry on beyond his own lifetime and be of lasting benefit to mankind. He coined the expression "Biorealism" in contrast to "dollars per square foot" realism.

In 1954, his epoch-making book, "Survival Through Design" was published. He had worked on it during the preceding twenty years, painstakingly developing, an essay at a time, a complex but penetrating insight which today in its second edition reprinting in soft cover form only now seems to be understood and heralded. (The entire first Galaxy paperback edition of nearly 7,000 volumes was purchased by the U.S. Army prior to its official publication, while the hard cover editions of the fifties sold about 6,000 copies in the preceding fifteen years!)

It was always Richard Neutra's hope that whenever his time would come, the current projects and future clients would continue

to seek out his office and survivors to enable further development of these ideas to take place on practical projects of social significance throughout the world. His organization is Incorporated and his son, 45 years of age, can truly claim an unusually rich thirty years' exposure to the ideas developed by his father and later jointly carried on together which started with his introdudction to the drafting room at the age of 12. As his wife of 48 years and longest collaborator, I fervently hope and pray that Richard Neutra's rich legacy of writings, ideas, and projects will not now mean an ENDING for his ideals of "Survival Through Design", but for his sons and faithful followers the opportunity to seize the torch he carried so long and carry on as he would have wished, in a glorious BEGINNING of the *next* fifty years of development and growth of an enlightened scheme for the design for Human Survival.

My husband was 78 on April 8, 1970. He and I were able to celebrate my own birthday on April 14 and he was spared the agony of deterioration of old age. He was vital to the very last moment and died while engaging in one of the many facets of the fascinating business of creating optimum environments for human beings. To the literally thousands of clients, friends, and loved ones, both old and very new, I beg you all to understand the difficulty of sheer numbers in trying to communicate with you all personally our loss. Please accept this as a testament from his family to a husband and father who always meant the very best to those with whom he came in contact.

POST OFFICE COOPERATES WITH OFFICE OF MINORITY ENTERPRISES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that the Post Office Department has initiated a new program to place postal bank accounts with several "minority-owned" banks throughout the Nation. This reflection of concern and commitment on the part of the Post Office Department is exemplary, for I would imagine that other agencies and departments of the Government might well profit from the Post Office's experience in this project. Recently the Department issued a general release on its program, which I am pleased to put forth in full for the information of all Members:

POST OFFICE COOPERATES WITH OFFICE OF MINORITY ENTERPRISES

The Post Office Department in cooperation with the Office of Minority Enterprises today announced that action has been initiated to establish postal bank accounts with approximately 25 minority-owned banks in various parts of the United States.

"By increasing the banks' available cash," Postmaster General Winton M. Blount said, "we hope to significantly increase their ability to provide more loans to enterprises owned by blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups."

The program will help implement what President Nixon called "one of the priority aims of this Administration-encouraging increased minority-group activity."

Edward E. Tillmon, President of the National Banking Association, a group of banks which are predominantly black-owned, called the Post Office Department's program "an important step toward enlarging our bank's lending base and increasing their ability to help minority group businessmen provide more jobs."

Mr. Blount said that post offices in nearly every city in the United States deposit funds on a daily basis. The minority banks will serve specific postal areas. In many cities the deposits will come from stations and branches located near minority-owned financial institutions.

The Post Office Department, along with other agencies, has actively participated in President Nixon's program of supporting minority-owned enterprises.

Some of the current manufacturing contracts which are from the Post Office include:

A $1 million order for canvas mail sacks and canvas inserts with the Watts Manufacturing Company, Compton, California.

A $283,000 contract with the Iron Nations Corporation of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, for canvas inserts.

A $16,300 contract with the B. & L. Metal Fabricating Company, Brooklyn, New York, for mail-handling equipment.

PROJECT READ

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, with the Nixon administration's new emphasis on reading instruction, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a factual report on the progress of Project Read in San Francisco during 1968 and 1969.

The following report is in the form of a memorandum from the San Francisco Unified School District's director of research and program evaluation.

IMPACT OF PROJECT READ UPON KINDERGARTEN READING READINESS

Dramatic improvement in the scores on the standardized reading readiness test administered at the end of kindergarten is observed for the two years since the launching of Project Read in the San Francisco Unified School District. This finding emerges now with the completion of the manually-performed distributions of scores, by groupings of elementary schools, from the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form A, for three successive school years.

READINESS TEST

Administered to all San Francisco public school pupils at the end of kindergarten, either in June of high kindergarten or September of grade low one, the Metropolitan Readiness Test provides estimates of the probable success of pupils entering more formal learning experiences in reading and numbers. By conversion of scores according to the test manual, the readiness status of a pupil may be compared to the national norms in which the typical or average pupil would be ranked at the 50th percentile, the highest scoring quarter of pupils at or above the 75th percentile, and the lowest quarter at or below the 25th percentile.

THREE SCHOOL YEARS

In the accompanying tables these three percentile points have been plotted for certain groupings of San Francisco public elementary schools for the three most recent school years. The year 1966–67 ('67) preceded the introduction of Project Read which had an eight-week piloting in 31 schools during March, April, and May of school year 1967–68 ('68). During 1968–69 ('69) Project Read experienced its first full year of operation. Thus the three years of readiness test results should reflect three stages of impact of Project Read—none, some, total—upon kindergarten pupils within the participating schools.

GROUPINGS OF SCHOOLS

Among the 31 Project Read schools were identified six advantaged schools and 25 disadvantaged schools, the latter group having been so designated in terms of eligibility for ESEA Title I compensatory programs. Within the disadvantaged group eight schools were further identified as bilingual, that is, having a majority of their pupils with Spanish and/or Chinese surnames, thus leading to a presumption that the native language was other than English. Although the designations were inexact, it seemed important to view the impact of Project Read differentially, if possible.

Also displayed in the table are the three-year results for all kindergarten pupils in San Francisco public schools including the 31 Project Read schools. Preferable would be the distributions for all other pupils separated from Project Read pupils; this presentation was prevented by loss of the score distributions prior to completion of this data separation.

TABLE FORMAT

Within the columns of the table are entered the 75th, 50th, and 25th percentiles, located at the appropriate level in terms of the national standardization percentile scale in the left margin of the table. The numerical values of these equivalents are entered at the foot of the columns.

The vertical line from the 75th to 25th percentiles marks off the interquartile range, that is, the range for the middle one-half of scores within the total distribution of scores. Immediately to the right of the test score percentile scale is a vertical line indicating the inter-quartile range of the national norm. This vertical line for national norm provides a visual means for comparing status of local schools.

OBSERVATIONS

While its effect upon the following observations cannot be assigned numerical value, the possibility that successive kindergarten groups may differ slightly in characteristics affecting readiness should be remembered. However, it seems unlikely that these would outweigh program differences.

1. Readiness status of pupils in all three categories of Project Read schools increased markedly during the two years of the special program at the kindergarten level. For all 31 Project Read schools the 25th percentile status increased by 11 points on the national percentile scale, the 50th percentile by 15 points, and the 75th percentile by 14 points.

2. As might be predicted, the impact of Project Read was most productive in the bilingual schools. The improvement in readiness status in bilingual schools was about 50 per cent greater than in the unilingual schools: 23 to 15 points of increase at the 75th percentile, 21 to 13 points at the 50th percentile, and 13 to 8 points at the 25th percentile.

3. In the disadvantaged schools, both bilingual and unilingual, improvement appears to have been greatest for the highest quarter (75th percentile) and least for the lowest quarter (25th percentile). A reversal of this finding is observed for the advantaged schools. Such observations suggest the hypothesis that the program, or the manner in which it was implemented, is more suitable for the middle range of pupils in terms of readiness development.

4. For all 31 Project Read schools, at the 75th and 50th percentiles, the larger portion of the two-year improvement occurred during 1967–68, the year of the eight-week pilot, and the smaller portion during the full year of program, 1968–69. While this difference may not be substantial, it does suggest a hypothesis that programs of greater concentra-

tion and briefer duration than one full year are relatively more effective.

5. Probably as a result of the improvement in Project Read schools, the District status in readiness for the more formal first grade program matched the national status at the end of the 1968–69 school year. The District's 75th percentile was identical with the national norm, while its 50th percentile was three points higher (53rd percentile on national norms), and its 25th percentile was one point higher (26th percentile). The burden shifts to first grade program during 1969–70 at least to maintain the "at grade" status implied by the readiness attained during 1968–69.

IMPORTS HURTING U.S. ECONOMY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining a growing number of my colleagues in introducing legislation that would restrain the growing volume of imports of textile, apparel, footwear, and other articles causing economic chaos to American industries and jobs.

Consumers definitely have a right to expect variety and quality and the lower prices offered by foreign imports, but not at the price of destroying an American industry and creating unemployment.

The legislation I am introducing, similar to a measure worked out by the distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, would limit 1970 imports of all textile, garment, leather footwear and other articles to the average annual quantity which entered the United States in 1967–68. After 1970 the permissible level of imports would be adjusted upward or downward annually, in proportion to increases or decreases in domestic consumption.

Certainly the diversity of price ranges afforded by foreign competition help increase the buying options for consumers. But those options are being bought at great sacrifice to the Americans who labor in domestic factories producing our country's own modest-priced products.

In New York and other cities, thousands of workers have been displaced from their jobs in bankrupt clothing manufacturing and footwear industries. They simply cannot compete with products produced under wages and working conditions that would be illegal and intolerable in this country.

I understand that for over a year the Government has attempted to negotiate agreements with foreign nations establishing a reasonable system of restraints on imports. Due principally to resistance by Japan, U.S. efforts have been completely frustrated while the domestic problems grow worse.

This legislation will also authorize the President to enter into international agreements regulating imports into the United States of all textile articles or footwear from any supplier nation. Any nation entering into an agreement with the United States would not be subject to the limitations imposed by the bill.

The provisions of any agreement must be consistent with the declared legislative purpose "to foster the maintenance and expansion of economically strong textile and footwear industries in the United States and to avoid the disruption of markets for textile articles and footwear in the United States."

GREATNESS PROVED IN ADVERSITY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the near tragic flight of Apollo 13 fortunately ended with the establishment of further, although unscheduled, achievements in space history. Understandably, the difficulties and dangers involved have prompted a number of questions about the future of space explorations. The Jackson Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., on Sunday, April 19, in a timely and informative editorial, addressed itself to a number of these questions and I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following:

[From the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Apr. 19, 1970]

GREATNESS PROVED IN ADVERSITY

James A. Lovell, Fred W. Haise and John L. Swigert truly came home from their ill-fated lunar journey in a blaze of glory.

Astronauts who have made perfect trips into space or to the surface of the moon stand out as giants among men. It is in adversity that the mettle of the space explorers and the skill of their earth-bound back-up organization truly are tested.

Although none of the three may reach the surface of the moon (who would want to go through that again?) Lovell, Haise and Swigert made the most dramatic kind of space history.

The fate they escaped only because of their great skill and calmness in the most distressing kind of emergency and the fabulous technological preparations for every contingency has been on the minds of Americans ever since the first of the sub-orbital probes beyond the atmosphere.

The risks have been accepted by the men who travel by spaceship and recognized by everyone connected with the space program.

Because accidents can happen with any machine, no matter how well-designed, and human beings are not infallible, the wonder perhaps is that America has gone as far as it has in space without the kind of disaster the Apollo 13 crew escaped so narrowly.

Yet the Odyssey mishap also served to prove why the record has been so good. It survived the accident and brought the three men home only because of the unbelievable skill of the men who planned and built the spacecraft and were able to give the astronauts the instructions they needed to bring their crippled craft home.

The slightest error in the calculations, a moment of panic by the crew, or one more technical failure might have written a different end to a drama which had America—indeed all the world—breathless and praying for the men.

Now that the adventure has ended successfully a natural reaction will set in. Again questions will be raised about the wisdom of sending manned spacecraft on missions which could be accomplished, although not so well, by machines.

Also, the space program unquestionably will be delayed while every step of the Apollo 13 mission is examined to determine what went wrong and to make certain that it does not happen again.

Inevitably the cost of the space program again will be brought into the discussion. The question will be asked, as it has many times before, whether the scientific and national benefits of lunar exploration and possible probes beyond the moon are worth their cost. The expense will be related to the multitude of problems faced by America and the crying need for funds to spend on other purposes.

The country's space policies perhaps do need a re-examination and the atmosphere for new questions has been created by the Apollo mishap.

The debate must proceed from the premise that what is happening in space in 1970 and perhaps what will take place in the next few years largely was determined by decisions made several years ago.

The late President John F. Kennedy made putting a man on the moon by 1970 a national goal. He was given almost universal support for this objective. Few voices were raised in opposition. Many critics of the manned moon missions today actually are in the role of second-guessers.

When the decision was made the scientists began designing the hardware. The astronauts began training for the step-by-step progress which eventually would lead to the moon. Science fiction became fact as the system for orbiting the moon and sending men to its surface in a landing craft (which, incidentally could not be tested until actually used in space) was perfected.

The lead time on space flights being what it is, the hardware already is built, or is in advanced stages of design and manufacturing for lunar missions far more sophisticated than the ill-fated Apollo 13.

All other things being equal it is doubtful that the space exploration program will be curbed short of a peaceful revolution by the people or a radical change in national policy.

The point can be made successfully that in the dramatic emergency the people learned more about space technology than they have in the previous textbook-perfect lunar missions. The sheer resourcefulness and courage of all concerned did more to stir the imagination of people throughout the world than any scientific gain. Thus it may be said that a failure did more for the support of the space program than would have come from an unqualified success.

Most unlikely is a complete reversal of goals by President Nixon and the Congress.

The prestige which has accrued to America through its successful moon landings (and an equally dramatic performance in the Apollo 13 emergency) probably would wane. This might be true, even though this country's only serious competitor in space, the Soviet Union, would take years to match our achievements, even if it should choose to do so.

Even so, we, as a nation, may be hard put to justify continued spending on space probes although scientists insist they are beyond value. A debate on the wisdom of going on and on certainly should take place.

Meanwhile, America can rejoice at the safe return of three brave men whose coolness and skill in an emergency matched or exceeded every American tradition.

Although their mission went awry, they have given a great boost to national pride as have their fellow astronauts who have carried out their assignments without a hitch.

The whole spine-tingling drama tells something important about America. Not only has it the skill and the men to achieve an impossible goal; it also has the deepest concern for human life and the greatest of respect for men who can come through in the face of the worst kind of adversity.

A WAR SHORTENED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an interesting report has been released explaining that the massive bombings of Dresden, Germany in 1945 caused great loss of life yet actually shortened the war and consequently saved lives on both sides.

The Russian educational system, it seems, conveniently overlooks any mention that the bombing was carried out at the specific request of the Soviets at the Yalta Conference.

Now that our experts have acknowledged that masssive bombings shorten war and save lives, why does not the same rule of modern warfare apply to North Vietnam? For conversely we have learned that by cessation of bombing in North Vietnam, the war has been extended, morale affected, and there has been unnecessary loss of life.

Paradoxically the same newspaper which carried the lesson from the Dresden bombings recently editorialized with bitter denunciation the recommendations of a large number of trained and experienced military men who have called for a resumption of bombing in North Vietnam to end the war and save lives.

There is no recognized double standard in warfare. Bombing to shorten a war, to save lives, and also free captured prisoners of war applies as positively to Americans as it did to Russians.

The object is to end the war. And until we decide to win, it will never end.

The discussed news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 13, 1970]

DRESDEN RAIDS SHORTENED WAR, AF STUDY SAYS

(By Orr Kelly)

The destruction of the German city of Dresden in massive bomber raids that began 25 years ago today—an attack widely described as an atrocity and massacre—helped to shorten World War II, according to a long-suppressed Air Force report.

The report, prepared in 1952–53 and classified "top secret," was declassified and made public this week at the request of the Star.

Written by Joseph Warner Angell Jr., who since has retired as a member of the Air Force Historical Division, the report disputes both claims of the number of casualties and Communist propaganda portraying the attack on the city as a cold-blooded American and British atrocity.

Dresden, which lies 111 miles south of Berlin in what is now East Germany, had remained relatively untouched by the air war although it was hit in relatively small raids on Oct. 7, 1944, and Jan. 16, 1945.

Since their city remained unscathed while many of the other cities in Germany were in flames, Dresdeners were convinced there was an agreement that the city would not be bombed.

FILLED WITH REFUGEES

When the attack came, Dresden was jammed with refugees—an estimated 5 million Germans were fleeing west before the advancing Soviet troops—and the German fighter defense had virtually collapsed.

Directed by their "master bomber," flitting back and forth across the rooftops in his light, wooded Mosquito bomber, a Royal Air Force flight of Lancaster bombers began unloading incendiary and high-explosive bombs on the city at 10:13 p.m. Feb. 13, 1945—four minutes after the residents had received their first warning of an impending air raid.

By 10:30 p.m., the Lancasters were headed home, leaving behind them the beginnings of a fire storm like the one that destroyed Hamburg between July 24 and Aug. 3, 1943.

At 1:24 a.m. on Feb. 14, another flight of Lancasters began bombing the city. Some of the crewmen later reported they could see the city's flames 200 miles away as the fire engulfed 40 square miles. Even at high altitude, they could feel the heat of the burning city.

At 12:12 p.m. that afternoon—Ash Wednesday—a flight of 316 Flying Fortresses of the American 8th Air Force began unloading 782 tons of bombs on the city.

The next day, 465 tons of high explosive bombs were dropped by 211 American planes.

ESTIMATES OF DEAD

Estimates of the number killed ranged as high as 300,000—nearly the total killed in all the World War II raids against German cities.

In 1963, David Irving, a British journalist, published "The Destruction of Dresden," still the most definitive study of the raid. He concluded the number killed at about 135,000.

This would make it by far the most devastating air raid in history, compared with estimates of 71,379 persons killed at Hiroshima by the first atom bomb; 83,793 killed in the fire bomb raids on Tokyo of March 9 and 10, 1945, and the 50,000 killed in the fire bomb raids on Hamburg.

Irving's figure has been accepted by both Gen. Ira C. Eaker, who was head of the 8th Air Force, and by Air Marshall Sir Robert Saundby, who was deputy chief of the British air staff at the time of the raid, in forewords to Irving's book.

The Air Force report now made available sets the casualties as "death to probably 25,000 persons and serious injury to probably 30,000 others, virtually all of these casualties being the result of the RAF area raid."

Other historians—including Irving—have now come to accept the lower figure of 25,000 dead as reasonable.

But there still is a sharp discrepancy over whether the raid was justified for military reasons.

Saundby, in his foreword to Irving's book, declared:

"That the bombing of Dresden was a great tragedy none can deny. That it was really a military necessity few, after reading this book, will believe. It was one of those terrible things that sometimes happen in wartime, brought about by an unfortunate combination of circumstances."

Angell's report insists, however, that the raid—"the last of several instances in World War II's European Theater when the shock effects of the combined bomber offensive resulted in the nearly total demoralization of a great enemy city"—had as its goal the disruption of a major German transportation center.

"Had the German communications centers leading to that front—among which Dresden was uniquely important—not been successfully attacked by Allied strategic air forces, there can be little doubt that the course of the European war might have been considerably prolonged," the report says.

"At the time of the Dresden bombings, Marshal Koniev's armies were less than 70 miles east of Dresden and by virtue of their extended positions highly vulnerable to German counterattack, provided the Germans could pass reinforcements through Dresden.

"With communications through Dresden made impossible as a consequence of the Allied bombings, the Russian salient in that area was rendered safe throughout the ensuing months of the war. . . .

"The death and destruction inflicted on the largest German city that had not before undergone large-scale bombing was almost certainly a major contribution to the final weakening of the will of the German people to resist."

CURRENT BEST-SELLER

Renewed attention has been called to the raid on Dresden by a current best-seller, "Slaughterhouse Five," by Kurt Vonnegut Jr., an American who was a prisoner of the Germans in Dresden at the time of the bombing. The book takes its name from the building where prisoners were housed in a former slaughterhouse.

The Air Force report notes, ironically, that "facilities such as slaughterhouses, warehouses and distribution centers were severely affected."

Russian propaganda has used Dresden to stir anti-Western and anti-American feeling, especially in East Germany.

But the Air Force report insists that the raid was carried out in response to a specific Russian request, at the Yalta Conference, for bombing raids designed to "paralyze the functions of Berlin and Leipzig" and to prevent movement of German military units toward the east, and that the Russians were told of plans for the raid just before it was carried out.

Angell's analysis is "based in its entirety on unclassified official documents and standard reference sources," but it has remained classified for 17 years, presumably because of the fear of opening old wounds or creating new ones with allies and former allies.

He notes, for example, that "American authorities were, throughout the war in Europe, opposed to the use of American forces in area or 'morale' bombing" of the type carried on by the British.

American targets, according to the report, were the Dresden marshaling yards and railway facilities, while the British targets included "the Dresden city area."

There is no mention in the report, however, of Irving's contention that after the noon raid by Flying Fortresses on Ash Wednesday, American Mustang fighter planes crisscrossed the city strafing anything that moved.

Despite the differences and uncertainties that persist 25 years later, there probably are few who disagree with Saundby, who wrote:

"It is not so much this or the other means of making war that is immoral or inhumane. What is immoral is war itself . . .

"Let us hope that the horrors of Dresden and Tokyo, Hiroshima and Hamburg, may drive home to the whole human race the futility, savagery, and utter uselessness of modern warfare."

"ALL WORKS OF MAN"

An appeal under the heading, "Prisoners of War—Everyone's Responsibility," in a back page ad in The Star recently invited contributions for funds to finance similar ads in other papers. It included a drawing showing Nixon smiling and providing march music for a column of American servicemen heading back home, leaving American prisoners behind the barbed wire of a North Vietnamese POW camp. The text wound up with an eight-step procedure it said the President "can and should" adopt.

This remarkable proposal starts with an ultimatum to Hanoi to deliver all POWs "to a predetermined location at a certain date and hour." It progresses through a sequence

of increasingly severe military sanctions to be applied against the enemy if he is dilatory in meeting the ultimatum. The closing of Haiphong harbor, presumably by blockade, is the third step; closing "all rail from China," presumably by bombing the rail lines into North Vietnam from China right up to the border, is next. The fifth and sixth steps would be the destruction of power plants and marshalling yards; the seventh would be the flooding of the rice fields, presumably by breaking dams and dikes with massive bombardments.

If these acts have not sufficed to persuade the adversary to release our prisoners—somehow miraculously preserved from the floods and bombings with which we would be attempting their rescue—the eighth step would be taken: "Destroy all works of man north of the demilitarized zone."

Where the American prisoners would be while all this was going on is not mentioned. This is not surprising. When heady rhetoric takes over, concern for individual human beings—prisoners or atomized Asian peasants—is likely to become secondary.

Distasteful as it may be for both of them, the sponsor of this ad and the senator who attacks the President for not high-tailing out of Vietnam next Tuesday appear to be working the same side of the street. They are both advocating solutions that would only substitute unknown and perhaps graver dangers for the one which the President is now striving to reduce.

As a newspaper, we have advocated every course likely to improve the lot of the American prisoners, and eventually to obtain their release. We will continue to do so. This is not one of them.

DAY CARE BOOM EMERGES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Select Education Subcommittee has recently completed hearings on H.R. 13520, the Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day-Care Act, cosponsored by the gentlelady from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), and myself.

A most thoughtful editorial concerning some of the kinds of programs to which this bill is directed appeared in the April 7, 1970, issue of the Elkhart, Ind., Truth.

The editorial follows:

DAY CARE BOOM EMERGES

A new "glamor industry"—child day care centers—may be emerging where before only small-time nonprofit operators and welfare-oriented government agencies dared to tread. The possibility that federal funds will pay some of the expenses could remove the sting in what seems an otherwise risky business. Parallels are being drawn to the boom in nursing homes as a result of medicare legislation in the early 1960s.

A number of national franchise operators already have opened for-profit day care centers in Florida, Rhode Island, Missouri and other states. The idea is to surpass mere babysitting and contribute to the over-all educational and emotional growth of the children. An executive of a Rhode Island firm, Romper Room Schools Inc., says: "Education, in general, is very profitable." The franchisers doubtless are looking toward Administration-backed legislation currently under consideration in the House. It would consolidate all federal child welfare spending—currently estimated at $560 million—add some $123 million in new funds, and allow some of that money to go to private, for-profit operators.

The new legislation is aimed primarily at helping low income families with working mothers. But it also opens the door to families of all income levels, giving the hopeful new educational entrepreneurs a shot at what U.S. Labor Department statistics indicate is a market of more than five million working mothers with children below school age. Further, day care is an integral part of President Nixon's proposed Family Assistance Program, assuring day care investors that the federal government is basically on their side.

COPPER INDUSTRY INVESTIGATION CHALLENGED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently a resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the creation of a select committee to investigate the copper industry.

An editorial appeared in the April 20 issue of Metals Week that throws a somewhat different light on this subject. I submit it for the consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Metals Week, Apr. 20, 1970]

METALS WEEK OPINION: JUST A MINUTE, MR. BLANTON

It's open season on the copper industry. The Presidential panel headed by Hendrix S. Houthakker hasn't even completed its study of the copper market, but already one Congressman has called the Houthakker study inadequate.

Rep. Roy Blanton (D–Tenn.) wants a separate congressional investigation of the copper industry. Blanton is not only concerned about the pricing inequities in the domestic market—the subject of the Houthakker study—but has also charged American copper companies with supplying, indirectly, the North Vietnam and the Vietcong war effort.

He has stated that American companies with foreign copper holdings "consent" to having their copper move through the London Metal Exchange to Red China and from there to North Vietnam.

This is the worst kind of jingoism. Blanton, is, in effect, charging the top executives of American copper companies with supplying the enemy.

Not only are his insinuations appalling, but his facts are all wrong. All of Anaconda's Kennecott's, and Roan Selection Trust's copper is sold to consumers. Some of Cerro's copper might get to the LME, but to imply that the producer has any control over who buys the copper out of an LME warehouse is absurd. A producer doesn't even know who ultimately consumes his copper after it has been moved into an LME warehouse.

Beyond this, the situation in Zambia and Chile is such that if the governments of these countries wanted copper to go to China, the producers could do nothing about it. The Chilean government could if it chose, sell copper to China from the former Anaconda and Kennecott properties now controlled by the government.

For Blanton's information, China maintains a representative in London to buy metal from the exchange whenever necessary. Chinese freighters pick up the metal—generally from Hamburg or Rotterdam LME warehouses—and transport it to China. There is absolutely no way for American copper companies to prevent China from buying metal in this manner. Blanton implies that they could prevent it, and that by taking part in this nefarious business, they are diverting to China copper badly needed in the Free World. Nonsense.

Congressman Blanton should learn the facts before he starts accusing anyone. He owes the American copper industry an apology and the American people more responsible behavior.

SO YOU WANT TO GET INVOLVED

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the recent leadership of Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel in defining new environmental priorities, and in establishing stronger contacts between young people and the Federal Government.

Earth Day, 1970, on April 22, attracted the participation of over 2,000 colleges and 12,000 high schools. In preparation for meetings, discussions, and teach-ins, people from all walks of life flooded congressional and Government offices with letters expressing their concern and asking for information and guidance on what they can do in the way of a personal commitment.

In an effort to assist and coordinate the tremendous enthusiasm and energies of young people committed to a better American environment, Secretary Hickel established a task force on environmental and youth activities within his office. Through this action the Interior Department has placed itself squarely in the front rank of Government departments and agencies in efforts against pollution.

The Department's pamphlet, "So You Want To Get Involved" outlines possible means by which individual citizens can help work against pollution. I insert this pamphlet in the RECORD at this point and commend it to my colleagues:

SO YOU WANT TO GET INVOLVED

APRIL 1970.

(NOTE.—If you would like further information about the environment and the related programs of the Department of the Interior, we suggest you write to: Task Force on Environmental Education and Youth Activities, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.)

This leaflet was prepared to answer students who have written to the U.S. Department of the Interior for information which can be used in connection with Earth Day 1970 and similar teach-in activities on the environment. It attempts to give a broad look at the meaning of the term "environment," and suggests some of the problems standing in the way of overnight solutions to environmental problems. It contains more philosophy than hard fact, but suggests ways you can arrive at your own conclusions. From there, you're on your own . . .

So you want to get involved with the environment! Maybe you want to protest

against air pollution, water pollution, land pollution, noise or overpopulation. Maybe you'll want to go as far as *doing* something, instead of just talking about these environmental problems. The purpose of this leaflet is *not* to tell you what to do, but rather to suggest some of the complexities of the situation and to point out some ways your actions can become more effective.

A FEW DEFINITIONS

Let's start with a few definitions. You don't have to buy these as valid, but in this leaflet we'll use these terms as defined here:

The *Environment* is the sum of all the factors that influence the growth and existence of an organism or a society.

Pollution is anything that is detrimental to the growth or health of an organism or society.

Society is a combination of government, business, industry, churches, schools and other institutions and private citizens who operate together as a society—with each individual seeking fulfillment of his own goals within the structure and rules of this society.

The *Establishment* is a shorthand (often oversimplified) description of the persons and groups with a special interest and relative amount of power.

Ecology is the science of the mutual relationships between organisms and their environment.

WE'RE RUNNING OUT OF TOLERANCE

Each plant and animal has its own preferred environment, its own best set of circumstances for survival and growth. But "best" is not always available, and most organisms tolerate something less than ideal but still survive. Such tolerance has its limits, and beyond those limits the organism no longer survives. Environmental influences are numerous, but sometimes it takes only one to be missing or inadequate for the organism to die.

Trouble is, man has unleashed many detrimental factors, some of which threaten to go beyond even mankind's own very broad tolerance. With a greater population, there are more kinds of factors influencing the health of a society and there is more likelihood that some will be detrimental. To many experts it follows that one of the most basic answers to environmental problems is to limit population growth; others are more concerned with better population distribution and changing the uses of technology. Any such basic attempt at a solution depends on educating people to one's views. Education requires time and thus is a long-term answer, so meanwhile we must seek other solutions to environmental problems.

PARTLY IGNORANCE, PARTLY ECONOMICS

Before you take on the mission of patching up the environment, it might be a good idea to examine why some spots have worn embarrassingly thin. The environment might be compared to a garment, one which we indeed do wear around us. Pull one thread and the tugging may be felt all over. Pull enough threads and a piece may fall off. And like a good garment, the environment wears pretty well if properly used—but parts of it can wear out. Sewing a new patch on the environment may be neither simple nor cheap—if you can get a replacement at all. Where do you get a new land, or a new river or ocean, or a new atmosphere?

The basic cause of our problems, of course, is people—and too many of them. But why should people who depend on the limited resources of this planet, abuse them so recklessly? Partly ignorance, partly economics. And by the time awareness has replaced ignorance, there is usually someone who has established an economic interest in perpetuating the abuse.

Continued use of "hard" pesticides such as DDT is an example; DDT has been defended as essential to agriculture long after its harmful effects on wildlife were recognized. Many underfed nations still defend its use to increase food production for their people.

DDT is not the only ecological time-bomb that threatens to blow up in our faces, as witness the growing list of drugs which scientists fear may cause cancer. In some cases the ecology involves a direct relationship with man as victim; sometimes the relationship is between a man-made chemical and an intricate food chain. People have used DDT to control crop-eating insects. Insect-eating birds were not intended victims. But have you seen a bluebird lately?

Not everyone responsible for pollution does it deliberately or even consciously; many polluters simply fail to look at the consequences, especially the side effects. You adopt an industrial process because it's simpler or cheaper—and the harmful residues or byproducts just happen.

A CHAIN OF CONSEQUENCES

Many of America's industrial giants trace their beginnings to a time when consequences loomed as far less important. They had impact on fewer people who were equipped with less sophisticated knowledge of health standards; the chemistry of pollution was simpler; big business had more influence over government; resources were more abundant; and individual citizens could afford less waste.

Perhaps the attitudes of some industrial polluters can be better understood if we look at their history—they began at a time when they could ignore the chain of consequences created by their actions because air, land, water, forests and wildlife seemed unlimited in this huge country.

Technological advances move in spurts, rather than as part of a system. A simple example is the development of aluminum cans and non-returnable bottles. Tin-coated cans would eventually rust away; aluminum cans last almost indefinitely. Just recently some aluminum manufacturers have begun buying back these cans for recycling, and experiments are now under way to utilize throw-away bottles for paving material.

A more complex technology involves the automobile industry and all the associated industries that provide raw materials, fuel and services. The auto industry's continued economic health depends on a rapid turnover, with replacement more profitable than repair—for the industry. The industry produces far more new cars than the Nation's present capacity for reclaiming old car bodies can handle. Materials used in modern cars are difficult to separate once assembled.

The complex nature of a technological marvel such as the automobile goes beyond the parent industry. As just one example, by doing shoddy work at high prices, some members of the auto repair industry have helped make it cheaper to abandon a car on the street and buy another one, rather than to get the old car fixed. But they may have problems too—like obtaining and keeping skilled mechanics at wages they feel they can afford to pay.

In following the chain of consequences of pollution, you could as easily follow the chain of consequences to solutions. These can include reduced corporate profits, threats to community payrolls, added costs to the consumer, and changes in the life-style of most of us. By our definitions, most forms of pollution are by-products of society.

UNDERSTANDING THE ESTABLISHMENT

So if you're going to get involved, you're going to get involved with the Establishment. There's an old saying, "You can't fight City Hall." That's no longer true, as many activists on many fronts have discovered. But in taking on the battle of the environment, it's worth a look at the nature of the Establishment, some of its likes and dislikes, to understand where a citizen movement can find sympathetic understanding and where it will meet a stone wall of resistance.

As said before, the Establishment includes the owners, operators *and* many employees of most sources of industrial pollution, as well as elected officials and many government employees. These are admittedly generalizations, but certain attitudes toward environmental problems characterize members of the Establishment:

1. They respect rights of privacy, private property and private enterprise.

2. They expect someone proposing a change to offer one or more alternatives; simply to "stop" a detrimental practice is not acceptable to the Establishment if it cannot be replaced by substitute means of filling society's needs.

MAKING A COMMUNITY INVENTORY

Before a community can act intelligently to protect its environment, it needs to know its problems. You can help by taking part in a community-wide inventory, documenting your findings with photographs and statistics. Here are some things to look for:

Water pollution: Is your city's water supply taken from protected sources, or must it depend on water that has been used before by upstream cities or industries? Is your water supply adequately protected from encroachment, or do zoning authorities permit building of new sources of pollution within the watershed? Does your city live up to its obligation to downstream neighbors by properly treating sewage? Are there industrial polluters who are lax in their treatment of plant wastes? What are their attitudes toward pollution, and what are their plans for future pollution abatement?

Air pollution: Does your community have a program for reducing air pollution? Is the program enforced? Does the city permit open burning of trash, garbage or industrial wastes? Does the community have plans for mass transit? Does the community require automobiles to have effective emission control devices? Are they checked periodically? Are there industrial polluters who contribute measurably to air pollution? What are their plans for abatement? Can you identify apartments and office buildings whose heating plants send up clouds of smoke?

Land pollution: Does your community have adequate zoning ordinances to encourage good land planning and good land use? Are industrial firms premitted to destroy future productivity of land by dumping industrial wastes or mine tailings? Does the city have adequate litter laws, coupled with enough litter cans to encourage people to properly dispose of trash? How are abandoned cars disposed of in your community, and at whose expense? Are abandoned buildings allowed to stand indefinitely, attracting litter, rats and other unwanted tenants? How does your community dispose of its garbage? Do you have a community dump, open at reasonable hours to encourage its use?

Noise pollution: Does your community require that automobile and motorcycle exhausts be properly muffled, and is the law enforced? Is construction work confined to reasonable hours? Are low-flying aircraft prohibited? Are loudspeakers and other noise-makers regulated?

Environmental education: Does the public school system use its resources for environmental education? Are there outdoor classrooms and are they being utilized? Are teachers required to have training in environmental education? Are inner-city children being neglected in outdoor education programs? Are there adult or extension courses being offered to help create an informed body of citizens?

Ecological awareness: Has the community taken steps to preserve unique examples of ecological situations such as swamps and marshes, streambanks and forests, rare and endangered species? Are land developers permitted to alter watersheds at will, creat-

ing erosion or causing downstream flooding by increasing run-off of surface water from paved lots and roof-tops? Are there adequate safeguards for use of pesticides and herbicides? Are there dangers of agricultural pesticides entering the community water supply? Are dairy products tested for residual insecticides? Are power-line rights-of-way granted regardless of scenic values?

These are just some of the questions that might be asked in your community environmental inventory; there are others that will be equally important in your locality.

And after you've completed your inventory, discuss alternative solutions to the problems you've uncovered with government officials, civic groups and the press.

Concerned, informed citizens must—and can—get results.

3. Most members of the Establishment favor restrictions on polluters of air, land and water—especially as applied to the other guy and at his expense. But some are willing to make personal sacrifice.

4. The government governs by laws and regulations which take months and years to move through the legislative and regulatory processes. But most members of the Establishment will argue that these lengthy proceedings contain safeguards for the democratic system. This argument may be small consolation to the impatient activist who feels that the Establishment's institutions should be more immediately responsive.

SIMPLE SOLUTIONS MAY NOT WORK

The complex web of the environment is too involved for simple solutions. Our present way of doing things is closely interwoven with economic interests, both at the level of corporate profits and in terms of jobs for factory workers. Halting pollution on any front calls for sacrifice by someone. Take again the environmental problems associated with the family car:

Motor vehicles—the cars, trucks, and buses—contribute perhaps 60 percent of the air pollution in America. Raw materials for the family car contribute still more air pollution, from the manufacture of steel, copper, plastics, synthetic rubber, and other products.

Abandoned and junked automobiles are a major source of land pollution, from individual heaps on the street to vast auto graveyards which rank as national eyesores.

The insatiable thirst of gasoline-powered vehicles has created a huge petroleum industry with its own urgent requirements, ranging from offshore wells to Alaska pipelines, to seismographic exploration. Some of these activities have scarred some of the Nation's most remote wildlands.

By-products of the automotive industry, from used crankcase oil and discarded tires to accidental spillage of gasoline, contribute measurably to water pollution problems.

Tremendous acreages of land have been taken from production of crops and trees to be smothered in concrete; even more land is diverted from production to be used for highway rights-of-way. A single interstate interchange may require 200 acres or more.

Motor vehicles, especially the two-wheeled breed, are among the major sources of noise, nerve-wracking and soul-jarring.

Mobility provided by the family car has caused so much vacation travel that the privilege of visiting some of the Nation's favorite national parks must now be rationed; you can camp for only a few days at several of the more popular parks. Too many prime recreation areas are being loved to death; it's become too easy for too many people to get there.

So, one simple solution might be to ban the private automobile.

But are we willing to pay the price of this simple solution?

Of course, the complete banning of the private automobile is not a solution acceptable to anyone who contemplates the chaos that would result. So which half-way measures will *you* settle for? Or are you content to stop at partial solutions?

SOME PARTIAL SOLUTIONS

Settling for half-way solutions depends on one's point of view. To use some ridiculously restrictive illustrations, suppose the lawmakers of the country decided to reduce pollution by limiting the number of people eligible to drive. This could be done in several ways:

The minimum age for an operator's permit could be raised to 25. This would eliminate a vast number of drivers, and would not directly affect most law-makers since they would still be eligible for licenses.

The price of an operator's permit could be raised to an exorbitant figure. Many people could still afford to drive, and the burden of the reduction would be placed on the young and the economically disadvantaged, who would become poorer for their lack of mobility in getting to jobs.

Physical requirements for operators' permits could be severely tightened, eliminating all drivers who need to wear spectacles. Many skilled professional drivers would thus be taken off the road.

Obviously, none of the above would be unanimously accepted because the sacrifice of the privilege of driving would be distributed unfairly—at least in the view of those losing their right to drive.

There are alternatives, some dealing with the basic problems of the automobile and some treating the symptoms. For example, steam or electric engines could reduce noxious exhaust gases. More planning on the drawing board could mean car bodies that would be more easily reclaimed. More subsidies to mass transportation could lessen highway construction costs and reduce the number of cars clogging our roads.

By being less responsive to style changes that woo the buyer annually and even semiannually with new models, and by demanding a more durable car with a longer useful lifetime, you as a consumer could influence the trend. You might insist on improved maintenance and repair services which would reduce the number of cars now being abandoned or junked. You might insist that automobile mechanics be trained and licensed. A barber has to be licensed to trim your hair; anybody can work on your car's brakes or steering mechanism without having to prove any competence to anyone other than his employer.

In each of the above alternatives, however, someone loses. The automobile industry thrives on producing new models each year; the petroleum industry profits as gasoline consumption goes up; segments of the mining industry employ thousands of people in producing ore for new steel; the highway construction industry relies on ever-increasing demands for new roads. You are affecting people's livelihoods as well as their life styles.

As an environmental activist you can pick your battleground. Choose carefully, and know the strength of your adversary; as Pogo says, we have met the enemy and he is us.

SOME LESS OBVIOUS POLLUTERS

We have chosen the motor vehicle as an example because most of us share the responsibility for the problems it creates, and most of us would be called upon to sacrifice something we see as convenient or necessary if it were banned. And most of us would have to reorient our thinking to willingly de-emphasize the role of the auto in our personal lives, and would have to find reasonable alternatives such as mass transportation. Some other sources of pollution have their own problems, though they may be less obvious than these of the family car.

You may find some of these less obvious polluters by taking a careful look around your community. What about the builder who disregards soil conservation practices and allows his bulldozers to start a chain of erosion that clogs flowing streams with tons of priceless topsoil? Or the local building code and zoning authority which tolerates such a practice?

What about the local sawmill which burns its slash, thus contributing to air pollution while wasting organic material? Or the rancher who grazes his livestock until the denuded rangeland washes away with every rain and shifts with every wind?

Or what about the miner whose settling basins fail to hold the wastes? Where do you get a new stream to replace the one he's contaminated? And what about the careless camper, who hikes far into the back country for the privilege of being the first to litter?

THE GOOD GUYS AND THE BAD GUYS

Life would be much simpler if the good guys always wore white hats and the villains dressed in black. But it's not that way. Many industrial concerns have made tremendous investments in reducing pollution, sometimes on their own initiative and sometimes with a little urging. Before you apply a label, it might be only fair to investigate and see what the company has done.

Many companies have installed expensive precipitators in their smokestacks to reduce ash and other particles causing air pollution.

Some breweries are now buying back their empty beer cans to reclaim the aluminum, paying $200 per ton for the old cans.

One Colorado sawmill operator stopped burning his wastes and found that the sawdust and trimmings helped improve worn-out soils.

An Arizona copper company built a nine-mile dike to hold its acid-laden tailings, and landscaped and irrigated the dike to improve natural beauty.

Many power companies have voluntarily gone to the expense of adding cooling ponds so that waste water from steam plants won't raise the temperature of nearby streams.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PERSONAL COMMITMENT

What's in it for the individual who wants to personally take up the crusade in behalf of the environment? There's satisfaction, and there's a cleaner environment to live in. What are some of the opportunities?

First, there's the opportunity to show your concern and to bring local and even national attention to environmental problems. Some people have indicated concern by going to the courts, others have demonstrated; some have tried working with State and local government officials while still others have tried working with, and sometimes against, manufacturers. If your case is good enough, you can "beat City Hall."

Over a longer period, there are other opportunities:

If you're in school or college, you can seek understanding of the rather basic facts of living on this planet, by taking courses in biology, chemistry, ecology, economics, political science. These and many other courses are helpful in understanding man and his ecological relationships.

As a graduate, whether you seek employment in a conservation agency or elsewhere, you can use judgment based on a clear consideration of the environmental consequences of an action. State and Federal agencies in the field of conservation traditionally have limited budgets and chances of finding employment are equally limited, but the opportunities to use good sense in business and government are unlimited.

As a citizen (even if you're too young to vote) you can use good judgment in campaigning for issues and for legislators who will support efforts to improve the environment. You should keep your legislators at every level of government informed of your support for environmental issues.

If you're looking for a way to fight land pollution, one way to get involved in environmental action movements is through eductional efforts to prevent further land pollution, and on-the-ground clean-up campaigns for volunteers who personally want to take part in the crusade against litter. Interior's Bureau of Land Management offers the Johnny Horizon Program for such an effort.

As a concerned person you can do your homework; learn the facts and explore both sides of the question—and then come up with a better way of doing things.

Good luck; maybe you *can* change the world. We hope so; it's everybody's world.

WALTER J. HICKEL.

CIGARETTES PACK A SELLING PUNCH

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the fine speech made by Mr. Joseph Kolodny, managing director of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, at Miami Beach, Fla. The address is as follows:

CIGARETTES PACK A SELLING PUNCH

The American cigarette—that handy, colorful little pack of twenty smokes—has few peers in the American industrial system or in the world. The American cigarette is more than just a good smoke. The American cigarette is an economic force.

We here know what is involved in producing and distributing the American cigarette. We know the extent to which its economic distribution, its community penetration and its wide popularity lend thrust to and, at the same time, cushion the American economy and resist inflation.

We know. But does the American business community at large know and appreciate just how much diversification of products and cash flow are owed to that pack of twenty smokes? Of course, that is not a question but an imperative: It is incumbent upon us to bring the story of the American cigarette to the American public—and especially to the American housewife, whose main concern is getting maximum value in the products she buys for her household at minimum cost.

What goes into a pack of American cigarettes? Twenty smokes. One little cigarette packed snugly against the next. Ten in a row. Twenty in a pack that fits any pocket or purse. A colorful, dramatically appealing package. A pack that is available at approximately one million, five hundred thousand retail outlets in the American market place. And at those outlets, the housekeeper saves money on thousands of diversified products whose costs are governed by the low distribution costs of the cigarettes.

That handy little pack of twenty smokes packs more commercial punch than any other American product because it gives thrust and impetus to products that are distributed with it: It gives them selling force. It is a powerful catalyst of diversification in distribution.

And it is distribution that underwrites national prosperity. Our country's prosperity is built upon a dynamic nationwide, low-cost distribution system that keeps commodities moving swiftly from the factory assembly lines to the point of sale shelves and counters for local store exposure so that the consumer may easily purchase them.

American business genius, motivated by unflagging public demand, keeps this handsome little pack of twenty smokes available all over the world. American blend cigarettes made of high quality tobacco have become a symbol of prestige to many other people around the world. Indeed, it is a measure of the American cigarette's success that everywhere, on the American scene and abroad, that cigarette is not something rare and precious. The American cigarette is, rather, something that is *taken for granted*.

Can we in good conscience envision what the business world would be like without this pack of twenty smokes? What would happen if the American cigarette were suddenly yanked out of the business structure? What happens when you remove any keystone from any structure: The structure collapses.

Without the American cigarette, the costs of distribution of products supplied by the wholesaler who sells cigarettes would skyrocket.

Cigarettes cost less to distribute than any other American product because (1) people buy them every day, (2) they are available in every conceivable outlet, from the mighty supermarket down to vending machines.

Because the costs of distribution of cigarettes are low, too, are the costs of distribution of product distributed *with* cigarettes. This can be illustrated quite simply and forcefully:

Candy distribution alone may cost 12% to 15% on the dollar. But the low distribution cost of cigarettes reduces the candy distribution figure to 7% or 8%.

For the typical wholesaler whose sales are 67% cigarettes, 11% candy, 12% cigars and 10% sundries, the cost of distribution levels off around 7½%.

This holds true right down the line on products that owe their distribution to cigarettes. Pens and pencils, normally 16%, watches and alarm clocks, normally 18%, and proprietary medicines, normally 16%—all of these ride into the marketplace on the 7½% cost of the wholesale distribution of cigarettes.

Without the low distribution costs of cigarettes, the outlook would be bleak indeed for cigars, snuff, pipes, pipe tobacco, cigarette holders and cigarette lighters. For candy, chewing gum, cough drops and other confectionery items. For proprietary medicines, chapsticks, small electrical appliances, pens and pencils. For clocks, watches and sunglasses. For lotions, shoelaces and razor blades. For toys, deodorants, stationery, school supplies, camera film and flash bulbs—the list is practically endless, a cornucopia of goods supplied by the tobacco distributor.

Countless thousands of small business entrepreneurs whose offices are their pockets, whose credit is based on human factors rather than cold facts and figures, would be threatened by sudden failure.

On the chart appended hereto are dozens of different kinds of outlets served by the wholesale tobacco distributing industry. It's an encyclopedia of distribution and diversification. It ranges, as you see, from airports and beauty parlors to barrooms and discotheques, to barber shops, slop chest stores and even zoos—a veritable A to Z of the buying panorama.

Aside from all this, however, there is a very human side to dealing in cigarettes. Cigarettes help to nurture something that is very precious to the American cultural and economic community, something that is implicit in the American Way:

The independent corner candy and tobacco outlet.

That, of course, is a bit of a misnomer. The kind of outlet we are talking about is no longer limited to candy and tobacco. The present store is something more. It is a *neighborhood* store.

It offers qualities that are more important than the dollars-and-cents quantities of goods on its shelves. It offers trust; it offers confidence and good will. It offers a familiar kind of hominess that no dazzling and shiny supermarket with all its variety and all its speed checkout counters can hope to equal.

Because this kind of outlet offers *people*. It offers people we know and deal with as friends. Its owners are neighborhood people. Their store goes by their names: It's John's. It's Jack's and Jennie's. It's Molly's. It's Mr. and Mrs. Z's.

And it sells cigarettes, the volume and traffic of whose sales support practically all the other commodities on its shelves.

The wholesale cigarette distributor is as vital to that store as the heartbeats, the life blood of its proprietors.

The wholesale cigarette distributor is Jack and Jennie's banker. He is Mr. and Mrs. Z's bookkeeper.

Most of the people he deals with have no mercantile rating. In many cases Jack and Jennie are a couple of plucky youngsters who are just starting out together on the road of business life, a life that frequently requires 18-hour days, 365 days a year. To them, Dun & Bradstreet sounds like an intersection in Manhattan's Financial District.

Since they have no mercantile rating, their credit is often more a matter of honor than a matter of figures on paper. And who provides them with that credit? Their cigarette distributor.

Millions of Americans and persons in foreign lands as well, the people who make, market, advertise and distribute the American cigarette, would be suddenly plunged into the already brimming unemployment pool without the American cigarette.

A sharp decline in the sales of cigarettes would paralyze the diversification processes of the wholesale distributor and the cigarette manufacturers could find themselves in a similar predicament in their own diversification programming.

The cash flow and rapid turnover of cigarettes is the gunpowder requisite to propel both diversification programs.

Where does the American cigarette come from? More than half a million farms are growing tobaccos: Brights, burleys, Maryland and Turkish among them. Most of these tobaccos are sold at public auctions, in competitive bidding. Before the tobacco goes into production, it undergoes the costly and painstaking process of curing, which resembles marination somewhat. and that calls for heavy investment of time and money: Cigarette manufacturers spend eighteen months and more than three billion dollars on their tobacco before it is converted into perfect American cigarettes.

We distribute the perfect American cigarette, which represents one of the major industries in the United States.

Here in the United States alone, more than five hundred and fifty billion cigarettes are sold every year.

Cigarettes provide the calling card; they provide, almost literally, the foot in the door of the retailer for other products, and they hold down those products' costs. Distribution costs are more often than not the determining factors in the value received by the consumer.

In recent years, excruciating competition made some distributing firms take a desperate step.

They dropped cigarettes and restricted themselves to cigars and sundries.

Much to their chagrin, and at an appreciable expenditure of mental anguish and financial resource, they were forced to go back to that little pack of twenty smokes. The alternative? Go out of business. Our nation, at this time, still has a handful of

such specialized distributors and their casualty rate is constant. Cigarettes, as ever, are the prime movers.

Today, diversification is the keynote of marketing. Today, almost every retail store is a general store. If there are specialists still thriving in the economy today, they are caterers to limited, perhaps even esoteric, tastes. Or they are, like the liquor dealer, creatures not of economic evolution but of the law.

The tobacconist was once a specialist. Today the tobacconist who sells only tobacco and tobacco products is rare indeed. Like every other retailer, he has diversified. His cigarette sales provide the cash flow that helps him make his new acquisitions, that allow him to venture into diversified product areas.

The world of business is very much like the world of nature. Actually, since we are creatures of nature, it is an extension of nature. It has little worlds within larger worlds, just as our earth is part of our solar system which is part of the Milky Way galaxy which is part of the known universe. There are businesses that depend upon and feed upon larger businesses that make up micro-economies that are parts of vaster economies and, ultimately, what we call The Economy.

The cigarette is an integral part of an economic system within an economic system. If distribution is the force that impels that economy, the cigarette is the spark that provides the energy for that economic force, and thus, in its way, is an economic force itself.

Take away the cigarette and you take away the availability of other popular products at popular prices; items that might never enter a consumer's mind as often as they do today because that consumer *would no longer see them before him.*

When that consumer stops in at those outlets for a pack of twenty smokes, he sees all those other items, and many more. They are all there in the store where he gets his cigarettes.

And so the consumer, householder or housewife, buys—at savings and with convenience. He or she is saved an extra trip and an annoyance.

That is how cigarettes open the retailer's door to the wholesaler, and benefit the consumer. That is how they bring so many other products to the retailer's shelves—and keep them moving off those shelves and into the consumer's home. That is how they make all those other products available to that consumer at reasonable costs and, finally, how they accelerate for the wholesaler and retailer the traffic of business and put savings in the consumer's pocket; and that is how the American cigarette renders the imperative service of blunting inflation.

Behind the little pack of twenty smokes stands this formidable army of persons and activities involved in all the steps of marketing tobacco, from the plantation to the counter:

Five hundred thousand tobacco growers.

Fifty thousand manufacturing employees.

Three thousand wholesale tobacco distributors.

Two thousand wholesale grocery distributors.

One thousand cigarette vendors.

Fifty thousand vehicles for distributor personnel and for manufacturer personnel.

One million, five hundred thousand retail outlets and their families, representing more than five million people.

Two hundred thousand warehouse, delivery and shipping and office personnel.

Then there is the American cigarettes tax yield:

Two billion dollars in federal taxes.

Three billion dollars in state taxes.

Fifty-eight million dollars in municipal taxes.

The tobacco industry also pours into the economy more than two hundred and fifty million dollars a year in advertising and collateral publicity.

Tobacco wholesalers keep an aggregate investment of more than seven hundred and fifty million dollars a year in motion for distribution of tobacco, confectionery and other attendant products, and part of that money goes toward extending credit to small entrepreneurs, coast to coast. The wholesaler acts as their bookkeeper by being only one man who represents a multiplicity of products, thus simplifying their ledger keeping.

The wholesaler may also help a small businessman get started in business. He may ease that entrepreneur's initial capital investment by supplying merchandise on credit and keeping his retail customers abreast of trends, sales techniques and new products.

As distributors, we play but one role in the continuing success story of the American cigarette. It is, however, a vital role. Through automation, through assembly-line manufacturing, the work force of American manufacturing makes up only 28% of the total number of persons employed, and the production workers themselves, the people behind the machines, constitute only 20% of those employed.

Now—inasmuch as 72% of those gainfully employed are in distribution and services, and the costs of those services eat up a substantial part of the budgetary dollar, any factor that tends to prune the costs of distribution inures to the benefit of the consuming householder.

The manufacturing-distributing ratio of personnel is not an inequity. It is the result of evolution. In far simpler terms, while machines make things, and advertising publicizes things, neither of them sell things.

Selling takes a human being, flesh and blood, charisma, and simple human judgment. And that human being is the distributor; it is he who steps in and *sells.*

It is incumbent upon us to safeguard the distribution and exposure of the American cigarette. We must:

Maintain vigilantly the cigarette's rightful place in the economy as an instrument and catalyst of accelerating diversification.

Fuel constantly the impact of the American cigarette and its vital cash flow.

Provide a source of income that means survival for America's independent, industrious and honorable entrepreneurs.

Contribute unceasingly to the de-escalation of inflation.

In conclusion, let us cite some imperatives.

It is imperative that an economically and smoothly functioning cigarette distribution system, which for proficiency has no peer in the world, be firmly maintained and *improved upon* when the need for improvement appears.

It is imperative that we reorient our thinking to *aggressive optimism* about the future of our industry and its product, cigarettes.

It is imperative that we bear in mind that the American cigarette *keeps down the prices* of thousands of products which the cigarette's low distribution costs channel to the consumer.

And it is imperative that we become physically and mentally involved—to put it bluntly, that we *give a damn*—about all the ways you can help the American cigarette maintain its full potential in the American economy.

JUNIOR MISS PAGEANT

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Junior Miss Pageant candidates from all over the United States will gather in our Nation's Capital this weekend.

I am delighted that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be represented by a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Melissa A. Hardy of Reading, Pa.

"Missy" Hardy, who recently participated in a youth action symposium at Gettysburg College, will travel to Mobile, Ala., next week for the National Junior Miss competition.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish Melissa Hardy good luck in Mobile. I am confident that she will ably represent the State of Pennsylvania in this national contest.

DR. EDMUND B. BOATNER RETIRING AFTER 35 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call attention to the significant contributions made by Dr. Edmund Burke Boatner, superintendent of the American School for the Deaf, West Hartford, Conn. Dr. Boatner will soon retire from his post after 35 years of distinguished leadership services—not only to the fine school he has headed—but also to lasting progress in the education of deaf Americans throughout the United States and the world.

Dr. Boatner came to the American School in 1935. It is the oldest school for the deaf in the Nation, founded in 1817 by Thomas Gallaudet, pioneer in the education of the deaf. Under Dr. Boatner's inspiring leadership, the American School has more than doubled its physical plant, led in innovative educational techniques, and has been in the forefront in the initiation of new Federal and State programs to provide additional opportunities for the deaf in our society.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to work on many occasions with Dr. Boatner in the development of legislation in this vital field. He has been a frequent and persuasive witness before our subcommittee over the years and has rendered valuable service in helping us to understand the complex educational and social handicaps of the deaf.

Dr. Boatner has had an unusually varied professional career. He was born in Potts Camp, Miss., in 1903, the son of Franklin Pierce and Mary Wills Boatner. His father was a senator in the Mississippi State Legislature. Dr. Boatner attended Millsaps College, the University of Illinois, and the University of Mississippi, where he received a degree in civil engineering in 1925. Shortly after graduation, he was employed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in New Orleans and worked on flood control projects on the Mississippi River. Over the next 6 years, he was employed as a civil engineer by the Illinois Central Railroad, the B. W. Construction Co., and in 1928 became assistant director for purchasing at the H. K. Ferguson Engineering Co. in Cleveland.

Dr. Boatner was married in 1928 to the former Maxine Tull and became interested in her profession as an educator of the deaf. His own interest and concern in the deaf continued to grow over the next several years and in 1932 he began graduate work at Gallaudet College here in Washington and received his A.M. degree the following year. Dr. Boatner then took a position as vocational principal of the New York School for the Deaf, where he could combine both his engineering and educational backgrounds. Over the next 2 years he continued his graduate studies at Columbia University and Pennsylvania State College. He was appointed superintendent and principal of the American School for the Deaf in West Hartford in 1935.

In the intervening years the American School has grown and flourished and Dr. Boatner's remarkable leadership in his profession spread. In 1950 he was chosen as secretary of the nationwide Conference of Executives of the American Schools for the Deaf; he became vice president of this organization in 1951, president in 1954 and served for 3 years. Dr. Boatner was also president of the Captioned Films for the Deaf, Inc., from 1954 to 1960 where he pioneered with the late Walt Disney a series of cartoons for deaf educational work. With his wife, Dr. Maxine Tull Boatner, he coauthored an idiom dictionary for the deaf. He was awarded a Doctor of Letters degree from Gallaudet College in 1952 and in 1964 he received the Outstanding Service Award of the Conference of American Schools for the Deaf. Dr. Boatner is the author of many articles on the deaf that have appeared in various learned journals.

Many other civic activities have marked Dr. Boatner's busy career. He was an incorporator of Mount Sinai Hospital, the Hartford Hospital, and the St. Francis Hospital. He was chairman of the management committee of the American Annals of the Deaf, a member of the advisory committee of Jefferson House, president of the Connecticut Association of Child-Caring Institutions, and president of the Boys' Club of Greater Hartford. He also served as chairman of the West Hartford War Finance Committee from 1944 to 1946. Dr. Boatner is a member of the National Association of the Deaf, the Council on Education of the Deaf, Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity and is also a Mason, a member of the Rotary Club and a former president, and the Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Dr. Edmund Burke Boatner for his lifetime of significant contribution in the field of education of the deaf. His work has had a significant impact on the lives of many thousands of our fellow citizens who have overcome the handicap of deafness and who have gone on to make for themselves more normal and productive lives. To Dr. Boatner and his wife Maxine I extend my own personal wishes for continued success in their retirement years ahead.

NEXT TURN IN BUSINESS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the May 4, 1970, issue of U.S. News & World Report features a very interesting and optimistic economic report.

I feel this article should be called to the attention of my colleagues, businessmen, and the public; and thus follows "Next Turn in Business":

NEXT TURN IN BUSINESS

The long, slow downturn in business is coming to an end—and may indeed have ended already. Just ahead lies a long, slow recovery.

More and more economists and executives around the country are adopting that view. In talks with "U.S. News & World Report," and sometimes in speeches, they are holding out these prospects—

Machinery in the nation's factories will now hum a little more vigorously. Output of new automobiles will increase, in part because the industry will be stocking up against the likelihood of strikes starting in September.

Home building will begin to show real improvement by late summer. Builders probably have seen the worst of their special kind of depression.

People will be spending more money in the stores. Demand for furniture and appliances, sluggish of late, will pick up by autumn.

None of this implies a new boom in the foreseeable future. Official reports, which lag a month or two behind actual events, may continue to produce some bad news in the next few weeks.

In times when the business cycle is turning, the statistics normally present a confusing mixture of ups and downs.

Profits of many companies will remain under pressure, as costs continue to rise. The thing that would do most to relieve the squeeze on profits is a strong surge in sales and output—and neither of these is expected to develop on a wide scale this year.

Meanwhile, if the majority of economic forecasters are right, producers will find it increasingly difficult to pass higher costs along to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

In short, businessmen—according to this consensus—can breathe the relief that comes from knowing the country has, in all probability, avoided anything like a serious recession. They can also look for more rough going, however, as the nation struggles to escape from the grip of inflation.

What authorities say. In the words of George W. Cloos, vice president and economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago: "I believe . . . that the forces making for decline are now losing momentum."

A top New York banker goes a step further: "There has been some strengthening of the economy in the last month or so. The question of whether or not we're in a recession is just a waste of time. The worry now lies in the possibility of an unbalanced federal budget. There is a chance that pay increases will provide too much buying power and that the consumer will be stimulated too much.

"As a result, the Federal Reserve will have to continue indefinitely to follow a fairly severe credit policy in order to restrain inflation."

Otto Eckstein, professor of economics at Harvard University and former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, says he expects the nation's total output of goods and services—the gross national product—to grow at a rate of about 3 per cent a year in the second quarter of 1970, after deducting the effects of inflation.

"Economic news was at its worst in February," according to Dr. Eckstein. "The picture has changed in the last six weeks."

At the Bank of America in San Francisco, Walter E. Hoadley, executive vice president and chief economist, warns that it will be impossible to gauge business trends this year by ordinary measures, "because we have so many gyrations, changes in monetary and fiscal policies, work stoppages and social unrest." He adds:

"We are building the base for a more sustained demand, but we won't see people buying more 'big ticket' items for some months, until they get a better picture of what their real income is to be. To a family that is tight on money, the old automobile suddenly looks a lot better. We're in the stage of buying new tires, getting a new paint job rather than buying a new car."

Increase in incomes. Another expert who expects a gradual upturn is Albert H. Cox, Jr., vice president and economist of the First National Bank in Dallas. In a speech in Detroit on April 21, Mr. Cox noted, "There are a number of good reasons for believing that the forces of expansion are about to reassert themselves." He summarized the reasons this way:

"At the top of most lists would be the impending sharp increase in personal incomes, reflecting in particular the boost in Social Security paychecks beginning in April, and the latest federal pay raise, retroactive to the end of last year. These two things alone add up to more than 7 billion dollars per year. It can also be argued that the mood of consumers, which deteriorated sharply throughout 1969, may be in the process of improving. . . . Another source of cheer, some say, is that business inventories have *already* been cut back sharply in many lines to conform to the realities of this new economic environment, so that the worst may be over there, too."

Mr. Cox concluded, "It can be said with almost complete confidence that business expansion will resume before the end of this year."

Sol A. Hymans, professor of economics at at the University of Michigan, expects a "mild" pickup in business by June 30, the end of the current quarter.

The same broad picture comes through in one interview after another.

Predictions of improvement are also voiced by men who are experts on major segments of the economy.

On the outlook for retail trade, Edward S. Donnell, president of Montgomery Ward, now predicts a gain of 6 or 7 per cent this year, with most of that increase showing up in the second half of the year. Price increases, Mr. Donnell notes, will account for some of that expected rise.

In the first three months of this year, retail sales ran only about 3 per cent ahead of 1969, and prices were up far more than that. Hence, the physical volume of trade actually declined.

Weakness in demand for autos is one of the major ingredients of that decline. Now, however, the industry sees signs that the slump has run its course. Sales are forecast at an annual rate of about 8 million U.S.-made cars for the second quarter, up from a 7.6 million rate in the first quarter.

Chrysler on April 21 announced plans to recall up to 1,500 workers who had been laid off from its assembly plant at Hamtramck, Mich.

Tourist trend. The tourist business already is picking up a bit, according to executives at a number of resorts.

In Miami Beach, where tourist-tax collections dipped slightly in the first quarter, "there's a definite uptrend" now, according to Elliott Roosevelt, executive director of the tourist-development authority.

"Of course, the hotel people are crying wolf," Mr. Roosevelt says. "But I would say all the first-line hotels are doing better."

Georgia's Jekyll Island had more visitors in the first quarter of this year than last year, despite a drop in January. Revenues were 23.5 per cent higher, according to Fred Griffith, assistant director of the State-owned facility. Gatlinsburg, Tenn., in the Great Smokies, is counting confidently on a 10 to 12 per cent increase in tourists this year. And the resort hotels on South Carolina's Hilton Head Island are hanging out "no vacancy" signs.

"We begin filling up last week, two weeks before normal, at all four hotels." says Jim Littlejohn, executive director of the local chamber of commerce.

The chief economist of a major metal producer makes two predictions:

Output of new cars will increase.

Spending by business for plant and equipment will rise substantially, perhaps by as much as the Government surveys early this year indicated.

This expert adds: "Many companies have gone ahead with their plans instead of waiting, because prices are rising, and they don't think they will level off in the near future."

Joseph C. Wilson, chairman of Xerox Corporation, told stockholders on April 16 that the company experienced a "lower rate of incoming orders and shipments" for computers early this year. "March orders, however, were encouraging," he said.

Both Dr. Eckstein and Mr. Hoadley believe demand for machinery may slacken later this year and in 1971. That would tend to keep a business recovery from becoming very exuberant.

How about the chances of a bounceback in the hard-hit building business? Dr. Michael Sumichrast, chief economist at the National Association of Home Builders, says, "Housing starts will move in a kind of zigzag for a few months. Then there will be a slow upturn in the fall."

Robert B. Pamplin, chairman of Georgia-Pacific Corporation, expects housing to improve "slowly but surely throughout the year." Prices of lumber and plywood already show a "mild firming," according to Mr. Pamplin.

THE MARKET PICTURE

The stock market remains something of an enigma for those who say business is about to turn up. In times past, stocks have tended to rise up to six months ahead of a real economic recovery. Today, the averages are near their lows, and market analysts, by and large, do not predict much of a rebound in the immediate future.

Harold Schreder, president of Group Securities, Inc., a New York-based mutual fund, expects further declines for some "speculative stocks" that have been selling at very high prices, relative to earnings. Mr. Schreder sees this shakeout taking "another few months," and he does not see these issues recapturing investors' favor for "a year or more."

A similar view from Armand G. Erpf, general partner of Loeb, Rhoades & Company:

"There seems to be continued readjustment in the so-called high-performance area, which has been the object of concentrated attention by many mutual funds both here and abroad over the last couple of years.

"As soon as this has more or less completed its courts, we might assume that there would be a mild upturn in stock prices which, in many areas, appear to be overdiscounting the slowdown in business. And there is some evidence that, beginning relatively soon, the slowdown will move to stability and a partial upturn."

"As soon as this has more or less completed its course, we might assume that there would be a mild upturn in stock prices which, in many areas, appear to be overdiscounting the slowdown in business. And there is some evidence that, beginning relatively soon, the slowdown will move to stability and a partial upturn."

Irving Trust Company's vice president John C. Sutherland is mildly optimistic: "I'm reluctant to predict an early, sharp recovery on the market, but I do think that barring unforeseen circumstances one should be due later this spring or this summer."

And Dr. Roger Murray, vice president of College Retirement Equities Fund, believes the market is even now "coming to life." He adds, "I can't tell you whether that process will take three weeks, three months or longer, but I'm convinced we are in or have passed the bottom of stock prices."

This relatively cautious attitude, echoed by a number of other analysts, seems in keeping with the rather unusual type of business recovery which the economists anticipate: a period in which output will climb slowly and the squeeze on profits may tighten.

THE 179TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the 179th anniversary of the Polish 1791 Constitution. On this day Poles and citizens of Polish origin everywhere celebrate a Polish national holiday.

All across the United States, from coast to coast, exercises and ceremonies are conducted throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind Americans that Poland was one of the first countries in Europe to champion liberalism.

In 1791, on May 3, Poland changed her political system and reversed her internal decline by enacting a remarkable constitution which reformed and healed the main defects in the Polish Parliamentary and social system. The primary basis of the 1791 Polish Constitution was the principle of the fundamental sovereignty of the people in the state.

Coming about 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States in 1789, the Polish Constitution was based on similar principles, and the philosophies behind the two constitutions appear to be congruent in many respects. For example, the 1791 Polish Constitution formulated its liberalism in these words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal and on a lasting foundation.

Unfortunately, the rebirth of democracy in Poland represented by the 1791 constitution did not last long. In 1795 Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

I would hope, however, that all Americans will reflect on May 3 on the meaning of this day for Poles all over the world. It is a day in celebration of liberty and sovereignty, values basic to all our lives.

I join with every Pole and every American of Polish origin in expressing my hope that Poland will once again be free to enjoy the liberty which it once held as a beacon to the entire world.

MAY 1: A DAY TO HONOR POW'S AND MIA'S

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the priority placed on settlement of the prisoners of war issue by the North Vietnamese is greatly misdirected. The Government of North Vietnam says it will not discuss the prisoners until the other issues of the war are resolved. What they do not seem to understand is that while Americans have differing views on this war, they are almost unanimous in their desire to have the Hanoi regime behave in a civilized manner and at the very least, release the names of the prisoners they now have in captivity.

To me, the sooner Hanoi realizes the solidarity of the American people on this subject, the sooner the entire war will end.

The torment through which the families and loved ones have been living is unconscionable. And, to date, the attempts at mediating the differences between governments on this issue have failed.

Friday, May 1, has been proclaimed by the President as Loyalty Day, a time to reaffirm our loyalty to the United States of America. It also is the day chosen for special tributes to Americans who are missing in action or who are prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

There are 1,472 American servicemen listed today as prisoners or missing in action. Of these, Mr. Speaker, 1,008 have been prisoners for more than 2 years; 493 have been missing more than 3 years; and 171 more than 4 years. Twenty-two have been missing more than 5 years, and one prisoner of the Vietcong, an Army sergeant, recently observed his 6th year in captivity.

Tomorrow would be a perfect time for not just an outpouring of American concern, but a worldwide expression of indignation for the position taken by the North Vietnam Government regarding prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, there is action that can be taken by any individual. Anyone, to express his feelings toward the hostile attitude of the North Vietnamese on the issue of prisoners of war, can write the Ambassadors of France, India, Poland, Rumania, Sweden, or the U.S.S.R. in Washington, D.C.

I strongly urge all Americans to participate in Loyalty Day activities, and to express their concern over U.S. prisoners of war.

THREAT TO THE COALITION

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a column entitled "Threat to the Coalition," written by Nick Thimmesch, a syndicated columnist, and published in News Day Specials. The article is entitled to our consideration.

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

THREAT TO THE COALITION

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration's conglomerate of the majority which is silent and the Americans who are middle might just become undone over the Cambodian crisis.

People are worried and upset over the latest revelations concerning involvement of U.S. helicopters, air-strikes and artillery—all in support of South Vietnamese troops chasing the Communist enemy in Cambodia. A new decision to send arms to Cambodian forces could cause this country to lose its patience with the President's steady policy of deescalating the war in that area.

Nobody likes the Vietnam war and everybody got some satisfaction from the President's announcement last week that he intends to withdraw another 150,000 American troops from that tortured land by next spring.

That speech, while loaded with ambivalencies, was still acceptable to most Americans. But most Americans want no part of Cambodia, and the President might be surprised to learn the true mood of the nation on that developing crisis.

Whatever rhetoric might emanate from the White House on the need to rush arms to the embattled army of Cambodia's Premier Lon Nol, the feeling in the Congress is that we've had just about enough in Southeast Asia.

Some heartland Republicans I have talked with don't want to go on the record on the Cambodian situation, but express strong private opinions that their constituencies just won't take any news about the U.S. getting a little bit pregnant there.

Senator Robert P. Griffin, as minority whip, must make brave utterances about how limited military aid to Cambodia might "hasten the day when American troops can come home," but that kind of song has been sung many times before, and by everyone from swooning liberals to hairy-chested hawks.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield is much closer to the sentiment of Congress when he says "guns to Cambodia would lead to supplies, advisors, then American troops to Cambodia—and *that* the Senate and the American people will not tolerate." Maine's Senator Edmund Muskie chipped in with the same view, and observed that the Johnson administration, using phrases like "a little more military effort . . . a measured response," escalated Vietnam to the mess it is now.

There is an important, clear-cut distinction between that rag-tag collection of war-protestors and the vast majority of Americans who are disgusted with Southeast Asia.

Part of the political genuis of Senator Eugene McCarthy in 1968 was that his low-keyed discussion of the Vietnam war was not only cheered by the anti-war crowd, but also made sense to much of the same "silent majority" eventually owned by Nixon. One survey showed that McCarthy's remarkable showing in the New Hampshire primary was partly explained by the sizeable vote he got from hawkish folk who felt the Johnson administration blew opportunities to win the war.

Another straw in the wind is the experience ABC's Paul Harvey, a highly patriotic and conservative midwesterner, has had in pushing the theme, in muscular verbiage, that "in this no-win war my country is wrong."

Harvey's peppery old fashioned fundamentalism reaches an enormous middle-American audience through 462 radio and 126 television stataions. He started blasting the Vietnam war in August, 1966, long before most dovish senators did, and one of his first rewards was to receive white feathers, symbolizing cowardice, in the mail.

But he continued to lace in a plea for us to "get out" with his red-blooded comments upholding traditional virtues, and claims that today the negative response is minimal.

"A faucet dripping blood makes no sense," Harvey says. "I hate to find myself in bed with Bill Fulbright, but there I am. I don't identify with violent peaceniks, but I get good response from college audiences."

In his programs, Harvey argues that the Peking Communists couldn't have designed a better blueprint for our destruction than our involvement in Southeast Asia. He says "America's six per cent of the world's mothers cannot possibly produce enough boy babies to police the planet;" and argues if we can live with Communism in Cuba we can survive it in Asia. This week, he likened our arming of the South Vietnamese in Cambodia to throwing a boomerang which could hurt the U.S.

Harvey's argument is old-fashioned midwest isolationism, the kind which flourished in Chicago 30 years ago. If Harvey can get away with it, if Congressional Republicans balk at any White House plan to sell the people on arming Cambodia, and with Democrats threatening to make a first-class issue of it—the President is in an awful jam in making a decision on Cambodia.

That silent majority of middle Americans can make some loud grumbles which could be felt in next fall's elections.

HON. STEPHEN PACE, SR.

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear of the passing of my warm and personal friend, the Honorable Stephen Pace, Sr.

Stephen Pace was an outstanding lawyer. He served his State with distinction in both the Georgia House of Representatives and the State senate before being elected to the Congress in 1937.

Stephen Pace rendered magnificent service to our country during his years in the House of Representatives. He was noted throughout the Nation for his advocacy of and devotion to a strong farm program. He himself had engaged in agricultural pursuits, and he personally knew the problems of our farmers. He shaped and developed the agricultural economy of our entire Nation. The United States was the arsenal of democracy during World War II not only due to our guns and munitions, but also because of our abundance of food, and Stephen Pace's efforts helped to build the strong agricultural program which contributed so much to our Nation's strength.

Stephen Pace has been greatly missed by our country and by his colleagues since his retirement from the Congress in 1950. Mrs. Dorn joins me in any deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Pace and the family.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 3, will be the 179th anniversary of the Polish constitution. It was on May 3, 1791, that this document was put through by patriotic forces in Poland, just 2 years after the United States of America began functioning under its Constitution. Unfortunately, a parallel was not established.

The United States prospered politically and materially under its new charter of freedom, increasing in number from 13 to 50 and becoming the most powerful nation on earth. Poland, during the same span of time, enjoyed but a brief period of freedom.

In 1772, the first partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria had deprived it of about a third of its territory and approximately half of its population. The second partition, by Russia and Prussia, occurring in 1793, less than 2 years after the promulgation of the new constitution, robbed Poland of half of its remaining area. The final partition, by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, occurred in 1795.

Poland's modern existence as an independent nation, which began as World War I ended, ceased as World War II began. The old Poland had been divided up by the Romanoff, Hohenzollern, and Hapsburg dynasties, all of which collapsed as a result of the first world conflict. The new Poland was divided between the Soviet empire, successor to the Russian empire of the czars, and National Socialist Germany, heir to the Prussian and German empires of the kaisers.

These evil forces, which had precipitated World War II, later dissolved their marriage of convenience. As a result, the people of Poland were caught between two Socialist fires; no matter which side won, the Poles were doomed to slavery under satanic foreign masters.

National Socialism's power lasted but 12 years. For its victims, they were long years, but they did finally end. On the contrary, communism, which has been in power for more than half a century,

is stronger today than ever. The territory under its control extends from the Baltic to the Pacific, including the Soviet Union and its numerous satellites, as well as Red China and its puppets. Even Cuba, a mere 90 miles from Florida, has become a bedfellow of international communism.

Mr. Speaker, while we are engaged in the war in Southeast Asia, a conflict waged against us by a puppet of the Soviet Union and Red China with their assistance, there is not much that we can do to help Poland and other Soviet colonies to regain their independence.

While we cannot embark on another foreign venture, we can discourage loose talk about peaceful coexistence, cultural exchanges, and increased trade with our Communist enemies. Let there be no more missions to Moscow by fuzzy-minded intellectuals, opportunistic politicians, and naive industrialists who would be the first to be liquidated if communism ever secured the upper hand in America.

Many of the people who left Poland to escape persecution at the hands of the czars and commissars and the kaisers and stormtroopers made their way to America, where they and their children have begun a new life as American citizens. These people, who have received much from America, have also given much in return.

Mr. Speaker, on this 179th anniversary of the Polish constitution, let us all unite in a fervent prayer to the Almighty that Poland, the land of their ancestors, will some day soon be able to return to the family of free nations.

TENTH OF MAY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is a national holiday of the Rumanian people traditionally held to celebrate three great events in Rumania's history.

Today the people of Rumania are not allowed to celebrate the traditional significance of May 10. Instead, official celebrations are held on the ninth of May signifying the anniversary of the Soviet victory.

In the past, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as the anniversary of three glorious and happy events in their history, in which achievements of the monarchy and the people were interwoven. These events—the founding of the Rumanian dynasty in 1866, the proclamation of independence in 1877, and the creation of the Kingdom of Rumania in 1881—were all dear to the hearts of Rumanians the world over.

Today, this great national holiday is kept alive by the observances held around the world by Rumanians and citizens of Rumanian origin. I join with these Rumanian patriots in celebrating this national holiday and I await the day when the citizens in Rumania will once again be free to celebrate with us.

REDS SET UP PEACE DRIVE ON ISRAEL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the deliberate escalation of military activity in the Middle East by the Soviet Union, comprehensive understanding of the complexities in that area are necessary as crucial decisions must be made in our Government circles.

Governmental decisions, of course, should be the subject of objective reaction on the part of the public and I must add that this should apply to the Far East as well.

A column in the Wednesday, April 22, Chicago Today, by John P. Roche, is, in my opinion, quite effective in its analysis of Communist activities in political warfare and I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

REDS SET UP PEACE DRIVE ON ISRAEL

The Soviets are tuning up their political-warfare apparatus for another spectacular. The last one was built around "Stop the bombing!" The message was that if the United States stopped bombing North Viet Nam, Hanoi would immediately move to "fruitful negotiations," and the war in Viet Nam would be terminated in a happy compromise. The new variation on the theme has Israel as the target.

A few words on technique may be in order. It begins innocently enough, usually at the United Nations. An east European diplomat takes a distinguished American, a man of known integrity and good will, to lunch.

In discussion, the diplomat suggests that the war in Viet Nam is unnecessary and could easily be ended by negotiations. He murmurs that perhaps reactionary forces in the state and defense departments have blocked communications.

The man of good will rushes to Washington, and the President, quite aware there is no communications problem (his ambassador in Laos can contact the Hanoi representative in Vientiane on about six hours notice), must make encouraging noises, however.

At this point, the distinguished citizen—with visions of the Nobel peace prize—is prepared to go anywhere, any time, to "open a channel of communication," and the communist diplomat is most cooperative. "The fish is on the hook!" is probably the word sent to Moscow.

The American, convinced he has succeeded where the whole burocracy has failed, joyously informs the White House, and sets off for Bucharest, scene of the "meeting." The White House damage-control squad is put on the alert: Old hands wearily explore the likely ploys. There is general agreement it will be No. 3 on the "Hanoi hospital" scenario.

Meanwhile, in Bucharest, a Romanian official assures our peacemaker of a meeting in two or three days. At the last minute the Romanian sorrowfully informs the American it has been canceled: "You know, yesterday your planes destroyed the Hanoi hospital." [It could be an orphanage, a school, a Buddhist shrine, etc.]

The American, frustrated and enraged [at the United States!], returns, changes his shirt, and holds a press conference. Our government, he asserts, has destroyed the chance of a negotiated settlement. "The bombing must be stopped." Between 1965–1968 there must have been 50 similar occurrences.

Now, the Israelis are in the slot. President Nasser has no problem communicating with Golda Meir—the line is open. But a propaganda campaign to convince "world opinion" that Israel is blocking reasonable negotiations took off with a bang when Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish congress, announced that a French journalist had told him Nasser wanted to meet him for a private peace talk. Cairo denied the story, the Israeli government lowered the boom on Goldmann, and, as the New York Times put it, "many Israelis and a surprising number of newspapers have expressed frustration and anger" that this initiative was not followed up.

Some advice from an old soldier, Mrs. Meir: This is just the first—alert your damage-control machinery.

AN APPEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, as part of Law Day U.S.A. ceremonies, the Nation's Capital will be a focal point for an appeal for international justice demonstrating our united support for those Americans who are missing in action or held prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Honorary cochairmen of this rally will be H. Ross Perot, the Dallas businessman who has made such an outstanding and unparalleled private effort to insure humane treatment and prompt release of our prisoners of war, and Mrs. James B. Stockade, of Coronado, Calif., who is national coordinator of the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia.

I urge all concerned Members to join in this observance which will take place tomorrow evening in Constitution Hall. Concerned individuals have traveled far for this event. In this connection, the Department of Defense has invited 700 families and wives of missing or captured U.S. servicemen to Washington, D.C., for this occasion. Military aircraft will provide needed transportation free of charge on a space-available basis.

As a former combat veteran, I know full well the fact that the risk of enemy capture is a risk that is part of a soldier's life. This is a fact that all American soldiers learn early in their training and a fact they carry with them daily on the field of battle. This risk does not become a reality for many soldiers; unfortunately, it does become a horrible reality for a few. Four close friends whom I flew combat with in Korea are now believed to be languishing in Communist prisons. And, due to my close association with them in many heated combat situations, I can empathize fully with their present tragic plight.

For those who have not shared similar experiences or who lack this empathy, let me refer to the statement of Lt. Robert Frishman who was captured October 24, 1967, and released September 2, 1969. This statement forcefully depicts the horrors that hundreds of American servicemen are experiencing daily in Southeast Asia. Lieutenant Frishman said:

I don't think solitary confinement, forced statements, living in a cage for three years, being put in straps, not being allowed to sleep or eat, removal of finger nails, being hung from a ceiling, having an infected arm which was almost lost, not receiving medical care, being dragged along the ground with a broken leg, or not allowing an exchange of mail to prisoners of war are humane.

Mr. Speaker, the appeal for international justice is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical observance. It is in no sense a type of observance which may be compared to some of the questionable observances we have witnessed in the Nation's Capital in recent months. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong are treating American prisoners in an inhumane and unconscionable fashion. Not even minimum standards of decency and compassion are being observed. In addition, the Communists are violating the Geneva Convention of 1957 regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, a document which they pledged their full faith and adherence.

I firmly believe Congress has a duty to act on the prisoner of war issue. For this reason I have introduced a House resolution calling on the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to provide humane treatment of prisoners of war and effect their release at the earliest possible time. I also believe that Congress has a duty to support appropriate nongovernmental observances such as the appeal for international justice rally planned for tomorrow evening. I urge my colleagues to give this occasion their fullest support and encouragement, and let it act as an inspiration for all of us in the coming year.

APPEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, North Vietnam is believed to be holding over 1,450 American servicemen as prisoners of war.

On May 1, 1970, there will be a demonstration in Washington in support of our American men who are missing in action or prisoners of war. The rally in Constitution Hall on that date will show to the wives and loved ones of these men that Americans do care. The gathering will further show to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that their treatment of the men and their failure to release information regarding their status, is inhumane and is abhorrent to the American people.

Veterans' organizations and private citizens have attempted to learn of the condition of American prisoners of war and to achieve their release. Their efforts have been ignored by the North Vietnamese who have shown no significant sign of good will.

Such action is in violation of the Geneva convention which outlines specific standards of humane treatment for prisoners of war. Further, by refusing to make known specific information as to their condition, Hanoi is inflicting painful sorrow upon the families of their prisoners.

Basic human decency demands an end to Hanoi's inhumanity to these men and to their families in America. I urge my colleagues to join in this national day of tribute to these deserving Americans who, each day, testify, by their imprisonment, to the freedom which means so much to every true American.

DDT PERIL TO OUR OCEANS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, according to reports in this morning's newspaper, an international conference which recently met in London has confirmed what many people have been saying for some time—that the use of DDT and other hard pesticides is a serious hazard to marine life.

The reports paint a bleak picture indeed, and they did not even deal with the question of the diminution of the ocean's ability to supply oxygen.

Reports from conferences such as this one are just another indication that it is important for the protection of our environment that we act now to ban DDT and other harmful chlorinated hydrocarbons.

The news report follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1970]

GREATEST THREAT TO SEA LIFE CALLED DDT, NOT OIL SLICKS

(By Alfred Friendly)

LONDON, April 29.—The pesticides that increase the harvests from the land imperil those from the sea, an international conference of marine biologists was told here today.

The DDT spread on fields finds its way to rivers, estuaries and coastal stretches and plays havoc with clams, oysters, shrimp, trout, salmon and other fish, the scientists reported. Even very slight contaminations in water—a few parts per million—can stop the reproduction of many species or greatly reduce their size and numbers.

But, the researchers said, present marine contamination by radioactive wastes, by hot water from power plants and, surprisingly, by oil spills are not noticeably injuring marine life.

The principal message of the two-day meeting, under the auspices of the Royal Society, was that while man has not been known to have died himself from too much DDT, he is using it to kill off important elements of the food chain he lives on.

The fatal mechanism is one of accumulation of DDT along that chain: The pesticide, carried by wind or rain run-off into rivers and harbors, contaminates them by only a few parts per billion, or less; but each feeder, up along the evolutionary ladder from plankton to predator, concentrates the residues more and more. Dead porpoises in the Gulf of Mexico, for example, contained DDT residues ranging up to 800 parts per million.

In an estuary on the Texas coast, where DDT is often sprayed on the fields three times a year, a concentration of 8 parts per million in the ovary of sea trout in 1968 prevented all spawning whatsoever, Dr. Philip A. Butler, of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service field station at Sea Breeze, Fla., reported.

After a heavy DDT pollution near Pensacola eight years ago, he noted, the entire scallop population was killed and has not reappeared. Even the slightest amount of DDT in the water, he said, is immediately fatal to shrimp.

Concentrations of DDT at much lower levels than the immediately lethal amount, Dr. Butler explained, can also be ruinous in inhibiting growth and reproduction, and rendering the organism easier prey for disease and parasite infestation.

An oyster's growth will be half the normal rate in water contaminated by only 1 part DDT in 10 billion. As long as the toxicant is present, the oyster continues to concentrate it, up to 70,000 times higher in its body than in the surrounding water.

Dr. J. M. Anderson, director of the New Brunswick station of Canada's Fisheries Research Board, reported that DDT reduces the ability of salmon to withstand temperature changes (as when they plunge into colder water), disorients their ability to return to their spawning ground, and greatly lessens their "survival repertoire," the mechanisms for avoiding hazard and for escape.

Study of "thermal contamination"—the runoff into the sea of water at high temperature from power plants—indicated no worrisome consequences, according to one research paper. Research on the Scottish coast showed that about the only result was the introduction of new species of fish previously found in warmer latitudes.

Similarly, no damage to marine life has been noted so far—nor do prospective levels indicate any danger—from the discharge in rivers and ocean of radioactive wastes from atomic power plants. A researcher quoted American experiments covering 21 years in which no injury was found to salmon eggs subjected to 50 times more radiation than that prevailing in the Columbia River below the Hanford atomic plant.

On the other hand, very deleterious results to marine life were noted in other reports on the effects of sewage and industrial waste—particularly that containing mercury, copper, lead and zinc compounds.

Finally, whatever damage was caused to sea birds and the amenities of the beaches by catastrophic oil spills, such as the sinking of the Torrey Canyon supertanker in 1967, they have not wrought substantial injury to other sea life, Dr. R. G. J. Shelton, of the Burnham-on-Crouch Fisheries Laboratory, declared. The more volatile elements in the oil quickly evaporate and the rest are not particularly toxic, doing more harm, as sludge, to fish nets than to fish.

He conceded, however, that chronic oil leakage, customary at pipeline terminals or storage tanks on the water's edge, could have a thoroughly blighting effect.

Prof. R. B. Clark of the University of Newcastle argued, with obvious reference to the new Alaska oil strikes, that oil contamination is a far bigger danger in the Arctic. In near-zero temperatures, the quick degradation of the oil products characteristic of temperate climates will not occur, and the different biology of cold water marine life makes it much more susceptible to oil poisoning, he said.

HON. JAMES B. UTT

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the death of our friend and colleague, James B. Utt, is a great loss to the Congress. He will be missed by all of us who were fortunate to know him and serve with him in the House of Representatives.

Jim Utt served his home State of California in the State Controller's Office and in the State Assembly before entering the Congress. He was also an outstanding attorney.

Jim Utt was an intelligent and responsible advocate of conservative principles who was dedicated to preserving our Nation and the Constitution. He was greatly devoted to our capitalistic system and actively supported private enterprise and property rights. As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he consistently advocated that less burden be placed on the individual taxpayer.

Jim Utt was a devoted and dedicated Christian. He was always a regular attendant at the House prayer breakfasts.

Our Nation, the State of California, and California's 35th District have lost a diligent patriot and servant. Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Utt and the family.

SPINOFF FROM THE SPACE PROGRAM

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, along with several of my colleagues on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I described various spinoff benefits of our Nation's space program. It has always been my contention that these direct and indirect benefits more than justify the total cost of the space effort while benefiting and improving the quality of life for all men on earth.

Since that time several of my colleagues have asked for copies of a special report which was compiled by my district Astronautics and Aeronautics Advisory Committee, composed of chief executives with the Nation's largest space industry firms. This report is enclosed as follows:

SPINOFF BENEFITS FROM THE SPACE PROGRAM

OBJECTIVE

The principal objective of the Subcommittee report is to inform Congressman L. Frey of the spinoff benefits to the American public resulting from NASA space programs. This information is presented in a format that can easily be understood by the general public.

The secondary objective is to provide as much general and related reference material and source of information material as could be found which will provide a listing that can be used by others who wish to pursue the spinoff subject further. These items can be found in Appendix III (Reference) and Appendix IV (Bibliography).

The third objective of this report is to provide recommendations to Congressman Frey as to what future actions he might take and what additional material might be gathered to assist him in meeting his objectives as a member of the House of Representatives Aeronautics and Space Committee. These recommendations present a consensus of the Subcommittee and are summarized on the following page, entitled Recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the unanimous recommendation of this Subcommittee that Congressman Frey encourage NASA to:

Stress the value of space spinoffs through the NASA Office of Public Affairs. These should include not only technological benefits but economic, political and educational benefits accrued by each of the fifty states and the country as a whole.

Make the Aerospace Industry aware of its responsibility to inform the general public of the benefits resulting from NASA programs. Aerospace firms should be asked to provide more spinoff material for the news media; particularly, during launch coverage by major TV and radio networks.

Initiate a full program to enlist the complete support of the American people. Like the NASA spacemobile carries the message to our intellectual communities, a "Spacecopter" could be used to communicate the Space Program to the country at large. With the space spinoffs as a selling tool, these space age vehicles would appear at public gatherings, such as sports stadiums, fairgrounds and/or shopping centers to present a show focused on the spectacles of the Space Program and how it is now and will in the future affect the peoples of the world.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has contributed significantly to the scientific knowledge, prestige and technological progress of this Nation in many ways. The influence of NASA's Space Programs on the National economy almost staggers the imagination. In terms of direct impact through contracts to industry, more jobs for our Nation's work forces, grants to universities and colleges and technological spinoffs affecting everyone, the space programs must be considered a major force in American life. The Subcommittee recognizes the need to inform the American people of how the space program benefits them.

This report presents examples of NASA space technology transfer best by illustrating NASA spinoffs which were selected from information provided by NASA, Kennedy Space Center, and its contractors. The Subcommittee has organized the examples in categories which should be of interest to the general public. The categories selected include:

Medical.
Urban Affairs.
Meteorological.
Energy and Natural Resources.
Communications.
Public Affairs.
Transportation.
Materials.

In each of the above categories where more extensive and/or illustrated information is available, the applicable subject title is followed by a reference number (1 through 9) which corresponds with the numbering of the bibliography.

To the colleges and universities of this country, research grants are important in that the grants provide challenging research work which motivates both students and faculty in "state-of-the-art" development. These have been summarized in Appendix I and the reference documents identified in the bibliography.

The NASA aerospace programs could not have been accomplished without the many major contractors and subcontractors who supported the various programs. In Appendix II the numbers are broken out by contractors per state, and the reference document contains the names of the companies, cities, and states.

One additional item should be mentioned here and that is the work being done by Denver Research Institute under NASA contract to provide a quarterly report to NASA on the technology transfer process and provide the capability of a central data bank for collection of useful data on actual or potential cases of technology transfer resulting from NASA's Technology Utilization Program.

SECTION 2. MEDICAL

General introduction

Of all the data covering aerospace spinoffs, the medical area provided the greatest amount of readily available material. Many times the same basic spinoff item has been applied to two or more medical uses, such as the spray on electrodes and miniaturized sensing devices. There are also many techniques that were derived from areospace research that were so technical or still within the medical research programs that they have been purposely omitted from this report. The best example of this case is the research being conducted in the nuclear field for devising a miniaturized nuclear-powered engine to be implanted in the abdomen of a patient to power a heart assist device.

Of great interest, the development of the Biomedical Applications Teams organized by NASA whose primary purpose was to carefully define important biomedical problems relevant to aerospace technology. The Teams systematically screen both computerized aerospace data files and NASA laboratories for potential solutions. The effect of the Team efforts will be:

(1) To shorten the time gap between the development of new technology and its effective utilization.

(2) Aid the movement of new knowledge across the organization, disciplinary, and regional boundaries.

(3) Help develop better methods for communicating and applying Government-generated knowledge to the general economy.

Many of the medical examples that follow were provided by the Biomedical Applications Team.

Breathing Sensor (3, 4, 6)

Infants, comatose children, or adult patients sometimes require surgical implantation of a tracheotomy tube in the windpipe to ease breathing. If the tube becomes clogged, breathing will stop and brain damage or death can result within two to four minutes.

Ordinarily a full-time nurse is required, who checks the tube visually and takes immediate corrective action when necessary. Integrated circuitry, designed and fabricated for aerospace use by NASA's Ames Research Center, has been modified to note differences in temperature of air passing through the tube, and actute an audible or visible alarm within 10 seconds of any change. The signal call be given at a nurse's station, or in another room if the patient is at home. Thus the patient's care is improved and faciliated.

Cardiac Catheter (3, 4)

A sensor developed at Ames Research Center is smaller than the head of a pin and can be inserted into a vein or artery to measure blood pressure without interfering with circulation. Less than 0.05 inch in diameter, the probe can be inserted through a standard hypodermic needle. The original version of this sensor was a transducer developed to provide pressure distribution measurements over the surfaces of small wind tunnel models.

Cardiovascular Pressure Transducer (2, 3, 4)

NASA research has produced a miniature transducer capable of transmitting blood pressure variations. About two hundredths of an inch thick and using less than 500 millionths of a watt of electrical power the transducer will be used to monitor blood flow changes in cardiac patients with coronary occlusions. Encouraging results have already been obtained by inserting this tiny device into the heart and arteries of anesthetized dogs and much smaller animals.

Computer Enhancement of X-ray Photographs (4)

For several years NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory has been using digital computers to enhance the clarity of television pictures

of the Moon and Mars transmitted from spacecraft. Although the original pictures were surprisingly sharp considering the circumstance, technical limitations of the camera and electrical distortion encountered in the transmission reduced the clarity desired. By processing the photos in a digital computer, details that were obscured in the original became apparent.

In 1966, this technique was applied to medical and biological X-rays, with promising results. Doctors were able to observe clarity of details that would otherwise be lost or overlooked. Computer enhancement of X-ray photos currently continues under development.

Cardiotachometer (4)

The medical division of an eastern optical corporation is developing an instrument to monitor certain functions of bedridden patients. The firm plans to incorporate this instrument into their "bedside monitor." This instrument was made possible from data taken from a NASA Tech Brief developed by the Ames Research Center.

Ear Instrument

When it becomes necessary to acquire specimens of tissue from the inner ear for medical examination, the outer bony structure must first be removed. A special air-abrasive device for acquiring inner ear bone specimens was suggested by the Midwest Research Institute Biomedical Applications Team to an investigator at the University of Kansas Medical Center. He found that it was substantially better than previous techniques for removing bone from the ear and saved considerable time.

Evaluating Drug Safety

In evaluating the safety and efficiency of drugs for human use, the effect of a particular drug on the circulation of blood through the capillaries is of great importance. Present methods for determining capillary circulation are relatively crude and indirect because the capillary vessel may have a diameter less than half that of a human hair. A search of NASA aerospace literature was made by the Midwest Research Institute Biomedical Applications Team, the results of which were helpful to a physiologist in beginning a pilot program for the solution of this problem at the University of Minnesota.

Heart Monitor (1, 6)

An investigator working under a NASA grant at the Duke University Medical Center wanted to monitor heart action more precisely by measuring electrical signals simultaneously along 15 points on a small area of the heart wall. For this, he needed a probe that would insure good contact at all 15 points and which would not result in heart wall damage upon insertion. The NASA-sponsored Research Triangle Institute Biomedical Applications Team explained the problem to an instrument engineer. He designed a 15-electrode probe within an ordinary hypodermic needle. It was fabricated, tested, found satisfactory, and is now in use.

Hospital Clean Rooms (4)

A particle counter was developed for the Marshall Space Flight Center to monitor air purity in clean rooms in which small precise components are assembled and tested. Several hospitals have shown interest in adapting it for monitoring air cleanliness in operating rooms and intensive care wards.

Microthermocouple (2)

Doctors in New York and Boston now use a commercially available microthermocouple probe in cryosurgery, (Nitrogen-320° F. in liquid state) to specify areas subjected to the cryogenic temperature. The probe, used to detect the body temperature in the local area of cryogenic application was originally developed under contract to the NASA Lewis Research Center, is used in treatment of dystonia, Parkinson's disease and other diseases causing abnormal muscular motion. It is also used for repairing lesions in the eye by "welding" tissues at cryogenic temperatures.

Physiological sensor (2, 4, 9)

Electronic sensors that were used to monitor astronauts during Mercury and Gemini flights have been adapted to continuously measure the pulse and respiration rates, temperature and blood pressure of up to 64 hospital patients and provide continuous observation at a Central Control station.

Respiratory ailment helmet (4, 6)

An adaption of the Gemini astronaut space helmet helps physiologists conduct studies on the proper exercise levels for children with respiratory ailment.

The helmet can also be used for delivery of medication, thereby permitting some mobility for patients formerly confined to tents.

Respirometer (4)

In the care and rehabilitation of the severely burned child, it is desirable that chemical changes in expired gases be monitored as a means of determining the child's over-all condition. This should not involve touching the child's body or connecting air tubes to his throat, because of the pain and airway restriction involved. The Southwest Research Institute Biomedical Applications Team located a respirometer developed at NASA's Ames Research Center which appeared to meet the qualifications of the investigators at the Shrines Institute of the University of Texas. A prototype of this respirometer will be made available for evaluation.

Sight switch (3, 4)

A sight switch, developed to give astronauts an extra pair of arms, has been adapted for use by people suffering from paralysis. With it a patient can manipulate a motor-driven wheelchair with only the movement of his eyes. The switch operates on the principal of infra-red reflection from the eyeball. An infra-red source bounces light off the white of the eye into a photoelectric cell which carries the message to a control activator. When the eyes are moved sideward, one eye reflects the light while the pupil of the other eye absorbs it. The resulting inbalance of voltage controls the direction of the chair. Other applications of this switch include the control of machinery and electronic devices.

Space underwear use

Study of the effects of stress on the normal heart helps to understand stroke and cardiovascular disease. Researchers at the University of Washington were evaluating the effects of physical effort and heat on blood oxygen transport. A means of carefully controlling skin blood temperature without interfering with movement was needed. NASA-developed "space underwear" with a temperature control system was obtained by the Southwest Research Institute Biomedical Application Team and was used by the investigators in successfully completing the study.

Specialized Transducer (1, 4)

A transducer developed for the Manned Spacecraft Center to measure the impact of the Apollo spacecraft Command Module during water landings is being used in the fitting of artificial limbs. The transducer is smaller than a dime and weighs less than an ounce. The sensing diaphragm is stainless steel and the whole unit is waterproof. It will respond to changes in pressure, and is not affected by temperatures between freezing and 120° F.

Spray-on-Electrodes (4)

A new technique for applying electrocardiograph electrodes to the bodies of test pilots was developed by the NASA Flight Research Center. A liquified, conductive mixture is sprayed over the ends of lead wires onto the patient's chest. This mixture dries quickly, is thin and flexible, and is not uncomfortable to the patient. It can be easily removed, but keeps the electrodes in contact with the skin during exercise which causes perspiration.

A plastic-metallic spray for attaching heart electrodes to test pilots is being used in equipment with which electrocardiograms of ambulance patients can be flashed ahead by radio to a hospital receiving room.

Training of the Physically Handicapped (4)

A sling support device was developed by Langley Research Center for the purpose of acquainting astronauts with gravity conditions on the lunar surface where the force of gravity is one-sixth that found on Earth. A NASA-sponsored Biomedical Application Team at Southwest Research Institute was aware of the need for a device with which to train and rehabilitate physically handicapped persons. The sling support device was thus made known to investigators at the Texas Institute for Rehabilitation and Research (TIRR) who, with assistance from Langley personnel, have adapted the lunar gravity simulator to suit TIRR's needs in training the handicapped. The TIRR device is in use at their clinic in Houston, Texas.

Electrocardiograms by Telephone (1, 4, 6)

A "Telamedic" device, which relays electrocardiogram data by telephone, has been developed. It is designed for immediate electrocardiogram checks for post-coronary patients. The "Telamedic" can be used in the home, hospital or physician's office. The battery-powered system includes a transmitter and receiver, each about the size of a bedside alarm clock. No special equipment is needed for the telephone.

To use the equipment, the patient attaches the transmitter's electrodes to previously marked positions on his chest, telephones his physician and places the telephone on the transmitter. The doctor places his telephone on the desk-top Telamedic receiver and gathers data on a standard EKG writer for immediate reading or permanent recording.

Laser Surgery (1, 4)

Laser technology developed originally for defense and space use is being adapted for delicate and precise use in medicine. Aerospace engineers have been working since 1962 with medical research teams to find new ways to use lasers in "knifeless surgery" and as diagnostic tools.

Lasers are being used with outstanding success in eye surgery, and are being evaluated in dermatology, organ repair, amputation and in microbiological studies. Such surgery can be painless and, in many cases, practically bloodless. As a diagnostic tool, the microscopically small point of focus of a laser beam might be used to lift painlessly and instantaneously a miniscule particle of skin from a patient's arm. Or, by passing the beam through a hypodermic needle, the laser can sample tissue inside the body.

Heart-Assist Pump (1, 6)

A circulatory assist pump for use in emergency treatment of heart attack victims is being produced as a result of aerospace research and development programs.

Hydraulically operated, this pump is quickly and easily connected by minor surgery to the femoral (thigh) arteries, and relieves the heart's workload by augmenting its natural pumping action.

In a more advanced program, engineers are involved in building and evaluating a "co-pulsation" circulatory assist pump designed to relieve a weak heart's workload. Co-pulsation is a new and untried method of circulatory assist that imitates the natural heart's blood-pumping action. The device will pump blood at flows and pressures proportional to those of the natural heart. The pump consisting of two liquid-operated diaphragms mounted in a plastic housing, will be driven by a piston automatically controlled by an electronic computer.

The pump will be connected to the aorta, the heart's great trunk artery that carries blood to the branch arteries.

Rescue Stretcher

An orthopedic stretcher has been designed to remove a workman from large, deep rocket fuel tanks having access holes of only 18" diameter. The stretcher holds the subject essentially in traction while raising him through the access hole.

SECTION 3. URBAN AFFAIRS

General introduction

In the area of Urban Affairs spinoffs from space have taken the form of providing a new method of tackling old problems. This new method is known by several titles, Systems Engineering, Systems Analysis and Systems Management. Whatever title you prefer, systems is the key word.

The systems approach utilizes the application of mathematics to simulate and determine the interaction of complex systems and predict their behavior. Concentration is on the design as a whole, as distinct from the design and production of the parts. It is an approach that insists upon looking at the problem in its entirety, taking into account all the facets, and seeking to understand how they interact with one another and how the best solution will bring these factors into proper relationship.

Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, when he was chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, stated that the techniques used to put man on the moon were exactly the techniques needed to clear up our cities. He was referring to this systematic approach to probelm solving. Since his statement, the systems approach has been applied to many problems inherent to the cities of this country. Included in this section are a few of the more specific examples.

Crime Detection Techniques (1, 6)

Improved methods of fighting crime through the use of modern scientific developments have been outlined by an aerospace corporation at national and local meetings on crime prevention.

"Nuclear fingerprints" have been advanced as a most useful method of comparing clues found at the scene of a crime with similar samples taken from a suspect. This "heutron activation analysis" can be used, for example, in comparing tire marks, hair samples and marijuana. Matching probabilities are said to be 99,999 percent.

The use of chemistry has been cited as a method for marking and tracking. For example, it could be possible to "sniff" around a house to determine if narcotics are inside without ever entering the house. Special markings on vehicle would allow police officers to follow that car chemically.

Fresno General Neighborhood Renewal Program (6)

Aerospace industry is assisting the Director of the Fresno Redevelopment Agency in the preparation of a management plan for the West Fresno General Neighborhood Renewal Program. This work will require: (1) defining program objectives, scheduling and budgeting the study phase of the program; (2) preparation of control procedures for directing and monitoring the progress; and (3) organization of data handling procedures to be used with the great quantities of data required in a project of this nature.

This approach to the planning process is comprehensive with stress on planning as a continuing process. But considering each of the major several elements of urban activities concurrently, and taking into account the relationships among the elements, the plans developed will reflect the total impact of proposed actions in the metropolitan area. This contractor plans to provide detailed action programs and implementation plans for community renewal and economic development plus a management and information system for use with the programs.

Justice, Welfare Studies (1, 6)

California selected an aerospace corporation to apply aerospace systems analysis techniques to the solution of social problems in two important areas.

In 1965, the company performed a systems analysis study of the problems of crime and delinquency in the State. Results of the six-month effort demonstrated the practicality of using aerospace techniques to gain new insight into crime prevention and control procedures. Of particular significance was the simulation of the criminal justice system on a computer. This mathematical model enabled systems engineers to determine how well the system functioned, and how changes would affect its functioning. This provided information on the operation of a criminal justice system that would require years to achieve in actual practice.

California awarded this firm a contract in 1966 which called for a systems analysis of the State's social welfare system. The study took a new approach to social welfare, differing from the relief concept of the 1930's when most of today's programs were devised. It marked the first application of advanced research techniques of the aerospace industry to problems of combating and preventing dependency, and has resulted in the initiation of a revised welfare program in California.

Law Enforcement and Crime (6, 9)

One company is applying aerospace industry management techniques to broad social problems such as law enforcement. The techniques could lead, in the next five to ten years, to the era of the "instant cop" through highly sophisticated, well-planned, computerized systems of information use, communication, storage, and retrieval to speed up investigative processes to improve the quality of justice.

The system of information processing currently being analyzed for Redondo Beach, California, will be designed for use by other cities of similar size and population makeup and for quick and easy integration into a computerized system. Correlated statistical information could provide the capability to predict when, where, and what kind of crime is going to occur. The ultimate product will provide quick and efficient use of warrant and fingerprint files and other pertinent records most useful when immediately available.

Low Cost Housing (3, 6)

One aerospace company has developed a new housing approach whereby communities of attractive and durable dwellings can be built quickly and economically of prefabricated sections manufactured on the site in mobile factories.

The central feature of the concept is a portable plant in which finished sections of floors, walls, ceilings and roofs will be built at the construction site. The mobile factory includes 22 trailers.

School Community Relations (1, 6)

Attacks on some of the problems posed by urban poverty and cultural gaps—particularly the barriers to education—have been mounted by one aerospace company in support of the State of California.

Under direction of the State Department of Compensatory Education (which, as the name implies, tries to compensate for cultural and economic drawbacks), a team of systems engineers and analysts assisted in an intensive study of school-community relations in urban poverty areas.

Project SEAR—a Systematic Effort to Analyze Results—employed aerospace skills to design questions for more than 250 teachers in poverty areas and later to analyze their answers. Findings showed the success or failure of schools to educate youngsters with ethnic cultural or economic handicaps can be a major contributor to either contentment or unrest in the modern city.

In another effort, systems experts are helping educators in San Jose, California, make great gains in motivating junior high school students who previously had "underachieved" because of social and economic factors.

This project, also supported and watched closely by the Department of Compensatory Education, has proved to the students the relevance of their basic classroom skills—reading and mathematics in particular—to job success as adults.

Both Project SEAR and the San Jose program have drawn heavily on a major aerospace company's experience in the analysis of enormously complex problems and the design of workable solutions.

SECTION 4. METEOROLOGICAL

General introduction

Observation of conditions all over the earth are required for accurate weather forecasting. The weather satellites provide this information. The results have a profound impact on agriculture, from the planning of land use to the transportation of crops. Timely warnings of severe storms and other weather hazards save lives and property. Barren areas of land can be made usable and productive today because of better understanding of meteorological factors with regard to plant growth. The safety of air and sea travel benefits greatly from satellite weather data.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, estimates that if weather can be accurately predicted for even three days in advance, man could save $60 billion a year, plus millions of lives and an untold amount of grief. Even if all other scientific, technological, and economic benefits of space research were disregarded or eliminated, the spectacularly successful performances of our weather and communications satellites indicate positively that investment in space has paid off and will continue to pay off in the future.

Today's satellites relay TV pictures of the earth and its cloud cover, radiation, measurements for ocean currents, vertical temperatures and humidity. All of this adds to the store of information available to the meteorologist and increases the value of his forecast. These advanced developments would not be possible without the capabilities provided by weather satellites.

Analysis of Hurricane Mechanisms (2, 6)

An aerospace contractor performed a research program utilizing information from the National Hurricane Project which compiled all the physical factors of a hurricane and then determined the magnitude and stability of the forces that hold the hurricane together and what causes it to seek the course it takes. The information acquired is being further analyzed and methods of altering the course of a hurricane or even reducing its force are expected to be available in the near future.

Earthquake Prediction System (1, 6)

A laser beam system to detect and measure minute movements of the earth's surface as a means of predicting earthquakes has been developed by a West Coast aerospace contractor. By measuring the small but continuous shifts of the earth's surface, scientists say they can pinpoint major areas of stress, and thus permit advance warning of a major earthquake.

The technique, called Project GLASS (Geodetic Laser Survey System), employs twin laser beams to precisely record movement of terrain along earth faults. Accuracy of the system has been established in tests over a 10-mile span in California's San Bernardino Mountains.

The developer has proposed the system as a solution to a problem posed by the Presi-

dential Committee for Earthquake Prediction, which stressed the need for constantly monitoring and measuring earth strain in fault areas.

Tornado and Fire Storm Analysis (2, 3, 6)

An aerospace contractor analyzed the severe storm and the fire storm phenomenon, investigated fundamental physical principles and derived a system that enables a meteorologist to predict, through the use of aerospace technology, anticipated occurrences and methods for preventing, altering or controlling storms.

SECTION 5. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

General introduction

The purpose of the NASA "Natural Resources Program" is to utilize remote sensors in space for the discovery, inventory, evaluation, development and conservation of natural and cultural resources.

A substantial amount of money is involved in the spaceborne observation system, but the benefits reaped both economically and in terms of usefulness to the people far outweigh the initial costs. The estimated value for doing such things as mapping of world vegetation, agricultural crop surveys, land use studies, worldwide ocean-sea data and forest fire detection data is beyond financial estimate.

Agriculture and Forestry Photography by Satellite (3, 6)

A recently developed single-channel thermal mapping and infrared photography system has several applications. In agriculture and forestry, it will provide:

Early detection of crop and forest disease.
Fire detection and mapping.
Classification of vegetation.
Water transpiration measurement.
Insect detection and migration.

Electrical Power Systems (6)

The development of aerospace control methods presently being used to define power scheduling of the Columbia River hydroelectric system for the Bonneville Power Authority. Control techniques have been developed capable of affecting substantial water savings through proper distribution of the generation load among four plants along the Columbia River during daily operation. In the near future, an effort will be made to extend this scheduling activity to all seven federal dams along the Columbia River.

Space computer technology is able to provide practical, reliable and efficient data management systems that can mean full optimization of all the water resources, maximum efficiency from the generator units at dams, and minimum power loss in transmission lines.

Explosion Forming (2)

Explosion-forming, a system of forming metals by blasting them into the required shape, is one of the important new processes to come from the space age. The area of metal working has had a large impact in technological fallout. The space age production methods have changed the whole appearance of the metalworking shops.

Flood Control (6)

Stress devices developed for measuring the thrust of rocket engines are being used to monitor internal stresses in dams to provide engineers with hitherto unavailable information about changes in dam structures during earth tremors. Fifteen of the devices are being installed in the new Castaic Dam in the Tehachapi Mountains of South Central California. This is providing essential information to the floodprone regions of California where earthfill dams have failed with catastrophic results.

Fresh water from the sea (1, 6, 8)

A major aerospace contractor is building an advanced nuclear plant to produce power and make fresh water from the sea. The plant features a sodium graphite reactor and a multi-stage "flash" distillation plant, each considered to be among the most advanced and reliable of its type available.

Fuel cell (1)

The fuel cell, which had lain dormant for many years, was activated to supply electrical power for spacecraft in orbit. Twenty-eight natural gas companies now have a $20 million program underway for adaption of the fuel cell for home power units.

Fresh water photography by satellite (3, 6)

Benefits gained in surveying fresh water from space stations have been demonstrated:

Lake colors can be evaluated relative to their biology, chemistry, sediment, and pollutant content.

Infrared photography can be utilized to locate fresh water escaping along our coastlines.

The ability to locate areas of water trapped by faults in earth's crust.

Detection of the growth and decline of glaciers.

Infrared optics (2, 3, 6)

Geologists have discovered in Gemini photographs some promising possibilities of detecting oil and mineral deposits in remote areas of our globe through the use of television camera system designed to visibly detect hydrogen leaks during the testing of the J–2 rocket engine. This system detects infrared radiation and has been adapted for use in many applications of observing and evaluating resources.

Oceanographic Photography by Satellite (3, 6)

Fisheries. Frequent photographic coverage on a global scale of the ocean areas lead to identification and location of new fishing areas.

Coastal Mapping. Acquisition of data is accelerated for improving and updating charts and maps for such groups as the fishing, shipping and petroleum industries.

Oceanography (2, 3, 6)

Power. Underwater and submersible vehicles and systems currently utilize silver-zinc batteries and fuel cells developed for spacecraft and space vehicle applications. Nuclear-powered electric systems developed for space—placed on the moon by Apollo 12—are being utilized as non-tended long term power structures for underwater use.

Liquid Gases (Cryogenics). Space involved techniques for using liquid oxygen in environmental control systems were used in the PX–15 submersible. This system permitted more room in the PX–15 for other experiments which could not have been on board if cumbersome conventional environmental control systems were used.

Underwater Breathing Apparatus. A two gas breathing technique using gaseous helium originally developed for space use is now being used in underwater activities. This two gas system allows the user to stay down for longer periods of time without being connected to an above surface system.

SECTION 6. COMMUNICATIONS

General introduction

The subject of space spinoffs in communications can be summed up in two words: Satellites and Microminiaturization.

Through our communications satellites network, we are now able to transmit audio, visual and telemetry information to every corner of the earth and, to date, as far into space as the planet Mars.

Because of the payload limitations inherent to space flight, the art of microminiaturization, as applied to electronics, has flourished under the space program. To realize the spinoff, you need only look into a department store to see television sets, radios, tape recorders and other electronic gear, which are dramatically diminishing in size with each passing year.

Some of the more significant applications in this versatile field are included in this section.

Intelsat Communications Satellite (3, 6)

Intelsat III is the third generation of commercial communications satellites built for the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT), manager of the 62-nation International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (INTELSAT).

Although underseas cables and short-wave radio provide communications between many areas of the world, each of these methods has inherent limitations in the development of a global system that will enable all countries to communicate directly and instantly. Cables give service only to those areas that are linked together within the cable network and normally do not carry television. Radio communications often are degraded by violent disturbances in the atmosphere and ionosphere.

Satellite communications, however, can cover all areas of the earth, and they are not subject to natural interference because they operate at higher (microwave) frequencies.

Communications satellites serve as "radio towers" in space. They receive communications signals beamed from earth stations, they amplify signals, and they transmit them back to other earth stations. A single satellite can be visible from about one-third the earth's surface; a series of satellites properly placed in orbit around the earth can provide complete gobal coverage. Countries within sight of a satellite will be able to communicate with each other.

International Telecasting and Broadcasting (3)

One of the most widely known communication satellite demonstrations was the international TV coverage of the Olympics from Japan in October 1964. TV programs were transmitted to the United States and Europe, marking the first time that two satellites had been employed in tandem for TV broadcasting purposes.

The broadcast of the Town Meeting of the World TV program via Early Bird 1 brought an international discussion program to many people. "The use of a satellite for the transmission of telephone calls and telegrams between North America and Europe has been extremely successful. As of September 30, 1966, its performance at that date was 99 percent reliable and the satellite increased the potential telephone capacity across the Atlantic by over 50 percent.

Miniature TV Transmitters (4, 6)

Miniature FM transmitters—tiny radios—developed by NASA for broadcasting biomedical data from space capsules, can transmit test data from industrial equipment to receiving instruments up to 1,000 feet away. A picture in Metalworking News for October 2, 1963, shows the miniature FM transmitters in use at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, for testing a chain in a power transmission drive under operating conditions.

Miniature TV Camera (6, 9)

The actual size of this model TV camera is 4" x 3" x 1½". It was developed to observe Saturn stage separation during Apollo flights. It weighs approximately 16 ounces and is battery powered. This camera is currently on the commercial market.

Phototransistor Mosaic (6)

A tiny mosaic of light sensitive transistors, developed by NASA's Electronics Research Center will soon replace the small vidicon tube that is presently being used in commercial TV cameras. Research is being performed now to produce a 1" x 1" plate which will employ 100 times more phototransistors and scanning electronics than the present solid state circuit board. An experimental camera using this mosaic is presently operational and is being evaluated for future applications.

Medical Training and Diagnosis (3, 4)

Medical training, diagnosis and consultation by satellite on a real-time basis are now

possible internationally and were demonstrated in the following transmissions:

The Relay I satellite transmitted an electroencephalogram from the Burden Neurological Institute in Bristol, England, to the Mayo Clinic where it was processed by a computer. After diagnosis was made, the analysis was sent via satellite immediately to the doctors in England.

May 28, 1963, a fetal electrocardiogram was transmitted from Mt. Sinai Hospital, in Milwaukee, to obstetricians in Paris; and a two-way consultation took place.

November 6, 1963, a new medical procedure, hyperbaric pressurization, was demonstrated at the Royal College of Surgeons in England and televised via satellite to the American Society of Anesthesiologists in convention at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. Such a capability may allow large conferences to be held without the necessity for moving people.

A group of Swiss doctors in Geneva has observed open heart surgery performed by Dr. Michael DeBakey in a Houston, Texas, hospital. They were also able to ask questions on technique during the operation.

SECTION 7. PUBLIC AFFAIRS

General introduction

Stimulating new thinking is the major contribution of the Space Program to the field of Public Service. This has taken many forms, from actual cash grants for higher education to innovative methods of approaching some of the problems faced by our cities and the surrounding rural areas. Besides incorporating some of the management techniques described in the Urban Affairs section, the area of Public Affairs illustrates some prime examples of the direct application of scientific techniques, which were derived from the Space Program.

Commercial Products From Air Pollutant (1)

A major air pollutant may be removed from coal-fired power plants and turned into a valuable industrial product as the result of a process being developed. Called the molten salt process, it removes sulphur dioxide from the flue gases formed by burning fossil fuels.

Sulphur dioxide from coal and oil-fired plants is a major pollutant in the U.S. In addition to being a pollutant itself, it combines with air and moisture to become sulphuric acid which causes corrosion, breathing difficulty and plant damage.

Should the molten salt process become practical on a large scale, a new source of sulphur or sulphuric acid worth hundreds of millions of dollars would become available to industry each year. Use of the process could result in a profit through the sale of sulphuric acid and it would permit use of a cheaper grade of coal containing sulphur.

Education and Research (1, 6)

NASA has played an especially effective role in improving the quality of education and increasing the number of trained young people in those disciplines relevant to NASA. By FY 1967, NASA had budgeted over $2 billion for grants to higher education.

NASA, in moving ahead, is trying to increae the number of students obtaining doctors degrees in space-related fields of science and engineering. The goal stated in 1963 was to expand the program of training grants to cover a total of 4,000 students over the next few years and to graduate 1,000 new PhDs per year. A goal of 7,500 PhDs per year by 1970 was suggested by the President's Advisory Committee.

Oculometer

This scientific instrument is an ultrasensitive scanning device that monitors minute eye movements. It was developed under contract through the NASA Electronics Research Center in Boston for the specific purpose of human factors research.

This device could be experimentally used in a learning exercise where the oculometer observes hesitation on the part of the student reading foreign languages on a movie screen. Researchers have found that data on fatigue and emotions can be recorded through the observations made by the oculometer of eye movements.

Portable Planetarium

This novel educational device, now on the market, permits a student virtually at a glance to determine the relative positions of the planets on any given day between the years 1900 and 2000.

Reliability Technique (9)

An analytical technique has been devised that permits a comparison of the reliability of alternate mechanical designs. This technique has been employed by a small manufacturer of mining equipment, conveyor systems and cargo handling gear, such as winches, lifts, cranes. Under contract to a Pascagoula, Mississippi, shipbuilder, the company was able to provide valid data on systems reliability and maintainability.

Teaching Devices (3, 6)

NASA information, searched by a Regional Dissemination Center, led to a teaching tool that may spark the formation of a new business. Available teaching machines were highly complex, requiring elaborate wiring systems. To make the same sort of units simpler to use, the NASA data bank was searched for information on "frequency synthesizers" and the resulting information enabled an engineer to design new equipment. There are no interconnecting wires in the new system, yet up to 800 students can participate. The teacher can know what each student answered, whether all the class has replied, and the portion of right answers for the class.

Waste Disposal (1)

The design and construction of refuse and reclamation plants which employ a nuisance free process is underway. The plants, completely enclosed, are designed to prevent contamination.

In another area, aerospace engineers, under contract to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are making a study to determine if techniques successfully employed in desalting water can be used to purify mine acid drainage, a major source of stream pollution.

Waste Food Conversion (1)

A system that reconditions sewer water for industrial and irrigation uses and simultaneously converts waste food into poultry mash has been developed.

Part of the city's sewage is fed to certain types of algae that devour noxious compounds. After the algae are skimmed from the water and dried for poultry mash, the water is returned to farms and the community for nonpotable uses.

Since cost is a critical factor in water reclamation, the poultry food by-product helps make the system economical.

Waste management (1)

Employing systems engineering techniques, a waste management study was conducted for California with projections 25 years ahead. In the study, the control and management of solid, liquid and gaseous waste generated by the state's rapidly expanding population was assessed. Major elements of a total waste management study were defined and recommendations were made for a study of a specific problem site.

The study of the Fresno area, typical of many other rapidly growing urban-agricultural complexes throughout the U.S., should provide answers to similar pollution problems throughout the country.

Some nine months before scheduled completion of the study, environmental conditions in the county were measurably improved by adoption of recommendations in the preliminary report. An ordinance prohibiting burning at all open dumps was put into effect; an unsanitary landfill site was closed; septic tank pumpage formerly disposed of on land is now put into the sewage system; substitution of bi-weekly garbage collection for a once-a-week schedule reduced fly propagation by garbage almost 90 percent.

Water purification (1)

Reclaiming waste water and converting it into pure water through the technique of "reverse osmosis" is being demonstrated in experimental pilot plant tests with sanitation authorities in Los Angeles County and the City of San Diego.

The simple and compact process uses paper-thin films or membranes—resembling the plastic material used for wrapping foods—to filter out salts and other dissolved solids and produce fresh water from waste, brackish or sea water.

Preliminary studies have shown that eventually it may be possible to produce fresh water from waste water using the reverse osmosis technique at costs which would be only a fraction of that involved when sea water is converted to fresh water.

Other experimental plants using reverse osmosis for the conversion of sea, brackish and waste water to fresh water are also in operation.

Preliminary studies indicate that water of reasonably high purity can be produced from waste water by the reverse osmosis technique at a cost of about 30 cents per thousand gallons in large plants. Lower unit costs could result from knowledge gained in the present studies, and also could be realized by lowering product water quality.

SECTION 8.—TRANSPORTATION

General introduction

While satellites are already at work for us today and offer exciting promise for the future, other and more substantial benefits have been derived to transportation from space technology. More and more, the products of solid-state electronics, miniaturization and micro-miniaturization are entering the transportation world. These techniques applied to transportation in the form of control devices, sensors, lasers, wave guides and sophisticated electronic devices are permitting highly reliable communication to aircraft and ships, improve navigation and air-traffic control for present day aviation, assist in the control of high-speed trains and aid in improving highway safety. Aerospace systems management techniques have found their way into the automotive, ship and aircraft building enterprises, and are increasing the effectivity of management as well as reducing the time and cost involved in planning, scheduling, and controlling these industrial giants.

Automated quality control

Newly assembled automotive brake cylinders are being automatically tested under fluid pressure. The text fixture is an outgrowth of techniques devised for testing the Saturn IB hydraulic components prior to launch.

Communication (6)

Voice and data transmissions between ships, aircrafts and business offices throughout the world are facilitated by communication satellites. Passenger telephone service to and from shore from commercial ships and aircraft is provided by these same communications satellites.

Highway safety (3, 6)

Many treacherous sections of highways and airports are safer as the result of a discovery by NASA test pilots in high speed planes that cars and airplanes "hydroplane" when water builds up under their tires. A grooving technique has been developed by NASA allowing

water to drain off a wet pavement and runways preventing skidding. The study of "hydroplaning" phenomenon has also led to improved tire tread design.

Navigation (2, 6)

A proposed air traffic control system has been devised from aerospace technology to eliminate aircraft collisions through the use of satellites in conjunction with computers. The satellites would relay special signals from each aircraft-to-ground control stations where computers would plot the aircraft's position within 50 feet in latitude and longitude and 80 feet in altitude which is 60 times more accurate than current systems. The computer would alert ground controllers of impending collisions who would, in turn, advise the pilots of the potential danger.

Satellites will provide search and rescue agencies accurate locations of ships in distress, ditched aircraft, lifeboats and exploration parties who may need assistance.

Shipping Safety (3,6)

Satellite photographing techniques enhance determination of location of and increase understanding of currents, waves, sea ice, icebergs and shoals; thus making it possible to minimize hazards to navigation and improve ship routing.

Solar Cells (1, 6)

The solar cell is of vital importance to the space effort because the major portion of all satellites and space probes obtain power to operate radio transmitters and to perform scientific experiments by the use of these cells. A prime example of the application of solar cells is the emergency radio-telephone system now in use in California for stranded motorists in remote areas. Studies are being made to put solar cells to other practical uses.

SECTION 9. MATERIALS

General introduction

One of the most important design criteria for space vehicles is that structural materials should have the lightest weight, the highest strength, be able to operate in a wide range of temperatures, and submit to fabrication processes such as forming, machining and welding. NASA programs have contributed to produce a variety of materials that satisfy these requirements. These include beryllium, titanium, stainless steels, super alloys, refractory metals, aluminum, magnesium, and high-strength steels. All are applicable to innumerable nonspace uses in almost every metalworking industry for all sectors of our economy—transportation, mining, farming, refining, chemicals, electrical, communication, construction, and roadbuilding.

Adhesives (9)

Polymer resin adhesives developed for the Apollo Program are now in more mundane service. An adhesive-bonded car that is as strong as conventionally joined autos is the dream of virtually every automobile manufacturer. Elimination of hole machining in body panels and the assembly operations associated with mechanical fasteners represent substantial savings. Further, water and salt that cause extensive corrosion cannot enter without holes and other openings. One automaker has already used adhesives to eliminate fasteners on body trim on its 1968 models and this usage can be expected to increase as space research continues to produce improved adhesives. The race car body that won the 1964 24-hour LeMans race was bonded entirely by adhesives.

Aluminum foil (6)

An ultra-thin, high-strength aluminum foil, developed for a communications satellite, is used for packaging quick-freeze-dried foods and sensitive pharmaceuticals.

Cryogenic insulation (9)

The requirement for cryogenic (super cold) propellant tanks used in launch vehicles has led to the development of a highly effective, lightweight spray-on foam insulation. The new foam-in-place material is being considered for insulation of cold-cargo shipping containers, tankers, prefabricated dwelling construction, furniture packaging, and other applications where lightweight or rigid insulation materials are required.

Fireproofing (9)

One important Apollo-generated material development has stimulated great interest among designers of fire-resistant structures. The novel material is a glass-fiber-reinforced composite that will not burn in a 100 percent oxygen atmosphere. The new laminate will be ideal for aircraft, automobiles, trucks, and many other vehicles and installations where fire constitutes a major hazard.

Flat conductor cable (9)

Flat conductor cable, with associated hardware, has been found to offer advantages to electrical system designers by saving weight, space, cost and lead time within excellent reliability and uniform electrical characteristics. A fourth symposium currently requested by industry on flat cable conductor technology is scheduled and is over-subscribed.

High-strength plastic pipe (1)

Aerospace production processes have been used to fabricate a new, high-strength pipe.

The pipe, made of plastic mortar, is reinforced with fiberglass, and is suited for carrying water or fluids for such universal uses as sewage, irrigation, flood control, and numerous agricultural applications.

The technology needed for the construction of the pipe was obtained in rocket production and represents a significant advance in fluid conveyance. It offers such advantages as lightweight, comparatively thin walls, built-in resistance to shock and the corrosive elements in fluids and soil.

For every mile of 24-inch diameter pipe installed, for example, use of the thinner reinforced plastic mortar pipe would save a contractor the handling of about 95,000 cubic feet of earth if he were laying pipe at a depth of 25 feet.

The pipe will be produced at Riverside, California. An important factor in the site selection was to provide job opportunities to the Mexican-American population in the area.

High-Temperature Plastics (1, 9)

A research program on high-temperature plastics has resulted in a new family of copolymers that have outstanding strength at temperatures up to 650 degree Fahrenheit.

Reinforced with glass cloth and pressed into laminates, the materials at these temperatures are stronger than aircraft aluminum and compare favorably with stainless steel and titanium alloys.

Used as adhesives under the same conditions, the materials bond together sheets of titanium and stainless steel with hot strengths in excess of 1,000 pounds per square inch.

The new class of plastics appears to be applicable for such applications as structural members of aircraft, heat shields, electric motor windings, printed electronic circuits and similar uses.

Inorganic Paints (3, 9)

Inorganic paints developed under NASA auspices were adapted to commercial products by companies in Illinois and California. The paint items produced by the Illinois firm are expected to be used by builders, contractors and industry. The California company used NASA information about inorganic paints to produce an extensive line of heat-resistant coatings, which are used in truck exhaust systems, oven liners, fire walls, brake drums, engine manifolds, mufflers, furnaces, boilers, electrical motors, generators, transformers, relays and insulation. The California firm noted that the knowledge received from NASA has kept them competitive.

An Eastern manufacturer of vacuum cleaners has improved his product that is marketed presently, by using an inorganic paint on the interior surfaces of his vacuum cleaner tanks. The company procured the information from a NASA Technical Brief that an inorganic paint had been developed at the Goddard Space Flight Center which would withstand considerable abuse and deterioration.

Special silicate-base inorganic paints have been developed to provide corrosion resistance in a broad temperature environment. The fire proof characteristics of this paint are such that a torch applied to the painted side of a piece of metal leaves the paint unmarked while heating the metal. The paint still adheres to the white-hot metal.

Metals, Alloys and Substitutes (2, 9)

Many of the new metals, alloys, fabrics, and compounds created or developed by space research are being produced commercially. Some particular examples are:

A ceramic insulation material, PSC Durock, withstands the extreme heat of combustion of exotic fuels. It is now being used in high-temperature applications in the civilian atomic energy program.

Spaceproof materials are being used to make nearly indestructible refrigerators and other appliances. New materials developed in space research are becoming more and more important in the air conditioning, heating and refrigeration industry.

Fluxless aluminum soldering, an outgrowth of space research, is being marketed and used in preparation of sandwich core of structural panels and mass production of automobile radiators.

Time-saving pots and plans are now coated with a plastics material developed to protect spacecraft from the extreme heat of launch and re-entry.

Sealants developed for the seams of spacecraft are being used in caulking tiles. Car windshields and rear windows are being sealed with a product made from solid rocket fuel.

Railroad tank cars weighing one-half as much as steel cars are now being produced from the lightweight plastics developed for NASA for use in its space systems.

Ocean vessels are able to increase cargo tonnages by using "higher strength structural steels and packaging employing lightweight reinforced plastic (RP) containers."

New Class of Plastics (2, 3, 9)

Space technologists working under contract to the NASA Lewis Research Center, have developed HYSTYL resins, a new class of plastics with improved strength, and with thermal and chemical stability. These new plastics, described in NASA Technical Brief 67–10197, have aroused interest from a maker of grinding wheels, an electronics manufacturer, a casket manufacturing company, a firm supplying aircraft and missile components, a chemical manufacturer, and others. A small company has been formed to produce and market these plastics.

APPENDIX I. NASA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS, GRANTS AND RESEARCH CONTRACTS

NASA's university programs have made major contributions not only to the aeronautics and space program but also to the national educational goal through the development of new scientific disciplines, technologies and educational facilities. NASA programs have provided continuing educational opportunities to thousands at the undergraduate and graduate levels within the nation's university community.

Between 1965 and 1971, 223 colleges and universities representing all 50 states and the District of Columbia will have shared in grants and research contracts for 1,640 NASA programs. In addition, 15 colleges and uni-

versities in 10 foreign countries have also provided assistance through research contracts for 18 programs.

The accompanying table provides a recap tabulation by states showing the number of colleges and universities affected by NASA grants and research contracts as well as the number of such programs within each state. It is of interest to note that New York leads all the states with the greatest number of colleges and universities (22) receiving grants and research contracts; followed by California (18), Ohio (14), Texas (14), Pennsylvania (12), Massachusetts (11) and the balance in descending order. California, however, is the leading state for the greatest number of NASA-supported college or university programs (271); followed by Texas (124), New York (122), Pennsylvania (75), Illinois (73), and Ohio (58).

As a direct result of these programs, the nation's university community has awarded in excess of 500 graduate degrees and has provided trained people, education and service in demonstrating the effectiveness of colleges and universities in helping to meet the space goals of NASA and the nation.

NASA UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS—GRANTS AND RESEARCH CONTRACTS (1965 THROUGH 1971)

State	Number o. universities affected	Number of programs
Alabama	3	35
Alaska	1	10
Arizona	3	43
Arkansas	1	1
California	18	271
Colorado	5	41
Connecticut	4	36
Delaware	1	3
District of Columbia	5	25
Florida	6	43
Georgia	3	27
Hawaii	1	14
Idaho	1	1
Illinois	6	73
Indiana	5	46
Iowa	2	18
Kansas	4	18
Kentucky	2	15
Louisiana	4	13
Maine	1	2
Maryland	4	45
Massachusetts	11	55
Michigan	6	64
Minnesota	2	30
Mississippi	3	11
Missouri	5	26
Montana	2	4
Nebraska	2	2
Nevada	1	4
New Hampshire	2	16
New Jersey	6	42
New Mexico	1	18
New York	22	122
North Carolina	4	32
North Dakota	1	2
Ohio	14	58
Oklahoma	5	14
Oregon	2	11
Pennsylvania	12	75
Rhode Island	3	9
South Carolina	2	6
South Dakota	2	3
Tennessee	3	16
Texas	14	124
Utah	3	16
Vermont	1	2
Virginia	9	52
Washington	2	15
West Virginia	1	5
Wisconsin	2	23
Wyoming	1	3
Total U.S. universities and programs (50 States plus District of Columbia)	223	1,640
Foreign countries (1 0)	15	18
Total, all universities and programs	238	1,658

Note: Total university expenditures by NASA (1959 through 1967): $2,079,356,567.

APPENDIX II. NASA PRINCIPAL PRIME CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS

NASA principal prime contractors and subcontractors shared $3.07 billions of U.S. dollars during the 1969 fiscal year. These contractual dollars provided direct employment to countless thousands of workers for the production of both space and related hardware and services in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and in 41 of the free world's foreign countries who support the global space network.

The accompanying table provides a compilation of the location of all NASA principal contractors and subcontractors who participate in the United States' continuing efforts toward achieving the peaceful conquest of space. Figures quoted in the table encompass the time span from 1960 through 1969 and compute only those NASA principal prime contractors and subcontractors who received individual awards (contracts, grants or purchase orders) of the following magnitude:

Research and development prime contracts of $10,000 and over.

Prime contracts, grants and purchase orders to educational institutions and other non-profit organizations of $10,000 and over.

All other prime contractors and purchase orders of $25,000 and over.

First and second-tier subcontractors and purchase orders of $10,000 and over on NASA prime contractors of $500,000 and over.

14,369 profit and non-profit business organizations in 1,882 cities throughout all 50 states and the District of Columbia received major NASA contracts and sub-contracts. In addition, 165 organizations in 41 free world foreign countries were also affected as participants in NASA's world-wide coverage for the space network. It is of interest to note that California leads all states in the number of cities affected by NASA contracts and subcontracts (235), followed by Pennsylvania (184), New York (182). New Jersey (155), Massachusetts (108), Ohio (90), Illinois (88) and Connecticut (75). In the area of business organizations, California again leads all states with 4,524 organizations affected by NASA contracts and subcontracts. Here, however, the trend changes. Next in order, following California, are business organizations in the states of New York (1083), Florida (774), Massachusetts (716), Ohio (672), Texas (622), Pennsylvania (598), and Virginia (577).

From this sampling, it can be seen that NASA procurement of quality space hardware and services has resulted in the development and expansion of the nation's business organizations for the material benefit of the national work force and for achievement of the nation's space goals.

NASA PRINCIPAL PRIME CONTRACTORS AND SUBCON- TRACTO..S (JULY 1, 1960 THROUGH MAY 31, 1969

State	Number of cities affected	Number of business firms
Alabama	31	469
Alaska	3	31
Arizona	13	67
Arkansas	4	6
California	235	4,524
Colorado	13	80
Connecticut	75	309
Delaware	6	18
District of Columbia	1	360
Florida	58	774
Georgia	17	101
Hawaii	6	12
Idaho	7	10
Illinois	88	371
Indiana	44	106
Iowa	11	17
Kansas	16	50
Kentucky	7	25
Louisiana	13	440
Maine	9	10
Maryland	70	571
Massachusetts	108	716
Michigan	70	249
Minnesota	17	111
Mississippi	18	122
Missouri	20	118
Montana	3	5
Nebraska	4	12
Nevada	7	30
New Hampshire	19	39
New Jersey	155	501
New Mexico	8	75
New York	182	1,083
North Carolina	28	68
North Dakota	2	2
Ohio	90	672
Oklahoma	11	81
Oregon	8	27
Pennsylvania	184	598
Rhode Island	10	29
South Carolina	12	81
South Dakota	4	4
Tennessee	19	73
Texas	61	622
Utah	9	23
Vermont	10	16
Virginia	39	577
Washington	15	43
West Virginia	11	15
Wisconsin	29	83
Wyoming	2	6
Total U.S. cities and business firms representing 50 States plus District of Columbia	1,882	14,369
Foreign countries and business firms	41	165
Grand total, cities, foreign countries, and businesses affected by NASA contracts and subcontracts	1,923	14,534

Note: NASA principal prime and subcontractors receiving individual awards of the following magnitude:

(1) Research and development contracts of $10,000 and over.

(2) Prime contracts, grants and purchase orders to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations of $10,000 and over.

(3) All other prime contracts and purchase orders of $25,000 and over.

(4) First and second tier subcontracts and purchase orders of $10,000 and over on NASA prime contracts of $500,000 and over.

APPENDIX III. REFERENCES

Anonym., "The Indirect Benefits Arising From Space Activities," *Eurospace* (Memoranda), January 1967.

Anonym., "The Payoff in Space," *Engineering Opportunities*, October 1967.

Anonym., "Space Age Production" (techniques), *Duns Review and Modern Industry*, March 1962.

Anonym., "Space Coming Down to Earth," *Economist*, March 20, 1965.

Badgley, P. C., "Current Status of NASA's Natural Resources Program," University of Michigan Symposium on Remote Sensing of Environment, Ann Arbor, April 12–14, 1966.

Burnett, J. E., "The Utilization of Technological Resources," Technical paper proposed for presentation at 1967 Automotive Engineering Congress and Exposition sponsored by the Society of Automotive Engineers, Detroit, Michigan, January 9–13, 1967.

Butz, J. S., Jr., "Under the Spaceborne Eye: No Place to Hide," *Air Force/Space Digest*, May 1967.

Caidin, M., "Why Space? And How It Serves You in Your Daily Life," New York, Julian Messner, 1965.

Cortright, E. M., "Space Science and Applications; Where We Stand Today," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, June 1966.

Coutinho, J. D., "Why A Space Program," *Mechanical Engineering*, May 1967.

Foster, W. B., "Space Experiments Program

Dubridge, L. A., "The Place of Space," *American Philosophical Society Proceedings*, Vol. 106, No. 5, October 1962.

for Practical Applications," paper presented at American Astronautical Society Meeting, San Diego, California, February 21–23, 1966.

Friedman, H., "The Next 20 Years of Space Science," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, November 1965.

Glennan, T. K., "Education," presented in the President's Forum on the Worth of the Space Program, at the AIAA 4th Annual Meeting and Technical Display, Anaheim, California, October 27, 1967.

Hamburger, P. T., "Application and Impact

of Space Research and Technology," *Ashrae J*, March 1966.

Harris, C. J., "The Aerospace Scientist as a Local, National, and Worldwide Community Planner," paper presented at the AIAA 4th Annual Meeting and Technical Display, Anaheim, California, October 27, 1967.

Haskins, C. P., "Science in the Service of Mankind," *Academy Political Science Proceedings*, April 1966.

Herwald, S. W., "Technology Utilization—The Industrial Opportunity," Fifth National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, St. Louis, May 26–28, 1965. (NASA SP–82)

Jaffe, L., "Space Applications: Growing Worldwide Systems," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, June 1966.

Karth, J. E., "What's Next in Space?" *Astronautics and Aeronautics*.

Katz, I., "Philosophy and Education in the Space Age," *New York Academy of Sciences Annals*. Vol. 140, Conference on Planetology and Space Missions Planning, 1965.

Keats, E. S., "Some Geopolitical Factors Surrounding Navigation Satellites," paper presented at the AIAA 4th Annual Meeting and Technical Display, Anaheim, California, October 23–27, 1967.

Kelber, C. C., "Social Significance of Space Technology," Douglas Missile and Space Systems Division, Santa Monica, California, August 1965.

La Fond, C. D., "IR Mapping System Readied for Market," *Technology Week*, February 27, 1967.

Langlo, K., "A New Look in Meteorology: The World Weather Watch," Impact of Science on Society, Vol. XVI No. 2, 1966.

Meitner, J. G., "Benefits of the Space Program," Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California (to be published).

Meitner, J. G., "Priority Analysis of Manned Orbital Research Applications," SRI Report, Project No. M–5465, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California, September 1965.

NASA, "NASA's Space Science and Applications Program," Washington, D.C., 20546, 1967.

NASA, "Our Investment in Space to Bring Manifold Returns," Science and Technology Section, Space Systems Information Branch, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, September 29, 1964.

NASA, "Our Investment in Space to Bring Manifold Returns,"—First Supplement, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, May 1965.

NASA, "Significant Achievements in Space Applications, 1965," The Office of Technology Utilization, Washington, D.C., 1966 (SP–137).

NASA, "Significant Achievements in Space Bioscience, 1958–64," STID Division, NASA, Washington, D.C., 1966 (SP–92).

NASA, "Significant Achievements in Space Communications and Navigation, 1958–64," NASA, Washington, D.C., 1966 (SP–93).

NASA, "Space: The New Frontier," General Publication, 1967.

NASA, "A Survey of Space Applications . . . for the benefit of all mankind," Washington, D.C., April 1967 (SP–142).

Ness, N. F., "Solar Wind and the Interplanetary Magnetic Field," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, October 1967.

Newell, H. E., "Goals and Potentials of Scientific Research in Space," Conference on Space, Science and Urban Life, Oakland, California, March 28–30, 1963.

Newell, H. E., and L. Jaffe, "Impact of Space Research on Science and Technology," *Science*, Vol. 157, July 7 ,1967.

Pittendrigh, C. S., "The Biologist in the Solar System," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, March 1967.

Puckett, R. H., "The Military Role in Space—A Summary of Official, Public Justifications," The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

Root, R. L., "The Return on our Investment in Space Exploration," *Looking Ahead* (National Planning Association), September 1965.

Rowan, T. C., "Systems Analysis in Society (Socio-Economic Problems are Challenging Skills of Aerospace Systems Analysis)," *Industrial Research*, August 1966.

Ruzic, N. P., "The Case for Technological Transfer," *Industrial Research*, March 1965.

Sawyer, F. G., "Ideas from Space Research; Special Report," *Hydrocarbon Processing, and Petroleum Refining*, October 1964.

Sinclair, M. P., "Materials Applications," *Industrial Research*, July 1967.

Sloop, J. L., "The Role of Research in Manned Space Flight," lecture presented to Santa Clara County Science Teachers, Ames Research Center, October 22, 1964.

Smull, T. L., "NASA Mission—Broaden the University Role," *Research/Development*, April 1963.

Sponsler, G. C., "The Military Role In Space," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, June 1964.

Thomas, S., "Full Non-Space Utilization of Space Capability," paper presented at the AIAA 4th Annual Meeting and Technical Display, Anaheim, California, October 23–27, 1967.

Trupp, P., "NASA's Knowledge Bank; A Spin-Off from Space Research," *Electronic News*, October 24, 1966.

U.S. Congress, House, "The National Space Program—Its Values and Benefits," A Staff Study for the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, 90th Congress, First Session, Washington, D.C., 1967.

University of Michigan, "Peaceful Uses of Earth-Observation Spacecraft, Vol. I: Introduction and Summary," Washington, D.C., September 1966.

Von Braun, W., "Space Technology and Progress," *Technology Week*, January 23, 1967.

Watkins, H. D., "California Effort is Key to Growth Area," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, February 7, 1966.

Webb, J. E., "Commercial Use of Space Research and Technology," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, November 1966.

Webb, J. E., "The Economic Impact of the Space Program," *Business Horizons*, Fall 1963.

Weckster, A. N., "Space Technology Proves Boom to Industry," *Mill and Factory*, December 1965.

Wenk, E., Jr., "New Challenges in the Sea, New Challenges for Space Technology," *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, May 1967.

Whittington, G. A., "Space Sciences Industrial Research and Development Information in Action," *Research and Development*, April 1963.

Wilks, W. E., "Industry Studies California Problems," *Missiles and Rockets*, February 15, 1965.

APPENDIX IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sections II–IX

1. *Aerospace Technology.—Creating Social Progress:* Aerospace Industries Associations of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.

2. *Benefits from Space*, a compilation of the *Stanford Report:* General Electric Company, Washington, D.C.

3. *The Family of Mann—Prospects for Progress:* General Electric Company, Valley Forge/Space Division.

4. *Medical Benefits from Space Research:* NASA publication.

5. *NASA—Its Present and Future Impact on Our Lives:* Speeches by R. L. Lesher, former Assistant Administrator for Technology Utilization; Statement before the Subcommittee on Advance Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics House of Representatives.

6. *New Dimensions for Space Technology, Callenge Magazine*, Winter 1968: General Electric Company, Valley Forge/Space Division.

7. *Reference Briefs of New Technology Transfers:* NASA/KSC—Technology Utilization Officer, Directorate of Administration.

8. *Skyline*, 1961, 1964: North American Rockwell Publication.

9. *Space Program Benefits:* North American Rockwell, Space Division, Downey, California.

10. *Useful New Technology from Aerospace Research and Development:* NASA Technology Utilization Program Pamphlet.

Appendix I

NASA's University Program.

A Study of University Programs.

Statement before the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications by Francis B. Smith, Assistant Administrator for University Affairs (NASA).

Appendix II

NASA Principal Prime Contractors and Subcontractors through 31 May 1969, prepared by NASA Procurement Office, Staff Operations Division, Washington, D.C. 20546.

Appollo 12 Principal Prime Contractors and Subcontractors, NASA Procurement Office, Staff Operations Division, Washington, D.C. 20546.

LOWER VOTING AGE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the President this past weekend, express his feelings about the proper way to bring about a constitutional change that would lower the voting age.

One week ago, I gave a talk to a large number of young men and women at a high school athletic banquet back in my district in North Carolina. These young people are all in that age bracket that would be affected by the lowering of the voting age. But these young people are also members of the great majority of their generation, the responsible young people, who, no matter how anxious they are to gain voting rights, understand that there is a need to handle this change in a constitutional and legal manner.

I submit that it is not the right of Congress to amend the Constitution of the United States. The great American patriots, when they wrote the Constitution, were very careful to make sure that certain basic States rights would not be abridged. If we disagree with these great men, then there are provisions within that document that make it possible for us to make the necessary changes. It is our responsibility as law makers to follow the lines of action that have been laid out in the Constitution, not to evade them.

There is legislation in committee here in the House that would present the voting age proposal in the form of a Constitutional amendment. I favor this method, because if passed by Congress, the States would have their guaranteed opportunity to vote on ratification.

There is very serious doubt that the Senate Amendment to the Voting Rights Act would ever meet the Constitutional requirements in a court test.

You would all agree that it is not the Supreme Court's right to legislate. I submit that it is not the responsibility of Congress to rewrite the Constitution. I call on the chairman of the conference committee to assume his Constitutional responsibility and table the Senate

amendment, and report out of his committee a bill that would present the lowering of the voting age in an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

MILITARY AID TO GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1970, I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some figures on military assistance to Greece.

I have now received a copy of the Department of Defense publication "Military Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Facts, March 1970."

This publication indicates that at least the following amounts of military assistance program deliveries/expenditures/deliveries of "excess defense articles," and deliveries of foreign military sales—not including commercial sales which, however, must be licensed by the Federal Government—have been delivered to Greece:

[Millions of dollars; fiscal years]

Category [1] (see text)	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1950–69
Military assistance program	104.0	78.7	44.0	45.0	56.2	1,465.0
"Excess"	5.6	2.7	4.2	2.5	25.6	101.0
Foreign military sales	.4	.6	.8	3.5	11.4	18.1
Total	110.0	82.0	49.0	51.0	93.2	1,575.1

[1] See text.

Let me iterate several points about these figures: they are official DOD figures; the value of the "excess defense articles" is the "utility value" of the equipment, "only about 30 percent of its acquisition cost," commercial sales—which require export licenses—are not included; there may be additional transfers—in all categories—which are classified; and there may be areawide expenditures which result in additional aid to Greece.

As a reference point, the takeover by the military junta occurred on April 21, 1967. A curb on deliveries of "heavy" or "major" military items was imposed by the Johnson administration shortly after this.

New York Times' reports of April 1, 1970, and April 23, 1970, give additional background on this military aid to Greece. I include them at this point:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1970]

ARMS-GRANT TOTAL PUT AT $3.4-BILLION GIVEN TO ALLIES IN 19 YEARS

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The State Department disclosed today that used military equipment valued originally at $3.4-billion had been given to allied governments over the last 19 years.

All the matériel, which included aircraft, artillery, tanks, trucks and ammunition, had been officially designated as surplus, in excess of the needs of the United States, and had a depreciated value of about one-third the acquisition cost, qualified officials said.

They disputed Congressional complaints that this military assistance had been given secretly. On the contrary, department officials said, full details of all grants are provided every year as a matter of routine to the Congressional committees overseeing military spending.

The officials confirmed, however, that a joint Defense and State Department control group had been established one year ago to examine each proposed grant, both in terms of overall foreign policy interests and to certify that the equipment was legitimately designated as surplus.

TWENTY-FOUR COUNTRIES RECEIVED AID

Last year, 24 countries received some aid through the military-assistance program, officials said, though three-fourths of the supplies went to only four countries—Greece, Turkey, Nationalist China, and South Korea.

Consistent with the embargo of heavy military supplies imposed against Greece after the military coup in 1967, grant aid to Greece consisted only of trucks, ammunition and small arms. Aircraft and tanks, such as have been supplied to the other three allies, are not available to Greece under the terms of the embargo.

The assessed, or utility, value of the matériel supplied to all recipients in the last fiscal year was $112-million, although bought new the equipment would have cost three times that much.

Questions about the military-assistance program were raised by an article in The New York Times Sunday listing aircraft, destroyers and artillery equipment, valued originally at $157-million, given to Nationalist China last year.

The State Department confirmed the news article, but it denied the implication that information on military assistance was being withheld from Congress. Officials explained the absence of public announcements of each grant and the refusal to provide an itemized breakdown by saying that this would constitute information of intelligence value about a country's armed forces.

State Department experts explained that the designation of surplus for any item of war matériel depended on its age, state of repair, estimated cost of rehabilitation to acceptable standards of use and the actual needs of the United States units at any given time.

They conceded that the designation was flexible and relative, but said that responsible civilian officials of both the State and Defense Departments reviewed each such designation under procedures laid down last August by David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

PENTAGON DOUBLES ARMS AID TO ATHENS DESPITE RESTRICTION

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Despite United States restrictions on arms shipments to the Greek junta, the Defense Department is reported to have secretly supplied this year nearly twice the amounts of military aid to Greece authorized by Congress.

The United States imposed the curb on deliveries of "major" military items to Greece in 1967 to show its displeasure over the overthrow of the government by the army.

However, the nature of this curb has never been publicly defined and the flow of equipment has continued at levels considerably above those approved by Congress under the military assistance program.

At the same time, the Administration is considering lifting altogether the embargo on military deliveries to Greece, reportedly under the pressure of the Defense Department, which is concerned over the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean, where the Soviet Union has been building up its fleet.

Figures made available in Congressional quarters showed that while Congress had authorized $24,498,000 in military aid to Greece in the 1970 fiscal year, the Pentagon plans to deliver additional equipment worth $20-million from stocks described as surplus.

Figures obtained here also showed that in the 1969 fiscal year the Pentagon quietly gave $470 million in surplus armaments to the four "forward defense countries"—Nationalist China, South Korea, Turkey and Greece—in addition to the total of $350-million in military aid approved by Congress.

The principal beneficiary was Nationalist China, which received about $157-million from this total, while Greece received nearly $26-million in 1969 on top of the authorized deliveries of $37,531,000.

Congressional sources said that the Pentagon set a "utility value" on the material of 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the cost, even if the the equipment was new. Congressional experts have adopted the method of multiplying the utility figures by four to arrive at the cost of the surplus shipments.

The Pentagon's actions have raised indignation among many members of Congress, who consider their authority disregarded by the department. But the Greek situation has international implications as well because of the strong sentiment in Western Europe against the authoritarian practices of the Athens junta.

Today, Senator Stephen M. Young introduced legislation requiring the Pentagon to make "complete and prior disclosure of all proposed disposals of surplus weapons."

The Ohio Democrat cited Nationalist China and Greece as the countries where, "through the surplus disposal program, Pentagon officials have been secretly subsidizing at least two tyrannical dictatorships without any advance information given to Congress nor any authorizaiton sought nor secured."

The restriction on arms to Greece was imposed by the Johnson Administration after the colonels overthrew the constitutional regime on April 21, 1967, and it has thus far been maintained by the Nixon Administration.

Under this ban, Greece is denied so-called "heavy" items, such as tanks and combat aircraft. But neither Administration has defined what items are considered "heavy."

In 1966, before the restrictions were applied, the total military aid to Greece was about $90-million.

FIFTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS IN MINOR ITEMS

Although the government said that only spare parts, trucks and minor items were being provided after the coup, Greece received $44-million in 1967 and $55-million in 1968.

Officials here were unable to explain at the time how this "marginal" aid could amount to such high figures.

Following the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet-bloc armies in August, 1968, the United States temporarily lifted the Greek embargo as it sought to encourage the allied countries to build up their defenses. As a result, Greece received in 1969 about $63-million in military aid, of which $26-million was from the surplus stocks.

Mr. Speaker, our policy of not supplying "major" or "heavy" military equipment to the oppressive Greek colonels is apparently very flexible. The terms of the denial of military aid are not widely

known. But the above figures make it clear that our military aid to Greece is steadily expanding.

Just 5 weeks ago this House authorized an extension of the loan of a submarine to Greece. Greek military men continue to be honored and entertained in this country. Seven other ships are on loan to the Greek Government and since the coup all these loans have been extended. It is time for us to call a halt to the present policy which symbolically denies "heavy" weapons to the junta while providing large amounts of military aid.

The NATO preamble declares:

[The Parties to this Treaty] are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

Until Greece lives up to this declaration the U.S. Government should cease providing arms to the colonels who rule the Greek people without the people's consent.

OLD LEFT GUIDES GROWING SUBVERSION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, an increasing volume of evidence documents the fact that many campus disorders are not the spontaneous expression of student discontent, but result from the exploitation of malcontents by an organized group of hard core militants. The following article explores in detail the activities of these militants and their ties with the "Old Left":

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 31, 1970]

OLD LEFT GUIDES GROWING SUBVERSION

(By Robert Betts)

The so-called student protest movement has moved a long way since a group of radical extremists, with Communist backing, led a "free speech" riot on the University of California's main campus at Berkeley in the fall of 1964.

It has swept across the nation, bringing disorder and violence to scores of university and college campuses as well as to many high schools.

Now, to the surprise of almost everybody except those who are organizing it, the "movement" is spreading out from educational institutions into surrounding communities—bringing rioting, destruction and death to American streets.

ALARM CREWS

The "silent majority" of Americans who at first shook their heads over the wild antics of "unruly youths" are becoming more and more alarmed as the violence increases. There have been calls for firmer action on the part of college administrators and for tougher laws to curb the activities of young rebels.

But the activists do not fear the "silent majority." They show in their speeches and writings their contempt for the millions of law-abiding Americans who seek solutions to social problems through traditional democratic means.

The activists have boldly stated their intention to wage guerrilla warfare. Using the schools as a base for their destructive activities, they have been busily recruiting young dissidents and other malcontents for an outright confrontation with established authority.

GUERRILLA TACTICS

They have instructed them in guerrilla warfare tactics, including directions for making bombs, sabotaging public facilities, businesses and organizations which represent the "capitalist exploiters," fighting the police, provoking chaos. They have, meanwhile, built up arms caches, some of which occasionally are brought to light after police investigation.

They hope to destroy first the educational structure, then the economic and political order and ultimately bring down the government itself and set up a Communist America. The enemy, in their own words, is "corrupt, capitalist, imperialistic, warmongering America."

It is the same sort of language that issues from Moscow, Peking and Hanoi, and the revolutionaries make no bones about it. They praise the works of Marx, Lenin, Mao and others, call themselves either pro-Communists, "communist with a small 'c,'" or outright Communists—all dedicated to the destruction of the present order.

WORK FOR REVOLUTION

"We're out to build a Marxist-Lenin revolutionary movement," said Mike Klonsky, national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, which has provided the main thrust of action.

The SDS has proclaimed, "We're working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We're actively organizing sedition."

It advocates abolition of the legal fortresses against internal Communist subversion as well as reduction of the military defenses against the external Communist military threat.

SDS is a nerve center of an interlocking network of related leftist groups which reaches far beyond the campus into the fields of civil rights, labor, religion. peace campaigns and poverty programs.

DISCIPLINED CONTROL

While the fringe is known to consist of a conglomerate of young dissidents and hotheads calling themselves part of the "New Left," agents of the FBI working inside the "movement" report that it is being controlled more and more by older, more experienced, more disciplined members of the Old Left—represented by such organizations as the Communist party U.S.A. (pro-Moscow), the Progressive Labor party (pro-Peking) and the Socialist Workers party (Trotskyite).

Despite differences and sometimes open wrangling between pro-Russian and pro-Chinese Communists, they work willingly together in the subversive campaign against what they consider to be the common enemy—"fascist America."

They speak at SDS-sponsored meetings and invite young SDS and other radical leaders to their own meetings. They confer together and circulate literature which not only attacks the American way of life but outlines programs for the scientific incitement of bloody riots like those which have occurred with increasing frequency across the country.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warns: "It is vitally important to recognize that these militant extremists are not simply faddists or 'college kids' at play. Their cries for revolution and their advocacy of guerrilla warfare evolve out of a pathological hatred for our way of life and a determination to destroy it. The workshops they hold on sabotage and how to use it to further their objectives are grim forebodings of serious intent."

As the revolutionaries are repeatedly reminded in the constant stream of Communist propaganda and directives aimed at them, it takes only a few hard-core, dedicated individuals to overthrow a country from within. Examples given are Russia, China and, nearer at hand, Cuba.

ADDED ENCOURAGEMENT

In addition to such slogans as Mao's "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun," they are encouraged with quotations from Lenin and other earlier revolutionaries, such as the Bolshevik leader who proclaimed immediately after the Russian revolution in World War I: "And to think that a short while ago we were only a handful of propagandists!"

One Communist-inspired directive circulated in this country, after discussing the need for "a tightly organized and highly mobile underground guerrilla force . . . well-versed in handling explosives and deadly accurate when deployed as snipers," confidently assert: "A minority revolution could succeed in America."

NO ONE IS EXEMPTED IN POLLUTION FIGHT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day, April 22, was a great occasion of an outpouring of interest and concern over the quality of our environment. Of the many speeches and statements that have appeared, I was particularly impressed by the editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., entitled, "No One Is Exempted In Pollution Fight." By focusing its attention on the need for all citizens to join in this effort, I believe the editorial has stated what will ultimately determine the success or failure of all Federal, State, or local laws on pollution control. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial:

[From the State Journal, Apr. 22, 1970]

NO ONE IS EXEMPTED IN POLLUTION FIGHT

Earth Day.

Twenty years ago, or even 10, the idea of a national observance focusing attention on the relentless, man-made pollution of our environment would likely have inspired little attention.

Except for a few far-sighted prophets, there was scant interest of perception of what was happening to the environment from exhaust fumes, trash, insecticides, dumping of industrial wastes in waterways, and the destruction of natural resources.

But the evidence finally came crashing through during the late 1960's with the documented facts compiled by researchers over the years.

Today thousands of college and high school students across the nation—along with concerned adults—are participating in symposiums, teach-ins and demonstrations to emphasize that Earth is indeed a small island of life in a vast emptiness of outer space. If we wreck it, there is no place else to go.

Recent journeys to the moon and back by American astronauts brought this fact home to roost perhaps more than anything else. No one can forget those stunning photographs of the blue planet shining in a sea of darkness.

Today's observance and those to follow will place increasing pressures on industries, government and adults to take reform steps to reverse the pollution tide. That is as it should be.

But youths also have a responsibility other than pointing the finger. One concerned parent explained this in a recent letter. In talking to his teen-age children, he advised them that it was well and good for them to

bug the Establishment about pollution since it would help bring reforms.

But he also advised that young people have a job to do with their own generation. He suggested they get after youngsters who scatter trash about the streets and in schools; those who cruise about needlessly in souped-up cars adding to air pollution, those who screech tires and add to noise pollution . . . to name a few things.

While not excusing the Establishment, the parent suggested that young people "clean their own house, too."

In short, pollution takes endless forms and no age group is exempt when it comes to reform. It's a fight we all must join.

EASTERN AIRLINE SHUTTLE SERVICE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months the New Jersey congressional delegation has been striving to preserve a service vital to the people and to the economy of our State. Through the delegation's teamwork and unity, the air shuttle service between Newark, N.J., and Washington, D.C., will be continued. A perceptive and comprehensive account of the shuttle controversy, authored by John J. Farmer, appeared in the April 26 edition of the Newark Sunday News. The article follows:

WEIGHT OF CONGRESS LANDED ON AIRLINE

(By John J. Farmer)

WASHINGTON.—Eastern Air Lines' reluctant agreement to continue its Newark-Washington air shuttle is a striking case of the effectiveness of congressional pressure in the public interest.

It is an equally classic illustration of the impotence of a government regulatory agency—in this case the Civil Aeronautics Board—in defense of the same public interest.

Had Eastern had its way, the shuttle would have been replaced, beginning today, with a lesser schedule of reserved-seat flights. The CAB raised no objection.

The airline abandoned its plans when confronted with a last-minute, but unanimous, campaign by the New Jersey congressional delegation that threatened Eastern with a court injunction, public hearings and legislation to give the CAB control over flight schedules, plus a blizzard of bad publicity.

AVOID INTERVENTION

Not just Eastern, but the entire domestic airline industry, looks askance at further government regulation.

The struggle began innocently enough last fall when Rep. Joseph G. Minish, D–11th Dist., N.J., began looking into Eastern's air shuttle fares, not its schedules.

To his surprise, Minish recalled, he was advised on Feb. 24 by James Reinke, Eastern's Washington representative, not to worry about the fares because Eastern was thinking of dropping the shuttle and switching to reserved-seat service.

What followed in the next two months was an exchange of letters between Minish and the Garden State congressional delegation, Eastern, the CAB, the Port of New York Authority, New Jersey Gov. William T. Cahill, the State Chamber of Commerce, New Jersey freeholders and angry businessmen around the state.

Emerging from that correspondence was a tale of Eastern's refusal to make known its cost data on the Newark-Washington shuttle and the CAB's readiness to accept Eastern's argument for abandonment.

Minish began by persisting in his demand for shuttle cost figures. The CAB could not provide them, and Eastern would not.

V. P. Sacchetti, an Eastern official in New York, in a "Dear Irving" letter to Irving Roth, director of CAB's Bureau of Economics, wrote that since the airline was not requesting a fare change on the shuttle, it should not have to supply the information.

His letter made no mention of any plans to abandon the shuttle April 26.

To this point, there still had been no official confirmation of Eastern's plans. But Minish, convinced he was on the right track, began alerting New Jersey congressional colleagues and, on March 4, wrote to Cahill complaining that the abandonment would be "an affront to the prestige of our state as well as total indifference to the needs of our citizens."

PROTEST LETTER

The next day he circulated a protest letter to the entire congressional delegation to be sent to Secor D. Browne, CAB chairman.

Eastern representatives—still without an official announcement of the shuttle abandonment plans—began contacting individual New Jersey congressmen with arguments for the need of a change in service.

But all 15 New Jersey House members, and both senators, signed the protest. It was forwarded to Browne March 10.

Only then did Eastern confirm the shuttle abandonment plans. The CAB requires only 10 days advance public notice of a schedule change.

Into the mushrooming dispute at this point stepped Webster B. Todd, Jr., son of the former New Jersey state Republican chairman and Browne's special assistant. He was to unwittingly arouse the New Jersey delegation still further with a letter March 13 to Cahill that, in effect, argued Eastern's case.

OUTLINES IMPROVEMENT

He wrote: "Thus, in reality, there will be an improvement to the New Jersey citizen because he will have all the cabin comfort and convenience that reserve-seat service entails since the cabin crew will, in the future, be able to devote their attention to the passengers' needs, and not the collection of fares."

"I think you will find, as a practical matter," Todd concluded, "that the changeover from shuttle to reserve-seat service will be most beneficial to the continued growth of New Jersey and not, as it might appear at first blush, place New Jersey at a competitive disadvantage with New York."

Still unaware of young Todd's letter, the New Jersey delegation met on March 17 with Browne.

From the delegation's standpoint, the meeting did not open auspiciously. Browne began by distributing a letter pointing out that the CAB's scheduling authority was limited to calling an "adequacy of service" hearing. Browne obviously did not favor calling such a hearing.

CAB FINDING

"It would be extremely doubtful," Browne wrote, "if a finding of inadequate service could be made in an instance where there was no question as to the number of frequencies, but only the question of shuttle versus reservation-type service."

The letter concluded that "under these circumstances, we do not believe that Eastern is abandoning its Newark service, and we trust that the new schedules will meet the needs of Newark passengers."

This did not alleviate the anger of the New Jersey congressmen.

The five planned reservation-type flights, they argued, would not only increase the cost of some seats, but would leave wide gaps in flight service between 7:20 a.m. and 10:20 a.m. southbound, and 5:20 p.m., and 9:20 p.m. northbound.

No one, at this point, realized that Eastern's north-bound service would not even originate in Washington, but at cities south and west of the capital. Thus, even fewer seats would be available for the Washington-Newark flights than the congressmen realized.

ASKS MORE FACTS

Nevertheless, Browne really got his ears blistered, said one source at that meeting. A day later, March 18, Browne—in a "Dear Floyd" letter to Eastern's president, Floyd D. Hall—warned of the Garden State delegation's position and of the need for Eastern to justify its position with more facts.

"Let me repeat," he wrote, "that while I consider the New Jersey delegation to be made up of reasonable men, they were unanimous in their displeasure towards the proposed service change, and I believe only the most complete record will resolve the problem."

Browne noted in the letter that "a serious question" had been raised about the "adequacy of the new service"—the CAB's first use of its unwritten but authentic power of persuasion.

TODD LETTER TOUCHY

Before Hall could reply, however, a copy of young Todd's letter endorsing the Eastern proposal reached Minish by way of Cahill. The New Jersey Congressman was livid, and let Todd know with an angry phone call.

On March 25, Hall—in a "Dear Mr. Chairman" letter—replied to Browne's request for more information, acknowledging that the new flights north into Newark would not originate in Washington. The service change, he wrote to Browne, would give Eastern "profits that would be improved."

Todd's letter, the meeting with Browne and Hall's subsequent letter to Browne provided all the fuel an angry New Jersey delegation needed.

But Eastern still showed no sign of relenting.

As late as April 13, Hall wrote to Rep. Peter Frelinghuysen, R-5th Dist., justifying the change.

Three days later, the New Jersey delegation announced plans for a public hearing at Newark Airport on the new schedules—a try at winning a court injunction against the change and a drive for legislation to give the CAB schedule approval authority.

QUICK REACTION

Eastern still gave no public hint that it was about to capitulate. But negotiations got under way quickly in the face of such official pressure, and Rep. Peter W. Rodino, D-10th Dist., emerged as the intermediary. Rodino is dean of the New Jersey delegation.

By last Tuesday, five days after the congressional delegation's announcement, Eastern representatives had offered Rodino a plan under which two shuttle flights would be kept each way, with the five new reserved-seat flights.

Rodino, speaking for the delegation, rejected this offer, according to Merle Baumgart, his administrative assistant.

By Thursday morning the offer was up to seven of the eight original shuttle flights, plus the five new flights. Rodino offered to take that plan to the delegation for its verdict. Before he could, Eastern representative called the same day and offered the full shuttle schedule without change.

The five reserved-seat flights are to continue for a time, but some or all will be phased out.

REASONS FOR CAPITULATION

The implication is clear that Eastern capitulated to avoid a court test, the threat of

new congressional legislation, or bad publicity.

Baumgart said no agreement was made to drop an attack on the airline.

But for several New Jersey congressmen, the issue will lose its immediacy now that the shuttle has been retained. Rodino for example, does not plan to press the issue. "We won the war," Baumgart said.

Minish is not so sure. He plans to circulate a proposed bill that would give the CAB greater authority over schedules. But, in addition, he's still interested in the one thing that started all this—shuttle fares.

"I still wonder why it costs $23.10 for a flight from Newark to Washington when a shuttle from Los Angeles to San Francisco—175 miles longer—costs only $15.50?" he asked.

That is where Eastern came in.

STUDENT VIOLENCE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one aspect frequently overlooked in the furor over student violence is the effect of such activities on the vast majority of students who are in college for the purpose of getting an education. Many young people are becoming increasingly critical of the disruption of their academic schedule and are organizing to counter the militants. During the past several days, I have inserted in the RECORD a series of articles by Robert Betts of Copley News Service, in which he explores in depth the background, organization, aims, and results of the student revolt and am pleased to have an opportunity to share his careful analysis with my House colleagues:

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 1, 1970]

MILITANTS FRUSTRATE THE MAJORITY; LAW-ABIDING STUDENTS CAUGHT IN TRAP SET BY VIOLENT FEW

(By Robert Betts)

The student rioting which has brought disorder and destruction to many university and college campuses is widely put down to youthful impatience and frustration.

Dissatisfaction with crowded classes and the mechanical, depersonalized nature of the modern educational process, "hidebound" administrators who refuse to consider their complaints, and overbearing "Establishment" which refuses to right the wrongs they see in society and which continues a war nobody wants—all these are given as excuses for domestic violence.

Many teachers, administrators and others—not necessarily liberal in their thinking—sympathize with the students and say the violence is understandable although they do not condone it.

One cause of frustrations which is rarely mentioned, although it is felt by a growing number of students, is the constant interruption of their studies by the disruptive activities of the militant minority.

This is bad enough, but the students are conscious of something else. They feel the growing alienation of an adult population which is sick of the unrest and which fails to distinguish between students interested in getting an education and those interested only in making trouble, lumping all students together in a blanket condemnation of today's "ungrateful, unruly" generation.

"Added to this irony is the fact that the majority of students, because they are law-abiding, have to stand by and do nothing while the activists are making trouble and inciting others to violence," said Steve Moore, football captain at the Santa Barbara branch of the University of California.

MORE LIBERAL IDEAS

"It is not that many students don't have grievances which they feel are legitimate," Moore said. "They feel there are some things wrong with modern education and in society generally which ought to be remedied. They generally have more liberal ideas than their parents.

"While I was brought up in a decent home by good parents who taught me honor and respect for this country's traditions, I find myself questioning some things.

"But, the basic honor and respect are still there—and I still believe that problems can be solved through the American democratic way, which is the best the world has ever devised. I think you'll find the majority of us feel the same way."

During the recent rampage in the nearby community of Isla Vista when rioters were smashing, burning and battling with police, Steve said another group of students was eager to tackle the troublemakers.

"But we were advised to stay clear and leave it to those whose job it properly is—the law enforcement authorities," he said.

Students have been told that fighting between civilians in the streets is precisely what is wanted by those who are trying to feed the flames of riot and spread revolution.

"Many of the rioters weren't even students,"said Moore, "and some of them weren't even from this area."

RISKED INJURY

Several fraternity men risked injury in a futile effort to put out the fire which rioters had started in the local Bank of America building, said Gayle Kerr, who has an apartment in Isla Vista.

Gayle is advertising manager of the Santa Barbara campus newspaper, El Gaucho, but she does not go along with many of the paper's radical views.

"I have been growing more and more disgusted with what has happened to the UCSB campus and to what was once a nice surrounding community," she said. "I have received many complaints from my advertisers about how horrible college students are and how the university is now full of a bunch of revolutionaries. Many of my advertisers have refused to advertise with me this year. I have had to say that I could not honestly blame them.

"Others have not wanted to advertise in what they believe to be a radical newspaper, but have been intelligent enough to see that not all of the 13,000 plus students attending UCSB are radical."

Gayle persuaded El Gaucho's editor to publish a letter in which she called on the "silent majority" of students who are "as upset about this as I am" to "stand up and be heard."

Many UCSB students had put their names to a petition condemning violence as a "self-defeating effort to correct society's problems."

"SIGN NOW"

At a table set up outside the University Center two girls sat with a stack of forms behind a notice which urged, "Show the mass media—sign the petition now."

"We've got nearly 5,000 signatures already and it's only been going a few hours," one of the girls said.

Harvey Levin, the 19-year-old sophomore who organized the petition, said, "We want to show the country that the majority of UCSB students are not anarchists. We fully recognize the many problems facing this country, but we believe our system is still viable and that these problems can be handled without recourse to violence."

Nearby stood the opposition—a tall, ungroomed, unsmiling youth, handing out leaflets which urged students not to sign the petition.

"Your name will be used to obscure the real issues and to put the citizenry back into their comfortable stupor that allows them to believe that their university and their society are functioning just dandy," it stated. "A statement condemning violence in Isla Vista will have as its consequence the perpetuation of violence in Vietnam, in the ghettos and ultimately, the streets of America."

It also called on students to "help the arrested to escape police brutality and to get decent treatment in the courts, and to raise money for their defense so that some modicum of justice might be preserved."

"NEED MONEY"

Another appeal was addressed to the "fortunate people who haven't yet been busted; we must support our brothers and sisters who are being arrested and beaten unmercifully by the local 'peace officers.' We need money to get these people out of jail before the police have more time to brutalize them."

One of the collectors for the "legal defense fund," who would not give his name, said the chief organizer was "away—up in Berkeley."

Local headquarters, however, was in the office of the Associated Students Information Agency, an agency set up last year reportedly with the object of investigating and uncovering incidents of "police brutality." Students arrested in the Isla Vista riots were advised to go there "for your own welfare."

The office was busy with serious-looking youths and eager girls preparing posters and leaflets which advised defendants of their rights. At a table a girl was interviewing bailees and recording particulars of their arrest.

One of the organizers, 21-year-old Patricia Drolet, a senior sociology student, said: "We have a lot of friends in the faculty as well as in the outside community. They have contributed to the fund to help bail out the ones arrested. The contributions vary from a few nickels to much larger sums, but I cannot say how much we have altogether in the fund. We are also taking particulars from any students who can cite cases of police brutality."

COMMUNIST PAMPHLETS

Whether such accusations can be substantiated or not, encouraging students and other citizens to charge "police brutality" is known to be part of the Communist-directed campaign to break down public faith in the American system of law, order and justice, by discrediting law enforcement and court proceedings.

The strategy has been outlined in Communist pamphlets which call on followers to "bring the class struggle into the courtroom," pointing out that "our tactics in the public proceedings of the law courts are not tactics for defense but of attack."

Such were the tactics used by the defendants at the Chicago riot conspiracy trial. Such are the tactics expected to be used more and more by militant leftists being tried for incitement to riot.

Most students questioned on any campus say their time is taken up too much with study and preparing for a career for them to become involved in political activity, whether on the right or the left.

Nevertheless, growing frustration over the disruptive tactics of the agitators has caused many opposition groups to spring up across the country. They take various titles and they range from militant confrontation to those calling themselves "moderate liberals," who would rather take on the extremists in debate and work for reforms through student government and other nonviolent means.

One growing organization, taking no political or ideological stand "which might label us with a left or right stigma, which, in turn, would diminish our broad appeal," is Voices

in Vital America (VIVA). The head office is in Los Angeles and it now claims members on nearly 50 campuses.

"VIVA has been organized simply to support the country in a stand against anarchy and violence," said executive director Richard Thies. "We promote the responsibility of each student to act in a responsible, rational manner to respect the law, promote due process as the proper redress to legitimate grievances and to seek orderly change through reason and dialogue."

CLEANUP POLICY

Students are encouraged to contact VIVA with complaints and grievances which then are taken up with the proper campus authorities. VIVA members volunteer for tutorial projects as alternatives to those it says are "dominated by militant student organizations in which high school and grammar school students are given a healthy dose of revolution along with reading and writing."

VIVA members also take part in cleaning up after the disorder caused by campus rioters.

Said VIVA national chairman Steve Frank, who attracted nationwide publicity last year when he led a Los Angeles City College group in tearing down barricades set up by the militants and opening the school to the student body: "It seems difficult to conceive that militants are using tax-supported facilities and in some cases the tax-supported school funds themselves to work toward the destruction of the very people who pay the bills.

"The students of VIVA may take down the barricades, prevent sit-ins, stand between radicals and military recruiters, but this is only a holding action. The real benefit that VIVA provides is the educational programs to teach other students the danger of irrational and violent actions.

"With enough support we can reach many more students across the nation through lectures, debates, seminars, panel discussions, leaflets and other constructive programs. But it is only with community support that these goals can be realized."

WALK FOR DEVELOPMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, while much is being done by government to combat the problems of hunger, other efforts to accomplish the same goal are being carried out in the private sector.

The late former Congressman from Iowa, Leonard G. Wolf, who headed the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, would have been proud of the work his organization is carrying on.

The Walk for Development programs created under Mr. Wolf's direction last year are to be continued.

President Nixon supported the program, saying:

The urgent problems of feeding the world's growing population must have a high priority on our national agenda.

He added that the "sustained support of private groups such as your own—American Freedom from Hunger Foundation—is indispensable if we are to reach our goals."

Those words of the President almost a year ago are even more true today.

I plan to participate in a Walk for Development being held May 3 in Marlow Heights, Md. This hike, one of 15 being made across the Nation, will help fund a day-care center in Oxon Hill in my district as well as a nutritional training center in Costa Rica.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in endorsing the walks for development. I am particularly pleased that so many young people are indicating their commitment to this cause by participating in the walks.

I wish all America could be aware of the positive contribution made by our young people in efforts such as this.

OBSERVANCE OF EARTH WEEK AT UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a part of the observance of Earth Week at the University of Montana, in Missoula, was an excellent and important address by our Governor, the Honorable Forrest Anderson.

In it, the Governor committed himself to work toward the improvement of our environment and laid out a broad outline for action by the State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Anderson's timely and meaningful address be printed in the Extension of Remarks, along with a summary entitled "Governor's 10 Points," published in the Missoulian of April 24, and editorials from the Missoulian and the Billings Gazette.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GOV. FORREST H. ANDERSON, EARTH DAY, MISSOULA, MONT., APRIL 22, 1970

I did not come to the University to tell most of you what you want to hear.

I came to tell all of you what I believe.

As Governor, I cannot listen to only the loudest or the most persistent, or the friendliest voices. I must listen to all the voices of the people of Montana—the people I serve.

On any issue there are conflicting interests. A political leader, elected by the people, does not have the luxury of making a decision for himself. He must make a decision for the people.

I cannot have a cause unless that cause is supported by the public.

I cannot be a crusader unless the objectives of that crusade will benefit the people of Montana.

I do not have the privilege of being adamant or even stubborn.

Politics has been called the art of the possible—and compromise, adjustment and understanding make politics possible.

I am not free to make strictly philosophical decisions. I must make decisions to serve the needs of the people.

I agree with the philosophy of Earth Day.

This is a noble cause. It is a crucial cause. And those who have gathered for Earth Day observances all across the country must keep this cause alive.

It is time that we cease destroying our environment.

Our population will reach 300,000,000 by the beginning of the next century—just 30 years from now.

This nation continues to use a disproportionate share of the earth's natural resources.

Americans comprise only 6 percent of the world's population, yet they consume approximately 50 percent of the world's natural resources.

The obvious result of these excesses is the environmental destruction that we see everywhere in America.

Each generation further despoils its legacy—the land—and leaves it uglier and dirtier for the following generation.

When I was attending law school in Washington, D.C. you could swim in the Potomac River. Today you could almost walk on the sludge in the Potomac River.

Factories and automobiles discharge noxious gases and particulates into the atmosphere. The skies are hung with an acrid shroud.

Oil leakages smear the sea coasts and kill off marine wildlife.

Haphazard land usage destroys the natural terrain and replaces hills and vegetation with stark concrete horizons.

Strip mining desolates forests and prairies.

The psychological effects of overcrowding are reflected in our crime and mental health statistics.

Our rivers have been turned into continental sewage systems.

Pesticides infect both humans and wildlife.

People have finally realized that this is unacceptable

We should have listened to Adlai Stevenson long ago, when he said, "While our cars have grown longer, our TV screens broader, our washing machines grander, our kitchens brighter—at the same time our schools have grown more dilapidated, our roads more crowded, our cities more messy, our air more fetid, our water more scarce, and the whole public framework on which our private living depends, more shabby and worn-out."

I believe we must begin an environmental counter-revolution to halt the long-term excesses of the industrial revolution.

We must substitute quality for quantity.

Today—Earth Day—this nation must begin to move in the other direction.

Most of the environmental problems we have today are the result of well-established, almost sacred attitudes, in our society.

For years, Americans have been proud of the nation's high standard of living, soaring gross national product, fantastic industrial production, amazing technological achievements and ever-expanding affluence and increasing population.

Materialism has been established as a national religion.

This nation's voracious consumer economy has made enormous demands upon natural resources and is largely responsible for the destruction of the environment.

If pollution is to be ultimately controlled, consumer demands on industry and resources must be reduced and the population explosion must be stopped. People will have to become willing to accept less powerful cars, fewer appliances and gadgets and smaller families. We will have to come to believe that material progress is not social progress.

This will require deep and personal attitudinal changes by all Americans.

Is this possible?

Not tomorrow, nor for many tomorrows.

If the individual changes of attitude necessary to preserve the environment cannot be immediately achieved, government, industry and technology must carry the fight. They must act to conserve natural resources before they are irretrievably destroyed.

Government must write and enforce laws to control pollution.

Technology must develop the processes to control pollution.

Industry must have the conscience to control pollution.

This is not the final solution to environmental problems, but it is a beginning and I believe this is an essential beginning.

In the past, government largely ignored its responsibility to protect the environment. Like the people, government was caught up in the national passion for production, consumption and junk.

Of course, in those times there was no publicized environmental movement. This is a recent development, the newness of which can be demonstrated by a series of events that occurred recently in Montana.

Last fall, my administration opposed the installation of the ABM system on the prairies of north central Montana. I considered the ABM a flagrant malappropriation of funds that were needed for social programs. I feared the boom and bust impact it would have on the communities of Shelby, Conrad and Chester. I did not appreciate the fact that our state would become the national bullseye in case of attack. And I didn't believe it was wise to tear up valuable wheatland to make room for a defense system of very questionable strategic value. I needed support—and received very little.

Where were the environmentalists last fall?

There were none, because at that time the environmental movement had not yet formed.

This is a new cause and a dynamic cause. It is growing.

Last fall, the ABM system came almost unheralded into Montana.

Today, seven months later, there is a national environmental teach-in on a variety of issues, which I would hope would include exorbitant military spending.

This country is beginning to develop an environmental conscience.

Governments, at the local, state and national levels, are becoming increasingly aware of the environmental crisis. Legislation has been enacted and programs developed to stop pollution and reclaim the environment.

Cities and towns are building sewage treatment plants. States, through regional cooperation, are attempting to clear rivers. The national government has initiated a $10-billion program to fight water pollution. Government, at all levels, has joined the fight against pollution.

This progress is encouraging, but it is not nearly sufficient.

It must continue.

In Montana we have taken what I believe are significant steps toward adequate protection of the environment.

During 1969, the Governor's Council on Natural Resources and Development became a functioning part of state government.

Decisions based on agency self-interest have been largely eliminated. Major environmental and natural resource issues are now subject to broad review by all agencies.

I believe the Council will allow us to consider the interests of all Montanans relative to environmental and resource questions.

The revitalization of the Council is beginning to have effect.

It has pushed for enforcement of existing anti-pollution laws.

Strip-mining of coal poses the greatest future danger to Montana's environment. The demand for coal is increasing. In Kentucky and elsewhere we have grim evidence of the destruction that occurs when that demand is unconsciously answered.

In November of last year, members of my administration recognized the inadequacy of reclamation contracts presently in force with coal operators in Montana.

The Council was asked to examine the problem. An advisory committee was set up, and has since been attempting to develop a model contract which will *assure* adequate protection of the environment. The committee will have completed most of its work by May, hopefully allowing time to make the changes before more prairie land is dangerously stripped.

The Council is concerned not only with environmental problems which are readily visible.

Recently we sent a letter to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare requesting that a long-range study be undertaken to examine health conditions in the smelter industry.

We have begun the long and difficult process of surveying our land and water resources. I believe this is an initial step in developing management programs compatible with environmental considerations.

Conservationists consider Montana's Stream Preservation Act model legislation to protect game fish from the effects of channel changes caused by road building.

We have laws in Montana to protect the environment. I believe next year we will have better laws and more effective enforcement.

Why?

Because myself, the members of the Legislature, and other state officials are politicians. As such, we must act on behalf of the public. The people want the environment protected. And politicians, who intend to remain in office, do what the people want.

We need better pollution laws to eliminate existing problems and to provide protection against future contingencies.

I believe the next Legislature will enact these laws because of the growing public concern for environmental quality.

A law is only good if it can be enforced.

Montana must begin now to enforce its existing anti-pollution laws. We must not allow our laws to become ineffective because of inaction and hesitation.

The state is not the only level of government responsible for pollution control in Montana.

Municipal governments must build sewage treatment plants to stop the discharge of stream fouling effluents.

The federal government must finance and initiate pollution control and reclamation projects.

The states must cooperate, on a regional basis, to clean up the water and air.

I believe a regional solution to environmental problems would be particularly effective.

It is important to establish uniform anti-pollution laws for an entire region. This would eliminate the possibility of one state lowering its standards to gain a competitive advantage in the search for new industry.

Also, air and water pollution move with the wind in the sky and the current in the rivers. A state boundary is no barrier against pollution.

We have taken the initial steps to form a Missouri River Regional Economic Development Commission to include the state of Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska and North and South Dakota. This Commission and the Federation of Rocky Mountain States, of which I am President, will provide the organizational framework to develop a comprehensive and uniform pollution control program for the region.

Technology made this nation what it is. It is responsible for both our affluence and the environmental crisis. From this time forward, we need a balance between technology and environment.

We cannot escape to the past.

We cannot solve the environmental crisis by abandoning our machines and technology.

We must use technology to meet the legitimate needs of the people, and at the same time to control the effect and quality of our lives.

Technology is ingenious.

Every day we are amazed by the feats of the scientists and technicians.

I believe that the technological tools needed to protect and reclaim the environment are available in our society.

What is lacking is the priority and motivation.

The continuation and further development of the environmental movement will create the priority and establish the motivation.

I believe that if environmental quality is establisheed as a high priority in this nation, technology will be able to achieve substantial results in preserving and restoring the air, water and land.

The United States has spent 35-billion dollars on the space program. During the same period we spent only four-billion dollars on environmental control.

We continue to ridiculously bankroll the Defense Department in a dangerous arms race.

We continue to throw good money after bad all over the world.

The entire structure of national priorities is twisted and bent.

I believe there is more challenge on an Indian reservation than in all of outer space.

There is more hope for security in environmental technology than in nuclear technology.

If priorities can be changed, technology will be released from present commitments to give its attention to a higher commitment—the environment and the quality of men's lives.

America can control pollution, because it is a wealthy nation. Poorer societies must spend all available money to provide for the basic needs of the people. They do not have the financial resources nor the public support to enable them to deal with pollution problems.

Affluence will provide the enormous sums of money that will be required if this country is to control pollution.

Planning will be extremely important in the fight against pollution. We must plan now for selective industrial development, land usage and protection of the environment. Planning will allow us to select the best sites for industrial developments. It will enable us to inventory resources and assess needs and problems in regard to the environment.

The State Department of Planning and Economic Development is presently making studies in these areas. More studies will be conducted by the Missouri River Economic Development Commission and the Federation of Rocky Mountain States.

Pollution will never be eliminated in an industrial society. But, I believe, technology can control pollution.

This will have to be a concentrated effort.

It will cost money.

It will impose restrictions.

It may mean a lower standard of living.

But, we have an obligation to answer this question.

What quality of life is possible in an industrial society?

Conservation, protection of the environment and pollution control are only pieces of the total science of ecology.

To the general public, ecology is a new and little understood science.

A year ago, few people knew that the science existed. Today, few people know what the science is about.

Ecology is not restricted to considerations of air and water pollution and degradation of the landscape. It is a much larger discipline. It is concerned with the living organism's relationship to its environment. It is the science of the total environment.

Watts is as much an environmental question as the Santa Barbara Channel.

Malnutrition is as much an environmental question as Los Angeles smog.

An Indian family living in destitution on a reservation in eastern Montana is as much

an environmental question as the Lincoln Back Country.

Quality of life in a total environment is the concern of ecology.

Beyond the environment, there is another type of pollution.

The pollution of the spirit that occurs when a man does not have a job, or cannot get an education, or is inadequately housed and fed, or is the subject of discrimination.

These, you might say, were the concerns of the sixties.

We are now in the seventies, but these problems still exist.

Is the protection of the environment so important that we must ignore unemployment, poverty and discrimination?

I do not believe so.

We must take up the new cause, while continuing to fight for the old causes.

In Montana, we *are* doing something to help people.

We have established the Council on Human Resources, a cooperative organization of 24 state agencies, working to maximize the potential of the people of this state.

We have set up a state-wide advisory committee on children and youth.

We initiated the first Governor's Conference on the Aging. And have worked to help Montana's older people with their problems.

We have hired a professional penologist, not a political creditor, to be warden at the state prison.

We have established the Governor's Crime Control Commission to help insure a safer life and provide a modern law enforcement system for the people of this state.

We now have a Commission on Drug and Alcohol Dependence to deal with these very serious social problems.

If you would like to see a serious environmental problem, visit an Indian reservation. There are seven reservations in Montana. The poverty, living conditions and lack of opportunity afflicting the Indians are problems that I will not ignore.

The statistics relating to the Indian population are appalling. And I remind you that these are not simply numbers—these are people.

The life expectancy among the Indian population is 6½ years below the national average. The suicide rate among Indian teenagers is three times the rate among whites, and 10 times higher on some reservations.

The rate of accidental death in the Indian population is four times the national rate. Suicide and homicide rank among the ten leading causes of death in the Indian population. They are not among the ten leading causes of death in the white population.

The educational level of this region's Indian population is 25 to 30 years behind the remainder of the nation.

Unemployment ranges from 20 percent on the more affluent reservations, to 80 percent on the poorer reservations.

Officials estimate that 90 percent of the housing on reservations is substandard.

What are we going to do about this?

We have established a Task Force on Indian Problems which will make recommendations to the next Legislature on action needed to help solve some of the problems facing Montana's Indians.

We initiated a survey of minority racial employment, which indicated the State of Montana had been neglecting minority groups, especially Indians. We then sent out a memorandum to all state agencies, requesting that they actively recruit minorities, particularly Montana's Indians.

These are only small steps into a large and shameful problem.

I believe there must be expanded opportunities for all of the people of Montana.

We must have jobs for the people and an expanded tax base to allow government to provide the services people require.

We cannot do this by closing the state off to development.

Montana cannot be a wilderness—and it will not be a wasteland.

We have serious pollution problems. We also have the third highest unemployment rate in the nation.

It is the purpose of my administration to improve in both areas.

I believe that conservation and economic development are not mutually exclusive.

We must write and enforce judicious laws to protect the environment.

We must maintain public awareness of the environmental problem.

We must demand that industry develop an environmental conscience.

We must also develop an economy that will allow people to continue to live in Montana.

We have serious economic and social problems in Montana.

Per-capita income in the state is far below the national level.

The rate of out-migration, particularly among the young, is among the highest in the country.

The demand for increased governmental services in our static economy drives taxes upward each year.

There is a severe shortage of opportunities for our college educated people.

We need schools, hospitals and other public facilities.

The need for doctors is becoming critical in Montana.

Institutional care must be improved.

And these are only a few of our needs.

I said sacrifices would be necessary to control pollution. I do not believe, however, that the people of Montana should be the only people to make these sacrifices.

I do not believe that the well-being, security, safety and opportunities that Montanans have the right to expect should be sacrificed.

We must expand the tax base to provide public education, health services, law enforcement, highways, institutional care, and a constantly expanding number of other governmental services.

As we move forward, we must look in two directions. We must protect the natural beauty of the environment of Montana—and we must protect the interests of the people of Montana.

To assure the protection of the environment and to improve the quality of life in Montana, I propose the following 10-point program.

1. An annual State of the Environment Report. To include areas of problems and progress in relation to the environment.

2. Programs of environmental education to convince people that preservation of the environment is essential.

3. Pesticide control, to include classification and labeling to eliminate the possibility of accidental contamination.

4. Definition of industry's responsibility to the environment to promote increased dedication and reductions in current levels of pollution.

5. Establishment of better land management policies to provide the means to control land usage and reduce degradation of the landscape.

6. Continuation of the roadside park and rest area construction program to enhance the environment and help control litter.

7. A legislative program to write new laws to correct existing environmental problems and to provide protection for future contingencies.

8. Expanded environmental research programs at the various units of the University System.

9. Selectivity and consideration of long-range effects in industrial development.

10. Progressive governmental programs to strive for, among other things, improved opportunities in employment and education, highway safety, improved institutional care, and regional and national cooperation to improve the quality of life in Montana.

Recently, members of the Nixon administration said that they thought the environmental movement was a political fad that would last 18 months.

I disagree.

The environmental problems afflicting this nation are too serious.

If this is a fad, we may be missing our last chance.

GOVERNOR'S 10 POINTS

(NOTE.—These are the 10 points to protect the environment and improve the quality of life in Montana which Gov. Forest H. Anderson presented Wednesday in Missoula. The points are taken from the text of his speech.)

1. An annual State of the Environment Report. To include areas of problems and progress in relation to the environment.

2. Programs of environmental education to convince people that preservation of the environment is essential.

3. Pesticide control, to include classification and labeling to eliminate the possibility of accidental contamination.

4. Definition of industry's responsibility to the environment to promote increased dedication and reductions in current levels of pollution.

5. Establishment of better land management policies to provide the means to control land usage and reduce degradation of the landscape.

6. Continuation of the roadside park and rest area construction program to enhance the environment and help control litter.

7. A legislative program to write new laws to correct existing environmental problems and to provide protection for future contingencies.

8. Expanded environmental research programs at the various units of the University System.

9. Selectivity and consideration of long-range effects in industrial development.

10. Progressive governmental programs to strive for, among other things, improved opportunities in employment and education, highway safety, improved institutional care, and regional and national cooperation to improve the quality of life in Montana.

[From the Billings Gazette, Apr. 23, 1970]

YOUR STATEMENT IS WELL PUT, GOVERNOR

Gov. Forrest Anderson took on the whole field and came out looking like a winner in his Earth Day speech to a Missoula audience.

We won't outline what he said in his talk—you can read the complete text on the opposite page.

He has said much of it before in bits and pieces while talking on various subjects. This time he put it all together in one place at one time.

The governor made his case, dealing in generalities it is true, but he did make it.

His official position appears to be that pollution will never be eliminated in an industrial society, the society that Americans want to live in. Therefore, government, industry and technology must do the work that should be done.

For starters, the governor made a three-point NOW program.

Government must write and enforce laws to control pollution.

Industry must have the conscience to control pollution.

The governor also grabbed the opportunity to let the Earth Day people know that Montana has other problems that need solution. He got in a few extra licks for some of the programs he has started or advocated.

In all, he spoke out for what many of us would like to see—orderly development of Montana's resources in a manner that protects its natural beauty and the interests of the people of Montana.

Your statement of position is well put, Mr. Governor.

[From the Missoulian, Apr. 24, 1970]

ANDERSON'S EXCELLENT SPEECH

Gov. Forrest Anderson's Earth Day speech in Missoula was excellent. He committed himself to environmental defense and improvement. He said things his listeners did not expect to hear and said them well.

He called for "an environmental counter-revolution to halt the long-term excesses of the industrial revolution." He said that people's attitudes toward unbridled consumerism must change, and that the population explosion must be stopped.

He called for more effective laws to control strip mining and deal with other types of environmental pollution and destruction. He said that national priorities are "twisted and bent" and should be re-ordered to deal with environmental affairs. He attacked high defense spending and defended the use of intelligent planning in pollution control, including the placement of industries where they will do least harm.

Anderson extended, properly, the meaning of the word "ecology" to embrace an individual's total environment—including his housing, job, racial problems, hunger. He cited pollution of the spirit and the appalling poverty of Montana's Indian reservations as part of the total environmental problem.

And he defended expansion of the tax base as a means for lessening many of these environmental ills. The tie-in between economic growth and conservation was effectively handled. The 10-point program he laid out was fine.

Yet there was a hollowness in the speech. The hollowness fell in the realm of action. At every turn, when the governor cited an action taken it was to list a commission, a task force, a study group which was looking into one or another problem.

Perhaps that is inevitable, since his predecessors in office did nearly nothing to gather the basic facts on which intelligent actions can be based.

Still, enough is known about Montana's insipid water pollution control law for a chief executive to recommend specific action. Enough is known about pesticide controls and strip mining reclamation for him to do the same.

So far Anderson hasn't really DONE much. What he has done has fallen short of the letter and spirit of the excellent sentiments contained in his Wednesday speech.

In other words, the governor has to DO, not merely SAY. The first thing he might do is side with those concerned with pollution of the Blackfoot River when the Land Board on May 13 considers the Anaconda Co.'s easement requests near Lincoln. Particularly in light of Wednesday's speech, Anderson will be the object of close attention at that meeting.

But it must be re-emphasized that this was an excellent and important speech. It culminated a groping by the governor for a viable position on the environment. The speech contained a broad outline for state action and, equally important, solidly committed the governor to work for environmental improvement.

This speech will serve as Anderson's measure. Having delivered it in Missoula, this hotbed of environmentalism, he must know it will get lasting careful attention. He must know that he will have to jibe his future actions with his fine words.

He has made a personal verbal commitment. From now on he must match action to words.

RETENTION OF THE KITTERY-PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, an excellent series of three articles calling for the retention of the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and rescision of the November 1964, McNamara order to close the shipyard in 1974 has been written by William Caldwell, the editor of the Maine Sunday Telegram.

I ask unanimous consent that the three articles be printed in the Extension of Remarks, and I invite the special attention of the officials of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy to them.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 12, 1970]

KEEP KITTERY! HOME TO 134 SUBMARINES—PART I

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—The skilled welder shielded behind his welding mask; the pretty girl in personnel; the merchant in downtown Portsmouth; the technician working in a nuclear submarine hull who wears a film badge to measure the radiation he may absorb; the apprentice starting out—almost 8,000 persons inside Kittery Navy Yard, and thousands more outside the security gates, are all seeking answers to the same plaguing question;

"Will Kittery be closed in 1974? Or will President Nixon countermand the standing order to close Kittery, issued by McNamara six years ago?"

This question looms larger every day. It looms large not only in Maine and New Hampshire, but also in the White House and in the National Security Council, in the Pentagon, in the Congress—and inside Soviet Russia.

For upon the answer hinges not only our burning local issue of some 7,500 jobs and some $80 million a year in local payrolls and procurement. Upon the answer also hinges the greatest question of our time—"Is American nuclear strategy about to get far-reaching overhaul? Is President Nixon soon to make a massive shift from land-based nuclear missiles to a sea-based deterrent?"

The Telegram will focus three successive articles upon first hand reports from the Navy Shipyard at Kittery. This first article deals with the yard's economic impact upon the people of Maine and New Hampshire; another will recount the illustrious 170 year history of Kittery Shipyard; and the third will deal with the role of submarines in nuclear war, and the imminent possibility of a major shift to maritime missiles.

That human model of machine management, Robert Strange McNamara, sometimes called "Mac the Knife", issued six years ago, in November 1964, a Defense Department order to close out the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard by 1974.

McNamara resigned as Secretary of Defense some two years ago. And the Presidency has since changed. But that Order still stands today. And unless the Nixon administration soon rescinds the McNamara order, Kittery will close in 1974.

That, at least, is official navy doctrine. However, well informed sources close to the highest levels of official Washington are now beginning to lay small side bets that Kittery will be in the nuclear submarine business for many years to come.

Here at Kittery in April 1970, there is very little sign in material matters that Kittery is "phasing out", or that the McNamara order has been much implemented since he issued it almost six years ago. But there is human nervousness among the 7,500 people who work here.

Some of Kittery's highly skilled technicians have left already to work in other yards, where no impending ax may fall. Thousands of other workers are worried about their jobs. For in addition to the worry caused by the McNamara order to close Kittery by '74, the Nixon administration has recently ordered a 20 per cent cutback in Kittery's work force by July 1971. This order is indeed being carried out now.

But this "reduction in force" is an economy measure applying to all naval shipyards everywhere and is unrelated to McNamara's order to close Kittery. Nevertheless it is adding to the job jitters, since 1500 jobs must be abolished by next July.

The average hourly rate at Kittery is $4.05. The everage yearly wage at Kittery is $9000; the average industrial wage in Maine as a whole is $6000. So it may not be easy to find as good a job nearby.

But the job-jitters are by no means at a panic stage here. Far from being "phased-out", Kittery is busy today. Her three drydocks are jam full. Five nuclear submarines are at Kittery now, undergoing overhaul, conversion, construction or refueling with nuclear energy.

Kittery is finishing the 292 feet, 4,600 tons submerged "Sand Lance", a $100 million plus nuclear submarine, the 134th submarine built at Kittery. Kittery is converting the Sam Rayburn from Polaris to newer Poseidon missiles, and overhauling the Kittery-built nuclear submarines Timaro, Dolphin and Albacore, Furthermore, the Navy recently announced that still another major overhaul and still another major conversion job are being scheduled for Kittery.

Such jobs can take up to 24 months, cost more than $30 million each. So there is plenty of life and work at Kittery now.

Last year Kittery did more than $100 million worth of submarine work. The volume booked for 1970 may be just as big.

None of these indicators point toward the closing of Kittery, the only Navy yard specializing 100 per cent in nuclear submarines. And there are 87 nuclear powered submarines in the U.S. fleet now, with 6 more to be launched in 1970.

However because Kittery is officially under orders to be closed by 1974, Navy funds for needed maintenance of the Yard have been meager.

Nevertheless close to $3 million are now being spent on giving Kittery a new sewer plant; another million has been recently spent for a Radiological Control Facility, directly related to handling nuclear submarines; a further $1.3 million has been spent on steam lines and electric power distribution. All these funds have been spent in the past 36 months.

Training programs, which cost about $2 million a year, are continuing, future needs for submarine technicians is increasing; and it takes four years to train an apprentice.

In the Commandant's office, Capt. D. M. Kearns, who has worked in submarines for 15 years, parries questions about the closing of his yard. "Look" he says. "I am a naval officer. My job is to carry out whatever orders the Navy Department gives me. And the order which stands now is that Kittery closes in 1974. So I cannot discuss anything else."

Among civilians in Portsmouth's business section, the attitude is radically different. Banker Arthur N. Berry, president of the Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Forces Committee, is eager to spell out how the citizens and the businesses of the area are fighting hard to keep Kittery open and to get the McNamara order to close the Yard rescinded.

This committee has some 4,000 individual members, is supported by contributions from shipyard workers, from businesses in 40 towns of the area, and from communities. From the $50,000 or so raised each year, the Committee maintains lobbying offices in Portsmouth and Washington, D.C.

The Washington office is headed by Rear Admiral Joshua W. Cooper, USN (Ret) who receives $20,000 for salary and expenses. An additional $25,000, taken from reserves, was spent in the past 12 months for public relations. Other operating expenses last year included $2200 of stationary and postage, $1250 for meals and travel and telephone, $10,000 for secretarial and administrative costs, $2500 for staging a membership drive.

In the past five years, the Committee has received $104,115 from business firms in 16 towns, $121,768 from shipyard workers and $40,770 from nearby municipalities. "We are fighting hard and well in a cause we know is right . . . right not just for this area, but for the defense of all the United States," says Arthur Berry.

Maine supplies about 42 per cent of the entire Kittery work force. There were 3200 Maine-held jobs out of the 7650 total in December 1969.

The Maine payroll at Kittery totalled $30,735,000 in 1969. A town by town analysis shows that the following Maine towns benefitted principally from employment at Kittery:

MAINE

Town	Workers in Kittery Yard	Payroll
Berwick	82	[1] $738,000
Biddeford	457	4,113,000
Eliot	277	2,493,000
Kennebunk-West Kennebunk	105	945,000
Kennebunkport	45	405,000
Kittery-Kittery Point	896	8,864,000
Lebanon-E. Lebanon	28	252,000
North Berwick	52	468,000
Old Orchard Beach	63	567,000
Portland-South Portland	70	630,000
Saco	187	1,683,000
Sanford-Springvale	306	2,754,000
South Berwick	183	1,647,000
Wells-Ogunquit	132	1,188,000
The Yorks	361	3,249,000
All other	171	1,539,000
Total	3,415	30,735,000

[1] Based on average $9,000 annual wage. Actual average is $9,351 in 1969.

In addition, navy personnel resident in Maine received pay totalling another $600,000, and the Kittery Yard made local purchases in Maine amounting to a further $700,000. Thus the Kittery Yard funneled $30 millions into the Maine economy directly.

By comparison, New Hampshire received a total of $39.3 million, and Massachusetts $8.9 million.

Because of federal operations at the Naval Shipyard, school districts in the area received substantial federal aid in 1968 to impacted school districts.

York County, Maine, received over half a million dollars, with Kittery getting $190,000, Eliot and So. Berwick getting $83,000 and York getting $75,000.

Rockingham County, N.H., received in all $1½ millions, and Strafford County $350,000.

Portsmouth itself was the largest single beneficiary, getting $975,000 of federal aid to its schools.

Outside the shipyard itself, the Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee estimates Kittery Yard generates 5000 jobs in the area. The Committee also estimates that the taxable property owned by shipyard employees has a value of $75 million.

For 170 years, from the War of 1812 to the Nuclear contest today, Kittery has been a vital source of American naval strength. "The Yard" and Maine and New Hampshire are bred into each other's bloodstreams through seven generations. "Keep Kittery!" is the slogan here.

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 19, 1970]

"KEEP KITTERY!" A VITAL YARD FOR OUR NUCLEAR NAVY!—PART II

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—The bad old news is that Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard—where 7500 Maine and New Hampshire people earn $70 million a year in paychecks—is under orders from former Secretary of Defense McNamara to close down in 1974.

But the good new news is that Kittery, far from closing down may surge into a new span of vigorous life. Kittery—170 years old, first shipyard of the U.S. Navy—may become a vital pivot point if a new American nuclear strategy now being weighed in the White House, is adopted by President Nixon.

The heart of the proposed new nuclear strategy is a plan to shift the United States from a land-based to a sea-based missile defense.

Under this plan President Nixon would disperse American's present land-based, fixed-site nuclear missiles to submarines, and would disperse America's land-based nuclear bomber force to mobile carriers at sea.

Reason for this proposed overhaul in strategy is that fixed-based Minutemen missiles and fixed-based bombers, once the keys of U.S. defense, are today becoming more and more vulnerable to destruction by new Soviet weapons, as documented later in this report.

In contrast to this growing vulnerability of land based missiles, new developments in American submarine design, submarine capability and weaponry, make U.S. nuclear submarines almost immune to detection. New emphasis on submarines is part of the new concept in nuclear strategy.

Since Kittery is the only U.S. naval shipyard on the Atlantic coast which specializes 100 percent in nuclear submarines, these new developments may place Kittery in a wholly new light compared to the light in which McNamara viewed Kittery six years ago, back in 1964, and ordered the yard closed by 1974.

Since changes in strategy are made to meet changes in challenge, let us return to the documentation of the developing Soviet challenge. The challenge just ahead lies in the new ability of Soviet weapons to destroy America's land-based nuclear missiles and nuclear bombers located in known, fixed bases inside the United States.

This is the major reason for a proposed change-over by the United States to maritime nuclear missiles instead of land based Minutemen. Specifically, Pentagon planners cite the fact that the Soviet is expected to have 420 of its mammoth SS-9 missiles on the launch pads by 1975.

These SS-9 missiles, each capable of carrying at least three 5-megaton warhears, are designed to destroy U.S. land-based Minutemen missiles sitting in their silos. Advanced Soviet missiles have a range of 6000 miles and an accuracy of hitting within three-tenths of a mile of their targets. Even a "thick" multibillion dollar ABM defense network to protect our Minutemen in their silos is likely to be inefficient and obsolete by the time the A.B.M. defenses are operational.

Hence the 'old' strategy of reliance on 1,054 land-based missiles is becoming shaky. Hence the arguments for a shift to sea-based missiles are gaining supporters. Hence the logic of keeping "Kittery," the U.S. Navy's most experienced nuclear submarine yard.

Another reason for shifting the emphasis of U.S. strategy to sea-based nuclear power is that new Soviet weapons may soon be capable of destroying many of our 450 long-range nuclear bombers on the ground at their airfields. This is because by 1975, Russia is expected to have a submarine fleet armed with missiles capable of annihilating U.S. bombers on the ground in a surprise attack.

The source for both these predictions is Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird.

In recent testimony to Congress this February Laird stated that the Soviets will be able to destroy 95 percent of America's land-based missile force by 1975.

Thus the 'old' strategy of reliance on land based, long-range nuclear bombers may be shifting to a new strategy of emphasizing sea-borne nuclear bombers aboard mobile carriers, as well as Polaris, Poseidon and ULMs missiles aboard submarines.

Nuclear-bomber carriers in turn would require nuclear attack submarines to protect them against Soviet attack submarines, a fast growing force in the Russian navy.

Kittery is experienced in building these types of underwater attack craft too, as well as building ballistic missile submarines.

In addition to Sec. Laird, another high Pentagon official has further documented in public the Nixon administration's awareness that new Soviet weapons endanger the 'old' American strategy of relying on land-based missiles for defense.

He is Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Engineering and Research.

In a statement to the Joint Armed Services Committee on February 26, Dr. Foster said: "We are not sure that the problems of land-based-missile survivability can be solved permanently. In the unfortunate case that they cannot, a backup is to place greater emphasis and independence on our sea-based missile forces. . . . A major restructuring of the strategic forces may be necessary to insure survivability if the Soviet threat continues to grow along present trends."

This kind of "restructuring of the strategic forces" points directly to a larger, better armed nuclear submarine fleet. This in turn points favorably to Kittery.

No naval shipyard in the United States has so long and so concentrated experience in submarines as Kittery. Kittery has built 134 submarines, from the first in any U.S. Navy yard to the most-modern nuclear research submarines.

Briefly, here is an abbreviated history of Kittery "firsts" in submarines.

Kittery built the first submarine ever launched from a navy shipyard. This was back in 1917. And Kittery went on to build eight more submarines in World War I.

Kittery designed half of the entire U.S. submarine fleet in World War II. On a single day in 1944, Kittery launched four new submarines. Kittery had a work force of over 20,000 people at the peak of World War II, and produced 75 submarines.

Since World War II, Kittery has designed and launched the first nuclear submarine in any navy shipyard; has designed and built the world's fastest submarine (Albacore); has designed and built the world's deepest-diving submarine (Dolphin).

Kittery is now completing Sand Lance, the Navy's newest nuclear submarine to join the fleet, and is converting the Sam Rayburn from Polaris to Poseidon missiles.

Kittery has built 134 submarines; has 7,500 skilled submarine technicians; has drydock facilities for five submarines; has the only "Sound Detection" basin for submarines in any U.S. navy shipyard; and has direct, unobstructed, swift access to the open sea. Kittery is one of only three U.S. navy shipyards on the East coast which is licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission to handle contaminated nuclear material. Kittery alone of all U.S. yards is the only yard 100 percent specialist in nuclear submarines. Kittery is also the spare parts and procurement center for the entire Atlantic submarine fleet, with

an inventory of $45 million worth of submarine gear.

Two other important aspects of national defense strategy are hammered at in the position papers given to the National Security Council by the experts who advocate a new nuclear strategy based on maritime instead of land-based missiles and bombers.

One involves the future U.S. ability to deliver a devastating retaliation in case of attack.

Military sources in Washington estimate that only about 50 out of 1000 Minuteman fixed-base missiles might survive a Soviet attack on the U.S. silos. They go on to predict that these 50 surviving missiles will have less and less chance of reaching the Soviet targets at which they are pre-aimed since the Soviets are saturating with ABM defenses the perimeter through which such missiles must fly.

These sources say that U.S. land-based missiles targeted for the Soviet would have to travel through a global arc of only 32 degrees, and that this line of attack narrows down to only nine per cent of the Soviet defense perimeters. These corridors could feasibly bristle with anti-missile missiles. And shoot down our pre-tracked missiles fired from fixed bases in the U.S. But, say these experts, if U.S. missiles were perpetually traveling on or under the sea, the Soviets could not guard so effectively against this far wider arc of attack. The Russians would not know in advance the track such dispersed missiles would travel.

The other argument put forward by advocates of more reliance on mobile maritime nuclear strategy involves the safety of the U.S. civilian population.

They argue that fixed-base Minuteman missiles within the U.S. automatically means that any Soviet or Chinese attack upon our missile force must also be an attack upon the continental United States, which means millions of civilian casualties.

The Soviet development of nuclear warheads with a 6000 mile range and with accuracy to within three tenths of a mile, has led Secretary of Defense Laird to tell Congress just two months ago:

"Should the Soviets follow a 'high-force, high-technology' approach during the next several years, they could pose not only an overwhelming threat to our cities, but also a very formidable threat to our land-based missiles and bombers."

Most of the vital considerations outlined in this article either did not prevail or were less pressing when McNamara issued his order to close Kittery back in 1964. Now the strategic situation has changed, the McNamara order maybe rescinded.

If President Nixon decides in favor of the new nuclear maritime strategy being proposed at the highest levels in Washington, then the Kittery Yard, outstanding specialist in nuclear submarines may be far from closing in 1974. It may be surging forward as one of America's major bulwarks in a new nuclear policy.

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 26, 1970]

CLOSE KITTERY? NOT ON YOUR LIFE!—PART III

(By Bill Caldwell)

KITTERY.—"Would YOU close Kittery, today?" I put the question to a Navy officer who, until recent retirement, ranked high in the Pentagon's Intelligence hierarchy.

"Close Kittery today?" he replied, "Not on your life! . . . Some years back, maybe. But not today—not on your life!"

Today . . . when the expanding Soviet fleet embarks upon the first global maneuvers in history.

Today . . . when the U.S. may be switching its whole nuclear shield from fixed bases on land to mobile ships at sea.

Today . . . when submarines, deep, silent, hard to detect, may be the only U.S. weapons not constantly targeted into Soviet weaponry.

Today . . . when a $44 million research program for Underwater Longer Range Missiles is before Congress.

Today . . . when the Chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee insists upon a $300 million addition to the Navy's $2.7 billion ship building program.

Today . . . when Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense says that 95 per cent of our land based missiles might be wiped out in an attack by Soviet SS–9's.

Today it is President Nixon and Defense Secretary Laird, and Navy Secretary Chaffe (formerly Governor of Rhode Island) however—and not President Johnson and Secretary McNamara—who will decide whether Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is to close in 1974 or to stay open.

How differently will they see Kittery in the light of today's facts of Soviet and American nuclear capabilities? Six long years ago LBJ and McNamara, with different facts to go by, ordered that Kittery be closed by 1974.

The first article of this series told how the closing of Kittery could throw 7,500 Maine and New Hampshire people out of work in the yard; how they would lose $80 millions a year; how 35,000 men, women and children would be affected in the area by any shutdown at Kittery.

The second article in the series spelt out how much nuclear and submarine know-how the Navy would lose if Kittery-Portsmouth, the foremost nuclear naval yard in the nation, were closed down.

This third and last article is totally different, unconcerned with strategy and economics.

Close Kittery?

The man who locks the gates on Kittery will lock the gates on the first and oldest shipyard in the United States Navy.

Kittery (or Portsmouth as they call it everywhere but Maine) has been a U.S. Navy Yard for 170 years.

On June 12 back in 1800, in the term of John Adams, second President of the United States, the government paid the sum of $5500 to William Dennett for a 58 acres inland in the Piscataqua River on which was established the first shipyard in the history of the United States Navy.

"See, here is the original map", says Captain Donald H. Kern, USN, the Commandant of the Yard in 1970. The brown parchment hangs on the paneled wall of Kern's big, barren office (one sheet of paper, one sharp pencil on a vast desk). "Note the handwriting in the bottom left corner" says Capt. Kern, 15 years a submarine expert.

Under the heading of "A Plan of an Island in the Piscataqua River as a Navy Yard" is the hand-drawn map, and the hand-written notes "Mr. Humphries will mark such places as he thinks proper for a Stone Store, a House, and Rope Walks" signed Jacob Sheafe, Navy Agent.

Now, 170 years later the Stone House and the Rope Walks have become $100 millions of buildings, drydocks, and millions more of submarine and nuclear technology.

Close Kittery?

The man who closes Kittery closes the Yard which built the 74 gun ship-of-the-line "Washington" back in 1815, a year after the British burned the White House, five years before Maine got statehood. He closes the Yard where 2455 men worked at shipbuilding in the thick of the Civil War and launched 26 ships, including two ironclads and 18 steam sloops. Among those Kittery ships was "Kearsage", who defeated the confederate raider "Alabama" in a most memorable sea battle.

Close Kittery?

The man who closes Kittery closes the Yard which was home to the U.S.S. *Constitution,* most famous ship in all the U.S. Navy. 'Old Ironsides' became Kittery's own Receiving Ship. "Don't give up the ship" has been in Kittery's bloodstream most of 100 years. And the man who closes Kittery will close the door on Admiral Farragut, the most famous sailor in the U.S. Navy. Farragut died at Kittery in 1870, in the same house where Kittery's commandant lives in 1970.

War ended at Kittery too. At 3:47 p.m. on 5 September 1905, in the Administration Building at Kittery, the envoys of Japan and Russia signed the peace treaty ending the Russo-Japanese war.

Close Kittery?

This is the Yard where the first submarine the U.S. Navy ever built was launched in 1917. And let today's Congress relish the fact that Kittery delivered that submarine for less than the price forecast.

Between 1917, in World War I, and 1941, before America got into World War II, Kittery built 33 new submarines, repaired scores of old ones, including Free French and British.

In World War II, Kittery designed more than half the whole U.S. submarine fleet. In three years, 1941–45, with 20,466 men in her Yards, Kittery produced 75 new subs, repaired or remodelled more. On a single day, January 27, 1944, Kittery launched four submarines. Kittery skills cut production time from 469 calendar days per submarine in 1941 down to just 173 days in 1944.

Close Kittery today? At the moment nuclear subs are becoming the first line of defense?

The man who closes Kittery closes the first naval yard to build a nuclear submarine, the Swordfish, in 1958.

Kittery also built Sea Dragon, the first submarine to sail under the polar ice cap.

Kittery also built the world's fastest submarine (Albacore) and the world's deepest diving submarine (Dolphin).

Today Kittery is building Sand Lance, newest of nuclear subs. More than 134 submarines have been built at Kittery; and today Kittery is the "home base" for repair, overhauls, spare parts, maintenance scheduling for the entire Atlantic submarine fleet. In her supply shops over $43 million worth of spares stand ready for submarines in trouble.

If Kittery is closed, where could her facilities, her know-how ever be duplicated? And at what astronomical cost in dollars? At what perilous risk in time spent?

Kittery is the only Navy yard in the nation which is a 100 percent specialist in nuclear submarines; it is the only navy yard with its own Sound Basin—an essential; it is one of only three navy yards on the Atlantic coast which has full licenses from the Atomic Energy Commission for handling nuclear cores.

Close Kittery? Since McNamara issued the closing order six years ago, the cost efficiency of Kittery has improved, and the need for Kittery has increased. Hear the testimony of the Navy's top submariners:—

The Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet wrote; "Completion of Sam Houston overhaul (cost $30 million) noted as shortest overhaul achieved to date in any shipyard . . . cost of overhaul will be lowest of class . . . the results of quality, timeliness and cost are tribute to command, management, technical and craft skills of shipyard."

Rear Admiral Edward J. Fay says, after tests of deep diving by Kittery-built Dolphin "Kittery Naval Shipyard has been the bastion of 'deep capability' . . . every successful major increase in depth incorporated into an operational submarine . . . has been attained first in a Kittery Naval shipyard product."

Close Kittery?

"Not today . . . Not on your life!" said the Intelligence authority quoted in the first sentence of this report.

Yet today Kittery is still under McNamara's order to be closed in 1974.

But Kittery, being a Navy Yard, is owned and operated by the citizens of America, and not by any private corporation.

Therefore if you believe Kittery should stay in operation—for your life or your livelihood—let your voice be heard. Write to Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. She is the ranking Republician on the Armed Services Committee, holds seniority on the Appropriations Committee and Space Committee. Or write to Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, at the Pentagon. Or to President Nixon at the White House. These are the men who will soon be deciding whether your Yard will be shut down after 170 years service, or will continue as a bastion in America's nuclear defense.

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I insert following these remarks some interesting columns of comment on the conduct of Mr. Justice Douglas from the Arizona Republic, the Grand Rapids Press, and the Christian Science Monitor.

[From the Arizona Republic, Apr. 22, 1970]

"BEHAVIOR" BASIS FOR IMPEACHMENT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—It has been 165 years since the Congress last undertook to impeach and to remove a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, and the precedent offers small hope for getting rid of Mr. Justice Douglas today.

Yet the effort launched in the House last week merits solid support.

Contrary to popular impression, members of the high court hold their offices "during good behavior."

It is not necessary to prove treason, bribery, high crimes or misdemeanors in order to impeach a judge. It is necessary only to establish to the satisfaction of the House that a judge's behavior has not been good.

In my own view, the evidence against Douglas on this charge is overwhelming. He ought to be impeached, and he ought to be removed.

This has nothing whatever to do with the unrelated fights over Clement Haynsworth and Harrold Carswell, though already it is being said that the 100 sponsors of the Douglas resolution are merely being vindictive. Neither does the effort have anything to do with the positions that Douglas has taken, whether wise or unwise, as a member of the court.

What matters here, as Minority Leader Gerald Ford told the House, is the pattern of Douglas's public behavior outside the court. It has not been good.

Viewed in this light, the bill of particulars against Douglas is far stronger than the charges brought in 1805 against Justice Samuel Chase.

By contrast, the case against Douglas depends solely upon his extensive moonlighting as a paid consultant, adviser, and freelance writer. His involvement with the tainted Parvin Foundation is too complex to go into here, but his involvement with such magazines as Playboy, Avant Garde, and the Evergreen Review can be judged on a few palpable facts of publication.

The Evergreen Review, to cite a current matter, is a lewd little satellite in the publishing empire of Barney Rosset, head of Grove Press. Its April issue is crowded with advertisements for sex books ond pornographic drawings. The principal illustrative feature this month is a series of hard-core photographs depicting a nude woman engaged in sexual intercourse.

And following along, just after the photographs, is a long excerpt from the book, "Points of Rebellion," by Mr. Justice Douglas. This is the work in which Douglas says, among other things, that "where grievances pile high and most of the elected spokesmen represent the Establishment, violence may be the only effective response."

Skip what Douglas says. The question of his good behavior properly goes to the circumstances of publication. What was Rosset buying when he bought these rights to reprint an excerpt from the Douglas book? A learned essay on rebellion?

No, indeed. Rosset was buying just what Ralph Ginzburg bought last year for Avant Garde and Hugh Hefner repeatedly has bought for Playboy: He was buying the name and reputation of an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court. That is what Douglas sold; and by the eternal, it is not for sale.

The question thus goes to propriety, to a sense of fitness, to an appreciation of honor and an understanding of dishonor. The question goes to good behavior. And as Congressman Louis Wyman of New Hampshire says, the House has an obligation at least to weigh the question.

It is almost inconceivable that in a Senate today dominated by liberals, a two-thirds vote could be mustered against Douglas. But the solemn act of impeachment, if voted by the House, would come as a stinging reminder to justices hereafter that the people expect better behavior from future members than they have had from William Douglas.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, Apr. 22, 1969]

DOUGLAS' WRITING SUFFICIENT CAUSE FOR IMPEACHMENT

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The Democratic Congressman who had demanded of Republican leader Gerald R. Ford that he be specific on the matter of why Justice William O. Douglas should be impeached, makes a good point—although it is as much his responsibility as Ford's to concern himself with whether Douglas has destroyed his usefulness, and Douglas' book is as easily available to Democrats as to Republicans. And anyway, a precis of Douglas' book appears in the current issue of a pornographic monthly readily available.

There, nestled among the pornography, is an article by Justice Douglas entitled "Redress the Revolution," an excerpt from his book, "Points of Rebellion." Douglas begins by talking about the generally unsatisfactory state of affairs in America today, including the recent elimination of his favorite trout stream.

Then suddenly he finds himself talking about violence, which he concedes "has no constitutional sanctions." This he would appear to regret, because he adds immediately, "but where grievances pile high and most of the elected spokesmen represent the Establishment, violence may be the only effective response."

Douglas reaches abroad for illustrations. He recites tales of horror about life in Guatemala as related by two priests and a nun—ex-nun and ex-priests being perhaps more accurate, since post-Guatemala they got married. Anyway, Douglas, who is supposed to be expert on the rules of evidence, passes along the extraordinary news that the Maryknoll priests, "between 1966 and 1967 . . . saw more than 2,800 intellectuals, students, labor leaders, and peasants assassinated by right-wing groups because they were trying to combat the ills of Guatemalan society."

An altogether astounding story, as I say. First, that there should have been 2,800 assassinations in tiny Guatemala over a one-year period without anybody knowing about it; second that the assassinations should have been directed against those who sought to combat rather than promote evil; but most extraordinary of all, that Guatemalan authorities should have summoned two priests and one nun to witness each and every one of said assassinations.

Douglas has at this point picked up a lot of steam, and he reports gleefully that the priests advised Guatemalan peasants who approached them that, under the circumstances, it is okay by God to use violence. Under the circumstances. . . .

Douglas moves now to America. Here, he concedes, who do not turn so readily to violence. However, we do run the risk of violence—because the young generation doesn't like the way things are run in America, believing that the entire governing class is run by special interests.

He explains that the situation was very similar back in 1776. Then, Americans demanded a restructuring of our institutions. "That restructuring was not forthcoming and there was revolution."

And then, explicitly, the climax. "You must realize that today's Establishment is the new King George III. Whether it will continue"—note that Douglas would have us believe the Establishment does now exercise the tyrannical practices of George III—"we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution."

Now, what Douglas has said very simply is that such conditions as legitimized revolution in 1776 exist in America in 1970. He seems to be saying that George III—the Establishment—might well be given, for a little longer, a chance to reverse itself. But that is one man's judgment. Those who—for instance the Chicago Seven—believe America has been given long enough to change its ways, and therefore advocate instant revolution, disagree with Douglas only on a matter of timing. What they advocate—violent revolution—is, in Douglas' view, very simply, honored by tradition.

If that is not sufficient cause for impeaching an official of the government who has sworn to defend the Constitution and the execution of its laws, then nothing justifies impeachment. It is quite extraordinary that Congress should have gotten lathered-up over the nickel-and-dime malversations of Justice Fortas while sleeping on this one. If Douglas is not impeached he may have proven, by means other than he intended, that indeed American society is irretrievably corrupt.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 16, 1970]

THE DOUGLAS ISSUE

One must conclude that there is responsible reason for a House of Representatives inquiry into the fitness of Justice William O. Douglas to continue serving on the Supreme Court. This investigation should not be vindictively motivated—a retaliation for the Senate's rejection of the presidential nomination of Judges Carswell and Haynsworth. It would need to be a bipartisan move, to carry weight in public opinion. But if handled with a strong sense of national responsibility, the inquiry could be a protection to the Supreme Court.

Justice Douglas has had a long tenure on the high bench. He has written powerful opinions, for the majority and in dissent. His liberal advocacies have helped carry the court into its controversial remaking of American institutions. His travels in faroff lands have displayed a lively interest in mankind. But recent statements and viewpoints of his, uttered off the bench, raise serious questions of both ethical and judicial propriety.

Justice Douglas' latest book, "Points of Rebellion," in effect approves if it does not advocate violence as "the only effective response" to the nation's ills. It is totally irresponsible for a member of the Supreme Court, to seem to condone the often senseless violence disrupting the nation—a violence which, as manifested in the courtroom, was denounced within the month by the Supreme Court. And it only adds to the impropriety for Justice Douglas to have permitted the pertinent excerpts from his book to appear in the Evergreen Review with its content of eroticism.

Again, Justice Douglas in a recent law school talk behaved like a left-wing pamphleteer in declaring that "Our greatest contributions abroad—apart from expeditionary forces—have been Coca Cola and comic books." Add in the Justice's earlier acceptance of income from the Parvin Foundation with its relation to Las Vegas operations, and the record builds.

It is a long and grave distance from a House investigation to actual impeachment, which requires a two-thirds Senate vote. In these divisive times, an impeachment case, pitting labor and liberal defenders against the South and other conservatives, could stir national emotions anew. But there is nothing to prevent Justice Douglas from taking heed, if the bill of complaints mounts, and deciding as no doubt Justice Fortas did, that his resignation would indeed serve to protect the Supreme Court from its detractors.

QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, Earth Day, many of us met in our districts with students and interested citizens to express our commitment and hopes for new environmental priorities in the future.

With less publicity on the same date we also paid our respects to the 519th birthday of Queen Isabella of Spain, the lady whose support to Christopher Columbus led to his first voyage of discovery.

In this connection, I am honored to place in the RECORD the Queen Isabella Day proclamation of California's Governor Reagan:

QUEEN ISABELLA DAY PROCLAMATION

On behalf of all California, I am pleased to commemorate on April 22, 1970, the 519th birthday of Queen Isabella, the Castillian queen whose faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus led to the discovery of a new world.

The great heights of discovery which we are reaching now in the 20th century are made possible by those in past centuries whose dreams of the future were far-reaching. Upon the faith and vision of those like Queen Isabella of Spain, we have built, and are building a world to reach into the infinity of space.

I urge all California citizens, schools, and historical organizations to recognize and give due credit to the great contribution of this outstanding woman of history.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN,
Governor.

TRIBUTE TO HERMAN D. HILLMAN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Herman D. Hillman, who is retiring after 30 years of Federal service. Mr. Hillman is presently directing programs for housing assistance in the New England States and New York for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Hillman is a graduate of the law school of New York University and became a member of the New York bar in 1936. Three years later he joined the legal staff of the U.S. Housing Authority and served in various legal capacities, both in Washington and New York, with that Agency and its successors, the Federal Public Housing Authority and the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. Hillman served as regional attorney of the Public Housing Administration in New York from 1948 to 1954. From March 1954 until August 1966, he served as Regional Director of the Public Housing Administration for the Northeastern States.

During his Federal career, Mr. Hillman created or participated in many fresh and innovative approaches to solving our Nation's housing crisis. Among these were the creation and marketing of a new type of housing-financing security, housing authority bonds; joint public-private financing of housing; rehabilitation and conversion of substandard housing; tenant organization; and public leasing and acquisition.

In 1956, Mr. Hillman's public service was recognized by the conferring of the Distinguished Service Award of the Housing and Financing Agency.

I have had the pleasure of dealing with Mr. Hillman a number of times over the last several years. On each occasion he greatly impressed me with the competency he brought to the task and, moreover, with the excellent cooperation he was always willing to extend.

On many occasions, Mr. Hillman and his staff have gone out of their way to meet with my constituents, discuss their problems, and provide them with much needed advice.

Just this year, for example, Mr. Hillman's cooperation was very helpful in enabling one of the cities in my district to begin a 23-unit housing project, their first public housing project since the 1940's.

This is but one small example of the good he has accomplished. I know of many others, as do many of my colleagues.

Mr. Hillman's career with the Federal Government has been one of dedication and service to the public. Public housing has been, and will continue to be, one of the most vital and pressing areas of Federal concern. I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Hillman on behalf of myself and my constituents. May he find satisfaction and happiness in whatever paths he pursues from this day forth.

GREATER CLEVELAND AMERICAN NATIONALITIES MOVEMENT DENOUNCES "LENIN'S CENTENARY"

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the American Nationalities Movement of Greater Cleveland is an organization of patriotic Americans representing many of the nationalities which make up our great Nation, and which make our Nation great—Albanian, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Croatian, Cuban, Czech, Estonian, German, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Puerto Rican, Rumanian, Russian, Russin, Serbian, Slovak, Slavenian, and Ukrainian.

At their last general meeting, under the chairmanship of a distinguished Clevelander, the Honorable Ralph J. Perk, the ANM unanimously adopted a resolution denouncing the United Nations Human Rights Committees' designation of "Lenin's Centenary." The resolution has been forwarded to me by Mr. Perk and the organization's secretary, Mr. Raymond Kudukis, another outstanding Cleveland voice speaking out in behalf of freedom.

I wish to associate myself with the American Nationalities Movement abhorrance of Lenin and my dismay that a committee designated "Human Rights" should honor him. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON LENIN-CENTENARY UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN NATIONALITIES MOVEMENT OF GREATER CLEVELAND, APRIL 21, 1970

The Representatives of the American Nationalities Movement of Greater Cleveland (Albanian, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Croatian, Cuban, Czech, Estonian, German, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Puerto Rican, Rumanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian, Ukrainian) assembled on this 21st day of April 1970, on the Eve of Lenin's Centenary (He was born on April 22, 1870, in Simbirsk) protest vehemently against the Resolution adopted by the United Nations Human Rights Commission, at the 25th Session in March, 1969, which approved arrangements for a "Centenary of Lenin and notes the historical influence of his *humanistic ideas* and activity on the development and realization of economic, social and cultural rights."

We applaud the United States Delegation for voting against this resolution which makes a mockery of Human Rights. We are at a loss to understand the logic of the resolution passed by the United Nations Human Rights Commission for the following reasons:

1. Lenin established in November, 1917, the most anti-human regime in Russia, using systematic terror against anyone who dared to challenge the Bolsheviks' right to impose their will on the majority of the nations of the former Russian Empire.

2. Lenin brutally suppressed the Constituent Assembly, the only Legislative Body in Russian history elected by free, secret bal-

lot, after only one day in session in January, 1918 (the Bolsheviks controlled only 24% of delegates).

3. Silenced the growing opposition to his terror system by suppressing the non-Bolshevik newspapers, books and other media of information and communication. It was the "humanist" Lenin who coined the phrase: "When in doubt, liquidate."

4. Ordered the Red Army to invade, terrorize and silence the neighboring countries, which proclaimed their independent and democratic states after the downfall of the Russian Empire, known as the Prison House of Nations. With complete disregard of the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, loudly proclaimed by Lenin before the Revolution, he ordered the Russian occupation of Byelo-Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaidjak, Georgia, Cossakia and Turkestan.

5. In the name of Lenin and Leninism, Stalin extended the Soviet Slave Empire after World War II by imposing brutal communist dictatorship over formerly independent states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia and aided communist takeover in China, North Korea and North Viet Nam; while Nikita Khrushchev, in the name of Leninism, aided Communist takeover in Cuba.

6. It was the "humanist" Lenin who initiated the greatest hate campaign in history of mankind against liberty and democracy and divided the world into two belligerent camps—Capitalism and Socialism—he promised a bitter struggle until the Communist victory would be achieved.

7. It was the "humanist" Lenin who made a mockery of the elementary human rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, worship, ordering his Secret Police to silence individuals and nations demanding this right.

8. In the name of Lenin and Leninism, Stalin murdered over 20 million non-Russians and held more than 10% of the population in the dreadful concentration camps of Leninism by silencing intellectual opposition.

In Lenin's name, the Communist Parties the world over are busy undermining peace; waging guerilla warfare; creating anarchy, lawlessness; engaging in assassinations, wholesale murders; and plotting the overthrow of the non-Communist political systems.

For these and many more reasons, we protest the United Nations resolution which makes a mockery of Human Rights for the protection of which United Nations was organized.

POLISH CONSTITUTION OF MAY 3, 1791

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege this day for me to join the 10 million Americans of Polish descent, as well as loyal Poles everywhere, in commemorating the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791.

It was just 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution here in the United States that a group of gallant Polish patriots, facing possible annihilation from Russia, united behind a Constitution, enthusiastically acclaimed at home and abroad, as the cornerstone of liberalism in central and eastern Europe.

Surely the very words of that remarkable document can attest to the truly courageous strides toward liberty made in the bloodless revolution of 1791:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Guided by this document, the Poles emerged from medieval times as a people of limited monarchy and constitutional government. With the first partition of Poland in 1792, the Polish people came to the painful realization that unless they had an effective government, they would be unable to resist their powerfully greedy neighbors—Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Rather than attempting to consolidate the monarchy into an overbearing dictatorship, the freedom-loving Poles resolved that a government which drew its strength from the support of the people, stood a better chance against these dangerous foes.

In 1788, a committee was formed from amongst the various members of the Diet—the Assembly—specifically for the purpose of drawing up a new Constitution. Procrastination and delay, often the case in this body, stalled progress for almost 2 years. However, when Russia ended her involvement with Turkey, the danger unified the competing factions, and, early in 1791, the final draft of the Constitution was submitted to the Diet for adoption. Due to the considerable statesmanship of the sponsors, the active support of King Stanislaus himself, combined with the statesmanship of the constitutional sponsors, the new Constitution was adopted on May 3 of that year.

Aside from alleviating many of the inherent difficulties in the old system, this document instituted many new procedures. The King, although retaining much of his power, was to be checked by a council of six, "Guardian of the Laws," composed of the Primate of Poland and the heads of the five. A legislature of two chambers, one legislative and one advisory, was to be elected. The nobles were to share their prerogatives with the ennobled townsmen, and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Although remaining officially a Roman Catholic country, Poland was to practice religious tolerance. Thus, without shedding a drop of blood, the far-sighted Polish reformers were able to establish a system based on popular support, quite revolutionary for its time.

We as Americans should especially cherish the aspirations of the Polish people in their attempt to bring constitutional government, with the highest regard for human liberties, to a most hostile and oppressive country.

The Poles, throughout their sad history, have been tragically thwarted in their efforts to enjoy "the civil liberty and the good order" of a free nation.

Four short years after their great assertion of democracy, the unfortunate people of Poland were unable to prevent partition by Russia, Austria and Prussia. Since that time, Poland has fallen into the clutches of the totalitarian forces of Nazism, and then communism.

Even today, as we celebrate this event, the Polish citizens are cruelly forbidden to observe what was formerly their national holiday. History may yet reward the Poles in their struggle for human dignity and national identity. To this end, free people the world over lend their support and encouragement.

It is only appropriate at this time to note the outstanding accomplishments of the Polish people throughout their history. Today marks the anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot who served not only in his native land, but as an aide to George Washington in our struggle for independence; the anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the brilliant Polish novelist among whose works is the outstanding "Quo Vadis"; and, the anniversary of the birth of Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie, whose discovery of radium is considered to be one of the most outstanding scientific accomplishments of all time.

And let us not forget the great contributions and sacrifices Polish-Americans have made throughout our proud history. Brave Polish settlers supported John Smith in the perilous days of Jamestown. During the Civil War, Polish soldiers helped preserve the Union, while Polish nuns helped care for the wounded and dying. In all our wars, the Poles have fought bravely for the protection of this Nation and its people.

Surely, on this day, we must pause to recognize the significance of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and pray that the goals for which it strove may soon be attained.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROCESSED BEEF—SUPPLIES AND PRICES

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I included in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement by Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary of the National Livestock Feeders Association entitled, "The Truth about Beef Supplies and Beef Prices." Now I am happy to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent followup statement by Mr. Magdanz with an analysis of the price and supply situation as it relates to processed beef:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROCESSED BEEF SUPPLIES AND PRICES

(By Don F. Magdanz)

This document is a sequel to that prepared by this Association on April 8, 1970, entitled, "The Truth About Beef Supplies and Beef Prices". Our statement of April 8 referred primarily to total beef supplies and over-all prices as well as the prospect for future production through 1975. This document is directed toward the production and availability of processing beef about which numerous inaccurate statements have been made recently both as to price and volume available.

OBVIOUS DISTORTION OF SUPPLY AND PRICE SITUATION

It is obvious that a determined effort is being made by the Meat Importers Council

and by agents for foreign nations to distort the supply and price situation of processing beef in the U.S. In so doing, they are deliberately propagandizing the American consumer for the sole purpose of doing away with the modest import restrictions we now have. If these restrictions are relaxed, supplying nations could then load our market with frozen boneless beef and a relatively few local importers would benefit personally by handling a substantial increase in volume of product.

They obviously have no concern for our domestic beef industry and, while posing as great benefactors to American consumers, they have no concern for the future welfare of consumers. Should the domestic beef industry be crippled to the extent it cannot fulfill future requirements of this Nation as a result of expanded competition from foreign production, the beef supply would be in serious jeopardy since foreign nations could supply neither the quantity or quality of beef desired by the growing and affluent population in the U.S.

In September of 1969 the Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., circulated a booklet entitled, "The Case Against Restrictions on Meat Imports." The booklet is full of misleading statements, twisted analyses and inaccurate conclusions, designed to propagandize the consumers of the U.S. The introduction contains the argument that, "The U.S. needs to supplement a diminishing domestic production of manufacturing-grade meats." The facts and records show that since 1964 we have had an increasing amount of processing meat available to consumers both in absolute quantities and per capita supply.

Seizing upon a short-lived bulge in cattle prices during mid-1969, the booklet refers to, "The highest cattle prices in U.S. history." This rise in price which did occur was of short duration beginning in April and ending the second week in June. Prices then receded to levels that prevailed in the first three months of 1969. Even at the highest point, however, live cattle prices had not reached levels that prevailed in 1952, eighteen years before.

Be that as it may, we wonder what is so wrong about beef cattle prices reaching their highest point in history in 1969. Certainly cattle were not the only commodity that attained highest prices in history during that year, since everything else also set record prices as the general price level climbed. By 1969 we had record hourly wage rates, record disposable income, record prices for consumer services, record payments of Social Security benefits, record welfare payments and the highest figures for practically everything that can be mentioned. How can anyone justify picking out cattle prices and condemn them for reaching the highest level in history, particularly when it was not true.

At another point, the booklet states, "It (imported fresh-frozen beef) is definitely not comparable to or competitive with American meats of higher grade which are used as table beef and classified as 'Prime', 'Choice' and 'Good'. While not necessarily being comparable to the better grades of beef being produced in the U.S., foreign beef is directly competitive with domestic supply because a great deal of processing beef is derived from our better grade animals. Furthermore, not all fed animals are finished to the choice grade and some of them do not even reach good grade. Moreover, processed meat products in the retail counters, such as hamburger or frankfurters, are definitely competitive with steaks, ribs and roasts as consumers make their selection according to price as well as their particular needs and desires at the moment.

The argument that imports do not affect fed beef (and thus fed cattle prices) to any degree because such imported products are used primarily in the manufacture of processed products is ridiculous.

Also, the contention imports do not affect fed prices overlooks the very important fact that over one-half of the domestically produced processing meat comes from fed carcasses (See Table 2). This portion of beef available for processing has been steadily increasing, not only because larger numbers of cattle are being fed, but also because the grade standards were relaxed a few years ago requiring less finish for an animal to reach the Good, Choice and even Prime grades.

Beef is its own closest competitor regardless of the form in which it's marketed. Attempts are often made to draw a fine line between the factors which affect the fed market and the so-called cow or processing type market, and to treat these as two separate and distinct markets as far as price is concerned.

Such an analysis is not valid because there is a very definite and intertwined relationship among the various segments of the cattle and beef market. Any factor which affects one class of cattle or beef very definitely does not do so at the exclusion of the other classes. The above conclusion is logical in view of the very real competition between various cuts and/or products in the retail counter and the substitutability among classes of beef.

The unfair competition of foreign beef, however, does not stop with its infringement on the domestic cattle industry. It also competes unfairly in the market for other domestic meat animals and products such as hogs, pork, lamb, as well as domestic poultry and fish.

At another point the booklet argues, "It is largely the drying up of this domestic source of manufacturing meat and the soaring demand for convenience low cost meats which has made the importation of meat necessary." Again the record shows that the supply of manufacturing and processing meat in the U.S. is not drying up, but, as mentioned before, has actually increased. We could go on and on with refutation of statements contained in the booklet; however, that appears unnecessary. Let's examine the facts.

THE ACTUAL SUPPLY OF PROCESSING BEEF

Manufactured or processed beef from domestic production comes largely from two sources. First, there is the production of cow and bull beef, much of which is extremely lean because the animals slaughtered have been produced on grass and not in the feedlot. The other source is that portion of steers and heifers, both fed and non-fed, which is not sold as fresh beef cuts in the retail counter as table beef. Fresh beef cuts largely come from the loins, rounds, ribs and chucks. Much of the remaining parts of the carcass, including the plates, shanks, brisket and trimmings, wind up as ground fresh beef which may be sold as hamburger or is used in other processed products. Even part of the chuck may find its way into hamburger instead of being sold as chuck roasts, since prices of this particular cut are often comparable or close to prices received for hamburger.

Table I contains the figures to show the processing beef produced domestically from 1964 through 1969, which volume, when added to imported beef, gives the total supply of processing beef available to U.S. consumers.

TABLE I.—COMMERCIAL DOMESTIC BEEF PRODUCTION—STEER AND HEIFER BEEF PRODUCTION—COW AND BULL BEEF PRODUCTION—DOMESTIC PROCESSING BEEF PRODUCTION—IMPORTS

[In millions of pounds]

	Total beef production [1]	Steer and heifer beef production [2]	Processing beef from steers and heifers [3]	Cow and beef production [2]	Imported beef carcass weight equivalent [1]	Total processing beef
1964	18,456	15,023	3,906	3,433	1,180	8,519
1965	18,693	14,457	3,759	4,270	923	8,952
1966	19,726	15,662	4,072	4,064	1,182	9,318
1967	20,212	16,478	4,284	3,741	1,313	9,338
1968	20,875	17,034	4,429	3,841	1,500	9,770
1969	20,953	17,150	4,459	3,880	1,614	9,953

[1] Livestock and Meat Statistics, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 333.
[2] Computed from total domestic beef production, steer and heifer slaughter, and cow and bull slaughter.
[3] Computed from domestic production of steer and heifer beef using accepted fact that 26 percent of all steer and heifer beef is used in processing and manufacturing.

TABLE II.—PER CAPITA SUPPLY OF DOMESTIC BEEF AND IMPORTED BEEF—PER CAPITA SUPPLY OF PROCESSING BEEF

	Total beef production (million pounds) [1]	Imported beef carcass, weight equivalent (million pounds)	Total supply (minus exports) (million pounds)	Per capita supply (pounds) [2]	Total processing beef (million pounds) [3]	Per capita supply processing beef (pounds)
1964	18,456	1,180	19,545	99.8	8,519	44.3
1965	18,693	923	19,525	99.3	8,952	46.0
1966	19,726	1,182	20,908	104.0	9,318	47.3
1967	20,212	1,313	21,437	105.9	9,338	46.9
1968	20,875	1,500	22,267	109.4	9,770	48.6
1969	20,953	1,614	22,485	110.6	9,953	49.0

[1] Livestock and Meat Statistics, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Bulletin No. 333.
[2] National Food Situation, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 1970, p. 15.
[3] From table I.

The information in Table I clearly shows the increasing volume of processing beef from steers and heifers in the domestic slaughter from 1964 through 1969. In addition, cow and bull beef have been increasing since 1967, although by 1969 had not quite reached the highest figure in 1965. The last column in the Table adds the processing beef from steers and heifers, domestic cow and bull meat production, and the volume of imported beef (carcass weight equivalent) to show the total volume of processing beef that has been available to consumers in each of the six years. Note the steady increase from 8,519 million pounds in 1964 to 9,953 million pounds in 1969, an increase of 1,434 million pounds or 16.8%.

Table II uses some of these same figures to show the per capita supply of beef in the United States as well as the per capita supply of processing beef, including that which is imported.

Note that since 1964 per capita supply of all beef has risen from 99.8 pounds to 110.6 pounds. At the same time, the per capita supply of processing beef has gone up a like percentage from 44.3 pounds to 49 pounds. The contention there is a gap in the supply of processing beef in the United States is an absolute myth and cannot be supported or substantiated.

PROCESSED BEEF DEMAND IS "CREATED"

It has sometimes been stated that the principal reason for substantial increases in meat imports in the United States is the increased demand in this country for processed

products. It must be realized that this so-called demand is a "created demand" and a larger tonnage which has moved from foreign nations is prompted as the result of offering a vast array of processed products to consumers, rather than any specific "call" from consumers for this type of product.

Instead, foreign nations desiring to export beef products have poured them into the United States and, along with the importers of these products, are now trying to convince United States consumers that they need more processed meat. They are also encouraging consumers to insist on the relaxation or elimination of import restraints.

SHORTAGE DOES NOT EXIST

If there is or has been a serious shortage of processing beef in the United States, why has not the retail price of hamburger, for instance, changed much more than prices of table cuts such as sirloin steak or beef ribs. According to Bureau of Labor Statistics the average price of hamburger in the United States during 1968 was 56.1c per pound. In August, 1969, when hamburger reached its peak price, the average was 65.6c per pound, an increase of 9.5c or 16.9%.

The average price of sirloin steak in 1968 was 119.5c per pound. During the highest month in 1969, which happened to be July, the average price of sirloin steak in the United States was 141.9¢, an increase of 22.4¢ per pound or 18.8%. If there was such a shortage of processing beef, as has been alleged, why is it that hamburger did not rise much more in price on the average than the example of sirloin steak that has been used.

By February 1970, the average price of sirloin steak in the United States did come down to 130.9¢ which was 11.4¢ per pound over the average in 1968 or 9.5% higher. The average price of hamburger did hold fairly steady at 65.3c per pound or 9.2c per pound over 1968, which was 16.4%. It's true that the price of hamburger did not decline as much as certain fresh table cuts, but neither did the price increase as much during the temporary price bulge in 1969.

If there is any validity to the allegation made by proponents for increased imports, why has not the price of hamburger gone up materially to reflect this contended shortage of processing meat? The truth of the matter is the shortage does not exist.

So far we've demonstrated there is no shortage in the normal sources of the supply of processing beef. There is still another source of beef available for sale as hamburger which tends to provide a ceiling on the price of hamburger. We refer to chucks from both steers and heifers.

For quite a number of years, the price of chuck roasts at retail has closely paralleled the retail price of hamburger at figures from 4c to 10c above. Furthermore, most of the time domestic boneless chuck is sold in the wholesale market for less than domestic boneless bull beef and at times is sold for less than imported boneless bull beef.

For example, on August 4, 1969, domestic boneless bull sold at $63.75 per cwt; imported bull beef was $62.50 and domestic boneless chuck was $62.75. On November 3, domestic bull beef was $60.00, imported bull beef was $58.00, and boneless chuck $57.50.

Continuing with examples, on February 2, 1970, domestic bull beef was $65.50, imported bull beef was $61.75, and boneless chuck was $63.50. On April 16, domestic bull beef sold at $68.00; imported bull beef brought $63.75, and domestic boneless chuck sold at $67.00.

CONSUMER DECEPTION

The National Livestock Feeders Association contends that those who are insidiously attempting to bring about relaxation of import restrictions and open the door for increased volume of foreign beef, are perpetrating a hoax on consumers of the United States, and are using it as a device to bring pressure on the Administration. This is a highly organized and carefully planned maneuver that should be stopped cold by complete exposure of the facts.

Table III containing the record of frozen beef in cold storage at the first of each month since January 1968 vividly exposes the deliberate attempt to falsify the supply situation.

In 1970 foreign nations have been shipping us products (covered by the 1964 Meat Import Law) at the unprecedented annual rate of 1.3 billion pounds. This annual rate contains an estimated volume for March, 1970, of about 100 million pounds.

In so doing, an attempt is being made to show that this high rate of imports has little or no effect on our domestic market. There is more to the situation than meets the eye.

TABLE III.—FROZEN BEEF IN COLD STORAGE[1]

[As of the first of each month in millions of pounds]

	1968	1969	1970	Change from previous year
January	261.369	265.860	356.540	90.680
February	239.542	256.979	378.300	121.321
March	211.145	261.656	363.012	101.356
April	202.376	254.428	----------	52.052
May	182.325	234.055	----------	51.730
June	186.769	218.614	----------	31.845
July	200.923	227.203	----------	26.280
August	218.268	254.255	----------	35.987
September	227.454	292.862	----------	65.408
October	251.775	321.888	----------	70.113
November	282.255	320.938	----------	38.683
December	281.549	340.515	----------	58.966

[1] Cold Storage Reports, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Feb. 1, 1969, through Apr. 1, 1970.

Column 4 of Table III shows the increased volume of frozen beef in cold storage as of the first of each month compared to the same month a year earlier. Note that on January 1, 1970, frozen beef in cold storage was 90.680 million pounds above January 1, 1969. February, 1970, was 121.321 million pounds above a year earlier, and March was 101.356 million pounds higher. Cold storage holdings of frozen beef in the last nine months of 1969 were only modestly above a year earlier with the exception of October which was 70.113 million pounds above 1968.

If there is such a terrific demand for processed beef, why is this much greater volume of frozen beef being held? We submit that frozen beef is being deliberately held out of market channels after it has been recorded as imported, in an attempt to force prices of manufactured products to go up, thus providing more ammunition to use in an effort to repeal the 1964 Act or prevail for the suspension of quotas once they might be put into effect.

In the opinion of this Association, those who are attempting to hoodwink the consumers of our Nation need to be told bluntly that it is not going to work. Not only are they advancing arguments that do not hold water, there is evidence of a deliberate attempt to force a situation on American consumers that is contrary to actual circumstances. To be equitable to American consumers and the domestic cattle industry, the facts must prevail.

WYDLER FIGHTS FOR PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO MITCHEL FIELD LAND

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, no single event will have more effect on the future way of life of the people of central Nassau County than the development of Mitchel Field. Every home, every family will feel the effects in the years to come. The quality of life will be made better or ruined beyond repair by what we do there. The time of decision is now.

I am interested for a number of reasons:

As a Congressman, I fought to obtain the 1,000-plus acres available in the heart of my congressional district for the benefit of the people of Nassau County.

As a homeowner, the exploitation of this land for profit will have an adverse effect on me and on my neighbors.

As a conservationist, I know the building of a new city in the heart of Nassau County will bring urban-type pollution, traffic, and over crowding, not only to the immediate area but to the whole of Nassau County.

My views on this development have been stated clearly and consistently for many years. Support for them has grown greatly; and people and organizations are becoming aware of the danger the present plan presents.

When public hearings were held, before any plan was drafted, I testified as an interested citizen and emphasized one point to the planners. I told them not to draw a plan for the 1,000 acres without taking into account the effect increased traffic would have on the area and surrounding roads. In spite of this, the planners proceeded to do just that.

On April 13, I stated my most recent position and the positive response has been great. I stated:

The recent revelation of conflict of interest in the development of Mitchell Field is unfortunate but hardly a surprise.

The standard of the development is monetary profit. That standard will not only destroy the area but all that surrounds it as well.

What started as a project to benefit the public welfare has become a private, commercial project whose sole aim is financial.

I still say that Mitchell Field should be developed for the benefit of the residents of our County. No new city is needed in our midst, at the expense of those who live here now.

The proposed plan of development is a bad one. A recent report by the Long Island Association makes this eminently clear. Proceeding with it would be foolhardy and contemptuous of the public need. The report also emphasizes what I pointed out 6 months ago—that the future needs of Nassau County for a civic center and for County office building sites are ignored! What kind of plan is that?

What kind of plan is it that talks about 30,000 new jobs in an area and 30,000 new people living there and does not deal with the transportation problem created? Only now has a transportation study been completed and submitted. It is a shocker! Current roads are now inadequate. They will become hopeless as traffic increases from a 43,000 plus flow of cars to 68,000.

The roads needed to feed this area will destroy us all. All roads in the area will have to be widened. The air pollution will be enormous.

Unless we end this plan now and plan for open space instead, we are preaching conservation and practicing destruction. Our county is deficient in open space by 12,000 acres today and another 4,000 acres will be needed by 1985. The 1,000 acres of Mitchell are to be

commercialized while we talk about conservation.

Unless we set some limits on population and density of growth in our County, we are doomed to become a big city with overcrowding and other urban problems.

Let us provide for the development of Mitchell Field by competent planners and make responsible for its development those elected to office who must answer to the people for the decisions they make.

Prior to this, and last August, I reported as follows:

The proposals for the future development of Mitchell Field are still receiving considerable public attention. This they certainly deserve. The development of the 1,000 acres in the heart of Nassau County will set the style for our future as a suburban area more than any other single factor. Reviewing the proposals for this area, as a representative of the people who live closest to it, I have come up with certain conclusions which appear to me to be in the public interest.

I have stated that there is no reason for a high-rise development since it would set an example for the future in Nassau County which would be irresistible and undesirable. In fact, a review of the proposals indicates that the planners may well have been considering the area for development as an individual, self-contained "city". In my judgment, it should be developed for the benefit of the existing communities and I judge it in that light.

The original proposals called for high-rise apartments, housing 30,000 people. The business and industrial portions were intended to employ about 30,000 people. These figures may have been complementary by coincidence but traffic generated by all these people, in addition to the public movements for the hotel, coliseum and cultural center, would probably make the area inaccessible to any outsiders for road travel. I must repeat that I see no good purpose to be served by high-rise development in this area. I doubt if many Nassau residents or their children wish to live in a Forest Hills-type area. Most people who live in Nassau County moved here to escape from such type housing.

I support Supervisor Ralph G. Caso's proposal for a 63-acre wilderness-type park of the Hempstead Plains at the eastern end of the property. This is a small but important concession to conservation and in the interest of all the people of Nassau County. In addition, I believe the County of Nassau should establish a land bank of 100 acres to be used for future county office building purposes. Not to recognize this need nor to plan for it indicates an attempt to avoid making this important decision. The need will not go away.

It should be done now, in the interest of sound government for the future.

Last June 30, I wrote:

The paid consultants' plan for the development of Mitchell Field is a classic example of how not to plan.

Testifying before the Mitchell Field Development Corporation more than a year ago, I pointed out the need—the absolute need—of planning adequate roads along with new buildings. I warned against proposals that looked good on paper but which would require 12-lane highways to service.

The planners avoided the problem by putting it off. The fact is that it cannot be avoided or put off.

Traffic and parking are essential considerations to the suburban way of life. The fact it was ignored by the planners indicates the city-type orientation of the plan.

The present situation is as bad as the future planning. The County Executive keeps constructing new buildings in the Mineola area without regard for the traffic and parking consequences. Recent mail indicates that county employees are writing me to help them get adequate parking. They should write the County Executive.

It is clear that the time has come for the County Executive to stop building more office buildings in the Mineola area. It cannot support the traffic jams and parking saturation.

Since it is clear the people of Nassau and their elected representatives will not support the Mitchell plans as drawn, it would be well to begin now to plan future County government expansion at Mitchell Field with adequate traffic and parking provisions.

Toward that end, I propose a County Land Bank be established there at once. Land should be set aside for future county office expansion. There is a precedent. It was done, at my request, by the Federal Government some years ago.

The County Executive is now suggesting double-decker parking in the Village of Garden City to accommodate the new Welfare Building parking requirements. He also suggested moving existing County buildings to Mitchell Field. Neither idea is good or sound.

Proper planning for the future only requires that the space now owned and available for County purposes not be let go for commercial exploitation.

The Nassau County Land Bank at Mitchell Field is a must!

And on June 9, 1969, I stated:

The Board of Directors of the Mitchel Field Development Corporation should adopt such standards of ethical conduct as would be required of elected officials.

As an elected representative, I am surprised at the double standards that is approved for appointed groups who are given great power over the disposal and exploitation of public property. Conflicts of interests are the same whether a man holds his position by appointment or election. In fact, appointed officials are less subject to public criticism and review. If anything, protective standards should be higher for appointive groups acting for the public in a billion-dollar project.

Press accounts and revelations of "self-dealing" of elected officials in Suffolk have brought Grand Jury investigations and resignations. The media is strongly silent when an appointed Board, answerable to no one, is to engage in self-dealing just so long as it is made known to other members of the Board. I wonder if this is to be the standard for all public officials in the future?

The project plans drawn up by the Development Corporation for the use of the area are incompatible with a suburban way of life. The plan stresses the very things that have made city living undesirable. High-rise apartments and fourteen-story buildings are unnecessary. The test is not how many people want to live in the area but how the area can maintain its attractive character. There are enough needs to be met for the people now living in the area to use it fully. There is no need to create a new high-rise City in the heart of our County.

The plan makes no provision for traffic that would be generated. My guess would be that we would need 13-lane highways to do the job properly. Until this matter is considered and solved, it is in the public interest to hold in abeyance the approval of any more of this project.

To date, not a single elected official has endorsed this plan. Many have condemned it. If there are any favoring it, they should stand up to be counted and let us know why they believe it to be in the public interest.

My conclusion is that the present plans for commercial development and exploitation of the acreage should be abandoned. New plans meeting the needs of the people of Nassau County for open space and community and civic services should be drawn.

What we do not need is Mitchell Field development. What we do need is Nassau County improvement and conservation.

GALLANT LADY FACES IGNOMINIOUS END

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is the trademark of the American press is the imaginative coverage of items in which the human aspect as well as the cold news is properly emphasized.

A column by Editor Bob Seltzner of the Chicago Daily Calumet on Saturday, April 25, discussing the history of the U.S.S. *Silversides*, is the type of human interest story to which I refer. As I place it into the RECORD, I also note that Mr. Seltzner is working with civic leaders and interested citizens who are hoping to make a memorial out of "Old" *Silversides* as a fitting tribute to her career and the men who served aboard her. The column follows:

GALLANT LADY FACES IGNOMINIOUS END

Crawling through the confining and unlighted passageways of the U.S.S. Silversides is an unusual experience. It is even somewhat depressing—depressing because this majestic "hero ship" as Navy men refer to her has begun to deteriorate.

The Silversides is a United States combat submarine. It is tied up in a slip beside Navy Pier, its berth now for 22 years.

Three of us—all veterans of service in the U.S. Army, not the Navy—visited the Silversides Thursday. Frank Martin, chairman of the executive committee of the East Side Chamber of Commerce; Henry Martinez, youth worker with the Illinois Youth Commission and a member of the South Chicago Chamber, and myself, president of the South Chicago Chamber, were special guests of Chief Petty Officer James A. Wieter.

Wieter's youthful looks belie his more than two decades in the Navy. But one thing is certain. He knows submarines, and the Silversides is one of the most famous and fabled undersea vessels in history.

The official Navy history of the Silversides is lengthy and detailed. It was one of the most deadly United States submarines in World War II, and the most deadly to survive the war. It operated exclusively in the Pacific against the Japanese. The ship was sent on a total of 14 patrols from April 30, 1942 to July 30, 1945.

It accounted for the sinking of 29 enemy ships totaling 147,062 tons, and the damaging of 15 more totaling 68,560 tons.

The Silversides suffered only one fatal casualty in its entire war experience—a gunner hit by enemy machinegun fire during one of the vessel's numerous surface actions.

TM3c Mike Harbin was killed while working as a second loader in a gun battle with an armed Japanese trawler on the Silversides' very first combat patrol in the spring of 1942.

The history of the Silversides began on August 26, 1941 when she was launched at Mare Island Navy Yard, California. Technically it ended last June when she was decommissioned here in Chicago.

But it isn't over for the Silversides. The Navy will not scrap her. Eventually it might tow her into deep water and sink her, but no decision apparently has been made to date.

The Navy in the meantime is attempting to find a permanent home for the Silversides. The Navy would most like to see her established as a memorial, but thus far has had no luck. It is obviously no little task to "relocate" a 306-foot long, 1,400 ton submarine.

Then of course, Chicago already has one land-mounted submarine. The only trouble is, it is the captured German U-boat U–505, preserved at the Museum of Science and Industry. The U–505 is somewhat smaller than the Silversides—252 feet long and 1,120 tons—but when it was transported overland to the museum in 1954 it turned out to be a project of far greater magnitude than initially imagined.

The Silversides today shows neglect. She is tied up a short distance from the U.S.S. Runner, a combat snorkel submarine launched just as the war ended in 1945. The Runner is still in commission and a 24-hour watch is maintained on her. She is painted gray and is in good upkeep. She offers stark comparison to the combat weary Silversides, which has a noticeable list to starboard and is painted black.

The Silversides nearly sank last fall when with no heat on board pipes burst and tanks filled with water. She was pumped out and righted almost perfectly, but we found on our tour Thursday that the flooding left its mark. The compartments of the 29-year old veteran of World War II are damp and musty. We went down into her with flashlights and the tour extended from fore to aft. It's all still there—including two torpedoes still in their racks.

The metal table in the tiny mess on which an operation for appendicitis was performed on Fireman 3c George Platter while the craft was under attack is still in place. That event was one of the most unusual of the war. It was on December 22, 1942 shortly after the Silversides left Brisbane, Australia that Platter became ill and it was evident that an operation was imperative. The operation was performed successfully by PHM 1c T. A. Moore, and Platter recovered despite being thrown off the table twice during a depth charge attack.

The Silversides has positions for two five-inch guns, one on the superstructure and one forward. The guns are gone however, one of them on display at the Museum of Science and Industry.

The superstructure needs a new paint job, and the wood decks shows considerable wear. Bullet and shell fragment holes, some of them repaired, are visible in several places.

Not exactly afflicted with claustrophobia, this columnist after nearly an hour below deck did begin to feel somewhat closed in. It is difficult to imagine 72 enlisted men and eight officers living in such confinement during the normal 50 to 60-day patrols. But Wieter, who served aboard the snorkel sub Runner shrugged it off. He told about 58 consecutive days submerged aboard the Runner: "You read a lot and you sleep a lot. It's not so bad," he said.

We passed through the compartment on the Silversides which contained bunks for 39 men. It was smaller than most modern-home single-bed bedrooms.

Wieter lamented that for the first time some rust had begun to appear on the submarine's instruments. It is not difficult to imagine the close attachment developed by Navy men for their ships, submarines most particularly. And the Silversides has got them all beat. The 12 battle stars on her Asiatic-Pacific Area Service Medal and Presidential Unit Citation attest to that.

But today her time has passed, and this gallant lady may soon be doomed to an ignominious end—being sunk by her own country. And you really cannot appreciate such an occasion unless you have the feel of her. She's a fine ship which deserves a better fate.

Some time ago she broke her moorings and drifted into the slip and endangered another vessel. As the Navy men brought her back to her berth. Wieter related, one veteran was heard to say, "Aw, she just thought she was still out on patrol. She just can't get it out of her system."

JOHN N. NORTON, NEBRASKA STATESMAN

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I include an article written by Evelyn Lincoln, private secretary to the late President John F. Kennedy, whose father contributed much to the development of this country. The article is as follows:

JOHN N. NORTON, NEBRASKA STATESMAN

On the Fourth of July a generation ago pious speeches grew lush like the goldenrod in my native state of Nebraska. But they were not always mere bombast and platitudes; sometimes at least they were born not on the edge of the lips but deep in the heart, rooted in life's experience. Such, I think, was true of the Fourth of July address that my father, Congressman John Nathaniel Norton, gave in a small town in eastern Nebraska:

"It is fitting and proper that we should celebrate this day. In so doing we pay tribute to the founders of this Republic . . . Had they not been willing to fight for freedom, to suffer hardship, to blaze the way . . . this might never have become what it is, a free, united and strong American nation."

In Congressman Norton's case these were more than words called forth by a patriotic occasion, they were reflections of a lifetime struggle of a man and a family.

The man who stood before those people that hot summer afternoon was one of a family of trail-blazers, of hardy folk who had sought opportunity, fought for freedom, and suffered hardships all along the way. The emotional power of that Independence Day speech actually began a hundred years earlier and over 5,000 miles away in Hillesocken, Sweden. Then it was that Olaf and Catherina Nordeen, their daughter and three sons had gathered together their small store of belongings and set sail for America. They knew the journey would be hard and full of danger. But their hopes were larger than their fears. Even so, hope was almost shattered when Olaf lost Catherina and one of his sons to shipboard cholera. But Olaf still dreamed of a better life for the rest of his family, so he pushed on, over the mountain barrier and along the weary miles until they reached Andover, a small Swedish settlement in Henry County, Illinois. By then his son, Charles O. Nordeen, who was to be my paternal grandfather, was seven years old.

They had hoped to find an America of opportunity, and opportunity there was in plenty, thinly disguised as hard and back-breaking labor.

They had also hoped to find an America of freedom, but the freedom they discovered depended largely upon the color of one's skin. A great shudder was going through the land as the awful question of slavery was debated, and tempers rose and hardened in North and South. By the time Charles was 21 the tension had reached the breaking point, and the Civil War had started. Both Charles and his brother Louis volunteered to fight for their new homestead under the leadership of another man from Illinois—Abraham Lincoln.

One of their first experiences was serving under a drill sergeant who never could learn to fit his tongue correctly around the name "Nordeen" so they Americanized it to "Norton."

In 1862, while the war yet raged, Congress passed a law that was to change the life of Charles O. Norton and tens of thousands of others like him. It was the Homestead Law that granted a quarter-section (160 acres) of public land to anyone who would undertake to cultivate it. Ultimately 100,000 homesteaders trekked into what is the present State of Nebraska. Among them was Charles O. Norton and his young bride, Mary Hurtig, also the child of Swedish immigrants. Finally, they reached the place upon which they were to stake their claim—a farm seven miles from what is today known as the "Swede Capital" of Nebraska—Stromsburg.

Building that first farmhouse was far different from their experience back in Illinois. For there was little or no timber in those seemingly endless miles of waving prairie grass. The only available building material was sod. So, they found a place where the grass grew unusually thick. They first plowed the ground and then cut blocks of sod 12 by 36 inches with a spade. These they piled up to form the walls of the house, using dirt and clay to stuff up the cracks and crevices at the side and ends of the sod blocks. Their first floor was bare earth. Later they bought some lumber and things began to be more pleasant. It was in this house that my father was born.

During the winter months or dry seasons nothing looked more bleak and woe-begone than that sod house. But when the rains and warm weather came, the seeds and dormant roots in the sod came to life, and the house was festooned with a gay combination of nondescript weeds, morning-glories, and prairie roses. There were times when those roses were needed to lift the spirit. For times seemed to range from difficult to terrible. Farmers looked at the burning sky week after week, as their crops withered and the ground caked hard. But there was no rain in sight.

Along with the drought came plagues of grasshoppers, alighting on the land and devouring every blade and stalk of grass, making men turn to their Bibles and read of the plagues of locusts sent down by the angry Jehovah. In the years between 1856 and 1873 there were seven such invasions, and in 1874 the insects made their most destructive attack. While the Pawnee, Omaha, Ponca and other Indian tribesmen took care of the grasshopper problem by the simple method of grinding them up into mash and eating them, the settlers who depended upon their crops for a living and who didn't care for grasshopper stew often were wiped out completely. Many sold or gave away their claims and turned back toward the East. One wagon bore the sign: "Eaten out by grasshoppers. Going back East to live with wife's folks." Others still saw before them a glimmer of hope and determined to stick it out. They turned to hunting, lived on dried buffalo meat, and traded hides and furs for food to keep them alive. Among those who held firm were the Charles O. Nortons. They made up their minds to stay on, no matter what. And their faith was rewarded by better times and eventual prosperity. The original homestead is still in the family, and my father's sister, Mrs. Nettie Carlson, lives there yet.

One of their first acts after staking their homestead claim and putting up that sod house, was to help create a spiritual life in the community. Charles O. Norton and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Helena Hurtig, started a church known as the Swede Plain Methodist Church. It lit a faint spiritual light on

that lonely prairie, one which still remains to guide the people of that community.

As a young boy my father, John Nathaniel Norton, walking along the country road and kicking the clods in front of him as he plodded to one of a series of one room school houses, somehow caught the virus of ambition and hope that hung in the air even in frontier towns like Stromsburg. While he was still a youngster he made up his mind that he was going to do something no other farm boy in that area even dreamed of—to go away to get better schooling. It wasn't the hardships and long heavy farm chores that made him dissatisfied, but he had a dream of a better life, and a life of service to the country he loved. His friends called him a "sissy" for his dream. The neighbors laughed at him. And his father too was opposed, for he knew one thing: "A man makes his living by using his hands." Grandfather was stubborn. But so was his son. He determined to gain an education with or without his father's help. And he did. Not only did he go to Business School and Nebraska Wesleyan, but he also gained his B.A. degree from the University of Nebraska, specializing in social, economic, and political sciences.

One of the greatest influences during his years of young manhood was that of another Nebraskan, the man who had electrified the Democratic Convention in 1896 by his famous "Cross of Gold" speech denouncing those who were exploiting the farmers. That man, William Jennings Bryan, was only 36 years old when he was nominated for the presidency. The election campaign that followed was among the most exciting in American history. And it swept many idealistic young people into the Democratic Party, including my father.

My father once said, "My purpose in life, as is well known to my friends and close associates, has been to devote my time and energies where I can best serve the common good."

He was a very young man when he was first elected to the Nebraska House of Representatives, but he immediately became known as a leader because of his desire to do the very best job to the best of his ability. He studied hard and soon became an authority on rules of the State Legislature. During the four terms that he served in that Legislature he was the leader of what was known as the "progressive" forces. He served in the capacity of majority floor leader during two sessions, and Speaker pro tem at another. As the Chairman of the Finance Committee he made a personal survey of various state activities, resulting in cutting the appropriations by $1,000,000.

From there he went on to serve as a member of the Nebraska Constitutional Convention, called as a result of his efforts. Later, the Democrats of Nebraska nominated him as their candidate for Governor. Although defeated in this overwhelmingly Republican State he received 45,000 more votes than the head of the ticket. And he was twice elected to the United States House of Representatives (1926, 1930).

Some of the measures which he either personally introduced or advocated during his service in the Legislature are evidence of the kind of legislation that he supported: Waterpower and municipal ownership legislation; state budget system; efficiency survey of state government; good roads and highways; unicameral legislature and a resolution providing for the calling of a constitutional convention.

Most lasting monument to the career of J. N. Norton is the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature. For 21 years he worked to bring this about, starting when he introduced the first proposed constitutional amendment to provide for a one-house legislature. He worked for this proposal because he believed it made government more responsive to the people.

"The present system," he argued, "where 17 members of the upper house can defeat the will of the other 116 members of the legislature is greater concentration of power than under a system where the entire 133 members would sit as one assembly, for then it would require a majority, or 67 members, to control legislation. The purpose of a legislature is to provide the machinery by means of which the people can secure the legislation they desire."

As a member of the Nebraska Constitutional Convention he again proposed a similar amendment. There was considerable support for the measure, but not enough for adoption. But it did bring the question before the people and the politicians. In fact, the late United States Senator George W. Norris, who too was a reformist, recognized the importance of this issue. As a result, he wrote an article on "A Model State Legislature" which stressed the importance of a unicameral legislature.

During the more than twenty years that my father worked for the constitutional change involved, he had been studying the organization and procedure of unicameral legislature and assemblies, as well as speaking all over the state on its behalf. Then in 1934 he and Senator Norris, realizing that the time was opportune, encouraged the Nebraska State Legislature to put the issue on the ballot to be voted on by the people of the state. At the time my father favored a large partisan body, but the Senator felt that it should consist of a small non-partisan body. They compromised and the amendment was submitted for a non-political body of 43 members. Together they stumped the state and as a result the unicameral legislature became a reality to go into effect in 1937.

Because of his interest in the success of the unicameral legislature, my father filed as a candidate to be a member of the first session. He felt that successful functioning of this first session would not only permanently establish the system in Nebraska, but would cause other states to adopt a similar plan in the years to come. He was elected and with him brought the knowledge he had gained in his legislative experience. He realized the importance of the rules for any legislative body, so he drafted the rules and by the time the gavel fell announcing the first session the rules had been written. He asked for and was granted the chairmanship of the Rules Committee. Through his leadership, his rules were adopted. To this day, those rules still stand.

Time and time again he came to the defense of the unicameral principle. Seventeen years later there was a strong movement to change back to a bicameral legislature. Once again he came out against the change and he issued statements to the press to that effect. He said:

"When compared with the bicameral Legislature, the Unicameral Legislature has so many advantages, for instance, simplified procedure, simplified representation, less duplication, less loss of effort, more work completion, less unfinished business, much greater efficiency, lower legislative expenses, fewer bills, fewer committees, greater fixed responsibility, less 'log rolling,' and no need for conference committees, which is the most objectionable part of a bicameral legislature."

The advantages of the unicameral Legislature are so very definite, a fact which is rapidly becoming recognized by many students of good government in other states.

It might be noted that in July 1969, in frustration at the lack of legislative response, the Governor of New Jersey reversed his previous stand and now thinks a unicameral legislature would be a good idea for his state.

In addition to his lifelong effort for more democratic government, my father also worked to secure economic justice for the farmer. As he also said in this Fourth of July speech:

"If I were asked to point to an industry where equality has been denied, I would point to agriculture . . The farmer knows that he has no control over the rainfall, the sunshine and the various elements that enter into the production of his crop."

My father, who had been active in the agriculture field all of his life, was a spokesman for the farmer. He was President of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation. He was likewise active in the Farmer's Union where he served as Executive Legislative Secretary. And as a Member of Congress he requested and was given an appointment to serve on the House Agriculture Committee. He felt that when the farmers' buying power is destroyed the merchant, the banker, the professional man, others in the rural town are affected first, but that injury is later reflected elsewhere throughout the land. Whenever the buying power of the farmer is destroyed, the market for a considerable part of the manufactured products of the country is materially reduced or destroyed.

Following the conclusion of the first session of the unicameral legislature, he returned to Washington and again took up his fight for the farmers. This time he was interested in giving the farmer some protection against the hazards brought about by the elements. He was particularly interested in what would be known as federal crop insurance.

The basic purpose of this idea was to promote the general welfare by providing farmers the opportunity to strengthen their financial position. With the help of others he went through all of the steps of interesting the Department of Agriculture and getting clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. Finally, after many hours, many weeks of contacting the members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, the bill was considered on the floor of the House and the Senate and became law. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was created within the Department of Agriculture under title V of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, approved February 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 72: 7 U.S.C. 1501), but only on a one year trial basis. During that year, as an employee of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, he travelled all over the United States on behalf of this program. It proved itself and is now a permanent feature of our government's agricultural program, a second monument for a concerned public servant.

In concluding his Fourth of July speech, my father departed from the usual unquestioning praise of country and asked people to think seriously about the real nature of America.

"What constitutes patriotism? It cannot be measured by our wealth or by our Nation's prestige among the Nations of the World. It cannot be measured by the Nation's resources in material substance; by the size of our Army and our Navy; by the boasting we do with reference to our greatness and our supremacy, but by the character of our people—of the men and women, the boys and girls."

What about the character of the man who made this speech? Did it match his words? Many seemed to think it did. For example, when he was nominated as the Democratic candidate for Governor, a leading newspaper commented that:

"If called to the governorship, Mr. Norton will go into the office free of any embarrassing obligations. He will be in a position to give the people of Nebraska his best and most conscientious service. His high character and sincerity of purpose are unquestioned by those who know him. He is not of the political school that makes lavish promises before election and forgets all about them afterward."

Another paper said that:

"One of the strong elements in favor of the candidacy of Mr. Norton is the loyalty

manifest for him by the people of his home county . . . If there is anything wrong with a candidate, his neighbors and friends at home are pretty apt to be familiar with it, and reflect their attitude towards him by their votes."

One of his later lectures on the Chautauqua platform was entitled "Diamonds in the Rough." It was an inspirational lecture assailing subterfuge, sham and make-believe as opposed to the genuine in life. It was an appeal for the real, painting in glowing terms the beautiful in nature, the virtuous in human life and the worthwhile in the efforts of mankind. His motto was always: "Be yourself, whatever it be, but be the best and the most that you can."

Not every father is able to leave to his children a big estate made up of lands, mortgages, and bonds, but any father can bequeath to his children an estate worth infinitely more. He can leave an honorable name, a good reputation, the memory of a godly life, a record of fair dealing. He can teach his children to have a profound respect for fact, a deep reverence for character, a thirst for knowledge, and a willingness to work.

This was the heritage of my father, J. N. Norton.

LAW DAY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation observes Law Day on May 1st, I think Americans should think about acceptance and enforcement of the law. For the benefit of my colleagues, I should like to include the text of my Law Day statement on this subject in the RECORD:

This year's Law Day theme emphasizes that law is a bridge to social goals and to the solution of conflicts in our society. It is not a lack of laws that keeps us from our goals, it is our failure to enforce the laws we already have. And that failure to enforce law traces to the basic reality that laws to be enforced must be generally—almost universally—accepted.

Our whole system of criminal process—our small police force, our court system, our lengthy trial procedures—is based on the assumption that only a small percentage of the population—acting as individuals—violate the law. When large numbers do—as in our big cities—and when organized crime is big business—the system breaks down.

College students have disregarded the law in their attempt to impose their views forcibly on others in the academic community. Students can claim no more privilege with respect to the law than anyone else. Indeed, by virtue of their education and opportunities—as well as of the generous awards of city, state and federal money—they have an especial responsibility to the law. But administration and faculty members must also carry out their responsibility to maintain an environment in which conflicts can be resolved and in which freedom of speech is protected for all groups. The college has effective weapons at hand—withdrawal of scholarships, suspension, and expulsion. If these weapons are used, there will be little need for outside action by either police or legislators. The fact that these weapons are not used probably means that the laws are not universally accepted on college campuses.

Postal workers in their attempt to get higher pay have disregarded the law. Although it is illegal for government employees to strike, numerous postal workers have participated in wildcat strikes. If the strikes had spread nationwide, all of us would have suffered unemployment, business losses, failure to receive pension checks and other hardships. The Army might be able to deliver the mail—if it did nothing else—but it cannot direct airway traffic, man the railroads, collect the garbage, and stand in for other striking government employees all at the same time. Thus, again the significance of universal acceptance of law if law is to be enforced.

Our pollution problems would be much smaller if the antipollution laws were enforced. But we are a nation of litterbugs. The vacant lots near my home are dumping grounds for old mattresses, beer cans, and worn out tires. One of the people who dumped there left license plates. I found them and informed the police, but the police told me they could not prosecute because no one witnessed the dumping. It does little good to pass an antidumping law unless the people accept it.

Almost as important as acceptance is enforcement. Homeowners are unwilling to spend money for sewers and to pay taxes to build sewage treatment plants. Industry pours liquid and solid wastes into our streams and rivers and releases manufacturing by-products into the air. Water is unfit for human use, and the air is almost impossible to breathe.

Only citizen consensus can turn disregard for the law into acceptance and enforcement of the law. This means citizen awareness—on the campus, in the government, and in every community—that we are all dependent on the law and helpless without it.

THE SECOND GRADE IS CONCERNED WITH POLLUTION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, long after the speeches and press releases died down from Earth Day, the second grade at Oak Hill Elementary School is still working.

They took us serious.

These children really believe that we are going to "do something" about ending pollution.

And they are willing to do their part to help.

Mr. Speaker, these children have agreed to "sacrifice a play period once every 2 weeks to clean our school grounds," according to their teacher, Mrs. Mary Scalco. In proportion to their love for play, this is quite a sacrifice indeed. On Earth Day, these youngsters participated by collecting trash on the school grounds and again at home.

Mr. Speaker, I know, from raising my own children, that there are many things that second-grade boys and girls would much rather do than pick up the grown-ups' garbage. Hence, their concern is genuine, their actions real, and their faith in government simple and to the point.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the letters these children wrote to me today. Each is short—only one or two sentences—but each cuts directly to the point. Each is completely devoid of adult shams and hangups. Each asks for action.

I would begin with the letter from their teacher, Mrs. Mary Scalco:

OAK HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Austin, Tex., April 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My second grade class is very concerned with the environmental problems that face our country. They participated in Earth Day by collecting trash on the school grounds and at home. They have agreed to sacrifice a play period once every two weeks to again clean our school grounds. They have read of the problems in their weekly readers and are truly aware of the crisis.

They have done something else by now participating in the democratic process by writing their congressmen. We know that you will read them and listen to the voices of the future teachers and congressmen. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY SCALCO.

Mr. Speaker, now, let us let the children speak for themselves:

APRIL 24, 1970.

DEAR HON. J. J. PICKLE: Please try to stop noise and water pollution and to stop air pollution. People burn trash and the smoke goes into the air.

Love,

DENISE.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Why don't you help us? There is to much noise in the world.

Love,

CINDY WOODMAN.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: I wish you could stop pollution please try.

Yours truly,

MARK.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Please help us. Would you help us? People are making pollution. They are making our world look bad. They are throwing things in the street.

DAWN SCOTT.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: I want to stop the noise. I am tired of hearing roar, rumble, rattle, beep. Would you please? I would be very, very, happy.

Love,

BRIDGETTE BILLINGS.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We want you to please stop the air pollution and water pollution. We want something to go with it. Our State is looking just nasty. The world is not looking good at all. So please do something to it.

Love,

BONNIE.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Please end the air water and noise pollution.

Love,

SHARI ANDERSON.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: I am try my best to keep the world clean. And I hope everyone is too. The noise, air, and water pollution is ugly. But, I can live.

Love,

MICHELE RICHARDS.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We think that you could help us with noise. Noise can make people not sleep and too much noise can make people deaf.

Love,

DONNY.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: The water pollution is bad here in Texas.

Thank you sir.

You're a good man.

CLARISSA LAVON SHEARER.

I love you Mr. Pickle.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We want our city to be cleaned. And I want you to be a Senator.

BILLY MARX.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Please Washington, D.C., please clean up our city.

Love,

STEVEN.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We want the earth to look pretty and the water to look clean.

——— ———.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Please help make noise quieter in the world. I know a girl that has been deaf from noise. I've been trying my best to keep trash in the country to be clean.

DEBBIE MACKEY.

APRIL 25, 1970.

DEAR SIR: We want something done about this stuff. It is beeping and noise.

Love,

CINDY LEE WALLIS.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: The pollution is horrible and dirty. Why don't you do something about it? It is very, very nasty and horrible. I hope you do something about it.

Love,

LEE ADA.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We need your help! The noise is horrible. I think you should do something about it.

Yours truly,

CONRAD WILSON.

APRIL 23, 1970.

DEAR SENATOR HONORABLE J. J. PICKLE: Please keep our dirty world clean.

NOEL.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: Keep our earth clean please.

Your friend,

DAVID.

APRIL 24, 1970.

DEAR J. J. PICKLE: Please Washington, D.C. You have to do something about this pollution. You got to do something about this. J. J. Pickle.

Love,

GENE.

APRIL 24, 1970.

Hon. J. J. PICKLE.

DEAR SIR: We want to breathe. It is too noisy and dirty. It is terrible. The water is ugly and the air is ugly. So help us please. We want it cleaned up now.

Yours truly,

MONA PIPER.

Mr. Speaker, how can I answer these children? All they ask is that we reverse our ecological slaughter and give them a fighting chance to grow up in a reasonably clean world.

Obviously, as a single Member of Congress, I cannot do what these children ask—I cannot alone bring an end to the urgly side of our technology that has caused our pollution monster.

But the Federal and States Government can, if it will strip away the unwieldy empires that have been built up within our bureaucracy. Earlier, I pointed out that we have too many pollution watchdogs and not a single keeper of the hounds. We are polluted with fragmented pollution control jurisdictions: this includes five Councils within the White House, eight major departments, five independent agencies, 19 congressional committees, and three Federal pollution control agencies. And I can say with certainty that surely I have left someone out.

Mr. Speaker, in mid-April the President plans to announce his plans for governmental reorganization. At that time, I hope he will move most, if not all, of the Federal environmental efforts to Cabinet-level status under the Department of Interior. I know he is considering renaming the Department of Interior and I would caution against a press release approach in this field. We need more than news letterheads and a new emblem for the Interior Department—we need action and control.

That is what these kids are asking. We should listen. We should act.

FORMER ICC MEMBER REBUTS CHARGES BY NADER'S ASSISTANTS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I read and found the following article to be of great interest. It answers many of the questions that have been of concern to those involved in the transportation industry. I am at this time inserting the article into the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read this responsible answer to consumers:

FORMER ICC MEMBER REBUTS CHARGES BY NADER'S ASSISTANTS

(NOTE.—The following was excerpted from an address by Charles A. Webb, president of the National Assn. of Motor Bus Operators, at the annual meeting of the New England Bus Assn. in Boston. Mr. Webb, a former practicing lawyer and Senate staff attorney served with distinction as a member of the ICC for nearly 10 years. His commentary was directed to testimony by associates of Ralph Nader, who is usually described as a "consumers' advocate.")

The battle report of Nader's Raiders was predictably hostile since their chief, presuming to speak for all the tribes of consumers, had previously declared the Commission to be a captive of the regulated industry and not fit to survive. The techniques of innuendo and distortion employed by the youthful raiders in their assault on the Commission are those employed by demagogues of every generation since the beginning of time.

. . . I want to make a sharp distinction between responsible and irresponsible criticism. Nader's Raiders are not the first to urge abolition of the commission. Professor George W. Hilton, for example, believes that the ICC is "virtually a pure cartel" and that, with the creation of the Department of Transportation, "one may now advocate its abolition with no qualification as to the retention of its noncartelizing functions elsewhere." Mr. Hilton and the youthful raiders share the belief that some of the most important functions of the Commission are economically indefensible. Included among the functions they would eliminate are controls over motor carrier entry, and authority to determine the minimum reasonableness of rates.

POINTS UP DIFFERENCE

There are vital differences, however, between Mr. Hilton's criticism of the Commission and that of Nader's Raiders. Mr. Hilton's views, however much you may disagree with them, are based on knowledge of the transportation industry, the Interstate Commerce Act, and Commission and judicial decisions. Also, Mr. Hilton's views are presented with no trace of vilification, malice, or argument ad hominem. By contrast, the report of Nader's Raiders is such a mishmash of distortion, exaggeration and misrepresentation that to excuse it on grounds of immaturity or ignorance would be far too generous.

There is another striking difference between the responsible criticism of Professor Hilton and the irresponsible criticism of Nader's Raiders. Mr. Hilton draws from his analysis the logical conclusion that the Commission ought to be abolished. Nader's Raiders, on the other hand, ostensibly call for abolition of the Commission but actually recommend creation of a consolidated transportation regulatory agency in which the Commission would be the dominant component.

The bulk of the report of Nader's Raiders is a 61-count indictment charging the Commission explicitly or implicitly with various acts of misfeasance and nonfeasance. These unsupported allegations are described erroneously . . . as "specific recommendations." References herein to the "report" of Nader's Raiders are to the prepared statement of testimony of Mr. Robert Fellmeth which he, accompanied by six other law students, presented to the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Surface Transportation. . . .

DESCRIBES MATERIAL

In addition to this 23-page prepared statement, three large volumes of copyrighted material were submitted to the Subcommittee. Each of these volumes bears the notation "Preliminary Draft—Uncorrected Copy for Receiver's Use Only." The first two volumes aggregate 734 pages in length while the third consists of several hundred pages of appendices. This uncorrected preliminary draft material is claimed to be the documentation for the charges leveled against the Commission. However, copies of the three volumes of documents were not made available to the Commission or to other interested parties. In fact, the three volumes, which allegedly support the 61 charges against the Commission, state on their cover page: "No part of this report may be reproduced in any form or by any means, execpt for brief quotations, without permission in writing from Robert C. Fellmeth or Ralph Nader." It is ironic that the Freedom of Information Act was the authority under which the raiders ransacked the files of the Commission.

The reckless nature of the charges in the report of Nader's Raiders can be illustrated by citing some which relate to the major portion of the Commission's caseload.

OPERATING RIGHTS

Charge: "The ICC has constructed barriers to entry into the transportation industry, barriers which protect the inefficient."

The charge is untrue. Controls on carrier entry have been constructed by the Congress, which does not regard such controls as outmoded barriers for the protection of inefficient carriers. Since 1957, controls on motor carrier entry, for example, have been tightened by six amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. The only relaxation was an unimportant amendment in 1963 exempting from economic regulation the transportation of accidentally wrecked or disabled vehicles.

Charge: "Carriers are not granted certification so long as existing carriers are potentially able to carry the traffic."

Potential ability to handle available traffic, as distinguished from demonstrated willingness and ability, has never been sufficient to defeat a gran of operating authority. Last year, for example, the Commission processed 4,902 applications for motor carrier operating authority. Of this number, 3,838 applications were granted in whole or in part. A total of 488 grants were made to carriers entering the motor carrier field for the first time.

RATES AND PRACTICES

Charge: "Low cost, low efficiency carriers are protected by the rate bureau—restriction process the industry has created through the ICC."

I cite this charge mainly to show that some portions of the report are unintelligible.

Charge: "The ICC's minimum rate powers are used to protect inefficient carriers and modes from competition."

This charge illustrates the rank oversimplification which permeates the report of the raiders. Section 15(a)(3) of the Act, for example, conveys no clear message but only a mood, a mood which can best be described as schizophrenic. Critics of the Commission's handling of intermodal rate controversies will recognize, if they are fair, that the statute is ambivalent and a severe handicap to agency formulation of sound intermodal ratemaking policy.

Charge: "The ICC continues to allow value-of-service pricing . . . [which] has directly contributed to urbanization, congestion and pollution."

Persons who can find a cause-and-effect relationship between value-of-service ratemaking and ecological deterioration would have no difficulty, of course, in fabricating links between Commissioners' appearances at industry meetings and voting on the merits of cases.

CARRIER UNIFICATIONS

Charge: "The ICC has failed to consider the impact of major rail mergers on the shipping public, despite the legal requirement to do so, and has generally rubber-stamped merger requests."

Charge: "The ICC has also routinely approved motor carrier mergers, despite the lack of natural economies of scale for the mode."

Published reports of the Commission bear witness to the contrary. Section 5 of the Act has not been amended in any significant way in the last 30 years. Rail unifications approved by the Commission have been upheld by the courts with hardly a dissenting vote. Logically, the anti-merger bias of the raiders would lead to castigation of the Congress and the Supreme Court rather than the Commission.

Charge: "The railroads have caused the decline of the passenger train because of greater profits on freight traffic."

Charge: "The ICC has done virtually nothing but preside over the funeral."

With respect to the latter charge, the Commission has followed the mandate of Section 13a which the Congress has not amended since its enactment by the Transportation Act of 1958. As to the former charge, the decline of rail passenger service is due essentially to the preference of consumers for other modes of travel, a preference which their self-appointed defenders fail to mention.

I have commented on only nine of the 61 "specific recommendations." The other 52 are equally meretricious. In addition, the report of Nader's Raiders contains some glaring contradictions. For example, compare the following statement on page 20 of the report: "Relations between the public and the ICC have been non-existent—The ICC does not discourage esoteric annual reports, news releases etc., which only the transportation industry can understand."

With the following statement on page 4: "In fact, the only vigor the agency has shown is in its own public relations."

The gravamen of the raider's indictment, upon which various changes are rung, is the following statement on page 3 of their report: "Rather, the ICC has become an extension of the industry it supposedly regulates. In a very real sense, the industry regulates the ICC."

Imagination boggles in visualizing a prisoner deciding the bread and butter disputes of its carrier and modal captors. The transportation industry regulated by the Commission is not monolithic. Most of the proceedings before the Commission are initiated, not by the regulated industry, but by its warring members and factions. I would like to examine the captivity charge in the narrower context of proceedings instituted by the Commission on its own motion and with particular reference to those vitally affecting the motor carrier industry.

At all times since the beginning of Federal regulation in 1935, the motor carrier industry, including intercity bus operators, has been involved in proceedings initiated by the Commission either on its own initiative or in response to a plea from some non-carrier interest. The affected carriers and their associations have often disagreed with the Commission, sometimes violently. At no time, however, have the carriers or their associations had any basis for questioning the integrity of the Commission, nor have our adversaries in these proceedings. During most of the 35 years of regulation the Commission has been short of funds and staff, a condition which the report of Nader's Raiders is more likely to aggravate than to alleviate even though, oddly enough, many of their recommendations could not be effectuated without a substantial increase in money and manpower.

You may wonder why I have chosen to respond to these accusations when it has been customary to ignore such screeds in the past. My reasons are three. First, there is the proclivity of the press to give extensive publicity to anything bearing the Nader brand. Secondly, there is a mistaken impression among those who will never read the report that if seven law students hurl literally scores of charges against the Commission, at least a few by the law of averages must be valid. And thirdly, the platform for this most recent attack against the Commission was erected by the Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation which should have anticipated the bilious nature of the report but which, inexplicably, provided no opportunity for prompt rebuttal by the Commission.

In conclusion, we can admire the zeal of the younger generation and its concern about our society's winter of discontent. Also, we should not expect law students in a single summer in Washington to grasp the intricacies of the entire field of surface transportation and its regulation by the Commission. There is a point, however, where tolerance ceases to be a virtue and becomes an accessory to defamation. That point is reached when misrepresentation is so massive and consistent that it can only be deliberate.

THEN THERE WERE TWO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Judge Blackmun, the most recent of Supreme Court appointees, must be a truly remarkable man. From all indications he pleases and satisfies members of both parties, the press, and the stringent criteria of morals and ethics of the heretofore extremist critics. Judge Blackmun's confirmation seems assured—in fact, it may be unanimous.

Overlooked, is the liberal egalitarian semantics of equal representation—the "one-man, one-vote" philosophy of fair representation as well as the multispectrum, philosophical background which has been advanced as being so necessary in the search for truth.

Of those many voices, so adamant to prevent one southerner from being seated on the Supreme Court, none have raised any question of the fairness that two out of the 11 judges will be not only from the same section of our country—the Midwest—but from the same State.

We of the South—the cradle of the history of the United States, with our strict constructionalist law and order philosophy, denied sectional as well as philosophical representation on the Court—remain an unrepresented people in the interpretation of our laws.

A small satisfaction comes only in the recollection that Minnesota was a portion of the Louisiana Purchase.

So that our colleagues can see the broad base of support for Judge Blackmun, I include excerpts of several news reports and items, and a column by David Lawrence on sectionalism as part of my remarks:

[From Time magazine, Apr. 27, 1970]

NIXON MAKES A WINNING CHOICE

The Senate's rejection of two consecutive Supreme Court nominees made most of Washington jittery about predicting how President Nixon's third choice would fare. Certainly, if only in a show of consistency, the Senators will carefully examine the credentials of last week's nominee, Minnesotan Harry A. Blackmun. Barring any disclosures of judicial misbehavior, the general approval greeting the nomination makes it all but certain that the President has finally come up with a winner.

The Democratic liberals and Republican moderates who effectively blocked Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell show no signs of objecting to Blackmun. Even Joseph Rauh Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and a slashing foe of the first two nominees, conceded last week that "President Nixon's nomination at long last of a judicial moderate validates the liberal efforts against Judges Haynsworth and Cars-

well." Civil rights groups also seem pleased with Blackmun. John Pemberton Jr., executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, praised the 61-year-old federal judge as a man with "a capacity for objectivity and fairness in the highest degree, combined with a high intellect and sharply honed legal mind."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 11, 1970]

MINNESOTAN MAY BE NIXON CHOICE FOR HIGH COURT

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. Circuit Court Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Rochester, Minn., is being seriously considered for nomination to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge Blackmun, 61, has been a member of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 8th Judicial Circuit—covering seven Midwestern states from Minnesota and the Dakotas to Arkansas—since 1959.

One factor that could lessen Judge Blackmun's chances is his Minnesota residence, since there is already one Supreme Court member—Chief Justice Warren E. Burger—from Minnesota.

Judge Blackmun's nomination would seem assured of strong bipartisan support from Minnesota congressional figures. He is highly regarded as a judge by Democrats and was supported for the circuit court in 1959—to which he was appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower—by then-Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey.

On the circuit court Judge Blackmun has figured in a number of notable decisions.

He wrote the opinion for a three-judge panel that forced the Minnesota Legislature to reapportion itself at its 1965 session. In that case the court found the existing apportionment in violation of the U.S. Constitution and directed that it be revised in line with the previously issued Supreme Court "one man, one vote" ruling.

He issued an injunction in 1968 delaying the induction into the Army of a Bemidji, Minn., draft resister so that the case could be heard by the full circuit court. In that case, Judge Blackmun found that the individual would be subject to "irreparable injury" if his induction was not delayed, while the local draft board would suffer "little injury" from a delay.

He was a member of a three-judge panel which in 1968 ordered Minnesota's secretary of state to place the Communist Party ticket on the presidential election ballot that year.

The panel did not act on a challenge raised on that case to the underlying federal Communist Control Act, saying that it would be "unwise" to try to resolve the issues on their merits in the short time then available. But Judge Blackmun was one of two judges on the panel who expressed doubts about the constitutionality of the anti-Communist statute.

Earlier in that same year, Judge Blackmun was a member of a three-judge panel which rejected a challenge by supporters of Sen. Eugene McCarthy to the composition of the Minnesota delegation to the 1968 Democratic national convention.

In that case, the court found that delegate selection at the precinct level had been in accord with the "one man, one vote" rule, and that any violation of that principle at higher levels in the party selection process raised questions which were essentially political and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the court.

In August 1969, Judge Blackmun wrote a decision overturning the second-degree murder conviction of an Iowa man who had been imprisoned 34 years for the crime. The decision was based on a finding that the instructions to the jury by the Iowa court violated the Constitution.

Judge Blackmun is a native of Nashville, Ill., who was graduated with highest honors from Harvard in 1929 and received his law degree there three years later.

He came to Minnesota in 1932 to serve as law clerk to Judge B. Sanborn of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals.

He joined the Minneapolis firm of Dorsey, Owen, Barker, Scott and Barber in 1933, became a junior partner in 1939 and a full partner in 1943. In 1950, he became resident counsel of the Mayo Clinic and served in that position until his appointment to the 8th circuit bench.

He served as an instructor at the St. Paul College of Law and later at the University of Minnesota Law School while living in Minneapolis.

His extra-legal associations over the years include service as director of the Rochester Airport Corp. from 1952 to 1959 and as a director of the Kahler Corp., Rochester, from 1958 to 1964.

He was secretary and a member of the board of directors of the Mayo Association in Rochester from 1953 to 1960, and has been a director and member of the executive committee of the Rochester Methodist Hospital since 1954.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 15, 1970]

NIXON SELECTS BLACKMUN FOR SUPREME COURT SEAT

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Minnesota was chosen by President Nixon Tuesday to be an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Blackmun, 61, has been a judge of the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals since 1959.

The former Minneapolis attorney lives in Rochester, Minn., where he served for nearly a decade as counsel of the Mayo Clinic.

* * * * *

One factor that should smooth the way for Judge Blackmun was the favorable reaction of Minnesota's two Democratic senators and of former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey.

Humphrey called Judge Blackmun "a fine man and an excellent nominee. He is without racial bias. He is a political moderate, a competent lawyer and a respected judge."

* * * * *

His court philosophy—"I guess in a way I'm brought up in the (Supreme Court Associate Justice) Felix Frankfurter tradition. My answer is that my record has to speak for itself."

Change in court rulings—"Law is, in part, social. Man is a social being. I can't get alarmed when they overrule a prior decision, especially if it is 5–4. Who is to say that five men 10 years ago were right, whereas five men looking the other direction today are wrong?"

Social protest by the young—Judge Blackmun said he had great faith in the younger generation, that it is more idealistic and more involved. But, he added, "I have no sympathy with violence . . . We can't bring the structure tumbling down around our ears."

His reaction to the nomination—"I feel like a load of bricks was landed on me."

Judge Blackmun, a boyhood friend of Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, praised him but emphasized, "We do not always see eye to eye. If by chance this thing (the nomination) should go through, he would be the first to expect that we would disagree.

"This has been the history of our life, that we've been able to disagree on things and have fun doing it."

The two men grew up only a few blocks from each other in Dayton's Bluff, a tough, poor neighborhood of St. Paul that Judge Blackmun describes as "the wrong side of the tracks."

Judge Blackmun, 61, is known as an endless worker and an untiring legal scholar. His chief relaxation is working evenings in the yard of his Rochester home, which he bought 18 years ago for $58,770, and which has doubled in value.

"I can take my frustrations out by getting my fingers in the soil a little bit," Judge Blackmun said.

A heart murmur kept Judge Blackman out of World War II, but it has never limited his activity and he describes himself "in disgustingly good health."

He keeps a green eyeshade in his law offices and still uses it when he is working late at night. According to his friends, he rarely takes more than one drink at a party.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Apr. 26, 1970]

BLACKMUN CIVIL RIGHTS RULINGS CITED

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The Justice Department has cited five Arkansas civil rights cases, each decided by Supreme Court nominee Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Minnesota, as representative of Judge Blackmun's decisions.

While it probably carries no significance it nevertheless is interesting to note that in each of the five cases Judge Blackmun ruled in favor of the Negro plaintiffs or defendants.

A study of the cases shows that in most instances Judge Blackmun overruled state courts as well as the federal district court in arriving at his decisions for the Eighth United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The first case cited by the Justice Department was that of Luther Bailey, a Negro convicted of rape in September, 1956, in Little Rock by an all-white jury and sentenced to death. His petition for a writ of habeas corpus, alleging Negroes illegally were excluded from the jury, was denied by the Arkansas Supreme Court and the United States District Court. Judge Blackmun, writing for the appellate court, March 17, 1961, overruled the lower courts, granted the petition, and gave the state nine months in which to re-try the defendant or to free him.

Lonnie Mitchell Jr., a 23-year-old Negro with a sixth grade education and no prior criminal record, was convicted in El Dorado, March 10, 1959, of raping a 77-year-old white woman. The victim testified against him but died sometime after the conviction. Mitchell confessed, and a recording was made of his confession, though his attorney was not present at the time. The conviction was affirmed by the Arkansas Supreme Court. Federal District Judge Gordon E. Young confirmed the conviction. In 1965, Judge Blackmun, acting for the federal appellate court, reversed Judge Young and ordered the state to give the defendant a hearing on the issue of the voluntariness of his confession or to give him a new trial.

In the summer of 1965, a total of 172 of the 176 Negro students who had attended L. V. Sullivan High School in Morrilton advised local school authorities that in the next school term they planned to attend other, integrated schools. The school board thereupon decided to close Sullivan High. The elderly Negro principal was retired and the seven Negro teachers were not re-hired. These actions were upheld by federal District Judge J. Smith Henley. Judge Blackmun overruled Judge Henley, held the teachers were entitled to damages, and ordered that they be given priority for new jobs in Morrilton schools, if they wanted them.

On July 26, 1967, Judge Blackmun ruled that a school desegregation plan for West Memphis School District No. 4 did not meet constitutional requirements. He ordered federal District Judge Young to see that faculty and staff were integrated, and directed that Young require reports from local school authorities, no less frequent than semi-an-

nually. The plan Judge Blackmun overruled previously had been approved by Judge Young.

The last of the five "representative" cases cited by the Justice Department involved school desegregation in El Dorado and was decided by Judge Blackmun on March 17, 1970, seven days before President Nixon's school desegregation policy statement.

Writing in the El Dorado case, Judge Blackmun applauded the federal district court's plan for integrating a white and a Negro high school even though it required substantial busing. "The high school result," he wrote, "was accomplished with pairing and transportation for the two facilities are some distance apart." He noted with approval a suggestion that two rather isolated elementary schools be closed and their students bused elsewhere. He observed that four elementary schools "are located in black neighborhoods" but nevertheless ordered them to be integrated.

Judge Blackmun's opinions, as expressed in the El Dorado case, are more liberal than those enunciated by the President in his policy statement. The president endorsed the neighborhood school concept and said "transportation of pupils beyond normal geographic school zones for the purpose of achieving racial balance will not be required."

[From Who's Who in American Women]

Blackmun, Mrs. Harry Andrew, club woman; b. Cloquet, Minn., Dec. 12, 1910; d. Paul Futhey and Emma Eugenia (Anderson) Clark; student Maclester Coll., 1929–31, U. Minn., 1945–47; m. Harry Andrew Blackmun, June 21, 1941; children—Nancy, Sally, Suzi. Sec. to pres. H. M. Smyth Co., Inc., St. Paul, 1935–41. Treas. Aldrich Meml. Nursery Sch., 1952–54; chmn. UN Week, 1956; pres. women's auxiliary Rochester Methodist Hosp., 1954–57. recipient good citizenship award, Radio Sta. KROC, 1959. Mem. Minn Hist. Soc., Assn. UN (bd. dirs. Rochester), Minn. Hosp. Assn. (dist. chmn., bd. drs. auxiliary). Home: 38 Skyline Dr., Sunnyslopes, Rochester, Minn.

[From Who's Who in America]

Blackmun, Harry Andrew, judge; b. Nashville, Ill., Nov. 12, 1908; s. Corwin Manning and Theo H. (Reuter) B.; B.A. summa cum laude, Harvard, 1929, LL. B., 1932; m. Dorothy E. Clark, June 21, 1941; children—Nancy Clark, Sally Ann, Susan Manning. Admitted to Minn. bar, 1932; law clk. for John B. Sanborn, judge 8th circuit, U.S. Ct. of Appeals, St. Paul, 1932–33; asso. Dorsey, Owen, Barker, Scott & Barber, Mpls., 1934–38, jr. partner, 1939–42, gen. partner, 1943–50; instr. St. Paul Col. Law, 1935–41, U. Minn. Law Sch., 1945–47; resident counsel Mayo Clinic, Mayo Assn., Rochester, 1950–59, mem. sect. administrn., 1950–59; judge 8th Cir., U.S. Ct. of Appeals, 1959——. Dir. Rochester Airport Co., 1952–59, Kahler Corp., 1958–64. Bd. publs. Methodist Ch. Sec., mem. bd. members Mayo Assn., Rochester, 1953–60; board directors, mem. executive committee Rochester Methodist Hosp., 1954——. Trustee Hamline Univ., William Mitchell Coll. Law. Mem. Am., Minn., Almsted County, 3d Jud. Dist. bar assns., Phi Beta Kappa. Methodist. Clubs: Harvard of Minn. (pres. 1940); Rotary (pres. Rochester 1955–56); Minneapolis, Univ. Rochester. Contbr. profl. articles legal, med. jours. Home: 38 Skyline Dr. Office: Rochester, Minn.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune]

COURT APPEARS SPLIT ON RED CONTROL ACT

(By Frank Wright)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Supreme Court demonstrated Tuesday that it is divided over the Minnesota case challenging the constitutionality of the 1954 Communist Control Act.

Donovan, a DFLer, was complying with an opinion issued by state Atty. Gen. Douglas Head, a Republican, who said the 1954 law, drafted by Democrat Hubert Humphrey when he was in the Senate, denied the Communist Party the rights and privileges normally granted to "legal bodies."

Subsequently a panel of three federal judges, acting at the Communist Party's request, ordered the party's candidates placed on the ballot.

The panel included 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Harry Blackmun of Rochester, Minn., President Nixon's most recent nominee for the Supreme Court.

The panel said the people of Minnesota could not be hurt by the presence of the Communists on the ballot. Judge Blackmun and another member of the panel, District Judge Edward Devitt, also expressed "grave doubts" about the constitutionality of the law, but did not rule on the issue.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 22, 1970]

LET REDS ENTER RACES, MINNESOTAN ASKS COURT

(By Lyle Denniston)

A Minneapolis lawyer has urged the Supreme Court to clear the way for Communist party candidates to enter state and national political campaigns in Minnesota this fall.

The party's candidates for president and vice president were permitted to run in Minnesota in 1968, but only under a temporary order issued by a three-judge court. The court included the man President Nixon has nominated to the Supreme Court, U.S. Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Rochester, Minn.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 20, 1970]

BLACKMUN SAYS HE FAVORS END OF DEATH PENALTY

ROCHESTER, MINN.—Supreme Court nominee Judge Harry A. Blackmun says that he personally is opposed to the death penalty and would not be surprised if it is ruled unconstitutional soon.

But Judge Blackmun, who has upheld the death sentence in past decisions, did not say how he would vote if he is confirmed.

Judge Blackmun could become the tie-breaking member of the court, thought to be deadlocked on whether the death penalty should be banned as cruel and inhuman.

The legal struggle has halted all legal executions in the United States for nearly three years. More than 500 prisoners are waiting on "death rows" across the country.

Judge Blackmun in an interview, said that repeal of the death penalty is basically a legislative issue. He said that, if he were a lawmaker, he would vote against the death sentence.

But he added:

"I guess I would say it wouldn't surprise me if one day the Supreme Court would say today in 1970 or 1980 that it is cruel and inhuman. Maybe we are progressing in our attitudes . . . toward criminal law."

Judge Blackmun, who sits on the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals, acknowledged that his personal views against the death penalty could plunge his nomination into dispute in the Senate.

"This will be a matter of grave concern to, I suppose, some senators," Judge Blackmun said.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 24, 1970]

BLACKMUN AND RIGHTS OF THE POOR

(By Lyle Denniston)

Harry A. Blackmun's first tough choice as a Supreme Court justice—assuming he gets the job—may be picking his side in the constitutional dispute over the rights of the poor.

It is likely to be, for him, an intensely personal choice.

Already, Blackmun has indicated that he is a judge who senses the human consequences of legal decision. His background as the son of an economically pressed grocer may well make him sensitive about rulings that affect economic want.

But more than the basic needs of people is involved when the poor and their rights become an issue for the highest court. A major philosophical struggle is building among the justices in that field.

As the court's current term is clearly proving, the fight over the rights of the needy is taking the place of criminal law controversy as the source of keenest division in the tribunal.

For Blackmun, as for almost all judges, the mere fact that the poor would insist they had "rights" has been something of a revelation. Only recently have lawyers found the legal doctrines and precedents that would make the poor's needs a fit subject for judges to consider.

The result has troubled many judges, even those who have found they had no choice but to deal with the new style of legal advocacy on behalf of the dependent poor.

Just the other day, Justice John M. Harlan remarked in an opinion in one of this term's "welfare" cases: "We view with concern the escalating involvement of federal courts in this highly complicated area of welfare benefits."

And the justice—one of the court's more conservative members—went on to say that "it is no part of the business of this court to evaluate . . . the merits or wisdom of any welfare programs, whether state or federal, in the large or in the particular."

However, he summed up without apology that "we find not the slightest indication that Congress meant to deprive federal courts of their traditional jurisdiction to hear and decide federal questions in this field."

That is a conclusion that is completely rejected by Blackmun's old friend, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger. The chief justice has been siding regularly this year with Justice Hugo L. Black, who thinks that the court's majority is ruling in welfare cases according to pity for the poor, not respect for judicial restraint.

Blackmun, as a justice, almost certainly would be torn between the views of Harlan and those held by Burger and Black.

So far, there is little in Blackmun's case record on the 8th U.S. Court of Appeals to show what he would do in this field. But borrowing loosely from his general judicial philosophy and declarations, it appears that he could be drawn more easily toward Harlan's side.

That "side," really, is somewhere in the middle of the court's philosophical spectrum on the rights of the poor. This "center" rejects, alike, the passionate treatment of welfare law by the group led by Justice William J. Brennan and the sober jurisdictional approach of Black and Burger.

Blackmun's "strict constructionism," or at least the part of his record that suggested to President Nixon that Blackmun fits that label, is not so strict that he would be uncomfortable either with the Harlan "center" or the Brennan "left."

In particular, Blackmun has seemed to see wide possibilities—at least for Supreme Court justices, if not jurists on lower tribunals—for reading rather expansively the rights to "due process" and "equal protection."

Those are the constitutional clauses most often raised in welfare rights cases, and they have been general enough to yield to a range of results in the high court's still-new precedents in that field. Indeed, Black recently complained of that flexibility, saying that the constitutional clauses could easily get

divergent translations if measured by the views of the National Welfare Rights Organization, the Chamber of Commerce or the John Birch Society.

But Blackmun has said openly that the idea of "fundamental fairness" can vary, from time to time, as a constitutional idea growing out of the "due process" and "equal protection" clauses.

The new justice will, if cleared by the Senate, arrive at the Supreme Court along with a predictable new flow of "poor law" cases. The results already in for this term have been sufficiently favorable to "poverty lawyers" to guarantee that there will be more—many more—test cases.

It is plain that the high court now considers public aid to the poor to be something other than "mere charity," and more nearly something a needy family can claim as a "right." At the least, this term's decisions alone strengthen the view—long advocated by lawyers for the needy—that welfare families have a property claim on their benefits.

Blackmun could definitely make a difference in the future court's decisions on how enforceable that claim is.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 22, 1970]

BLACKMUN'S CLEAN BREAST

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

With remarkable candor, Judge Harry A. Blackmun has made a clean breast of anything he could think of that might be used against him by senators determined to put him through the confirmation process wringer. They will try to show they can be as tough on a Northern as on a Southern Nixon nominee for the Supreme Court.

It wasn't easy for a modest man, in the limelight for the first time in his 38-year-long career. He told reporters he felt he was stripping himself naked, making him like "Exhibit 14–B" in a trial court record. Still, he went through it with grace and wit.

The record he disclosed to President Nixon and Atty. Gen. Mitchell prior to his nomination, and which he discussed in a news conference in his elaborate Rochester Towers office, appears to bear out the Justice Department claim of de minimis non curat lex . . . or, "the law does not notice trifles."

Blackmun said he has been on 900 cases. Only a few were germane. And his stock holdings are peanuts relative to shares outstanding. Some matters could be viewed as explicable in the context of importuned favors by old and dear clients, related to perhaps an over-zealous sense of responsibility toward the Mayo Clinic and its business organizations. He venerates the clinic as a public service organization, though in hindsight he might have done better to divorce himself from its extensive financial ramifications after he became a judge.

For a brilliant lawyer with a prestigious Minneapolis law firm for 17 years, he is not rolling in wealth: his net worth is $125,000. In the nine years ending in 1959 as house counsel for Mayo he was also in a position to quite legitimately get in on the ground floor of financial opportunities. But the figures indicate he exercised restraint, and he said humorously after his Friday news conference that he was far less wealthy than some of his Harvard law school classmates, class of 1932.

What we have now is a preview of his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Blackmun was confirmed as a judge of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals Sept. 14, 1959.

Here is how his off-bench activities break down:

Directorships: He continued until June, 1960, as a director of Rochester Airport Co., operated by the clinic's Association, its property-holding unit. He said it was run in the red as a community service and to assure transportation for patients. He did not say what fees, if any, he collected as a director.

He was a director until January 1964 of the Kahler Corp., for which he received a $1,500 annual fee. He explained the Mayo organization had a "substantial" interest in the corporation, having encouraged John Kahler to build a hotel in Rochester. He indicated his "cherished" relations with the board were largely social.

However, his proffer of resignation late in 1963 followed a resolution in September, 1963 by the Judicial Conference of the U.S., the federal judiciary's administrative arm. It said no federal judge should serve as an officer, director or employee of a profit-making corporation.

Blackmun said "in retrospect" he should have left the board as soon as he became judge, although he added that the resolution was primarily aimed at directorships on financial institutions. In any event, the words do cover any profit-making corporation, although other sources have previously interpreted the Conference's action as he did. He has had no cases involving Kahler.

Probate Work: Blackmun was a leading probate lawyer during his 17 years with the Dorsey firm here. No branch of the law involves a more intimate relationship with clients and their families.

In 1963 he handled the $155,800 estate of Dr. David C. Balfour, one of the original clinic founders. But he took no fee.

He was one of four executors of the estate of Mrs. Mabel F. C. Kahler, widow of John, who had died before he went to the court and for whom he had done considerable work. He was under pressure from the family to serve as an executor under wills he had drawn. The probate figure, according to public records, was $550,000, but often there are assets handled outside actual probate, and lawyers say his fee of $3,500 in 1962 was nominal in the light of the time he doubtless gave the family.

In 1964 and 1965 he received $5,000 from the estate of Charles Gilfillan, a family friend he described with affectionate humor as a "grand old eccentric." Gilfillan was a clinic benefactor, who died in 1962. His set of wills left property, primarily land, worth $1,091,000 in a trust for the widow, with the clinic as residual beneficiary. Blackmun said she urged him as a co-executor to get the probate started; he said he was "embarrassed" about the fee, but took it as Mrs. Gilfillan proposed, as an education nest egg for his three daughters.

While, as a general proposition, the American Bar Association Canons of Judicial Ethics (now being revised) frown on a judge's practicing law, Canon 27 specifically says a judge is not disqualified from holding executorships or trusteeships if they pose no conflict of interest. The Federal Judicial Conference recently in effect reaffirmed this for federal judges.

Stock Ownership: Judge Clement Haynsworth accumulated nearly $1 million in 20 years, 12 of them on the bench. His interest in one company touched by litigation before him was $437,000, and in another over $18,000.

In Blackmun's experience, he had 50 shares of Ford (16 million shares outstanding) purchased in 1957 for about $2,500. In 1960 he wrote an opinion adverse to Ford (reinstating a $24,500 lower court jury verdict against Ford). He participated only after getting specific permission from the chief judge of the district.

In 1964 he participated, but did not write the opinion, in a $12,500 case won by Ford. He then had 100 shares. In January of this year, however, he disqualified himself in another case involving a Ford subsidiary, the Haynsworth debacle being fresh in mind.

In 1963 and 1964, Blackmun bought 22 shares of American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) for about $1,350. He participated in a case affecting, not AT&T but its subsidiary, Northwestern Bell, headquartered in Omaha. In that case, his court upheld a lower court's dismissal of a $35,000 claim against Northwestern Bell on the ground that federal courts lacked jurisdiction because there was no diversity of citizenship. This is a procedural point, not one of the merits. (Time: 1967.)

Blackmun also disclosed that he bought $2,250 worth of 3M stock, on Dec. 28, 1960, but noted that a patent case decided against 3M came down prior to his purchase, on Dec. 1, 1960. He said he raised the point only because sometimes there were rehearings, though he indicated there was none in this instance.

Club Membership: In the controversy that defeated Judge G. Harrold Carswell, his part in organizing a segregated golf club was pivotal. Blackmun was aksed Friday about his membership in the Minneapolis Club, which has lowered its bars against Jews and Negroes, but which was once described as a "WASP bastion."

Sam Scheiner of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Minnesota has asserted that both the Minneapolis Club and its counterpart in St. Paul, the Minnesota Club, have tacit Jewish quotas, and the Minnesota Club has no Negro members. The club said Blackmun had "club privileges," as does State District Judge Stephen Maxwell, a Negro.

Blackmun said the Minneapolis Club elected him an "honorary" member along with other public figures, including Hubert H. Humphrey, and this courtesy gave him nothing to do with policy. He said the Minnesota Club opened its doors to 8th circuit judges attending St. Paul meetings for luncheon privileges.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1970]

BLACKMUN MAY PROVE A SURPRISE TO NIXON

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON.—It is now almost a year since the Warren Court came to an end, and last week there seemed to be almost as much uncertainty as ever as to what the Supreme Court should do for an encore.

President Nixon's crusade to restore "balance" to the liberal-leaning Court led him to pluck another Appellate judge from Attorney General John N. Mitchell's handy list of 150 candidates last Wednesday, as Judge Harry A. Blackmun became the latest nominee for Associate Justice.

Judge Blackmun is the fourth middle-aged, Protestant, Republican Federal Appellate judge to be named by Mr. Nixon to the Supreme Court since former Chief Justice Earl Warren ended the "Warren Era" by retiring last June.

Mr. Nixon's distaste for that judicial style had been clear since his 1968 political campaign, but his own image of the "Nixon Court" had been fuzzy until the latest appointment. It suggests that what Mr. Nixon really has in mind is a Supreme Court that behaves like a middle-level appellate court.

Many lawyers have agreed with Mr. Nixon that it is time to give the country a rest from the recent activism of the Supreme Court. But the Warren Court is a difficult act to follow, because few people want the Court to revert all the way back to the negativism of bygone years.

Mr. Nixon has encountered trouble in establishing a new identity for the Supreme Court, and even assuming that Judge Blackmun will be confirmed by the Senate, the Court will probably not change too much—at least not right away.

Judge Blackmun is a Harvard-trained, grandfatherly jurist who writes long opinions on almost any subject, but likes tax cases best. He does not appear to be as con-

servative as his two ill-fated predecessors, Judge Clement F. Haynsworth and Judge G. Harrold Carswell.

Superficially, he seems much like Justice Burger, who is his childhood friend from Minnesota and who urged his appointment to the Court of Appeals and to the Supreme Court. Judge Blackmun has tended to take moderate positions on civil rights, and civil liberties cases, and like Chief Justice Burger, he has frequently bucked the tide of the Warren Court's enlargement of criminal suspects' rights.

This seems to suggest that the two men might team up to form the nucleus of the future "Burger majority" to champion a more conservative approach to law-and-order issues. But so far Mr. Burger has tended to be a loner, dissenting far more frequently—and acidly—than most newcomers to the Court do, and not yet drawing a core of justices to his views.

Also, Judge Blackmun has often said, when making conservative decisions on the Court of Appeals, that it is the Supreme Court's place to innovate. That does not necessarily mean that he would do so as a justice, but another former Republican appeals judge, Potter Stewart, has become an extremely flexible justice, and Justice Blackmun seems much like Justice Stewart in philosophy and style.

Normally, when the Supreme Court has been without a ninth justice for a long period, deadlocked issues tend to pile up. A new member has enormous impact at the start. This happened to Arthur J. Goldberg, who accelerated the Warren Court on its libertarian course in 1962 by casting the deciding votes in 14 cases shortly after he took the seat vacated by Justice Felix Frankfurter.

If Judge Blackmun is confirmed, he will be disqualified from participating in the most important appeal before the Court—a key test of capital punishment—because it is his decision that is being appealed.

Judge Blackmun's inclinations on other upcoming issues are difficult to anticipate. The Supreme Court has been waiting for its ninth justice before deciding if state criminal anarchy laws may be invoked against radical militant groups, if police agents may record suspects' conversations on concealed recording devices without first obtaining court permission, and whether some of the criminal rights declared by the Warren Court will be applied retroactively to void old convictions.

Appeals already on the docket for next year raise such varied issues as pornography in the mails, secondary labor boycotts, equal employment rights of women, local government reapportionment, privacy rights of welfare clients, and Southern Negroes' voting rights.

IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT

Other questions that are certain to be faced eventually include the constitutionality of the Federal law that makes it a crime to cross state lines to incite a riot, the legality of the 1968 act that permits police to wiretap with court approval, the question of busing to eliminate segregation in the South, and the many thorny issues raised by the convictions of the "Chicago Seven" militants in Judge Julius Hoffman's court.

Attempting to predict in advance how an open-minded jurist will react to these questions is all but impossible. But one hint on Judge Blackmun is that Professor Yale Kamisar, a Michigan law professor who cheered the Warren Court on to its most liberal criminal rulings, feels that Judge Blackmun is, for President Nixon, a good choice. "All the evidence supports Judge Blackmun's own statement that he can't be classified as a conservative or a liberal," Mr. Kamisar said last week. "I wonder," he added, "if Nixon might have been somewhat misled."

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 29, 1070]

SENSITIVE TO PROBLEMS OF "LITTLE PEOPLE," BLACKMUN STATES

(By Lyle Denniston)

Supreme Court nominee Harry A. Blackmun today described himself to senators as a judge who has "a sensitivity to the problems of little people."

Questioned at length by the Senate Judiciary Committee about his philosophy as a judge, Blackmun said he regards the Bill of Rights as "very precious," that he believes judges should "start with precedent," but not always avoid change in the law, and that it is the role of the courts to interpret the Constitution "in the light of the problems of today."

The atmosphere at the opening hearing was clearly favorable to President Nixon's third nominee for the year-old vacancy on the highest court. Each senator who questioned him praised Blackmun's answers and his background.

NO BITTER DEBATE

There was no sign of the bitter debate which surrounded Senate consideration of the two rejected nominees, federal judges Clement Haynsworth, Jr., and G. Harrold Carswell.

A leading challenger of the prior nominees referred to those past disputes in remarking to Blackmun:

"If we've accomplished some small thing by getting a man of your caliber here, perhaps the old battles were worthwhile."

The 61-year-old federal judge from Rochester, Minn., gave replies that seemed to satisfy senators of broadly varying philosophies.

To the chairman of the committee, Blackmun said he does not believe a Supreme Court justice should rely on his own personal notions in reaching decisions.

"The Constitution," he said, "is a document of specified words and construction. I would do my best not to have my decisions affected by my personal ideas or philosophy."

Blackmun commented:

"Conditions are different today, and I suppose that we have federal courts to construe the document (the Constitution) in light of the problems of today. That is why it has endured. In a way, it is very rigid, and in a way, it is very flexible."

Blackmun told the committee of the many letters he had received from strangers since his nomination was announced. Of their contents, he said: "What comes through most clearly is the utter respect which the little person has for the Supreme Court of the United States. The little person feels this is a real bastion for the protection of his rights."

TURN TO ETHICS

Blackmun made clear he feels it has been his experience as a judge to encourage that belief.

"I like to feel that my record will show, particularly in the civil rights area and the labor area and in the treatment of little people, what I hope is a sensitivity to their problems."

After questioning the judge about his judicial philosophy, the senators turned to an examination of his attitude and performance on judicial ethics.

Replying to a question about his investments, Blackmun said that if he is confirmed for the Supreme Court "the thing for me to do would be to dispose of these securities forthwith—and take the risk of further inflation."

He said that he had not bought stocks as an "in-and-out" trader, but he had bought them and "put them away and forgot about it, and perhaps that is the way it should be."

New disclosures made late yesterday about the judge's financial and ethical record, during the 11 years he has been on the 8th U.S. Court of Appeals, had been examined by senators overnight to see if there was any basis for complaint.

The new data, given to the Senate by Judiciary Committee by Deputy Atty. Gen. Richard G. Kleindienst in answer to written queries by four Democrats on the panel, showed these key points:

Blackmun has invested $92,318 in public and private securities during his years as a judge. His wife has never owned any securities.

He has bought no stocks in any business corporation since 1963, and his only investments since then have been in publicly issued securities, primarily U.S. Treasury bills.

His current portfolio, based on this week's market prices, is worth about $62,502—$32,887 in common stocks and the remainder in bank certificates of deposit or public bonds or bills. At the time he became a judge in 1959, his portfolio had a value of $18,785, plus $9,960 in a savings account.

During his 11 years as a judge, he has sold stocks worth $19,179, and has received about $45,500 from debt securities which matured.

He has taken part in only four court cases in which he might have had an interest—three while he held stock in one of the parties or in a firm related to one of the parties, and one case decided 27 days before he bought stock in one of the parties.

Blackmun has joined in deciding six cases in which his former Minneapolis law firm represented one of the parties, but in no case was the party a "regular client" of the firm when the judge was a member.

He has taken part in decisions in five cases involving firms which had done some legal business with his old firm, but were represented in the specific cases by other firms.

The judge has voluntarily disqualified himself from three court cases—one because he had an investment in the parent firm of one of the parties, and two because former law clerks were involved in the cases as attorneys.

He has taken no part in any court case involving a party he ever represented as a lawyer, and has not joined in deciding any case involving a organization or firm which he then served as an officer or adviser.

In making these disclosures, Kleindienst told the Senate committee that Blackmun had in no way broken any code of judicial ethics, and had violated no federal law governing judges' conduct.

The description of Blackmun's current portfolio included these items: The largest single holding is $9,631 worth of U.S. Treasury bills, due to mature next month; other investments include IBM stock, now worth $7,546; J. C. Penny stock, $6,847; $5,012 worth of Federal Land Bank bonds; $5,000 worth of bonds on the fire station in Mankato, Minn.; and stock investments—all below $5,000—in Ford Motor Co., Kahler Corp., Manufacturers Hanover Corp., Florida Power & Light, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and American Security & Trust Co.

WORST FRAUD IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The south would probably swallow its grievances over the defeats of judges Haynsworth and Carswell for seats on the Supreme Court if the majority in Congress would help to correct the worst fraud in American history—the enforced "adoption" of the fourteenth amendment, on which numerous cases in the desegregation controversy are currently based.

Few people today know about certain undisputed facts of history which occurred just after the war between the states ended in April 1865—that the thirteenth amendment, abolishing slavery, was legally ratified by state legislatures in the south as well as the north, but when the fourteenth amendment was proposed, it seemed to be confronted

with failure. It takes three-fourths of the states to ratify. In this case, 16 out of 37 state legislatures did not vote to approve—just a little less than half. Outside the south, six states had failed to ratify, and in the south ten had rejected it.

Congress had ousted all southerners from their seats in the Senate and the House, and then passed a law of coercion. It provided that military rule be established in the Southern states and that none of them could be regarded as in the union unless they "ratified" the fourteenth amendment.

Amnesty to former rebels had been declared in May 1865 by President Andrew Johnson because the war was over. In 1867, under penalty of continued exile, the southern states were told specifically they must ratify the fourteenth amendment as the price of readmission to the union. In one instance, a general sent down from the north presided over a state legislature.

When Secretary of State Seward in July 1868 was faced with the problem of proclaiming "ratification" of the fourteenth amendment, he said frankly that he wasn't authorized "to determine and decide doubtful questions as to the authenticity of the organization of state legislatures or as to the power of any state legislature to recall a previous act or resolution of ratification." He said the amendment was valid if the original resolutions of the Ohio and New Jersey legislatures were to be deemed effective, notwithstanding subsequent rejection.

Many noted historians point out in their books that new state legislatures in the south had been elected to function in 1866 after the war, but in 1867 were put under military rule and the senators and representatives from the states were denied seats in Congress. President Andrew Johnson had vetoed the measure. It was, however, passed over his veto, and, of course, no southerners were there to vote.

The Supreme Court of the United States 20 years later refused to rule on all these illegal procedures, claiming they were acts of the "political departments of the government." This was obviously a means of avoiding a decision on a ticklish question. But several decades after its passage the same fourteenth amendment is being used by the high court to regulate the operation of the schools by the federal government, hitherto a function of the states.

Clearly there is need for the American people through their representatives in Congress to rewrite the so-called "fourteenth amendment" and to stipulate where state rights begin and end and where federal power may be interposed. The people have every right to erase from the record the chapter of history after the war was over by some by military power—to "ratify" an alleged amendment to the Constitution.

The facts are available in the history books. They are unquestioned. If America is to live happily as "one nation, indivisible," the mistakes of the past will have to be re-examined. It means building a new respect for law and a restoration of confidence in national concepts of the Constitution.

No longer would it be necessary to worry whether a Supreme Court justice came from the south or the north or the west or the east. For if the Constitution hereafter defines the limits of judicial power and the functions that are beyond it, and requires adherence to the existing amending process alone as the way to obtain change, there is little likelihood of any regional resentments arising in the future. Racism would lose its fervor because people in all sections of the country would then feel they were being treated alike by the Constitution.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is appropriate to place certain matters on the record in proper context.

One of those times is now in connection with the issue of postal reform which has become entangled with a number of side issues.

I have received the following April 27 letter from Gustave J. Johnson of New York City, national field director for the National Association of Letter Carriers:

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: At the conclusion of the recent postal workers' protest against intolerable wages, etc., we ("we" meaning the thousands of members of Branch 36, NALC, in New York City, members in New York State and throughout the nation) were informed that no reprisals, I repeat, no reprisals, would be taken against any postal worker in any way involved in the job action. This understanding was brought about between high officials of the U.S. Government, including key legislators and top postal officials. These assurances brought our people back to work.

It is with both incredulity and a sense of distaste that I am forced to send this letter advising you that Postmaster General Blount (speaking for the Nixon Administration?) has disavowed this agreement. Considering the volatile temper of our membership at the present time, we do not need any inflammatory statements, by a top administration official, regarding reprisals. To my amazement, however, this is precisely what has happened.

In the May 4, 1970 issue of "U.S. News & World Report," Postmaster General Blount is specifically asked, "What would you do about those who go out on an illegal strike?" He replied:

"I would like to emphasize what we've done in the recent work stoppage. No. 1, in our agreement that has been signed by all of the unions in the Post Office Department, we specifically have said, as far as disciplinary action is concerned, that the Department will not initiate it until we have discussed with the unions the policies that we're going to follow.

"Now, we have very plainly stated to these union leaders that we cannot condone this illegal walkout. We're not going to condone it, and we are going to take appropriate disciplinary action."

A second question put to him, "What disciplinary action are you going to take?", elicited this answer:

"I think it would be inappropriate for me to discuss here what actions we plan to take. But our actions will be appropriate to the circumstances.

"We had between 150,000 and 200,000 people out on strike. I would like to emphasize that there were 500,000 postal workers who never walked out.

"Now, of those 150,000 to 200,000 who did walk out, some percentage of them—some large percentage of them, in my opinion—were not really involved in this matter. They didn't want to get involved in whatever might happen by crossing the picket line—but they weren't on the picket line, they weren't leading the strike. And I think that you look at individual circumstances differently.

"But I tell you that we cannot condone that strike, and we are going to take appropriate disciplinary action."

I earnestly solicit your aid in restating the guarantees that there would be no reprisals against men forced to take a dramatic step to express their plight to the people of this country. You know, Sir, that the agreement originally arrived at listed terms of a 12% pay increase. Our people have thus far seen only a 6% increase which amounts to less than a dollar a day. We were also told that talks would be concluded and the agreement implemented. Our membership reminds us of these promises every day. Frankly, we are still sitting on a keg of dynamite and a lighted match has just been applied to it by PMG Blount. We need your urgent assistance, now.

Respectfully yours,
GUSTAVE J. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, just so there will be no question raised that Mr. Johnson has taken his quotations out of context, I am excerpting the entire section of the interview by the Postmaster General as printed in the May edition of the U.S. News & World Report, including both the questions preceding and following the quotes in Mr. Johnson's letter:

Q. Do you think the binding arbitration would be a solution for all strikes by government employees—those working for local and State governments as well as for the Federal Government?

A. Let me say first that I'd rather workers had the right to strike, and I'd rather we could handle it as we do in private industry. But, in view of the essential nature of most government services, you just cannot accept the right to strike. You can't have a thing like a police strike, for example. So you've got to provide an alternative.

I don't know what that alternative could be, other than this. Now, maybe there are better ways, but we don't know what they are. Nobody else has come up with any better solution.

I think that the thing that's important is that you don't undercut the bargaining process by a binding-arbitration procedure, so that everything just goes to arbitration. We have tried to prevent that by this 180-day period from the start of bargaining, and with the fact-finding techniques, mediation, and all the other things that try to get parties themselves to resolve their disputes.

I hope that we'll never use that ultimate conclusion of binding arbitration.

IF THERE'S AN ILLEGAL WALKOUT

Q. What would you do about those who go out on an illegal strike?

A. I would like to emphasize what we've done in the recent work stoppage. No 1, in our agreement that has been signed by all of the unions in the Post Office Department, we specifically have said, as far as disciplinary action is concerned, that the Department will not initiate it until we have discussed with the unions the policies that we're going to follow.

Now, we have very plainly stated to these union leaders that we cannot condone this illegal walkout. We're not going to condone it, and we are going to take appropriate disciplinary action.

Q. What disciplinary action are you going to take?

A. I think it would be inappropriate for me to discuss here what actions we plan to

take. But our actions will be appropriate to the circumstances.

We had between 150,000 and 200,000 people out on strike. And I would like to emphasize that there were 500,000 postal workers who never walked out.

Now, of those 150,000 to 200,000 who did walk out, some percentage of them—some large percentage of them, in my opinion—were not really involved in this matter. They didn't want to get involved in whatever might happen by crossing the picket line—but they weren't on the picket line, they weren't leading the strike. And I think that you look at individual circumstances differently.

But I tell you that we cannot condone that strike, and we are going to take appropriate disciplinary action.

HOW MAIL RATES WOULD BE SET

Q. Mr. Blount, who will set the price of first-class mail under your reorganization system?

A. Under the reorganization bill we recommend to Congress, all mail prices or rates will be set in this fashion:

Management will propose a rate change to a board of independent rate experts. These rate experts will be appointed by the President, not by the operating management of the Post Office Department. They will be appointed for six-year terms. They will be professional rate-making people. They will be charged with the responsibility of holding public hearings in which those affected will testify, and, at the conclusion, of making rate-change recommendations to the public commissioners on revenues and costs.

The commissioners then make the decision on the rate changes—subject to a veto by a two-thirds vote of either branch of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, without burdening the RECORD with further duplication I would call the attention of Members to my remarks on Tuesday, April 28, at page 13368 regarding the related statements made by the Postmaster General in a speech at the National Press Club last Monday.

I was interested to note the report on the General's speech as given in the Press Club Record, dated April 30, as follows:

[From the National Press Club Record]

"The situation is urgent, and we are going to have more difficulties," warned Postmaster General Winton M. Blount at a Club luncheon April 27. "I don't know how I can make it any plainer than the work stoppage made it," he said, referring to the subject of postal reform. "Only Congress can decide the outcome," he added.

Will the strikers be punished? Blount replied: "We cannot condone this strike. On the other hand, we realize that a great number were just caught up in it. We have agreed to discuss with the union the matter of discipline." What if Congress doesn't go along with the reform?

The former Alabama businessman answered, "If a bill doesn't come through by Friday, we'll turn Martha loose on them and if that doesn't work, we'll have them play golf with the Vice President." What's his own future if the Post Office becomes a corporation? "I'm not worried about unemployment," Blount chuckled. "I heard today that there is a vacancy in the presidency of the I Quit Smoking Club."—George Beatty

Mr. Speaker, there are charges from downtown that Congress is dragging its feet on postal reform. The facts do not substantiate the charges.

I announced to the House, simultaneously with the delivery to the House of the postal reform message by President Nixon, that I was ordering immediate additional public hearings on the subject notwithstanding the fact that we had compiled many thousands of words of testimony during 34 days of public hearings last year.

Our committee on Post Office and Civil Service held 3 days of hearings during which we heard all of the parties who were involved in the new elements added to the situation as the result of the so-called negotiations downtown.

In order to complete the testimony and maintain the tight schedule of committee activities which I had outlined, I kept the committee in session late Monday night.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS BEGIN

I had scheduled an executive session of the full committee for Tuesday morning and I wanted it to proceed on schedule. It did—and almost on time. We had 12 Democrats and five Republicans on hand when I gaveled the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m., another Democrat and four more Republicans arriving subsequently.

We had a good meeting, settled preliminary procedural matters and proceeded to amendments before adjourning at noon when the House convened.

On Wednesday, we began having the problem of assembling a quorum to do business—a familiar problem in our committee deliberations on reform. At 10:15 a.m. we had nine Democrats and only one Republican present for the meeting. It was not until 10:27 a.m. that the meeting could be started with a quorum present.

Once again, we had a productive meeting in which the Members considered a number of proposals and took action on several amendments.

The Thursday meeting never got underway at all, notwithstanding the fact that the Postmaster General had been pressuring the Members and Congress for speedy action on this measure. Indeed, he had wanted the bill finally acted upon by our committee on that date.

MINORITY MEMBERS ABSENT

The lack of a quorum was caused by the fact that the Republicans had notified the chairman on the previous day that a caucus of all Republicans in the House had been called for the same hour and that they would attend the caucus rather than the regularly scheduled executive session.

As usual, a large number of Democratic Members were on hand promptly, but when it was apparent the Republicans were not going to appear, I adjourned the session.

There was one Republican who was on hand and that was the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) whose attendance and dedication to the work of our committee is above reproach. He was prompt and was the only minority member who showed up before adjournment.

ACTION NEEDED—NOT SPEECHES

The Postmaster General keeps making speeches and statements to the press in complaint about the delay by Congress in acting on postal reform.

But when our committee meets to act on this matter, the problem invariably lies with the members of his own party who are absent, thus making it very difficult for us to obtain a quorum to do business.

In a 26-member committee, we must have 14 members physically present in the committee room in order to transact business.

If they really want postal reform—as I do—it might be helpful if the people downtown would spend a little more time assisting us in obtaining a quorum for committee business rather than devoting their time to speeches, press conferences, and attacks on Congress.

POLLUTION AND OVERPOPULATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on one of the campuses I visited during Earth Week, I remember running into a professorial looking gentleman of advanced years who had been watching with amazement while a group of students donned gas masks and other paraphernalia in order to pose for a press picture. He looked at them, and then, at me, and remarked with a cynical smile:

Well, I suppose the price of victory is eternal publicity.

I suppose what this gentleman said is true. There can be no victory in the battle to save the environment unless the public spotlight is permanently focused on the twin evils of pollution and overpopulation. But publicity that is not accompanied by strong governmental action will soon fade, and a fickle public will move on to some new cause, and then still another.

That is why I have decided to introduce today a series of proposals, some of them highly controversial, which deal straightforwardly with the cardinal sins against the environment: Pollution, overpopulation, poison, and congestion. Our penance for these sins will be tough and unpleasant, and necessarily it will involve parting with some of our most cherished traditions. It will require us to alter nothing less than some of our basic and fundamental attitudes about "progress," growth, "prosperity," taxes, living standards, and customs.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist, and I believe the American people are prepared to take a hard look at the choices that lie ahead. I believe that the people are far out in front of the politicians on the environment issue, and I believe they have the resolve to win this battle if only leaders will show the way.

Last year I introduced an important measure. Known as H.R. 10515, this measure would have Congress declare a national policy of voluntary population stabilization. It would authorize within the Department of Interior a Bureau of Population and the Environment which would, among other things, make studies to determine the optimum desirable population for this country.

Here is what I propose today:

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

I am first of all proposing an amendment to the Constitution that would guarantee every person a right to a decent, clean environment. The importance of such an amendment cannot be overemphasized. By elevating this matter to constitutional status, governmental, business, and personal pollution producing activities will all be subject to the constraint of constitutional law. For the first time individual citizens will have a constitutional remedy they can pursue individually, rather than relying on the good will of an anti-pollution enforcing agency.

WATER POLLUTION

I am introducing two bills that will amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The first introduces an important new dimension to the water pollution battle—the bill is designed to prevent pollution before the fact, rather than waiting for new activities to cause pollution and then trying to undo the damage. The bill does this by requiring builders or operators of facilities that will or are discharging any substance into any water system to acquire a certificate of compliance from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—FWPCA—upon a showing that the activity will or is complying with FWPCA water quality standards. However, the FWPCA is directed not to issue a certificate of compliance to any person whose activity would in any way lessen the quality of water in any water system, notwithstanding the compliance with existing water quality standards. Appropriate judicial relief is afforded to both the FWPCA and private citizens for violators of this bill.

The second bill is designed to combat pollution caused by the dumping of phosphate detergents in our rivers and lakes. That phosphates have a very serious effect on water quality is beyond question. This bill fights the problem by banning the use of phosphates in detergents by June 30, 1972, by directing the Secretary of the Interior to set water quality standards for all synthetic detergents and by establishing Federal assistance for the development of nonpolluting detergents.

AIR POLLUTION

Another bill is aimed at the critical problem of air pollution as caused by our automobiles. The provisions of this bill include:

First, phasing out new high horsepower high polluting engines;

Second, establishing a Federal development program for pollution-free vehicles;

Third, establishment of Federal purchase of low-pollution vehicles and encouragement of similar State purchases;

Fourth, application of the California auto pollution standards for 1971, 1972, and 1974 nationwide;

Fifth, strengthening of enforcement criteria for auto devices;

Sixth, establishment of pollution standards for used cars and commercial fleets; and

Seventh, the banning of lead in gasoline and regulation of rubber and asbestos emission levels.

RAPID TRANSIT

Realizing that the problem of automobile congestion in our cities has also reached critical levels and that an attractive, alternative means of urban transportation must be furnished, I am introducing a bill that will strengthen Federal involvement in the development of large-scale rapid-transit systems. The most important feature of this bill is that it establishes an urban mass-transit trust fund which will consist of Federal revenues received from the automobile excise tax and general appropriations by the Congress. Amounts authorized under the bill start at $1 billion for the fiscal year ending in 1971 and rise to $4 billion for the fiscal year ending in 1974.

The key attribute of the trust fund is that there will always be money available for rapid transit programs; thus the Congress' largess need not be relied on. Further, the amounts authorized under this bill are in excess of funds presently available for rapid transit programs. I believe this to be a more realistic approach to a national problem than the existing program.

PESTICIDE CONTROL

Pesticide pollution has reached critical proportions on a worldwide scale. Legislation I am introducing today would help solve this problem by banning all uses of "hard" pesticides.

SOLID WASTE RECYCLING AND DISPOSAL

Even the casual observer would agree that our country is fast disappearing under a heap of waste materials. Present approaches to the problem are palliatives only—they are concerned with improving garbage handling techniques. We must view production of consumer goods as a drain on our natural resources. Recognizing that there is a finite limit on these resources, we must insure that maximum use is made of them. Accordingly I introduce today a bill that directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a research program on various methods of solid waste recycling techniques. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to assist State and local governments in the planning, building and/or improvement of solid waste handling facilities.

NOISE POLLUTION

The term "noise pollution" is a misnomer. To pollute means to soil or dirty—noise does not do this. But it is proper to use the term "noise pollution" since it conveniently describes an irritant which at least lowers the quality of the environment and at worst affects bodily health and state of mind.

No one questions that our surroundings are becoming noisier. The effect of this environmental change on physical health, however, is disputed. Some scientists maintain noise can cause damage to one's hearing ability; others say sustained noise produces tension which can lead to mental disorders. A panel of scientists of the American Association for the Advancement of Science recently suggested that sonic booms threaten the health of unborn babies and that excessive noise may contribute to heart trouble and high cholesterol blood counts.

On the other hand many scientists brand as speculative the claims that noise produces various ailments. They point out that research leading to the various theories on the effect of noise pollution is incomplete.

I am in no position to resolve the scientific dispute, but I do feel this is a legitimate area for congressional concern. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today that will set up in the Office of the Surgeon General an Office of Noise Pollution that will serve as a research center and clearinghouse for information and data on noise pollution. The bill also appropriates funds for grants to State and local governments which have satisfactory noise pollution control programs.

NOW IS THE TIME TO PROVIDE PLANES AND ARMS FOR ISRAEL

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of April 27 and in today's New York Times there are articles which report the introduction of Soviet troops and planes into the Mid East in support of Egypt and against Israel.

Surely, if any further evidence were needed by President Nixon that the military balance was tipping adversely to Israel, he has it now. If we here in the United States are not, as Mr. Alsop puts it, to "be remembered as the murderers of Israel," the President should immediately authorize the furnishing of planes and arms to Israel so that it can protect itself. Those planes and arms should be furnished now and without cost. I am inserting for the benefit of our colleagues the comments of columnists Joseph Alsop, James Reston, and Max Frankel:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1970]

RUSSIAN AIRMEN BELIEVED FLYING MISSIONS IN U.A.R.—BUT EVIDENCE IN WASHINGTON INDICATES ROLE IS DEFENSE OF EGYPTIAN INTERIOR—U.S. CONCERN MOUNTING—NO DIRECT CLASHES REPORTED—ISRAELIS LIMITING THEIR TARGETS TO CANAL AREA

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON.—There is growing evidence that Soviet pilots are now participating in the defense of central Egypt against penetration raids by the Israeli Air Force. But no direct clashes have been reported so far.

Israeli diplomats say that their Government has become convinced over the last 10 days that Russian-speaking pilots flying MIG-21's are scrambling into attack formations at almost every potential approach by an Israeli plane, with orders to intercept.

United States officials are still studying their own intelligence reports, but in what is visibly an atmosphere of mounting concern. An intensified Soviet involvement in the Middle East fighting would be expected to have a serious effect on the balance of forces there.

JETS REPORTED PURSUED

While Soviet and Israeli fliers have not made direct contact or exchanged any fire, the Israelis report that two of their planes were pursued by eight Soviet-flown MIG fighters on April 18, the day that a new pattern of Soviet operations was first detected.

The Israelis say that they have been careful since then to avoid provocative flights beyond the Suez Canal region, in which they

have concentrated most of their recent bombing attacks. The Soviet pilots, in turn, are said to have been careful so far to avoid the canal region, as if to signal a primary interest at this time in the defense of Cairo and other population centers around which they have been emplacing modern SAM-3 antiaircraft missiles since early March.

CONSIDERABLE EFFECT SEEN

If the Russian purpose is to deter Israeli attacks on Cairo and Alexandria and on the Soviet missile sites, their action has already had a considerable effect. The last announced Israeli raid on targets in the Egyptian interior was on April 13. The two planes that turned tail at the approach of Soviet-flown MIG's on April 18 are said to have been on a reconnaissance mission. The Israelis say that none of their planes have penetrated so deeply since.

Neither American nor Israeli officials would discuss the detailed intelligence information on which they must base their judgments.

It has been established for some time that Russian-speaking pilots were flying reconnaissance missions in Soviet planes with Egyptian markings over the Mediterranean, close to the vessels of the United States Sixth Fleet. Soviet pilots have also flown training missions in Egypt, presumably for the benefit of Egyptian fliers and ground controllers.

But this pattern of activity is said to have changed drastically earlier this month. The Israelis believe that the Russians are assuming responsibility—with missiles and planes—for the defense of most of the United Arab Republic, thus freeing the best Egyptian pilots for more combat duty near the Suez Canal and beyond it in the Israeli-occupied Sinai Peninsula. They also fear that Soviet pilots will eventually be ordered to join in the defense of the canal region, making a direct clash inevitable.

Even the most cautious analysts here appear to believe that the new flight operations by Russian-speaking pilots are designed, at the least, to train Soviet fliers for the active air defense of Egypt under combat conditions and to lead the Israelis to believe that they are in fact performing that mission.

At supersonic speeds, however, the destination of an oncoming Israeli fighter-bomber cannot be determined. Over the last 10 days, whenever Israeli planes heading for the canal region have approached Egyptian air space, MIG–21's in pairs and fours with Russian-speaking pilots at the controls are reported to have scrambled from three different bases in pursuit patterns. According to the Israelis, they have made ready to attack any intruder of the interior regions.

The planes are believed to bear Egyptian markings, but they have not been observed by Israeli pilots. At least 50 different Soviet fliers are said to have been overheard on many more sorties.

The anxiety prompted by the Soviet operations in Egypt extends in several directions. These include the following:

President Nixon has repeatedly cautioned the Soviet Union against "steps which could have the effect of drawing the major powers more deeply into the Arab-Israeli conflict." He said in his state-of-the-world message that he would view any effort by the Soviet Union "to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern."

The still developing involvement of Soviet fliers and soldiers in Egypt is seen here as an extension of Moscow's bid for "predominance." It is also seen as a commitment to the United Arab Republic from which the Soviet Union could not easily withdraw in case of still more intense fighting there.

Moreover, though the United States has no treaty commitments for the defense of Israel, it is pledged to supply her with enough arms to preserve "the military balance" in the area—meaning Israel's capacity to defend herself. In postponing action on Israel's latest request for additional Phantom and Skyhawk planes last month, Secretary of State William P. Rogers said that "if steps are taken which might upset the current balance or if in our judgement political developments warrant, the President will not hesitate to reconsider this matter."

The Nixon Administration interpreted this delay as an act of "restraint" and pleaded with Moscow to follow its example, despite earlier threats.

Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin had written to President Nixon early in February that if Israel continued her raids into central Egypt then the Soviet Union "will be forced to see to it that the Arab states have means at their disposal with the help of which a due rebuff to the arrogant aggressor could be made."

American officials now believe this message may have been misleading and that arrangements for Egypt's air defense were actually concluded late in January, during President Gamal Abdel Nasser's visit to Moscow. Israeli officials tend to believe that Moscow has been testing American responses one step at a time and that the now evident flight operations were determined only after Washington postponed any further commitments on the sale of aircraft to the Israelis.

Either way, at least some officials here are seriously concerned that Moscow chose to act more boldly in the Middle East in the belief that the Nixon Administration was mired down in Southeastern Asia and was prevented by public opinion from any decisive defense of American interests abroad.

ISRAELI ARMY DECLINES COMMENT

JERUSALEM.—An Israeli Army spokesman declined tonight to confirm a report from Washington that Israeli sources had said Russian pilots were flying air cover in Egyptian aircraft over the United Arab Republic.

He said that it had been known for some time that Russian pilots were flying reconnaissance missions in Egyptian aircraft over the Mediterranean, but he could add nothing about flying air cover over Egyptian territory.

Reports to this effect began circulating abroad some weeks ago. Israeli military officials said at the time that they had no independent information to support this speculation and have not confirmed it since then, officially or unofficially.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1970]

SOVIET MISSILE CREWS IN EGYPT ARE FIRST SLICE OF THE SALAMI

(By Joseph Alsop)

JERUSALEM.—Israel is now in deadly peril—not immediately, to be sure, but for the long pull. That is by far the most probable meaning of the introduction of Soviet SAM–3 missiles into Egypt, complete with Russian crews masquerading in Egyptian uniforms.

This is no personal, alarmist judgment. It is the bleakly down-to-earth reading of the new situation by Israel's great prime minister, Golda Meir, by the brilliant defense minister, Gen. Moshe Dayan, and by almost every other responsible Israeli leader this reporter has talked to.

The source of concern, it must be understood, is not the appearance of this new type of Soviet antiaircraft missile. The source of concern is, rather, the unprecedented use of Soviet troops to man the SAM–3.

"After all," a leading member of the general staff said to me grimly, "this is the first time since the end of World War II that the Soviets have accepted direct responsibility for an operational weapons system in this very special kind of context. They didn't do it in Korea. They didn't do it in Vietnam. But now they have done it in this war."

In sum, the new departure in Soviet behavior is seemingly much too radical to be an isolated development. If it is NOT isolated, in turn, you then have to think very carefully about what sort of broader intention the new departure indicates. And this, of course, is precisely what the Israeli leaders have been doing, with such disturbing results.

On the darkest but most likely assumption, the Soviet soldiers manning the SAM–3 missiles are no more than a first slice of salami. In the old days, when people in America used to give serious study to the Kremlin's methods, everyone knew the phrase "salami-slicing tactics."

It means the Kremlin has a way of taking a thin first slice, too small to upset anyone (just as the Soviet troops manning SAM–3s have been accepted with fat-headed complacency in Washington). Then comes the second slice, and the third, and the fourth. And finally, by such slow stages, always without provoking opposition, the Kremlin characteristically reaches a result that would have aroused a typhoon of shocked opposition in the first instance.

The threat, in this case, is deeper and deeper Soviet involvement in the Arab-Israeli war. The next step—perhaps many months later—could be the Soviets taking over the whole Egyptian ground-air defense system.

The third step—perhaps again much later—would then be Soviet pilots flying Mig-21s, no doubt in Egyptian uniform, "to defend" Egyptian territory against the wicked Israeli aggressors. And the final step might be the same Soviet pilots in the same Migs turning up over Sinai in a "forward defensive role."

So described, this sort of progressive Soviet involvement may not sound very serious. For Israel, however, it would be a life-and-death matter.

Israel today, in truth, is like a thin-shelled egg, seemingly impervious but inwardly fragile. The defensive shell is in fact mainly composed of the incomparable skill and courage of the Israeli people; and at some stage in the process above outlined, Israel's defensive shell would surely be broken. Or else the Israelis would be driven to launch a desperate counter-attack, regardless of the increasing Soviet involvement in the war.

These are the hideous perspectives you now hear the most responsible Israeli leaders discussing, with a kind of naked courage that no longer seems to exist anywhere else in the free world.

They are by no means sure that the future will unavoidably bring the kind of progressive Soviet involvement that has been described.

They are very sure, however, that more and more direct Soviet participation in the war has suddenly become a strong possibility. If the U.S. goes on weakly standing aside, moreover, it will even be a strong probability. Hence the contrast is frightening, between the President refusing to guarantee Israel the planes on which Israel's survival depends, and the Kremlin simultaneously pouring out arms for the Arabs, and also sending in Soviet troops in a combat role.

"Until recently, we thought there were two deterrents to another full-scale war," Golda Meir said somberly. "The first was our own success in ending Nasser's War of Attrition. The second was the feeling in the Kremlin that at a certain point, the United States would say, 'This exceeds the limit.' But the second deterrent has already been greatly impaired."

This woman like an Old Testament prophet reflected briefly, and then continued: "So what are we to do, if worst comes to worst? Shall we lie down and die? I tell you, we shall never do that. We shall fight!"

That should give food for thought to the purveyors of American weakness, who may one day be remembered as the murderers of Israel.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1970]

WASHINGTON: AND NOW THE MIDDLE EAST AGAIN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—When President Nixon refused Israel's request for more Phantom fighter bombers recently, he did so in the hope that the Soviet Union would also limit its military aid to the Arab states and thus help bring stability to the Middle East. That, however, is not the way things are going.

On the contrary, there is reliable evidence that Soviet pilots are now flying MIG–21 fighters in defense of Alexandria and Cairo (though not yet in defense of the Suez Canal war zone) and that their technicians are manning over 20 SAM–3 missiles in a major effort to knock down the low-flying Israeli planes that have been ranging over Egypt at will in recent months.

This introduces a new and ominous element into this sensitive and inflammable area. The Soviet pilots have kept their distance so far. They have not yet fired on the Israeli planes, but the Soviet pilots scramble into the air whenever the Israelis come close, and talk to one another in Russian to let the Israelis know what's up ahead.

In short, for the first time since the Second World War, the U.S.S.R. is now apparently intervening with its own pilots and technicians in a conflict between outside nations, and this raises some troublesome questions for a Nixon Administration already harassed by the spread of the Vietnam war into Cambodia, and by a nervous and inflated economy at home.

In his foreign policy report to the Congress last February, President Nixon said: "This Administration has shown its readiness to work with the Soviet Union in cooperation with nations in the area in pursuit of peace. But the United States would view any effort by the Soviet Union to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern."

THE SHIFTING BALANCE

Is this what is happening now? The Israelis are naturally afraid that it is. They see the introduction of Soviet pilots and Soviet technicians as a direct threat to their campaign against the Arab states and as a new threat to the existing balance of power in the region.

They have always regarded the Israeli Air Force as their main means of equalizing the superior numbers of the Arab armies and also as a means of warning President Nasser of the U.A.R. that his refusal to accept a cease-fire would mean air attacks on his military establishment all over Egypt.

What the Soviet pilots and SAM–3 technicians mean is that the Israeli pilots cannot penetrate beyond the Suez Canal zone without risking direct conflict with the Soviets, and this in turn is freeing the Egyptian Air Force to step up its attacks on Israel.

THE TWO INTERPRETATIONS

Diplomats here differ in their interpretations on the meaning of all this. The most alarming interpretation is that the Soviets, seeing President Nixon in trouble at home and in Southeast Asia, are stepping up the pressure in the Middle East while the Administration is preoccupied elsewhere.

The more moderate interpretation is that Moscow is not engaged in a major power play at all—having economic troubles and Chinese preoccupations of its own—but is merely warning the Israelis to stop their deep aerial penetrations of Egypt or risk the fire of the Soviet pilots and technicians.

Even this latter interpretation, however, troubles Israeli officials. For they have always been concerned that President Nasser might misjudge his power, as he did in the 1967 war, and stumble into another major war.

It was to warn him against this that the Israeli Air Force penetrated to the outskirts of Cairo in the first place, but lately it has been avoiding these raids precisely because of the danger of taking on the Russians.

Washington too is concerned, and puzzled, for if the Soviets go beyond this implied threat of force to actual shooting, or move their planes up into the fighting along the canal, then the balance of power in the war will clearly be upset—and this is precisely what President Nixon committed himself to avoid.

For the President, this latest move by the Soviets, coming on top of the widening war in Southeast Asia, could not possibly have come at a more awkward time. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has already put him on notice that most of its members are opposed to large arms shipments to Cambodia, and the country is clearly in no mood for another confrontation with the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

Yet even the enthusiastic supporters of the Vietnam war concede that America's stake in the Middle East is greater than in Indochina. The Soviets have moved, in short, despite the warning and appeals of Washington for reason that are not quite clear. But whatever the reasons are, they are doing nothing to reduce the mounting anxiety of this troubled city.

BEWARE OF SOCIALISTS WEARING VESTS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 21 of this year, Congressman BOB ECKHARDT and I introduced H.R. 15487, legislation to tax the excess profits of banks directly attributable to high interest rates.

The bill was prompted by the excessively high rates of interest being charged by banks, rates encouraged by the administration in the name of controlling inflation. According to Standard and Poor's, these high rates have meant an unparalleled rate of profits for the banking industry.

While the high rates of interest are no doubt the result of market pressures and cannot be condemned sweepingly as an explicit effort by the banking industry to raise its profits, this legislation would remove any potential incentive to raise interest rates solely for profits.

To ease the pressure on mortgage funds, the revenue raised by the tax would go to help low- and moderate-income families obtain mortgages.

The New York Times carried a full page advertisement on April 24 prepared by Edward Swayduck, president of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America. In it Mr. Swayduck analyzed as few others have the underlying fallacies and bias of the administration's present economic policy. As Mr. Swayduck's analysis suggests, this policy in the name of inflation is providing banks and large corporations with an economic windfall, while squeezing the worker and small-to-medium-size business.

Swayduck challenges the bankers to prove him wrong by supporting H.R. 15487 as a demonstration that they are not attempting to reap excess profits from the current economic situation. I commend this analysis to my colleagues and insert it and the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD.

The text of the advertisement as well as of H.R. 15487 follows:

BEWARE OF SOCIALISTS WEARING VESTS

(By Edward Swayduck)

Establishment bankers aren't all bad. They just have problems ordinary people don't have. The English language doesn't make much sense to them, and they don't understand the mathematics of our society at all.

For instance, the Republican bankers and their friends around the Treasury and the White House have put together an equation that goes like this: "When unions negotiate wage increases, they bring on inflation. But when banks raise interest rates—which raises the price of everything—that corrects inflation."

Does this make sense? Not to me it doesn't, but that may be because I learned my math under Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If I understand former commercial banker, now Treasury Secretary David Kennedy correctly, he's telling us that when you and I make more money and spend more money, we somehow put a hex on the dollar. In our smudged hands, the dollar loses value. It becomes inflationary. But when big business and big industry and big banks get their hands on the dollar and stuff it away for their own use, it is a "sounder" dollar and the economy is stronger.

If that isn't either a double standard or double talk, then I suspect it may be both.

The banks today—with the approval of the Republican Administration and the cooperation of their partners, the corporate giants of business—are charging 49 per cent more interest than they were charging a year ago. It is no burden at all to the big industrialist because he doesn't borrow from banks. He finances his expansion out of excess profits. But it is a tremendous burden on the small businessman, the homeowner, the wage-earner who must borrow for emergencies. The banks are charging 425 per cent more interest—at a minimum—than they were charging in 1950 (the prime rate in 1950 was two per cent versus eight and a half today). One is compelled to think that the hard-hearted banker of the old time melodrama has come back—except that this time he is not merely foreclosing the mortgage on Little Nell, he is, with hydrophobic rage, putting the bite on all of us.

Now, it's painful enough to be gouged like that. But it's downright excruciating to be gouged for a phony reason, and the banks have the phoniest.

They say they are charging these rates to save the country from inflation.

They explain that if they succeed in putting such a high cost on money that you and I can't afford to borrow any, then we won't squander it on food and clothing and house payments and college education and hospital care. The banks thereby will have saved us from a life of over-indulgence.

And since money will be scarce, it will be more valuable to those who have it—which won't be you and me. And thus the bankers will have restored to America the virtues of thrift, and the laboring man will be more humble and more willing to do twice as much work for half as much money.

Higher and higher interest rates are the Republican key to the "sound dollar," and since interest rates are now the highest in our history, they must see economic perfection just around the corner.

HONEST, IT'S ONLY PATRIOTISM

Now, let's put this pious explanation of theirs in perspective. Let's imagine that all the trade unionists in America were to call a press conference today and announce that we were demanding a 31 per cent wage increase out of a sincere desire to save the

country's economy. We would point out that in the first quarter of 1969 corporate profits *after* taxes hit $53 billion compared to $49.1 billion a year before. And we would explain that our 31 per cent wage hike would keep money out of the hands of the employers, who otherwise would bring on an inflationary spiral by blowing their big profits on new fleets of Rolls Royces, winter homes on the Riviera, and matching sets of His and Hers yachts. We would be careful to make it understood that we were raising wages to the highest point in history as a public service. Not for our benefit, mind you. Strictly as an act of patriotism.

You know what the reception to that announcement would be. By showing great restraint, the Republican Administration might stop short of calling out the Marines. The Republican press would denounce us as crackpots and bandits. Anti-labor speeches would fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. New laws would be proposed to crush unions.

If *we* were to tinker with the economy on such a grand scale for *our* personal gain, it would be highly irresponsible, but it would be no more irresponsible than what they, the bankers, are doing today.

Albert Rees, professor of economics and public affairs at Princeton University, says in his book *The Economics of Trade Unions:* "Direct union effects on wage costs, on what seems a generous estimate, account for less than one-fifth of the rise in final prices."

THE LITTLE MATTER OF $15 BILLION

We can easily make another comparison. If all the unions in America—all of them, industrial as well as trade unions—got together and forced a pay raise of 49 per cent (making it a total of 425 per cent more than in 1950, as the banks did) without an iota of increased productivity to our society, the United States Attorney's office would take instant action to prosecute labor leaders for anti-trust conspiracy. Yet this is exactly what the bankers who are behind the present administration have gotten away with.

Back on June 9, 1969, the banking community of this country—the *entire* banking community, not just a few scattered collaborators—raised interest rates by a full percentage point overnight; this was the first time in a generation that such a big increase had been made at one time—and Washington's sympathetic bureaucrats did not even threaten the bankers, much less punish them for this anti-trust conspiracy. One percentage point may not sound like enough to get excited about, but that percentage point costs the average borrower an extra ten per cent in interest; and since borrowing of all kinds now totals about $1.5 trillion a year, the percentage point increase puts $15 billion more into the pockets of the bankers. When Wright Patman asked Treasury Secretary David Kennedy did he "ask the bankers to roll it back," his anwer was: "Why should I."

The officially stated policy of the Federal Reserve Board—similarly indifferent—is that "it is not up to the Federal Reserve Board to pronounce judgment of either approval or disapproval" of the higher rates. Such things, says the board, should be determined by the money market.

This position is fraudulent. The interest rates have not been determined by the money market for nearly 40 years. The interest rates have been rigged throughout our history by the major banks, and since the early 1930s there has even been a "minimum price" for money—a minimum price which is set by the banks themselves. That is what the prime interest is—a minimum price. Or, to put it bluntly, the prime rate is a price-fixing device.

THE TWO FACES OF INFLATION

And this brings me to a point that union leaders and union members had better get firmly in mind: We are bucking one of the most powerful propaganda campaigns since the 1920s.

Inflation is a rising price of something that you use. The rising price of steel is more inflationary than the rising price of bananas because steel enters into more products. But nothing enters into more products than money, and therefore when the price of money goes up (that is, when interest rates go up) the price of *everything*—food, housing, utilities, clothing, you name it—goes up.

After a year of the highest interest rates in American history—rates that allegedly were supposed to stop inflation—prices are higher than ever, the Consumer Price Index in January 1970 showed that it took $131 to buy the same goods and services that cost only $123 in December 1968. And while you and I were paying record prices for necessities, the banks were making record profits. Net income per share of stock in the Bank of America, the world's largest bank, rose 15 per cent between 1968 and 1969. Morgan Guaranty of New York did equally well. But banks that only made 15 per cent were practically poverty stricken compared to, say, the First National Bank of Chicago, whose earnings per share rose 44 per cent, or the Valley National Bank of Phoenix, Arizona, whose share earnings rose 62 per cent.

The greatest contribution we can make to the economy of our country is to exert a counter-balance to the bankers' propaganda by convincing our neighbors of the truth: that the word "inflation" is meaningless unless you say what kind of inflation you're talking about.

There are two faces of inflation, two kinds of inflation—contrary to what the bankers have told the American people for so many years.

One kind produces growth. It is a Controlled Inflation and except in periods of depression or sharp recession it is normal to our economy; Controlled Inflation comes from the investment of federal money in better education, better health, better highways and homes. This kind of inflation supplies money for cleaning up ghettos, for improving sharecroppers' farms, for building roads through the mountains of Appalachia so that the poverty-stricken mountaineers can come down to the flatlands where the jobs are.

SOME SOCIALISTS WEAR VESTS

Controlled Inflation is investment in America. Bankers know that money invested in improving a piece of property will increase its value manyfold. When we use a Controlled Inflation to obtain money to correct social problems, we are going to gain in the same way by making this particular piece of real estate—these 50 states of the United States—a better place to live.

The money we lay out to rescue a man from the slums and turn him into a wage-earner instead of a welfare dependent is an investment—and it may not be an inexpensive project; but for the rest of his life he will be paying us back by spending what he earns in the American marketplace. What we spend to clean up a river is a costly investment; but for many years thereafter we will be getting back profit from the river in commercial fishing, sports fishing, recreation industries, and in a clean water supply for the cities served by it. It is interesting to note here that as late as 1840 the Hudson River contained so much sturgeon that we exported caviar to Russia. There were oyster beds in New York Harbor and schools of salmon swimming up the Hudson River. We all know what goes up the Hudson River now, and what comes down. The money we spend to purify the air over our soot-clogged cities is a heavy one-time investment, but it will profit us for years to come in more productive lives and fewer hospital bills.

Republican bankers would probably call this socialism; they call anything socialism that helps the average person. And this is very funny indeed, because the most vigorous socialists in America are the bankers themselves. The federal government literally puts the banks in business by *giving* them the credit and the money they sell. Every day of the year the banks have on hand an average of $6 billion of federal money, for which they pay no interest and which they lend to you and me at nine per cent to ten per cent interest. The federal government lets the banks use our income tax payments; they lend us back our own taxes. Through the generosity of the federal government, the banks don't have to pay a penny on the $225 billion we have in our checking accounts. The Federal Reserve Board can, and does, *give* money at no cost to banks which, in turn, lend it to us at usurious rates. For example, when the Federal Reserve rules that the banks can lend six times as much as they have in reserve, this literally gives the banks six dollars for every one dollar in reserve. The banks take no risks, they are insured by the federal government. In short, banks claim to be the most capitalistic enterprise in the world and they are the most socialistic. They are put in business by the government and they are kept in business by the government, and the merchandise they sell is government-issue (money). And you can't get more socialistic than that.

TIME TO CHANGE DEFINITIONS

The difference between socialism of the bankers, by the bankers, and for the bankers and what I have been calling Controlled Inflation is similar to the difference between a parasite and a taxpayer. But perhaps to avoid any confusion, this controlled investment inflation should have another name. After all, we don't say that when a child passes through his juvenile years and into manhood he has become "inflated." He has simply matured; he has become stronger; he has grown up. When our government pumps money wisely into the development of the people and the land, there may be an insignificant devaluation of the dollar but there is a tremendously significant improvement in the distribution of wealth, and the overall result is not inflation so much as it is growth.

The other face of our inflation is the one that the bankers who are running this administration like to see. To them it's beautiful. It is the kind of inflation that raises all prices simultaneously—not by raising the purchasing power of the wage-earners and not by creating more wage-earners but by raising the price of money itself, the profit from which goes directly into the bankers' pockets.

I call this "Bankers Inflation" because that's what it is. Among the many disasters that it creates is a much higher price tag on the national debt. The highest cost in the federal budget—next to national defense—is the interest we are paying directly to the bankers on this debt, which of course drains away tax money critically needed elsewhere.

Bankers Inflation raises the cost of education so high that many young men and women are dropping out of college this year; they can't pay the interest required on a student loan, which bankers have forced up to the ten per cent level. Because of the Bankers Inflation, the average young newly-married couple will work one year of their lives to pay the interest added to the cost of their home just during the past year.

Bankers Inflation keeps people from buying new houses. Considering the increased population, we are building homes at a slower rate today than 20 years ago. Houses aren't being built because Americans are being priced out of the market. Congressional studies show that half the people in this country cannot afford the mortgage payments on a $20,000 home, a price which in some areas would hardly buy a shack. On a home of that price,

spread over a 30-year mortgage, a person will pay $10,000 more than he would have paid with pre-Nixon interest rates.

Bankers Inflation burdens the taxpayer. Thanks to the Federal Reserve Board and its emphasis on higher interest rates, the taxpayer is now paying more than $9 billion a year in extra interest on the federal deficit that he would not be paying if the rates had been held to their 1952 level. In other words, thanks to the Federal Reserve Board, the highest cost in the budget—next to national defense—is the interest we are paying to the banks on the national debt. The public debt, as a percentage of the gross national product, is only half as large today as it was 20 years ago. The public debt isn't killing us; it's the interest we pay on the national debt that is killing us. How can the Federal Reserve Board on the one hand say the most inflationary thing in the world is the federal deficit, and then deliberately—through rising interest rates—increase the burden upon the federal government by more than $9 billion in annual interest rates?

Bankers Inflation undercuts needed health and educational programs. Remember when President Nixon vetoed the education and health budget passed by Congress because it contained about one billion dolars more than he wanted, and he said that was inflationary? Well, in the past year his administration has permitted the banks to increase the interest on the national debt by $1.5 billion. If he had required the bankers to hold the line, the savings on the debt alone would have more than offset the HEW increase. In other words, this administration has forced our school children to pay the bankers' excess profits.

Bankers Inflation is the kind you get when you tie a rope around a man's arm and cut off the blood supply. The arm becomes puffy. It is a sick, unnatural swelling. The rope of high interests is choking our economy like that right now.

But the Republican economists tell us to have patience. If commodities can be priced out of the reach of the average man, they say, then prices will be stabilized and all will be well. It just shows, they never change. The most stable price level this nation has ever seen—except for falling farm prices—was between 1922 and 1929, when the wholesale price index was virtually stationary—and *still* we ended up in the biggest crash we have ever had.

Why? Because while the price level was stable, wages were rising much slower than productivity. People couldn't buy what they were making. We got a terrible distribution of wealth. Republican economists didn't do anything about it.

RETOUCHING THE X-RAY

When Republicans say as they do now that by raising the price of money they will curb inflation, it is as if a patient shown evidence of cancer in his X-ray were to say: "I don't need surgery, just remove the cancer from the X-ray." The Republicans refuse to recognize that the malady was lack of purchasing power. They would rather tinker with the x-ray for their own benefit than treat the real cause for the benefit of the country.

It took a man like Franklin Roosevelt to come in and read the X-ray honestly and go to work on the ailment. He spent federal funds on vast social programs that sophisticated Republican economists sneered at. He built back our purchasing power and let the nation begin a healthy growth once more. He consciously created a Controlled Inflation, which is the kind I believe we have no reason to fear.

But did the Republican bankers learn their lesson from that period—a period in which the bankers drove themselves into bankruptcy and were jumping out their corporate windows like sparrows? Absolutely not. They have taken an X ray of our economy today, and as usual, they have diagnosed everything backwards, in a way which benefits them, not the welfare of the country.

TESTING THEIR SINCERITY

So I propose a test. If the bankers want to prove that they are raising interest rates for patriotic and not for selfish reasons, let them now come forward and support a bill (H.R. 15487) introduced recently by Congressman Farbstein of New York and Congressman Eckhardt of Texas, which would tax excess bank profits. It would permit the banks to charge any level of interest they wanted to charge, but it would tax them in such a way that they would make no profit on an interest higher than nine per cent. If they wanted to charge ten per cent interest, or more, "to fight inflation" as they claim, they could go right ahead and do that, but the extra profits would be returned to the government. I think the cut-off point for profits should be seven or eight per cent interest, at most, but if Farbstein and Eckhardt want to bend over backward to be fair, at least this gives the bankers the chance to show their sincerity by supporting a ban on excess profits. Surely they would want to do that.

Let them give that money back to the government to spend on cleaning up slums, rivers and air; on creating jobs and raising the social security payments of those who, on fixed income, are hardest hit by rising costs. When we speak of big banks, we also mean big business and big industry, for through interlocking directorates they are the same. So we can say the establishment bankers, along with their partners, the corporate giants of business, have destroyed the oxygen in the air through the pollution from their smokestacks. They have destroyed the oxygen in the water by dumping chemical waste that kills fish and plant life in the rivers and lakes. Now they are cutting off the oxygen in our economy—money—and are killing the borrower with high interest rates. If they want to show that they have done this out of the goodness of their hearts, then let them return their excess profits to the United States. This would be only fitting, proper and patriotic, for the high interest rates they charge have been the catalyzing agent for recessions, bankruptcies and strikes.

The proposals I have outlined here were submitted to a number of members of the House of Representatives and overwhelmingly approved—by a ratio of nine to one. Phillip Burton, Calif., Bob Eckhardt, Tex., Wright Patman, Tex., chairman of the Banking Committee, Bertram L. Podell, N.Y., Benjamin S. Rosenthal, N.Y., William F. Ryan, N.Y., John V. Tunney, Calif., and Morris K. Udall, Ariz., are among those giving wholehearted support. Write your own Congressman to keep the reform momentum going!

H.R. 15487

A bill to increase the actuarial soundness of the Government National Mortgage Association

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

SECTION 1. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, every person who makes a finance charge for any extension of credit at an annual percentage rate in excess of 8 per centum shall pay an annual interest stabilization fee to the Government National Mortgage Association in an amount equal to 1 per centum of the annual interest charge for each one-tenth percentage point by which the annual percentage rate exceeds 8 per centum. Where the amount financed varies during the year, or the period of repayment is less than a year, the amount of the fee shall be ratably adjusted. Where the period of repayment is more than a year, the fee shall be paid with respect to each year during which there is at any time an unpaid balance outstanding, but need not be paid in advance of receipt of the finance charge.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) do not apply to any loan meeting all of the following conditions:

(1) the amount of the loan is under $10,000, and

(2) the making of the loan is regulated by an agency of a State under a small loan law or similar statute.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the terms "finance charge", and "annual percentage rate" shall be defined as in sections 106 and 107 of the Truth in Lending Act, but shall not be restricted to consumer and agricultural transactions.

SEC. 3. The Government National Mortgage Association shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any fees paid pursuant to this Act shall be held by the Government National Mortgage Association in a separate fund, and pursuant to title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, to stabilize and strengthen the national housing market.

THE WELFARE FORD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Ford Foundation and its controversial misuse of tax-free funds continues in disrepute.

More Americans are sharing in the dividends from this monster of special interest wealth—dividends in violence, anarchy, and even subversion.

While not all Ford Foundation grants are funneled into lost causes, destructive of free enterprise and Americanism, nevertheless it has been permitted to become associated with the extremes of society to where mention of its name is rapidly becoming a household nasty word.

In Washington its funded educational TV station, WETA, has even become under attack by the liberals for denial of freedom association. A $50,000 a year male newscaster was fired simply because his wife went to work for a southerner.

But then Mr. Ford the Second has now completed his tour of Russia as a guest of the Socialist government of that democracy and announces he is considering giving the Russians one of the world's largest truck plants.

Silence prevails as to whether his decision was thought to escape Walter Reuther or if merely to give the world a Ford vehicle in a competitive price bracket with the Sovietized Fiat—also being funded and machined with U.S. dollars and mechanical ingenuity.

Competition between foreign manufacturers using slave labor should produce a sure monopoly on the international market but it may prove a desperate step for Ford merely to keep from realizing any profits to add to the Ford Foundation kitty. And there is reason to doubt that under the Soviet system any such powerful reactionary mechanism as a tax-free foundation would be tolerated.

But as long as the tax-free dollars earned with free competitive enterprise hold out there will be a new class develop in Russia to commemorate Lenin's 100th birthday. Those with the welfare Ford.

I insert several related news articles, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 26, 1970]

SOVIETS INVITE FORD FOR VISIT

DETROIT, March 25.—Henry Ford II is going to Moscow April 12 because the Russians apparently are looking for help from the Ford Motor Co. in building an auto industry.

The industrialist, board chairman of the world's second biggest auto firm, was invited to the Soviet Union "for a series of discussions." The visit is expected to last about a week.

There is no agenda set yet but the meetings obviously will deal with the auto business. The invitation came from the Soviet ministries for science and technology. It was sent through diplomatic channels two weeks ago.

A Ford spokesman said the company has no present plans to sell cars in the Soviet Union or to build a factory there. But the spokesman admitted the Russians may be interested in such a deal. Ford apparently is also interested, but with some reservations.

The spokesman noted that Ford "has said previously that the time has come to dismantle many of the obstacles to trade between the Western world and the countries of Eastern Europe."

The company made it plain that it's not interested in building a factory under a contract, then turning over the keys to the Soviet government and going home. Fiat of Italy and Renault of France are engaged in such work contracts. British Leyland Motors has been trying for years to arrange a similar deal. Volkswagen had discussions with the Russians last fall but the German company denies it plans to sell the Soviet tooling for its beetle.

It was not known today if Ford will visit the Fiat plant, at Togliatti, about 500 miles southeast of Moscow on the Volga River.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1970]

RUSSIA ASKS FACTORY AID, FORD REPORTS

Moscow.—Henry Ford II reported yesterday the Soviet Union has asked the Ford Motor Co. to help in development and construction of a vast truck-manufacturing project here.

Ford said the company is interested but many factors had to be looked into first.

Ford declined to put a price tag on the project but said it involved a complete plant, including a foundry, for making heavy duty trucks. Eventual output would total 150,000 trucks a year.

Ford described the project, to be built on the Kama River, tributary of Volga, as "tremendous" and would eventually be one of the largest truck plants in the world.

He indicated his company was interested in the Soviet bid for Ford assistance but said no commitments had been made and considerable study was needed before he could decided how he would respond to the Soviet request.

A factor to be considered and investigated, he said, was whether U.S. restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union would apply to the project.

Ford made the announcement after meeting in the Kremlin with Premier Alexei N. Kosygin.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 29, 1970]

"NEWSROOM" FIRING POSES FOUNDATION TROUBLE

(By Richard Wilson)

A $50,000-a-year newsman for the local educational television station, WETA, has been fired because his wife went to work as a public relations woman for Mrs. Martha Mitchell. Conflict of interest was supposed to be the reason.

This has caused a tremendous flap in media circles but for other reasons the discharge of William Woestendiek, editor of the station's "Newsroom," came at an extremely inopportune time for the big foundations. The Ford Foundation is one of the supporters of WETA and its TV adviser, Fred W. Friendly, has told a House subcommittee that he had nothing to do, as was originally thought, with firing the husband of Martha Mitchell's press agent.

As it happened, certain influential officials in the Nixon administration, apparently with the President's encouragement, were at the time beginning to burn with indignation over foundation-financed "sharp-shooting and second-guessing" of the Republican administration in Washington.

The firing of Woestendiek was taken as confirmation that the intellectual and political climate fostered by foundation financing is hostile to the administration. It goes farther than that. Some of the President's advisers think that Democratic castouts from the Kennedy-Johnson era have found haven in foundations, universities and international organizations, from which protected positions they have launched a tax-exempt assault on the political, economic and social structure of the country.

They are accused of clandestine political activities, and writing books and articles and turning out speeches for their allies on Capitol Hill in a concerted attempt to blacken the administration and promote a series of liberal causes ranging from unilateral disarmament to the advancement of educational television and dissolution of the military-industrial complex.

A good deal of research data has been drawn together to show that such accusations are well supported. This should be useful to the Treasury Department in drawing up regulations to implement the new limitations voted by Congress on foundation financing of politically related causes and institutions. So it is plain that the WETA officials could not have picked a worse time to protect their intellectual purity from any subtle marital taint by the wife of the attorney general secondhand.

Mrs. Mitchell, it has been pointed out, might well have been equally as concerned that the husband of the press agent who was supposed to protect her was directing news from educational television.

Whatever the merits of that controversy, it does serve to bring to public attention the impressive emigration of the Kennedy-Johnson clique into the shielded and well-heeled cloisters of the privately controlled educational and charitable foundations.

We start right at the top with Robert S. McNamara, president of the World Bank, who is a trustee of both the Ford Foundation and the Brookings Institution and an honorary associate of the Kennedy Institute of Politics.

The list becomes much longer and includes dozens of former officials in the Ford Foundation, the Brookings Institution and other establishments which are offering critiques on national policy which sometimes send Nixon up the wall.

Some of the Nixon people call the foundation experts a "shadow government" and the "academic-foundation complex."

Poor Woestendiek, having gotten used to a $50,000-a-year job, need not despair. A foundation may come along to finance his cerebrations but he probably wouldn't like the work as well with H. L. Hunt, the Texas defender of our freedoms.

HARRY CHADDICK GETS "RAGS TO RICHES" AWARD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to learn that one of the most prominent members of the Chicago community will be among 10 Americans to receive the 1970 Horatio Alger Award from the American Schools & Colleges Association at the 24th annual award dinner in New York on May 6, 1970.

Harry F. Chaddick is the founder of one of the Nation's largest trucking companies, and is also respected in Chicago as one of our most prominent civic leaders.

He has become most successful as a real estate developer. He was named one of the recipients of the "Rags to Riches" Award on the basis of his phenomenal success in real estate developing and in his transport industry.

Harry Chaddick grew up on Chicago's west side and left school at the age of 14 to help support his family by working as an errand boy for 7 days a week.

Today, he is recognized as one of our city's most prominent millionaires. Mr. Chaddick continues to retain the humility and the kindness toward his fellow men which has helped bring him his huge successes. Mr. Chaddick became successful because he learned early in life how to work with people; how to gain their confidence; how to provide effective leadership; and above all, high standards of integrity in his dealings with his fellow man.

Harry Chaddick's word is his bond.

His energy is inexhaustible. Besides directing his own successful business institutions, Harry Chaddick has served as chairman of Mayor Daly's Zoning Review Committee and was also instrumental in setting up the zoning code for all of the unincorporated area of Cook County.

He has been the campaign manager of County Assessor P. J. Cullerton who today is regarded as one of the most highly respected public officials in Illinois.

Harry Chaddick is the principal owner of the Tennis Club in Palm Springs, Calif., and is currently involved in a number of other developments in this exciting region.

I am sure his legion of friends join me in congratulating him on the honor being paid him by the American Schools & Colleges Association. Harry Chaddick is a constant source of inspiration to his fellow man and we are all fortunate to be able to include him as our friend.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Superintendent to fly a flag in honor of Mr. Chaddick on May 6 because, indeed, Harry Chaddick symbolizes the boundless opportunities that are offered to the American individual under the principles symbolized by the American flag.

It is my hope to present him with the flag on the day he receives the Horatio Alger Award.

DISSENT AND REVOLUTION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the latest theme of the permissive cult is that the clarion call should be for order with justice and their complaint that those who call for order make a fetish or order at the expense of justice. Whatever may be the merits of this position in individual cases, there can be no justice without order. Nor for that matter can there be much of anything except anarchy in a disorderly society.

Dissent is constitutionally protected only within the framework of order. When dissent spills over into revolution by force and violence it is no longer dissent. It becomes revolution pure and simple.

A good question nowadays is how far America can afford to continue to tolerate unlawful revolutionary dissent. In this connection a recent column by William F. Buckley, Jr., is most interesting:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1970]

REVOLUTION AND USES OF REPRESSION

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

I have been kid-watching for the last few days, trying to explore the mood of those who listen and think about the current disorders, the causes and the cures thereof.

I have been advancing at the colleges the thesis that precisely what is needed these days, properly understood, are very solid doses of repression; not in a spirit of vindictiveness, but in the spirit of teaching those who wonder, that the United States is very serious about surviving the current doubts about itself, and about the worthwhileness of its essential institutions.

I have advanced the proposition that the toleration of revolutionary dissent is something America has traditionally practiced (at such times as we have practiced it) primarily as a demonstration of our own complacency, not out of respect for any abstract right to revolutionize.

It is a high form of self-indulgence to stroll through London's Hyde Park and listen lazily to the orators who denounce the nation's free institutions, while we know them to be utterly safe—rather like the child's dream of waking in a jungle surrounded by wild beasts which, however, are powerless to hurt, because you are surrounded by a bubble of glass that is proof against their aggressions.

We are engaged in testing in this country, in such proceedings as those against the Chicago 7, whether the law can stand up against such organized judicial assaults upon it as the bomb throwers and their lawyers are capable of launching. That is the moment for action, bearing in mind the injunction by Hamilton, "The hope of impunity is a strong incitement to sedition; the dread of punishment, a proportionably strong discouragement to it."

So, in an age when barbarians plot to drop bombs in department stores, and other barbarians succeed in preventing others from speaking, the time is clearly at hand for what some choose to call repression, what others call a militant defense of the law.

Thoughtful students can see the point, but the great tug of their emotional opposition, or so it seems to me, is their profound conviction that the adults' concern for the law is a selective thing, that we are disposed to enforce only those laws we desire to see enforced and that we are careful to select our victims from the ranks of the weak and the dispossessed. They have a point.

I think, for instance, of Gov. Claude Kirk of Florida, who has been grandstanding his defiance of the law these days. At this writing, the courts appear to have won, and the governor has capitulated under the pressure of a $10,000-per-day sentence. It is good that he should have done so.

On the other hand, I did not run into one student who believed that the day would ever come when, in fact, he would have to put up that $10,000, any more than the postmen and the teachers and the motormen and the air traffic controllers have had to put up the money they have been formally assessed.

Do you remember Ross Barnett? He was governor of Mississippi. He defied the law flagrantly, was threatened with all manner of things. I know not where he resides—perhaps at the Smithsonian Institution. But I do know he does not reside in jail. The government, in order to be convincing, needs to go after some big targets.

I would suggest, for instance, Justice William O. Justice. It is simply unconvincing to try the Chicago 7, and to maintain on the high court a gentleman who publishes a book in which he suggests revolution is probably the only indicated course to break the institutional logjam. Douglas should be impeached, and notwithstanding Robert Welch gave impeachment a bad name.

There are interesting signs of a crackdown on licentious sedition. The Supreme Court has ruled that a refractory defendant can be bound and gagged. Another court has ruled that a policeman may disperse a meeting that veers toward unruliness.

A grand jury is investigating charges that students at American University violated the rights of other students by preventing them from engaging in activities of the ROTC.

Here is the warp and woof of what the revolutionists, always oblivious to the rights of counter-revolutionists, call repression: what others call the politics of stability. But if we are to be convicing, we must go also after the high and the mighty. Other nominations are welcome.

FOOLING AROUND WITH THE CLOCK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, now that the country has once again gone through its semiannual exercise of readjusting the clocks, transportation schedules, working hours, and so forth, I would again like to call this body's attention to H.R. 16139, introduced in February by myself and 10 colleagues.

This bill would direct the Secretary of Transportation to undertake a detailed study of the concept of year-round daylight saving time. If the results of that study were favorable—if it showed substantial public benefits from year-round daylight saving time—then the bill would authorize a 2-year trial period.

Personally, I believe there would be many positive results from having daylight time through the winter as well as the summer. These would be reduced crime, improved traffic safety, more afterschool playtime for children and an end to the twice-yearly confusion surrounding time changes.

The Milwaukee Sentinel recently editorialized on this subject, pointing out that there are two schools of thought on the subject of daylight saving time. The editorial of April 25, 1970, follows:

THAT TIME AGAIN

With the time at hand to spring forward an hour on Sunday to gain 60 minutes of evening daylight for the next six months, the question of fooling around with the hands on the clock once again comes to the fore.

The Uniform Time Act of 1966, which established Daylight Saving Time for all states that didn't choose to exempt themselves, did not settle the issue. Some, mainly the rural types, would like to see the DST period shortened to June, July and August or done away with entirely. Others, principally the urban types, want to see DST put on a year round basis.

The British are into their third year of a year round DST. Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.) has introduced a bill proposing a study of year round DST looking toward a two year trial in America.

Proponents of permanent DST are primarily concerned about giving urban residents an extra hour of daylight in which to get home from work in the winter months. They say this would act to prevent crime and ease traffic problems, although opponents respond that winter daylight time might simply transfer the problems of darkness to the morning rush hours.

Another point made by those in favor of year round DST is that it would eliminate the confusion and bother of resetting clocks and schedules twice a year.

Which brings us back to the point that Sunday is the day for setting clocks ahead an hour. If this fiddling with "God's time" upsets you, look on the bright side. You have one less hour this weekend to worry about it—or whatever other cosmic problem is troubling you. Take advantage of this lost hour, for you will, God willing, be paid back with an extra hour of worry time comes Oct. 25.

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has acted decisively and with forthrightness in sending troops into enemy enclaves in Cambodia to protect our men from an increasingly intolerable situation in Vietnam. I have sent the President the following telegram in support of his courageous action:

GREENWOOD, S.C.,
May 1, 1970.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

There could be no peace or orderly withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam with privileged Communist bases only a few miles from Saigon reigning death and destruction on our men and on women and children as well. You will have my support in your courageous decision to eliminate this enemy sanctuary in Cambodia. Your positive action will save American lives and contribute to peace.

Respectfully and sincerely,
WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress

JUSTICE FOR THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the outspoken critics of the Nixon administration are fond of hurling accusations and charges, but they often neglect to support them with facts.

Such is the case with the charges that the Nixon administration, and particularly the Justice Department, has been falling down in the area of civil rights.

An enlightening editorial from the Boston Herald Traveler points out that these charges are indeed without substance, and gives precise statistics to back up this statement. For instance, the Justice Department, under John Mitchell, filed in 1969, 40 percent more civil rights cases than it did under Ramsey Clark during the last year of the Johnson administration. And a fact which the Nixon critics would never admit to is that more southern school districts have been forced to convert their schools to unitary systems during the present academic year than in all of the years from 1954 to 1969 combined.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

JUSTICE FOR THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Most reasonable people who have followed the matter closely would concede that the Nixon administration has taken at least a moderate position on the issue of civil rights. Nonetheless, a good many people seem to have the impression that the President—and particularly the Justice Department—have been back-tracking in this area. Hardly a day goes by without some new charge being leveled to the effect that the administration is doing nothing for black Americans and is easing up on the enforcement of civil rights laws as part of a cynical Southern strategy.

There have been several actions and policy statements by the administration which might lend credence to such charges and suspicions. But in the main, they are without solid foundation. In fact, there is considerable evidence to suggest that in many important respects the Nixon administration has been doing more for black Americans and has been more vigorous in its enforcement of civil rights laws than its predecessors.

Surprising as it may seem, this happens to be true of the Justice Department—although, ironically, Attorney General John Mitchell's shop seems to be the target of particularly severe criticism on this score.

Has Mr. Mitchell's department really been lackadaisical in the enforcement of civil rights laws? Not at all. During the last year of the Johnson administration, the Justice Department under Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark filed a total of 131 rights cases. Last year, under Mr. Mitchell, the department filed 186 cases (an increase of 40 percent), and in the first two months this year 56 cases have been filed.

Has the Justice Department really been letting the South get away with evading the responsibility to eliminate the old dual ("separate but equal") school systems? Not on your life. Believe it or not, more Southern school districts have been forced to convert their schools to unitary systems during the present academic year than in all of the years from 1954 to 1969 combined!

Is Mr. Mitchell, perhaps, discriminating against blacks in his own bailiwick? No indeed. There are more black lawyers serving in the Justice Department today, as assistant U.S. attorneys and deputy marshals, than at any time in history.

It may be argued that the Nixon administration in general, and the Justice Department in particular, could be doing more in these and other areas of civil rights. But it is hardly fair to suggest, as so many have been suggesting, that the administration has either been doing nothing or, worse still, that it has been turning the clock back.

NEEDS, COSTS, AND VALUE OF WATER IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was not long ago that the Congress was deeply involved in legislation relating to the water needs of the Colorado River Basin, which includes a substantial area of some 244,000 square miles and seven Western States and the Republic of Mexico. Earlier this month, Mr. Myron Holburt, chief engineer, Colorado River Board of California, presented a summary of the needs, costs, and value of water in the Colorado River Basin to the Second National Conference on Weather Modification, which was sponsored by the American Meteorological Society.

I thought this was an excellent paper. Accordingly, I insert his remarks into the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues and others in the Federal Government might have this opportunity to review an up-to-date status report of a matter which was considered by the Congress:

NEEDS, COSTS, AND VALUE OF WATER IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss some of the needs, costs and value of water in the Colorado River Basin. The purpose of this paper is to provide background information on water needs in the Colorado River Basin as basis for a discussion of the role weather modification might play in meeting a portion of these needs.

INTRODUCTION

The Colorado River and its tributaries drain 244,000 square miles, which is approximately one-twelfth of the coterminous United States. It drains portions of the upper states of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico, and the lower states of California, Arizona, and Nevada, as well as the Republic of Mexico. As the only major river in this vast, largely arid area, it has been looked to by the seven states and the Republic of Mexico to support their present economy and also to provide a basis for future development. Since it is the only major river in this area, the Colorado River has been one of the most controversial rivers in the world. There have been political battles, legal and engineering disputes, and interstate agreements and disagreements extending over a period of more than one-half century. Even with all this activity, the problems of the river have not been solved; in fact, they grow more complex with time. Each state considers that it has certain rights to the river and very jealously will move to protect them.

The water is used and reused many times. In the last decade only a minor amount of highly saline water has flowed to the Gulf of California. In addition to the needs of lands within the drainage basin itself, the waters of the Colorado River are diverted out of the basin by transmountain diversions into other regions of the states of Colorado, Utah, and California. Work is under way on transbasin diversions into New Mexico, and the State of Wyoming is also studying possible diversions out of the basin.

WATER SUPPLY

The natural flows of the Colorado River represent a picture of violent contrasts, with rampaging floods occurring in some years and drought conditions in others. These erratic annual flows, measured with reasonable accuracy since 1922 and estimated by correlation with other measurements since 1896, indicate an average long-term runoff of the river at Lee Ferry, Arizona (the Upper-Lower Basin division point) as unaffected by the works of man, of 14.8 million acre-feet per year (maf/yr) (1896–1968). Many of the high flows which develop this average occurred prior to 1922. The records show two striking periods: the 1896–1930 average flow of 16.8 maf/yr and the 1931–1969 average flow of 13.0 maf/yr. After making detailed analyses, the Board and other water supply experts have concluded that even with long-term regulation, the dependable yield of the river at Lee Ferry (undepleted by man) will be less than 14 maf/yr.

AGREEMENTS, LITIGATION AND LEGISLATION

The early settlers in the Colorado River Basin diverted stream flows and developed irrigated areas as the basis for their agricultural economy from the earliest days of settlement in the Basin. While irrigation was practiced throughout the Basin, because of the year-round growing season and extensive areas of easily developed arable land, use in the Lower Basin advanced more rapidly than that in the Upper Basin. However, in the years after 1900, Lower Basin uses along the mainstream reached a limit whereby further uses would require regulation of the erratic flows of the Colorado River. Interest centered on the construction of a dam which would be large enough to provide (1) carryover storage of wet year runoff into the dry years, (2) annual regulation of the spring snowmelt so that water would be available year-round, and (3) flood control storage to protect the lands along the lower river from floods that occurred with regularity.

Initially, there was opposition in the Upper Colorado River Basin states to such a dam because it would enable irrigation and municipal uses in the Lower Basin to rapidly increase. They feared that the unappropriated water yet remaining would be appropriated by the Lower Basin. Generally speaking, under the water law existing throughout the West, prior appropriations have priority over later appropriations.

The Upper Basin states wanted division of water of the river by an interstate agreement before they would agree to construction of a major dam to regulate the river. Accordingly, the seven states, with Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, as the Federal Chairman of the Compact Commission, developed the Colorado River Compact in 1922. Subsequently, it was ratified by six of the seven states in the 1920's, with Arizona withholding approval until 1944.

The Compact apportions water between the upper and lower parts of the Colorado River Basin. Each Basin is apportioned 7.5 maf/yr for beneficial consumptive use, with the Lower Basin having the right to increase its beneficial use by one maf/yr. The Compact provides that the upper states of Colo-

rado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry (below Glen Canyon Dam) to be depleted below 75 maf during any ten-year period. At the time the Compact was agreed to, the river had experienced a number of years of high flows, and the negotiators thought the river would produce a dependable flow of at least three maf/yr more than it now appears is available.

The Compact also provides that waters of the Colorado River Basin, over and above the apportionments made to the Upper and Lower Basins, shall be used to meet any obligation to Mexico, but if such surplus quantities are insufficient, then the two Basins are to share equally in meeting the obligations of any treaty.

Subsequent to the Compact, the United States and Mexico entered into a treaty whereby the United States guaranteed to deliver 1.5 maf/yr of the waters of the Colorado River Basin to Mexico at the International Boundary. The amount of the Upper Basin Mexican Treaty obligation is a matter of dispute between the two Basins.

In 1948, the Upper Basin states divided the rights to water by means of the Upper Coloradio River Basin Compact. The Lower Basin states of California, Arizona, and Nevada were never able to agree upon a division, and 1964, the Supreme Court handed down its decree in *Arizona* v. *California*, which provided a basic document for establishing the rights of the three states. However, the decree did not define how much each state would share shortages but left this to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior or to Congress.

In 1968, Congress passed the Colorado River Basin Project Act, which provided that, in the event of shortage, existing water contractors would have a priority over the Central Arizona Project with California's priority limited to 4.4 maf/yr. This act also authorized the Central Arizona Project and several Upper Basin projects, as well as providing a number of other significant and important provisions.

The above documents together with three other Supreme Court decisions between Arizona and California, the Boulder Canyon Project Act and other major federal legislation, major legislation by the basin states, and numerous contracts between the federal government and public and private entities are collectively known as the "Law of the River", and are basic documents for actions taken on the river. It is important to recognize that many of these documents have not been interpreted in court and there is disagreement among concerned parties over their meaning.

PRESENT USES AND FUTURE NEEDS

The river is presently used to support vast irrigated areas, the major urban areas of Southern California, Denver and other cities on the eastern slope of the Rockies. In the future, it will help to develop the Phoenix, Tucson and Salt Lake City urban areas. In California alone, the river supplies approximately 80 percent of the water used in Southern California. It serves more than 700,000 acres of highly developed irrigated land and provides supplemental water for more than ten million people.

Water from the Colorado is used to generate hydro-power and provide cooling water for thermal power to meet the needs of the Southwest. It provides major recreational and fishing opportunities annually for millions of citizens. There are also major scenic and wildlife areas along the river. The demands in the future for all of these activities will be much greater than they are now.

For the basin as a whole, annual use of river water at present consists of nearly 3 maf in the Upper Basin above Lee Ferry, 6 maf in the Lower Basin, 1.5 maf delivered to Mexico, and 1 maf of losses below Hoover Dam for a total of about 11.5 maf/yr. Inflow between Lee Ferry and Hoover Dam on the average approximately balances reservior losses from Lake Mead. It is planned that the recently authorized Central Arizona Project will have a capacity of about 2 maf/yr (deliveries would average less than 2 maf/yr), and the five projects authorized in 1968 in the Upper Colorado River Basin will deplete the river by 360,000 maf/yr. In addition, there are a number of others previously authorized and in various stages of financing, construction and completion in the Upper Basin.

It is assumed that California's present use of approximately 5.0 maf/yr will be cut back to 4.4 maf/yr when the Central Arizona Project becomes operative, which is now estimated to occur in 1980. At that time, because of the priorities agreed to many years ago by California agencies, it is anticipated that The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) will have to bear a loss of at least 660,000 af/yr. Works are now nearing completion that will provide the replacement water for this expected loss. MWD increased its State Water Project allocation from 1.5 maf/yr to 2.0 maf/yr. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is constructing a second aqueduct from its Owens Valley supply which is expected to produce 152,000 maf/yr. Even with the cutback by California of its use of Colorado River water, completion of all authorized projects will greatly increase the total basin water demands, setting in motion the steps leading to future water shortages in the Colorado River Basin.

A number of experts have studied the growing demand for water of the states and regions within the Colorado River Basin and have made forecasts of the relationship between supply and demand. In testimony given to Congress in 1965, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Lower Basin states of California, Arizona, and Nevada, and consulting engineers for the Upper Basin states independently testified that major shortages will develop in the Colorado River Basin sometime between 1990 and around the turn of the century.

At the present time, major reservoirs in the Basin are at about one-half of their total capacity. If the undepleted flow at Lee Ferry averages 13.8 maf/yr, there will be an increase in storage in the major Colorado River reservoirs during the next decade. With the Central Arizona Project operative by 1980 and Upper Basin Projects completed as estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the minimal amount by which demands will exceed the supply is 0.7 maf/yr in 1980, 1.2 maf/yr in 1990 and 1.7 maf/yr in 2000. With the above assumptions, severe shortages can be avoided until the turn of the century by drawing down the major reservoirs to low levels. Water is also needed to refill MWD's Colorado River aqueduct, fill the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and meet additional demands. When these demands are considered, the total need for supplemental water by year 2000 is approximately 4 maf/yr.

SALINITY OF WATER

Coincidental with the problems of an insufficient quantity of water, the salinity problems (dissolved salts in water) associated with the Colorado River are also becoming more serious. At present, the salinity of Colorado River water at Lake Havasu, the point for diversion to the south coastal area of California and the future point for diversion to Central Arizona, averages about 700 ppm (parts of dissolved salts per million parts of water by weight). At Imperial Dam, the point from which water is diverted to the major California and Arizona agricultural users of Colorado River water, the salinity averages about 850 ppm, with seasonal fluctuations up to nearly 1100 ppm. At these levels, water is rated as poor to fair, largely because of the taste factor, but it is usable for municipal and industrial purposes. However, it does impose higher costs on users to compensate for the high salt content. The water is also adequate for agricultural purposes on easily draining soils, but for the tight soils that predominate portions of Imperial and Coachella valley, water of this salinity level causes a rapid accumulation of salts in the root zones to the extent that remedial measures are necessary in order to maintain an irrigated agricultural economy.

The most widely used remedial measures are the combination of installing a subdrainage network of tile pipes under irrigated fields that are connected to drainage outfall canals that remove water and salts from the soil, coupled with the application of excess amounts of water to leach out the salts that would otherwise accumulate in the soil. These measures are expensive.

With regard to the future, preliminary studies indicate that unless other remedial measures are taken, the salinity of Colorado River water will reach about 1300 ppm at Imperial Dam after the turn of the century. It appears, however, that it may be possible to substantially reduce the river's future salinity from these high levels by constructing various salinity control projects. These projects would include the elimination of highly saline springs, plugging flowing wells, lining of irrigation canals, construction of drainage ditches, reducing water deliveries to farmers, and better selection of irrigated lands. In addition, it is widely recognized that if the Colorado River were to be augmented by large quantities of relatively salt-free water, the dilution effect of this water would result in a significant reduction in the river's salinity.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

As the only major stream in this part of the country, the river is used for purposes other than meeting domestic and irrigation needs. Certain groups are demanding that backwater lakes be maintained and improved for fish and wildlife purposes. They want marshes maintained and oppose attempts to prevent the river from meandering. Many people oppose control of phreatophytes (water-loving plants along the river) and other aspects of programs to salvage water on the river. All of these activities are additional demands on the river. Millions of people visit the reservoirs and river for boating, fishing, waterskiing and general recreational purposes.

COST AND VALUE OF WATER

There is a wide variety of costs to users in the Colorado River Basin. The diversion from the Colorado River to the coastal plain of Southern California is made by The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California through a 240-mile aqueduct system with 1607 feet of pumping lift. They pay the federal government a nominal charge of $0.25/af for storage of water at Lake Mead. The cost of operating and maintaining the facilities is approximately $10 per acre-foot, and it costs another $10–$15/af to amortize the capital investment. The Central Arizona Project will divert from Lake Havasu, the same location as the Metropolitan diversion. Reports by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation indicate that they will charge Arizona municipal and industrial users $50/af and irrigation users $10/af at delivery points in Central Arizona.

The value of water has been a matter of dispute by economists, engineers, legislators, and others for many years. One recent indication of value was given by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation in its report on the Central Arizona Project. The Bureau estimated that each acre-foot of water used for irrigation purposes in Central Arizona has a direct benefit worth of $52.50/af and an indirect benefit of $45.50/af for a total benefit of $88/af.

Another measure of value of water is replacement cost. The capital cost to MWD of facilities to provide the 500,000 af/yr additional water from the State Water Project will be over $300,000,000. The total cost of this water including amortization of capital plus operation and maintenance costs is about $60/af. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power estimates its investment in the second Owens Valley aqueduct will be around $100,000,000. The total cost per acre-foot is estimated at about $30/af.

The bare figures given in the above paragraphs are inadequate measure of the value of a major water supply in an arid region. The completion of Hoover Dam in 1936 was a tremendous boon to Southern California. It enabled the storage of flood-water, and the construction of Parker Dam, which created Lake Havasu, the diversion point for MWD's Colorado River Aqueduct. Hoover also eliminated the flood and silt threat to the California and Arizona valleys, and enabled the expansion of safe agricultural development of Imperial, Coachella, Palo Verde and Yuma valleys. The availability of low cost energy from Hoover stimulated industrial development in the southwest.

The current cry is against development, and severe critism comes from many quarters about congestion and suburban sprawl in Southern California. Nevertheless, people came to Southern California because life was better here than where they came from. The net result of the use of water, power and recreation on the Colorado River is a better life for millions of citizens of this country.

In summary, only high quality water added to the Colorado River will have value for domestic, industrial, agricultural and power uses, as well as salinity control, recreational and wildlife uses. It would also serve to prevent further strife among the several states and the Republic of Mexico and help the further development of a major section of this country.

AUGMENTATION OF THE COLORADO RIVER

In order to prevent shortages from occurring in the future, the natural supply of the river should be augmented. At this time the alternatives being discussed are: (1) transbasin importation from areas of surplus, such as the Columbia River Basin or the California North Coast, (2) desalting of saline water, and (3) modification of weather to produce increased runoff.

In addition to these major sources, there are possible smaller quantities of water that may be made available through watershed treatment procedures and waste water reclamation. In regard to this latter possibility, it should be recognized that involuntary reclamation is now occurring throughout most of the Colorado River Basin, in that all return flows from domestic sewage plants are discharged, either into natural water channels or groundwater basins, where a significant portion is subsequently recovered and used.

Increased quantities of water that may be introduced into the river basin through any of the preceding means would be susceptible of being diverted to California's south coastal areas through future unused capacity in The Metropolitan Water District's Colorado River Aqueduct, or into the Central Arizona area through future unused capacity of the Central Arizona Project facilities. There is also unusued capacity in the existing agricultural transportation facilities. Accordingly, the initial transfer of augmented supplies to areas of use (up to the limits of unused capacity) would represent only the costs of operating and maintaing existing and to-be-constructed facilities.

Transbasin importations

To date, studies of importations into the Colorado River Basin have not been made in sufficient depth to give any reliable cost information. Any cost would probably be in excess of $70/af.

The Colorado River Basin Project Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop a plan to meet the water needs of the eleven western states. Preliminary reports are to be submitted every two years commencing June 30, 1971, with a final reconnaissance report due by June 30, 1977. However, the Secretary is precluded from making a study of any plan to import water from the Columbia River Basin into the Colorado River Basin until September 1978.

Desalting

Several years ago, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation investigated the feasibility of desalting water in the Pacific Ocean near Camp Pendleton, California, and delivering the desalted water to Lake Mead for use in the Lower Colorado River Basin. At that time the estimated unit cost of water based on Bureau data was $84/af. Updating of this information indicates costs on the order of $150/af.

Another possible source of desalted water to augment the Colorado River supplies has recently been proposed by Dr. Robert Rex, Professor of Geological Sciences at the University of California at Riverside. He has been evaluating the geothermal resources of the Imperial Valley, and has reported that present studies suggest that low-cost water could be produced through the distillation of geothermal water sources in sufficient quantities to provide 10 maf/yr of fresh water for over 100 years. This process has an advantage over desalted water produced from fossil fuel or nuclear powered distillation plants in that (1) power produced from the geothermal sources will absorb many of the basic costs, (2) there would be no cost for heat input, and (3) the distillation equipment can be considerably less complex than that required for conventional facilities. While geothermal distillation is still in the conjectural stage, it should be considered in any future planning for the river's augmentation.

Weather modification

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has its Colorado River Basin Pilot Project under way at the present time with a goal of trying to determine if it is feasible to increase runoff in the Colorado River Basin by weather modification. High officials of the Department of the Interior have been very optimistic about weather modification. In May 1967, former Secretary of the Interior Udall testified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate that within eight to ten years water can be produced by weather modification in quantity at a desired place. On July 22, 1968, Mr. Floyd Dominy, former Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives. With respect to the Colorado River Basin, he stated that: "We expect to utilmately obtain an additional 1,870,000 acre-feet of streamflow from these areas at a cost of about $1 to $3 per acre-foot." If any of this optimism is warranted, weather modification would certainly be a boon to the basin.

In considering weather modification as a potential producer of new water for the Colorado River Basin, legal questions have been raised and considered in the past. Such legal analysis has heretofore usually considered questions of liability relating to both increases and decreases in precipitation, both within and without the watershed. However, I would like to call your attention to another aspect of the legal problems associated with the Colorado River Basin. As previously stated, the Colorado River Compact divides the water of the Colorado River Basin between the Upper and Lower Basins. A major question is how any water produced by weather modification would be accounted for under the Colorado River Compact.

One interesting aspect in considering weather modification is that there are some watersheds of the Colorado that contain more highly soluble salts than do other watersheds, with resulting differences in the salt pickup therefrom. For example, the salinity of the Colorado River and three major tributaries within 100 miles of the headwaters of each represents an interesting comparison of relative watershed solubility.

	Parts per million
The Colorado River above Glenwood Springs	238
The Green River at Fontenella Reservoir	184
The San Juan River above Farmington	152
The Gunnison River above Delta	143

A detailed analysis of salinity with respect to any future increase in flows due to weather modification is needed. I understand that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has been doing just such an analysis, and that its report will be published within the next several months.

CONCLUSION

I recognize that I have covered a vast amount of material, much of it complicated, in a short time; however, I do hope that this presentation will aid in apprising you of the water needs of the Colorado River Basin. If weather modification is to make a significant contribution to the water supply of the Colorado River, its protagonists must be prepared to demonstrate on an engineering basis the quantities that are expected to be obtained and the reliability of such a supply. They must further be prepared to participate in the many legal, engineering and institutional problems that will arise.

A NASA CONTRACT

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been allegations of irregularities in the award of a NASA contract for the ATS-F and G satellite project. The Administrator of NASA, Dr. Thomas O. Paine, has denied these allegations, but to satisfy those who may entertain doubts about NASA's contracting procedures in this case he has requested an independent review by the Comptroller General. Dr. Paine has asked that the GAO submit its report within 60 days.

I applaud Dr. Paine's action in this case. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, I believe Dr. Paine's response is entirely appropriate. An independent investigation by the GAO should resolve all questions that have been raised and lay this matter to rest.

In view of the fact that the Committee on Science and Astronautics has legislative responsibility for the NASA program, and as part of our committee's continuing oversight of NASA activities, I have requested that the GAO report be furnished to our committee as soon as it becomes available.

Without wishing to prejudge this case, I want to say that I have the highest

regard for Dr. Paine. Moreover, our committee has found over the years that NASA has established an excellent record for fairness in its dealings with American industry.

TRAINING THE M.D.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of escalating health care costs and the growing need for expanded medical training, I commend to the House's attention a recent innovative suggestion by president-elect of the American Medical Association, Walter C. Bornemeier. His suggestion of an inquiry into present medical school curricula and procedures was discussed in the following editorial from the American Medical News of March 16, 1970.

TRAINING THE MD

The health manpower problem isn't going to go away. Instead, it must be solved.

And the medical profession must take the lead in formulating the solutions to this complicated situation.

Physicians already are involved in developing ways to meet the shortage, including expanding the functions of other health professionals, developing new medical schools, and expanding the enrollments of the existing ones.

But another step which may not be getting the attention it deserves is speeding up the education of the physician.

Earlier this month, AMA President-elect Walter C. Bornemeier, MD, made some pertinent comments about this problem when he addressed the Chicago Medical Society's Midwest Clinical Conference. He said:

"We should take a look at this period between age 22 and 32 and ask ourselves if all of this time is well spent; 'is all of this trip necessary?'"

The length of graduate training is a major problem. Internship and residency problems often mean that it's often not until five years after graduation that the MD is ready to begin caring for patients.

"In this day of an acute shortage of physicians," Dr. Bornemeier said, "it might be well to take a look back to the days when we learned from the practitioner, rather than to continue the present trend toward sitting at the feet of a full-time professor during the under-graduate years and in many instances, continuing in the same atmosphere during the internship and residency."

Two logical steps logically follow Dr. Bornemeier's analysis of the problem: (1) shorten the medical school curriculum and the period for graduate study; (2) give the future physician "more contact with all of the facts of life, let him have contact with the community at community level, and let him do this at the elbow of the teacher-physician, who knows what it is that makes people sick, not just those who know how to make him well."

In some areas, commendable efforts are being made to meet these goals. But in too many other areas, the status quo is being maintained.

Most of today's medical students have the advantage of pre-medical training far superior to that which was available in the past. And vastly improved teaching methods make it possible for today's students to cover much more complex material than in the past.

Our medical schools—indeed, the entire profession—must recognize this situation. Medical education cannot and must not remain static. This is a time for boldness, imagination, innovation; nothing else will meet the needs of the nation.

DR. PAUL DUDLEY WHITE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 27, the Massachusetts Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives honored two Bay Staters whose contributions to the Nation have improved the quality of American life.

It was my great privilege to assist in honoring one of them, Dr. Paul Dudley White, by presenting him, in behalf of the association, with his reward.

We all know Dr. White as a man and physician who has made the care of the heart, and therefore man's healthy existence, his life's work.

When I was informed of this honor, I was given a long biography listing honors, associations and activities. They are much too numerous to list, but they cover every aspect of the medical profession and appear to be the combined biography of several dedicated and brilliant men. I would like to mention just some of them so that my colleagues may have an impression of the variety of this man's life work.

A graduate of Harvard Medical School, Dr. White interned at the Massachusetts General Hospital and there became physician in charge of cardiac laboratory and clinics where he served with great distinction for many years.

In addition to his demanding regular work as a heart specialist, Dr. White found time to be faculty instructor, assistant professor, lecturer, and clinical professor of medicine at Harvard Univerity. He was a founder and served as president of the Massachusetts Heart Association and the American Heart Association, the association which has done more than any other to provide advances and knowledge in the field of cardiology. He was executive director of the National Advisory Heart Council and chief adviser of the National Heart Institute. Since 1958, he has been president of the International Society of Cardiology. Paul Dudley White is a recipient of the U.S. Freedom Medal and has been honored by medical societies and universities from all over the world. The U.S. Army Surgeon General and the Veterans' Administration has frequently consulted him. Of course, the entire Nation remembers him for his personal diagnosis and care of President Eisenhower during his illness.

With all of these activities, Dr. White has found time to write several books regarding treatment of the heart, and written numerous articles for medical journals. He is presently honorary physician at Massachusetts General Hospital and clinical professor of medicine emeritus at Harvard.

I have only mentioned some of the achievements and activities of this fine son of Massachusetts. Perhaps only a close examination of them will reveal the scope of his interests and the depth of his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I include my remarks to the MACCE meeting in the RECORD:

PAUL DUDLEY WHITE—GREAT LIVING BAY STATER

Tonight we are honoring a man who has dedicated his energy and his life work to discovering information and dispensing knowledge in the care of the heart and the preservation of human life. In medical circles and among the concern laymen, his name is synonymous with service, knowledge and dedication in research and dedication on the heart.

But I prefer a less sophisticated and more widely held view of this great physician. When the public thinks of him—true, they think of a heart specialist, but they also think of a man who seems to be involved in every endeavor regarding care of the heart from the most personal doctor/patient relationship to the broad field of heart education through the mass media. They also think of a man old enough to drive a car who is always on a bicycle. Now this is not frivilous, for in a sense it describes him as much as the honors he has received, the associations he has founded and led, the hospitals he has served and the universities where he has taught and received degrees.

For this son of Massachusetts is a great and knowledgeable man who always finds time to be where he is needed and to offer his advise, counsel and energies for the preservation and extension of life and who practices what he preaches in a light and admirable vein. I think it is this public image of a humane and active man that best describes the gentleman we are proud and happy to honor tonight.

It is my privilege to present the Great Living Bay Stater Award for renowned contributions to the field of medical knowledge to Dr. Paul Dudley White.

FATHER JOSEPH A. MARJANCZYK CELEBRATES SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my good and dear friend, Father Joseph A. Marjanczyk, recently celebrated the 25th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood.

It would be hard to find a better exemplar of the Christian spirit than is "Father Joe." For his unfailing integrity and dedication, his selfless contributions to the community, and his compassion and sensitivity, he has endeared himself to all who have known him as counselor, colleague or friend.

My warmest congratulations go to him on the achievement of this milestone, and for a future of continued fulfillment.

PORNOGRAPHY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, though the House passed H.R. 15693 protecting the public against the intrusion into their homes of sexually oriented mail matter this past Tuesday, I nevertheless believe my colleagues will find the following three-part Christian Science Monitor series on pornography in the United States to be a most helpful discussion of the problem:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 18, 1970]

PORNOGRAPHY—SHABBY FRONT FOR A BIG INDUSTRY

(By Lansing R. Shepard)

(NOTE.—First of three reports on the growing problem of pornography and efforts to curtail its distribution in the United States.)

Take a walk through the "tough" section of any big city—Boston's "Combat Zone," Baltimore's "Block," New Orleans' "French Quarter," or New York's Broadway and 42nd area. Sooner or later you'll come across it.

The stores are generally shabby, hole-in-the-wall affairs. Dirty windows, flaking ceilings, bare walls, and dull lighting contribute to an alleylike atmosphere.

The people who come and go—the browsers and the buyers—are mostly men. In one corner, on an elevated platform the cashier oversees the potential customers. No one talks. No one looks at anyone else. Silence reigns.

PRICES RANGE UPWARD

Looking around, one would hardly suspect these shoddy shops are the distribution centers for one of the fastest-growing industries today. But that is just what pornography is.

Everything for the prurient taste can be bought here: magazines, picture books, pocket books, records, and maybe for a quarter, a five-minute movie in the back room.

Racks and racks of pulp offer all varieties of the genre. The magazines are the most obvious. They range from the "girlies"—"Dude," "Nugget," Cavalier"—which promise much on the outside but include very little, to the "hard core" stuff wrapped individually in cellophane bags.

"Lash," "Leather," "Mr. Sun," and "Boy" hint the abrasive nature of the show-all material to be found within. On their covers frolic nude or partially clad men and women—correlative come-ons to the publications' suggestive titles.

The price of these magazines depends on the salaciousness of content. The lewder the publication, the higher the price. Hard-core magazines in Boston, for instance, may range anywhere from $3 to $20.

Then there are the thin paperbacks, their covers bearing only their titles against a plain-colored background: "Far East," "Dorita." These are the books most often found on the display shelves behind front windows.

And there are the so-called "sex manuals"—purported medical journals—sprinkled in among the countless number of just plain dirty novels: "Nazi Slaves," "Wives Tales," etc.

Pornography, of course, is not just limited to books and magazines. There are posters, comic books, packets of photographs, and tabloids. For the customer who is willing to pay, there may be other sexual paraphernalia to be had "under the counter."

AREAS OF ORIGIN IDENTIFIED

Most of the country's home-grown pornography originates from New York (specifically New York City), Maryland, or California. And much of that which is imported comes from Denmark and Sweden.

In Boston, there are roughly 15 outlets for pornography—smut shops centered either in or around the downtown two-block area known as the "Combat Zone."

And according to Capt. Daniel McDonald, head of Boston's vice squad, about half of all such pornography found in the area comes through Providence, R.I., from an organization called Literature, Inc. The company owns about five Boston smut shops.

Periodically haled into court on obscenity charges, distributors of pornography appear little fazed by the costs of such litigation. One look at the economics of the industry explains why.

According to a recent Magazine Industry Newsletter report, the "girlie" magazine market, up until last year, was pretty much in the hands of East Coast entrepreneurs who charged about 75 cents a copy.

EMPHASIS SHIFTS

But according to the report, the West Coast "girlies" have recently moved in, charging around $1.50 a copy.

The report contains a rough breakdown of who gets what in the "porno" industry. According to the newsletter, a "hard core" paperback containing 24 pages of photographs now sells for up to $5. Of this, the wholesaler gets around 20 percent and the retailer as much as 40 to 50 percent.

Under this system, the retailer, selling 20 copies of "hard core," nets around $50—or as much as he would make selling 250 copies of "Playboy" at 20 cents a copy commission.

The publisher, too, stands to make a considerable sum, according to the report, since a 24-page book that wholesales for $1.50 actually costs less than 20 cents to produce.

Such books are usually manufactured in quantities of 5,000 to 25,000.

REVENUES ESTIMATED

According to the report which breaks down the circulation revenues of the three major types of pornographic literature, the East Coast "girlies" gross $40 million to $50 million a year. "Hard core" magazines take in $30 million to $35 million. And "hard core" paperbacks attract $25 million to $30 million.

This adds up to a minimum gross of $95 million annually and an incredible maximum gross of $115 million.

At the crux of the whole problem of pornography are two basic questions:

Is any kind of censorship in this area constitutionally acceptable?

Just what is a legally acceptable definition of pornography?

The fact is that, despite sporadic attempts to do so, a workable legal definition of pornography has yet to be found.

More and more, the major antagonists appear to be the "libertarians" on the one hand opposing those who might best be called "community standardists" on the other—the latter being those who would, more or less, leave censorship up to local authorities.

The former argues that pornography is an irrational phenomenon and that there is no rational regulation for it.

DEFINITIONS ARGUED

"Obscenity cannot be measured as a crime, but only as a sin," says Gerald S. Maltz, a former associate editor of the New York Law Forum. "A sin is a very subjective standard and not amendable to legal sanction." He adds that "the best regulation is selfregulation."

"Censorship spawns its own particular evils: timidity, cynicism, unwarranted curiosity" he continues. "It stifles expression that may be therapeutic. Furthermore, it is self-defeating.

"The 'big business of pornography' thrives on the very laws that impede its supply and increase the demand. Experience has shown that word 'censored' is more profitable to the pornographer than the content of his material."

There are many people who take issue with such a stand.

Harry M. Clor, Kenyon College political science professor and author of "Obscenity and Public Morality," sums up this point of view this way:

"The unrestricted circulation of obscene materials could operate to break down moral standards by undermining the convictions and sensitivities which support them."

MORAL EROSION SEEN

Constant exposure to such literature and "art," he says, which "overemphasize sensuality and brutality, reduce love to sex, and blatantly expose to public view intimacies which have been thought sacred or private must eventually result in an erosion of moral standards."

The Supreme Court of the United States itself is divided on the question. It is quite probable no other issue has consistently caused so much disagreement among the members.

In three major pornography decisions (Ginzburg v. United States, Memoirs v. Massachusetts—the celebrated "Fanny Hill" case—and Mishkin v. New York) the court handed down no fewer than 14 separate opinions.

Just as others have done, it seems, the high tribunal has settled into its own opposing camps.

Associate Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo L. Black are often described as taking the libertarian stand on the subject. Both have consistently shied from almost any kind of legal censorship of the genre.

COURT POSITION SKETCHED

Their general position has been that it is neither the court's nor the government's business to curtail expression unless that expression falls into the area of behavior that demands government control. This means that it must present a clear and significant peril to the community.

Taking issue with this stand are, principally, Associate Justices John M. Harlan and, most recently, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger. Both men feel that that "hard core" obscenity possesses enough harm that it should definitely be suppressed.

Both men subscribe to the past Harlan decision that while the federal laws should be limited to controlling only "hard core" obscenity, states should be granted broad discretion in their regulation.

Violation of First Amendment rights, states the Harlan opinion, would occur only if local officials' definition of obscenity is "wholly out of step with current American standards."

The upshot of all of this has been general confusion. The states look to the Supreme Court for guidance, but the high court has consistently backed off from the role of censor—handing down over the last ten years only vague "tests" by which obscenity may be "defined."

DECISIONS REVERSED

At the same time, the court has consistently refused to uphold most lower-court obscenity judgments coming before it. And for this it has sustained a continuous barrage of criticism from those who feel that the court has the legal means to take a harder stand against pornography, and so should do so.

As of now, the court has decided that for a work to be pornographic it must (1)

appeal in general to "prurient interests"; (2) be "patently offensive," and (3) be wholly lacking in "redeeming social importance."

There have been added to these, over the past three years, certain correlative tests. These require that material, before it can be judged obscene, must be found to have been "pandered" (disseminated as if it were obscene), or to be an "assault" on individual privacy, or to be aimed at juveniles or specific sexually deviant groups.

These latter tests have brought the court into the direct fire of those who see the added requirements as an attempt to avoid the basic constitutional issue.

TESTS DEPLORED

Mr. Maltz labels these tests "dubious grants of power to the states and federal government."

"This is a frantic effort," he said, "to rebalance the scales in favor of the censors after a decade of tipping them in favor of free expression—which favored the panderers.

"It is an effort to alleviate the frustrations of the states occasioned by the First Amendment by an alternative route—a back door to censorship by imprisoning the merchants of sex literature."

And so the debate goes on, punctuated by an occasional court decision and the constant ringing of cash registers as the producers and distributors of pornography continue to rake in the profits.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 22, 1970]

JUDICIAL HARD LINE ON SMUT?

(By Lansing R. Shepard)

(NOTE.—Second of three reports on pornography in the United States discusses the difficulties in drafting a legal definition of obscenity.)

BOSTON.—"Obscenity cases? Ha," said a state attorney recently. "They're real losers.

"You just can't get an obscenity conviction today that will stick. The lower courts look to the Supreme Court for guidelines, but they aren't getting any. The whole thing's a mess," he commented bitterly.

The lament is a familiar one. And despite the emergence of a more conservative United States Supreme Court, the complaint is not likely to diminish. The court as constituted under the liberal leadership of former Chief Justice Earl Warren was long criticized by many as being too "libertarian" in its reluctance to free the censor's pen.

Some think, however, that with the confirmation of Warren E. Burger as Chief Justice, and with the pending appointment of a Nixon-selected associate justice to fill the seat vacated by Abe Fortas, some form of judicial "hard line" on pornography may be at hand.

Such expectations have also been fed by the probable retirement soon of two of the court's most liberal justices, William O. Douglas and Hugo L. Black.

DECISION OVERTURNED

Confirmation of just such a conservative trend is seen in the recent stand taken by the new Chief Justice in the Carlos v. New York case decided early last December.

In that case, the high tribunal overturned a New York Court of Appeals decision to uphold the conviction of a Watertown, N.Y., man for selling obscene matter in the form of two "girlie" magazines. But in a dissenting opinion joined by Associate Justice John M. Harlan, the Chief Justice opined that the First Amendment granted broad discretion to state officials in suppressing "hard core" obscenity.

His view was based on a past Harlan opinion which held that federal obscenity laws should be more narrowly construed than state laws, and that the court should uphold only those federal laws which suppressed "hard core" obscenity.

The earlier Harlan opinion stated that the First Amendment did not bar states from curtailing obscenity unless the local official's definition of obscenity was "wholly out of step with current American standards."

Chief Justice Burger's agreement with this viewpoint has led many to expect a crackdown on pornography.

To other observers, however, such an expectation is unrealistic.

They hold that the court's attitude over the last few years reflects not so much a deliberate liberalizing as an attempt to avoid becoming a case-by-case "official United States censor"—a role traditionally suspect.

Observers point to the ambivalence of court pornography decisions over the past 10 years. Instead of setting down a precise definition of pornography, the court has created a number of vague tests.

Observers note that while judicial condemnation of pornography may be found throughout these decisions, the court has consistently declined to uphold the majority of obscenity convictions which have come its way.

In 1957 in Roth v. United States the court set up the first of these tests when it held that material could be considered obscene only if "to the average person applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme . . . taken as a whole appeals to the prurient interests."

In the nine years that followed Roth, however, the high tribunal did not uphold a single lower-court finding of obscenity, although it reviewed 12 cases.

REQUIREMENT TALLIED

Then in 1966, the court turned out a bumper crop of obscenity requirements:

Ginzburg v. United States saw the creation of the "pandering" test—materials could be found obscene only if the purveyor's sole emphasis was on its sexually provocative aspects. In other words, publications advertised in an obscene way were illegal.

Mishkin v. New York, decided that same year, applied the Roth requirement to "sexually deviant groups." Materials were obscene if they openly appealed to the prurient interest of a particular sexually deviant group rather than to the general public.

And Memoirs v. Massachusetts (the "Fanny Hill" case) provided, until just recently, the "latest word" in obscenity tests.

In this case it was decided that an obscenity conviction could stand only when it has "passed" all three of the following requirements:

1. The dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to the prurient interest.

2. The material is patently offensive in that it affronts contemporary community standards relating to the description or representation of sexual matters.

3. The material is utterly lacking in redeeming social value.

While this three-pronged definition admittedly still left obscenity interpretation up to the court, it was nonetheless something the lower courts felt they could hang their hats on.

They were entirely unprepared then for Redrup v. New York, decided the very next year (1967). In this case the Supreme Court overturned three states obscenity convictions. It held:

"In none of the cases was there a claim that the statute in question reflected a specific and limited state concern for juveniles. . . . In none was there any suggestion of an assault on individual privacy. . . . And in none was there evidence of the sort of 'pandering' which the court found significant in Ginzburg v. United States. . . ."

The decision was an apparent shift in emphasis away from judging the obscene material itself toward stressing the surrounding circumstances. In any event, it set the stage for Ginzberg (no relation to the other Ginzburg) v. United States in 1968.

PARENTAL ROLE NOTED

This decision stated that what may not be obscene for one group (adults) may be obscene for another (minors).

The court reasoned that parents have a primary responsibility in the rearing of their children and so are "entitled to the support of laws to aid in the discharge of that responsibility."

The court added that states have an independent interest in the development of their youth, so it was not unconstitutional for the rights of minors under 17 to be more restricted than those of adults to judge for themselves what sex materials they may see and read.

This decision did nothing to simplify the situation. And last fall the high court further muddied the waters when it overturned a Georgia obscenity conviction by adding still another requisite.

In this case—Stanley v. Georgia—the high tribunal overturned a state law making it illegal for an individual to possess pornographic material.

POINT OF THE CITATION

The court ruled that "If the First Amendment means anything, it means that a state has no business telling a man sitting alone in his own house, what books he may read or what films he may watch."

The statement, on its face, would not seem so terribly radical. But in supporting its opinion, the court cited a 1965 Supreme Court decision which appears to turn the whole censorship-obscenity concept upside down.

The point of the citation—Lamont v. Postmaster General—was that the right to receive information and ideas, regardless of their social worth, is constitutionally protected. And Congress (or a state, for that matter) has no right to place a burden on that constitutional right.

GROUP EXPLOITATION

Could this mean, then, Congress has no right to restrict the sale of that which is alleged to be obscene?

"It's going to be interesting to see what happens," commented one prosecutor.

Court watchers see all of this as reflecting a recognition that legislation on a moral issue tends to raise problems of constitutionality.

Many observers feel that these later cases constitute perhaps an attempt to avoid a general categorization of obscenity (with all its inherent dubious constitutional validity) by concentrating, not so much on the questionable material itself, as on the group to which the alleged obscenity is directed and the context in which it is sold.

Group exploitation, invasion of privacy, and the like—these are the areas for which there appear to be more logical grounds for legal control. The chances seem slim that any new court faced with the now incredible complexity of the obscenity issue will do any radical "reversing" of direction.

The view of the Burger court will soon become clear. Cases from Texas, Maryland, California, Massachusetts, and Georgia now are pending before it. Only recently the court also agreed to review two state-supreme-court decisions from Massachusetts and Maryland which declared the film "I Am Curious—Yellow" to be obscene.

This could be only the beginning. The Supreme Court may well be faced with continuous litigation stemming from some 200 reported antipornography bills which have been referred to the committees or subcommittees of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Senate Post Office Committee, and both the House and Senate Judicial Committees.

GARGANTUAN TASK: PORNOGRAPHY PROBERS STRUGGLE

(By Lansing R. Shepard)

(NOTE.—*This last of three reports on pornography in the United States outlines the problems faced by a presidential commission.*)

From the ruins of the past it seems apparent that pornography has been with man since the dawn of civilization.

Many sociologists cite this fact as evidence that pornography is necessary to a society as a kind of social "safety valve."

This controversial idea is but one of many such notions currently being considered by the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

ANALYSIS OF LAWS

The commission is headed by William B. Lockhart, dean of the University of Minnesota law school and one of the country's outstanding authorities on legal aspects of pornography.

Since the group's inception in January, 1968, it has found itself grappling with a monster. It was assigned four specific tasks by Congress:

1. To analyze the laws pertaining to the control of obscenity and pornography—to evaluate and recommend definitions of obscenity.

2. To "explore" the distribution, nature, and volume of traffic in obscenity and pornography. (Who buys it? How do they get it? Where do they get it? How big is the business?)

3. To study the effects of obscenity and pornography upon the public (particularly on minors) and its relationship to crime and other antisocial behavior.

4. To recommend legislative, administrative, or other appropriate action to regulate the flow of such traffic "without in any way interfering with constitutional rights."

Much of the group's research is being done through the mailing of questionnaires, national sample surveys, and clinical studies on selected populations.

The group has until late summer of this year to complete its work. To accomplish its tasks within the designated time seems ambitious, to say the least. Any one of the congressional requests is a gargantuan undertaking in itself.

In the entire history of American jurisprudence, no one has yet been able to come up with a definition of obscenity that is generally accepted as constitutionally satisfactory.

The situation is probably somewhat related to the fact that no one has ever really made any serious study of obscenity before. Commission members realize they have their work cut out for them.

Save for some indications that the Cosa Nostra might have a substantial investment in the purveyance of pornography, it is not really known who—if anyone—controls the bulk of its distribution, or what the volume of that distribution is.

EFFECTS EXAMINED

A bit is known about the different types of pornographic paraphernalia. But little is known about who buys what and why.

Probably the toughest and most important job facing the commission is its evaluation of the effects of obscenity on the public. Such knowledge is recognized as essential to the creation of any truly comprehensive pornography laws. Some new evidence is coming to light in this area.

In Denmark, intial assumptions concerning the beneficial effects pornography could have on society are being questioned. In 1967, Denmark dropped all legal barriers against printed pornography. And in July, 1969, the Danish Government legalized the selling of any pornographic paraphernalia to persons over 16.

In 1969, the country's crimes involving sex dropped 31 percent. And many people pinned the reason on the legalization of pornography.

STATISTICS WATCHED

But late results show that the decline has been among such crimes as voyeurism, public indecency, male prostitution, and the sale of pornographic material.

Rape, sexual assaults, and similar serious sex crimes remained at their 1968 level. The situation is likely to be carefully watched by the commission.

The commission has felt so strongly about this area of "effects" that one of its members presented a formal complaint to Congress when the group issued its only progress report before that body last year.

Morton A. Hill, S.J., president of an anti-obscenity organization, Morality in Media, charged that the group was "becoming an 'effects' commission, and that this was not what the Congress intended."

He complained that such efforts would not stop the traffic in obscenity.

Not exactly helping Chairman Lockhart's endeavors has been the commission's slow start. Initial funds were not appropriated until July, 1968. And when they had finally been cleared, they had been slashed from the requested $643,000 to $225,000.

SUPREME COURT HINT

In order to meet the original two-year tenure set for the group, the due date for the commission's final report was pushed ahead to July 31 of this year. But it is reported that this has been revised to sometime in September.

Taking a hint from recent Supreme Court decisions, the commission, in drawing up its legislative recommendations, is concentrating on possible statutes concerning only: (1) pornography and juveniles, (2) pornography and the invasion of individual privacy and offensive public displays, and (3) statutes prohibiting "pandering" (disseminating material as if it were obscene).

One of the projects the commission is working on is a model statute designed to meet the problem of unsolicited mailings of pornographic material.

The proposed law would require all persons who mail "potentially offensive sexual material" to recipients who do not request such material to label the outer wrappings with a government prescribed "symbol."

LABELING PROPOSED

The "potentially offensive sexual material" would be defined in detail in the law.

Also incorported in the statute would be a provision requiring the Post Office Department not to deliver the labeled material to any person who informed the department that he did not wish to receive it.

Violation of the law would be a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of $1,000 to $50,000, depending on the extent of the violation.

Despite the overwhelming nature of his job, Mr. Lockhart still feels optimistic about future results.

Speaking before Congress last year, he said, "Although the commission cannot exhaust the studies that need to be made in this huge and difficult area within the time and funds available, the commission believes it will be able to make significant contributions . . . when it makes its reports and recommendations."

QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to honor the birth of the great Castillian Queen of Spain, Isabella, whose confidence and daring were in large part responsible for the discovery of America.

The Governors of 29 States have signed proclamations declaring April 22 Queen Isabella Day. And, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the proclamation made by Newark Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio to commemorate this important day:

QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

Whereas April 22, 1970 marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization; and

Whereas in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for her clear intellect, energy, virtus and patriotism; and

Whereas the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration;

Now, therefore, I, Hugh J. Addonizio, Mayor of the City of Newark, New Jersey, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1970 as "Queen Isabella Day" in Newark and urge that all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitable observe this significant event in the history of the world.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Mayor.

TOWARD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is pursuing an Arab policy as insidious as its southern strategy. It is a policy which favors oil over morality; which trains those bent on Israel's destruction even as it withholds from Israel the means to defend herself.

I recently revealed that in the last 10 years, the United States gave more than a billion dollars' worth of arms, materiel, and training to Arab nations. During that same period, we permitted Israel to buy well under $100 million worth of military equipment.

And while President Nixon is full of polite rhetoric about commitments to Israel, he continues to authorize the training of 600 Arab military officers in the United States this year, and he continues to withhold sale of the Phantom jet aircraft Israel so urgently needs for her protection.

This is a clear example of the administration's Arab strategy—a strategy which gives higher priority to oil interests than to the survival of the bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Attempting to end the arms race in the Middle East is a commendable objective. But it makes little sense to try to cut off the arms flow at a point when the Soviet Union has rebuilt Arab military strength to a point of superiority. And it is naive to believe that the arms race can be

halted unilaterally. There is absolutely no indication that either the Soviets or the French are willing to halt the steady shipment of arms to their Arab clients.

We simply cannot remain silent while the administration tries to win the Arabs back from the Soviets by offering Israel's security as an inducement. Secretary of State Rogers made clear the administration's attitude when he declared last December 9:

We will not shrink from advocating necessary compromises.

I say we cannot even talk of compromise when the security of Israel hangs in the balance. John Foster Dulles stated long ago:

The preservation of the State of Israel is one of the essential goals of U.S. foreign policy.

And it must remain so. Israel is the one longstanding and devoted friend of the United States in the Middle East. Assuring her survival and strength is vital to our own national interests and to the interest of world peace.

America is morally committed to the preservation of Israel as a Jewish homeland. History has made tragically clear the necessity for a place to which Jews may turn in the face of the persecution which has continued to infect Western history. The spectacle of Jews vainly seeking a haven from Hitler's death camps must never be repeated.

If we do not honor such commitments, if we are prepared to barter them away for influence and oil, then we no longer stand for anything. We no longer hold out the promise of leading the way to a more sane and humane world order.

And let us not confuse what constitutes real commitment. It is not the fabricated obligations to support a corrupt military clique in Saigon which lacks the support of its own people and jails its opposition. It is not the willingness to supply arms to a brutal military junta in Greece because we are afraid they might turn to the Soviets.

By "commitment" I mean the determination to help a free people shape their own destiny free from the threat of foreign domination or annihilation. This is the kind of commitment we owe Israel.

That commitment must rest on two basic policies:

First, the maintenance of Israel's military strength as the best deterrent to the fourth major Arab-Israel war, and

Second, insistence on a settlement negotiated by Israel and the Arabs, one which all parties have a real interest in preserving. For an imposed settlement is not a durable peace; it merely defines the borders over which the next war will be fought.

I have introduced legislation to accomplish that first goal—to cut off all military aid to the Arabs and provide Israel with the aircraft she has requested. The text of my bill is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 556

Whereas the close relationship between Israel's survival and United States national interests has been recognized by five successive presidents; and

Whereas the Soviet Union continues to supply the Arab nations of the Middle East with modern arms; and

Whereas France has contributed to the tension in the Middle East by selling jets to Arab interests; and

Whereas the United States has over the past ten years supplied extensive arms, material, and military training to the Arab nations, while providing considerably less aid to Israel; and

Whereas the United States continues to train Arab officers this year while not training a single Israeli officer; and

Whereas the President has failed to act on an Israeli request for additional jet aircraft essential to its defense; and

Whereas a balance of power is the best available deterrent to full-scale war in the Middle East:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate concurring) that it is the sense of Congress that (1) the President should take immediate steps upon the adoption of this concurrent resolution to terminate every form of military assistance to any belligerent Arab nation, including those aligned with the United Arab Republic and those harboring or assisting Arab terrorist groups or guerrillas, and (2) the President should, as soon as possible after the adoption of this concurrent resolution, negotiate with the Government of Israel an agreement to sell to Israel the requested United States military aircraft in amounts necessary for the security of Israel.

It is unfortunate that military strength should still be the key to peace in the Middle East, for the nations of that area need bread, not bombs; they need tractors, not tanks; they need water, not war. But until a meaningful peace is achieved our course is clear.

We serve neither honor nor the cause of lasting peace by threatening to turn our backs on our one true friend in the Middle East in hopes of currying favor with those who have aligned themselves first with the Nazis and now with the Communists.

Let us never forget that we must live with ourselves and with the world we help to create.

POLICE CHIEF JOSEPH C. WRIGHT OF BROCKTON, MASS., RETIRES

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with the many friends of Police Chief Joseph C. Wright of Brockton, Mass., in wishing him well in his retirement. He faithfully served the people of Brockton since 1933 when he began as a reserve officer in the police force and it is everyone's hope that his retirement years will be filled with health, wealth, and happiness.

Joseph C. Wright was born in Newburyport, Mass., May 12, 1909, son of Mrs. Mary Wright and the late Ernest J. Wright, who died in 1962. He came to Brockton as a boy of 8, was graduated from St. Patrick's parochial grammar school and attended Brockton High School.

Prior to his full-time employment by the police department he was a truck driver for an oil company. He was appointed a reserve officer December 18, 1933, by former Mayor Horace C. Baker. He became a regular patrolman 4 years later, on December 20, 1937, receiving his appointment from then Mayor Lawrence E. Crowley.

The late Mayor Joseph Downey named him a sergeant and he was confirmed by the city council October 17, 1947. He was advanced to the rank of lieutenant on May 17, 1953, by ex-Mayor C. Gerald Lucey.

He was promoted to chief on January 2, 1956, when former Mayor Hjalmar R. Peterson assumed office. Voters of the city placed him on permanent tenure on November 8, 1960. The chief was notified by civil service on February 6, 1961, that he had passed the qualifying examination and he was sworn in a permanent chief on February 17, 1961.

The chief attended the FBI National Academy in Washington, D.C., in 1950. He was elected president of the 9,500-member Massachusetts Police Association for 1962–63, after previously serving on its executive board for 10 years. He is also a member of the Plymouth County, Southeastern Massachusetts, and Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Associations.

Locally, he is a member of Seville Council, K. of C., and Lodge 164, BPOE. He golfs as a hobby at the D. W. Field and Thorny Lea courses.

He is married to the former Alice McLaren of Brockton with whom he resides at 101 Packard Way. He is the father of three daughters, Mrs. Whitney (Lilymae) Reed of Maryland, Mrs. Dino (Joyce) Ierado of Brockton, and Miss Patricia Wright, also of this city. His seven grandchildren are Thomas, Melinda, and Jonathan Reed and Mark, Stephen, Lisa, and John Ierado.

He has two brothers, Ernest J. of Wareham, and Dr. Robert Wright of Brockton. A third brother Thomas A. Wright, CSSR, died in 1960. His two sisters are Mrs. Lee (Gladys) Moore of Brockton, and Sister Patricia Ann, a member of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, stationed at the St. Thomas More School, Braintree. His mother, Mrs. Mary A. Wright, is presently in the St. Joseph's Nursing Home, Brockton.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose the following article which appeared in the Brockton Enterprise concerning this evening's event to honor Joe:

WRIGHT DINNER PLANS ADVANCE

Plans for the testimonial for retired Police Chief Joseph C. Wright were advanced at a meeting of the committee Monday night at the Capeway Manor. More than 400 tickets have already been sold for the event and the entire 600 tickets available are expected to be gone by early next week.

The affair will be held April 30 at the Greek Community Center with a catered dinner by a noted Providence Italian caterer. A short speaking program is planned, followed by dancing to the music of Bob Kovner's orchestra.

Chief speaker will be James L. Handley, special agent in charge of the Boston office of the FBI, a long-time friend of former Chief Wright. Also on the speaking program will be Police Comm. Edmund I. McNamara of Boston. Atty. George L. Wainwright will act as master of ceremonies for the evening.

The retired chief will be honored for his 32 years of work as a member of the Brockton Police Dept., the last 13 as chief, longest tenure in that office in the history of the department.

Guests at the head table in addition to the speakers will include members of Chief Wright's family, Mayor John E. Sullivan, Police Chief Joseph L. Johnson and Police Chaplain Rev. Edmund J. Corrigan of Our Lady of Lourdes Church.

Heading the general committee for the affair are Patrolman Frank P. Gentile and Det. Ralph G. Ruggiero, with Patrolman Frank M. DeChristopher as secretary-treasurer. The head table will be in charge of Francis Pieroni and Gerald Kelleher, while the reception committee will include John A. Yanni, Patrolman John Krikorian and Ugo Paparo. Refreshments will be in charge of Arthur Pigeon.

Serving on the ticket committee are Sgts. John C. Gillis and George A. Dufresne, Patrolman Frank Gracevicz, John Zinkevicz and James L. McClaren, Dets. Thomas G. Thibeault and Leo Dodero, John A. Yanni, Gerald Kelleher, Ugo Paparo, Ralph Tamulonis, James Jones, Francis Pieroni and Alton L. Caldwell, Jr.

The committee will meet again Monday night at the Lithuanian Citizens Club, Ames St.

All of us who are his friends wish Joe only the best that life has to offer.

FROM MARSHMALLOW TO MASTER—HOPEFULLY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 1, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Vice President AGNEW continued his observations of the deterioration of American values in many of our institutions of higher learning. Referring to the criminal left which is making the headlines so regularly today, the Vice President stated:

This is the criminal left that belongs not in a dormitory, but in a penitentiary. The criminal left is not a problem to be solved by the Department of Philosophy or the Department of English—it is a problem for the Department of Justice.

Two weeks previous to the Fort Lauderdale speech Mr. AGNEW had been critical of President Robben Fleming of the University of Michigan for buckling under to radical student demands. President Fleming responded firmly and forcefully—in curious contrast to his handling of the campus confrontation—and elicited this reply from the Vice President last Wednesday:

As for the vigor of my criticism of President Fleming, it was conscious—based on an old Cub Scout theory that the best way to put a tough crust on a marshmallow is to roast it.

Listing nine recommendations, the Vice President also included some parents and clergymen in the cause and solution of our campus dilemma, accentuating the role played by lack of discipline and religious misdirection in transforming yesteryear's child into today's criminal campus activist:

They are the children dropped off by their parents at Sunday school to hear the "modern" gospel from a "progressive" preacher more interested in fighting pollution than fighting evil—one of those pleasant clergymen who lifts his weekly sermons out of old newsletters from a *National Council of Churches* that has cast morality and theology aside as not "relevant" and set as its goal on earth the recognition of Red China and the preservation of the Florida Alligator.

Finally, to set the record straight, the Vice President inadvertently cited an incident as taking place at Cornell University which, in reality, occurred at the University of Connecticut.

The next day the president of Cornell University issued a statement at Ithaca, N.Y.:

In a speech delivered last night, the Vice President of the United States, Spiro T. Agnew, made a brief reference to "the score of students at Cornell who, wielding pipes and tire chains, beat a dormitory president into unconsciousness."

No such incident has ever occurred at Cornell University. No incident even remotely fitting this statement has ever occurred at Cornell University. It is incredible that the Vice President of the United States should publicly make such a statement for which there is absolutely no basis in fact.

The Vice President promptly corrected the record:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

The beating of a dormitory president by students wielding tire irons and chains occurred this month at the University of Connecticut rather than Cornell.

It was at Cornell University this month that the African Studies and Research Center was destroyed by fire, probably arson, that small groups of students vandalized the bookstore, that university authorities had to obtain restraining orders to prohibit violence, that these orders were tested by SDS and the Black Liberation Front with no action taken against them.

It was at Cornell this month where numerous bomb threats were received by campus authorities, where a Molotov cocktail was thrown through a window of the University Library and where Molotov cocktails were discovered in other buildings.

The Vice President regrets that he misplaced the location of the beating of the dormitory president at Cornell rather than at Connecticut.

I insert at this point the address by Vice President AGNEW at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., on April 28, 1970:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Tonight, at the risk of being further charged with divisiveness, insensitvity and mediocrity, I want to continue my discussion of the deterioration of American values in many of our institutions of higher education.

Let us not be naive enough to believe that there are no seeds of revolution in the rebellion that radical young people describe as "the movement." Let us be candid enough to face the fact that the spawning ground and sanctuary of "the movement" is the American university. Few institutions are more vital to a free society; none is so susceptible to capture and destruction by the radical or criminal left.

Before some of my detractors are tempted to skip blithely to the conclusion that I am labeling all college students as members of the criminal left, important distinctions must be drawn.

I am *not* talking about the overwhelming majority of college students who are on the campus to learn, nor am I talking about the majority of faculty members who find it increasingly difficult to teach in a spreading climate of disruption and disorder. But I am gravely concerned that their majority will soon become a minority unless some strong swift steps are taken by administrators who up until now haven't shown much heart for counter action.

The vulnerability of the academic community to exploitation by the radical or criminal left is based on the communal spirit and identity of interest of its members. Each year a malleable swarm of new undergraduates enters the hive and is immediately caught up in peer customs and permeated by peer opinions.

For them, all the ingredients of a new independence coalesce. Parental supervision is removed or greatly diminished; the heady wine of intellectual elitism courses through their veins. More than anything else, they resemble probationers of some esoteric organization—eager to the point of sycophancy to do all the right things and make all the right noises so that they will be accepted into the group.

And the group to which they feverishly seek admission has unfortunately become alienated from the values and institutions of our society. The most vocal and well publicized members of that group are committed to radical change. Small wonder, then, that each year a new group of impressionable consumers falls victim to the totalitarian ptomaine dispensed by those who disparage our system.

The real pity is that many of the students of our universities really feel that the theatrical radicals are the architects of a brave new, compassionate world. Spiced with "rock" music, "acid" and "pot," the old Marxist idea of regulated equality without effort becomes exciting, and they assail the institutions of the free enterprise system without beginning to understand them.

The true responsibility for these aberrations and the nurturing of arrogance and contempt for constitutional authority rests not with the young people on campuses, but with those who so miserably fail to guide them. I can well understand the attitude of the majority of the student body at Yale University when most of the Yale faculty votes to endorse a strike in support of members of an organization dedicated to criminal violence, anarchy, and the destruction of the United States of America.

And when the President of that respected University describes the election of a President of the United States by the people of the United States as a "hucksterized process" under which they could not expect much better "which ever package was bought or sold," it is clearly time for the alumni of that fine old college to demand that it be headed by a more mature and responsible person.

President Brewster of Yale has also stated that he does not feel that black revolutionaries can get a fair trial within our judicial system. I do not feel that the students of Yale University can get a fair impression of their country under the tutelage of Kingman Brewster.

What kind of mentors are we entrusting our young people to when two college professors are convicted of brutally beating a third because of his political beliefs? When a former Associate Dean at a major university is charged with setting fires on the campus? When faculty members join students in acts of property destruction and encourage discourtesy to guest speakers on the campus?

Most of these young people who depend upon the ideology of "the movement" for moral and mental sustenance will in time find themselves as well nourished as a new baby on a diet of cotton candy. At that point, they will return to the enduring values just as every generation before them has done.

But unfortunately, there is a much smaller group of students who are committed to radical change through violent means. Some of

these may be irretrievable; all will require very firm handling.

Within their ranks are the students who last week hurled stones at the home of the President of Penn State University, the students responsible for the arson at the University of Kansas, the score of students at Cornell who, wielding pipes and tire chains, beat a dormitory president into unconsciousness.

This is the criminal left that belongs not in a dormitory, but in a penitentiary. The criminal left is not a problem to be solved by the Department of Philosophy or the Department of English—it is a problem for the Department of Justice.

The journalist, I. F. Stone, recently stated that:

"Statistics on bombing from cities around the country suggest that we may be entering the first stages of an urban guerrilla movement."

I confess to being comforted that there is little likelihood that reality will ever intersect with the rhetoric of Mr. Stone.

He hurries on to suggest that far-reaching political reforms can coax the bombs and rifles out of the hands of the criminal left. His is a traditional and historically fatal error.

Black or white, the criminal left is interested in power. It is not interested in promoting the renewal and reforms that make democracy work; it is interested in promoting those collisions and conflict that tear democracy apart.

In the current student year there have been twenty-five separate acts of sabotage against ROTC installations on campuses; there have been seventy-eight separate incidents of arson; the rate of violence and the volume of damage now exceeds that of the spring of 1969.

The question I raise tonight is how the university is to survive the current crisis.

My answers are not complete—the subject is complex. But some rules, it seems to me, are clearly dictated by experience.

First, the era of appeasement must come to an end. The political and social demands that dissidents are making of the universities do not flow from sound basic educational criteria, but from strategic considerations on how to radicalize the student body, polarize the campus and extend the privileged enclaves of student power.

Let me quote you Mark Rudd of the SDS in one of his more coherent comments:

"Let me tell you. We manufactured the issues. The Institute for Defense Analysis is nothing at Columbia. Just three professors. And the gym issue is bull. It doesn't mean anything to anybody. I had never been to the gym site before the demonstrations began. I didn't even know how to get there."

When peace comes through appeasement and capitulation to the likes of Rudd, by trading away sound educational principles and the safeguards of academic freedom, the peace thus purchased is not worth the price. That sell-out is intellectual treason. Better a confrontation than a cave-in.

Second, a concise and clear set of rules for campus conduct should be established, transmitted to incoming freshmen, and enforced—with immediate expulsion the penalty for serious violations.

The rule of reason is the guiding principle in an academic community, and those who apply the rule of force have no business there. For the good of the academic community, they should be booted out.

Third, as I stated in Des Moines, it is folly for universities confronted with their current crisis in our turbulent times to open their doors to thousands of patently unqualified students.

A recent survey sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education indicated that less than one-half of the more than 60,000 university and college faculty members polled favored relaxing normal academic admission standards for minority group applicants. And almost three-quarters of the 60,000 did not favor relaxing normal academic standards in appointing minority group members to the faculty.

I am going to pause on that note for a moment. It is not a daily ocurrence to find my opinions shared by such a large number of the academic community. I now await patiently the second thoughts of the columnists and commentators who dismissed my recent speech at Des Moines and my comments at Chicago as knee-jerk racism and reaction.

Just as I argued then that our colleges, simply by opening their doors, cannot solve the problems created by discrimination and deprivation in the central city; so, also, those colleges cannot succeed by becoming circus tents or psychiatric centers for over-privileged, under-disiplined, irresponsible children of the well-to-do blase permissivists.

It was that first point I stressed in my remarks two weeks ago in Des Moines.

Mr. Gardner Ackley, whom I quoted in that speech asserted his words were taken out of context. Yet, the text of his statement is nestled now in the cocoon of the Congressional Record. It reveals Mr. Ackley as a bird of the feather—on the issue of defending the university against radical tyranny, Mr. Ackley flies in tight formation with the hawks.

Criticism of my speech also came from Italy where it was contended my charges about the University of Rome were unsubstantiated. If that be the case, my apologies—but the source of my facts was an analysis in the *Washington Post*. That is where the diplomatic protests should be lodged. And if any of the information that the *Post* printed was in error, I am sure they will come forward with their usual prompt retraction.

Finally, my remarks also met with acid criticism from Michigan University President Robben Fleming, of whom I had been severely critical. "Your facts were wrong," charged Mr. Fleming; but the facts are these:

Two months ago, the militant Black Action Movement at Michigan made non-negotiable demands, including the enrollment of nine hundred black students by Fall of 1971, a full ten percent black enrollment by the Fall of 1973; to thereafter increase until black registration was proportionate to Negro population in the State of Michigan.

When the demands were not met fully and precisely, BAM, supported by SDS, struck. For twelve days classes were disrupted, furniture and windows broken, and students and teachers intimidated and assaulted by black and white radicals. Fires were set in campus buildings. Local and state police, mobilized to restore order, were kept away on the directive of President Fleming.

Twelve days after it began, the strike ended. The concessions granted were indistinguishable from the demands.

At the strike's end, a spokesman announced, "BAM has called an end to the strike, but the revolution is only started."

To President Flemming the agreement may be a "bold commitment" for Michigan; to me it looks like the kind of settlement intimidated garment manufacturers used to "negotiate" with Louis "Lepke" Buchalter. President Fleming has set a target that will almost be impossible to reach without imparing the quality to his institution. Moreover, he has greatly expanded the power and influence of a militant organization that is flushed with a victory gained by having cripple his school. The plain truth is that Fleming buckled under to a few squads of kid extortionists.

As for the vigor of my criticism of President Fleming, it was conscious—based on an old Cub Scout theory that the best way to put a tough crust on a marshmallow is to roast it.

Our colleges and universities are charged with a grave duty—to preserve and broaden the intellectual heritage of our nation and civilization and to educate the leaders of that nation and the world in this and the next century.

In the past that slice of national responsibility seemed to be sufficient. No longer. Today, the glamor stocks are the war against poverty, the war against racism, the war against pollution, the war against war; and the colleges and universities want a piece of the action. Selling short their traditional portfolio, they are buying into the high flyers.

But, in committing resources to these political and social ventures, for which they are totally unprepared; the colleges must necessarily neglect their prime responsibility in which they are highly expert. They will get a measure of glamor and headlines—and the approval of students who prefer campaigning to studying. But one day the crash will come; and this country will wake up with a serious loss in net educational worth.

So, one of America's problems is that her great institutions are neglecting their callings and, like the French Army in 1914, marching off singing and cheering into the kind of political and social battles for which they are ill-trained, ill-armed and ill-equipped. If they persist, they will be cut to pieces.

Fourth, no negotiations under threat or coercion.

Fifth, no amnesty for lawlessness or violence. This last canon is crucial. Once an individual has deliberately and consciously violated the crimnal law, he should be removed from the academic community, which is not equipped to deal with the argument of force, and left to the larger society which has both the aptitude and determination for the task. A crime is no less a crime because it is committed in an ivy hall in the name of academic freedom.

Sixth, any organization which publicly declares its intention to violate the rules of an academic community and which carries out that declaration should be barred from campus. The university is a community with its own rules; and one of these is that reason governs and ideas prevail on their merits, not on the number who can be massed behind them.

Two years ago, at the time of the violence at Columbia, President Nixon said that the Columbia disorders were

"The first major skirmish in the revolutionary struggle to seize the universities of this country and transform them into sanctuaries for radicals and vehicles for revolutionary political and social goals."

He counseled Columbia to rid itself of any student organizations involved directly in the violence.

"If that student is either rewarded or goes unpunished then the administration of Columbia University will have guaranteed a new crisis on its own campus and invited student coups on other campuses all over the country."

Columbia ignored the counsel and granted a general amnesty, an amnesty received with contempt, jeers, and a stream of four-letter epithets from the militants who had held out for it.

Now, two more years have passed and the commonplace seizure of campus buildings has been pushed off page one by the burning of campus buildings.

Civil disobedience has degenerated into criminal violence. From sit-ins, we have moved to clubs, bricks, bottles and guns—to violent clashes with police—to burning the Bank of America.

It is late in the day—but it is not too late to save the colleges and universities of this country from the future the anarchic

dreamers have in store. It will take courage and it will very probably involve the kind of confrontations understandably distasteful to men of thought.

The prescient professor of philosophy from New York University, Dr. Sidney Hook, traces the seeds of the current disorders back to 1964. A year ago, in Saturday Review he wrote:

"Shortly after the riotous events at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964, I predicted that in consequence of the faculty's refusal to condemn the student seizure of Sproul Hall, the administration building, American higher education would never be the same again, that a turning point had been reached in the pattern of development. I confess, however, to surprise at the rapidity of the change, if not its direction, and by the escalation of the violence accompanying it."

American higher education has never been the same since. The toehold of the anti-democratic left at Berkeley has become an established beachhead in both universities and the larger society.

Campus anarchy that might have been nipped in the bud at Berkeley with a single act of administrative decisiveness and faculty courage—can now be contained only at considerable cost. But the sooner the price of saving the universities is paid, the better.

Seventh, we must look to how we are raising our children. In the New York Times, columnist Tom Wicker made a lugubrious lament that those were "our children" in the streets of Chicago giving the Bronx Cheer to the Conrad Hilton. To a degree Wicker is right—and the fact that we raised some of the crowd that was out there in Grant Park is one of the valid indictments of my generation.

But precisely whose children are they?

They are, for the most part, the children of affluent, permissive, upper-middle-class parents who learned their Dr. Spock and threw discipline out the window—when they should have done the opposite.

They are the children dropped off by their parents at Sunday school to hear the "modern" gospel from a "progressive" preacher more interested in fighting pollution than fighting evil—one of those pleasant clergymen who lifts his weekly sermons out of old newsletters from a National Council of Churches that has cast morality and theology aside as not "relevant" and set as its goal on earth the recognition of Red China and the preservation of the Florida Alligator.

These parents not only indulged their children; they indulged themselves—leaving Junior alone night after night with his favorite babysitter—the TV tube. By the time the average child reaches eighteen years of age, he has spent something like 18,000 hours squatting mesmerized before the make-believe world of television. Now undeniably, he learned some good things there, but they cannot substitute for parental guidance. Unfortunately, he also learned that instant gratification can be had with a proper admixture of credit cards, fast automobiles, cigarettes, pills, toothpaste, deodorants, and hair dressing.

Today, by the thousands—without a cultural heritage, without a set of spiritual values, and with a moral code summed up in that idealistic injunction, "do your own thing," junior—his pot and Portnoy secreted in his knapsack—arrives at "The Old Main" and finds there a smiling and benign faculty even more accommodating and less demanding than his parents.

For a decade these colleges and universities have undergone a barrage from the underground press, films, plays, manifestoes, novels, and even mass magazines; the theme of which is that American society and all its institutions—business, the army, the government, the universities—are irrational, racist and corrupt.

Glorifying direct action and violence, these publications have as their pervasive emotions—contempt for Western culture and hatred for the United States. Undeniably, this stream of opinion has been influential on the campus. Is it any wonder that in 1970 some are easily radicalized by the SDS?

Eight, we must look to the university that receives those children. Is it prepared to deal with the challenge of the non-democratic Left?

To most academicians the traditional enemy has always been on the Right. The sixties showed how pitifully unprepared the academic community was for an assault from its ideological rear.

They had best learn how to deal with it, for their survival is at stake. One modest suggestion for my friends in the academic community; the next time a mob of students, waving their non-negotiable demands, start pitching bricks and rocks at the Student Union—just imagine they are wearing brown shirts or white sheets—and act accordingly.

Ninth, let us support those courageous administrators, professors and students on our college campuses who are standing up for the traditional rights of the academic community, against what the New York Times rightly calls the "New Fascists." Their number is growing.

Last week President Eric Walker of Pennsylvania State University along with his wife was driven from their home by rock-throwing students. He has pledged no amnesty for the thugs responsible, his trustees are behind him; and the country will be well served if he stands by his guns.

The country will support these principles—and from the recent survey of the Carnegie Commission on Education, college facilities themselves have had a bellyful and are ready to act as well. Eighty percent interviewed said these campus disorders were a threat to academic freedom; three out of four said that students who disrupt the college should be suspended or expelled. Can it be that within the faculty lounges there is also a Great Silent Majority?

One final thought about academic freedom and the true liberal philosophy. Neither can be reconciled with the coarse repression by the New Left of other points of view. The rude shouting-down of guest speakers is totally incompatible with the presence of intellectual excellence. Therefore, we must presume that intellectual excellence is no longer present on campuses where another viewpoint cannot be expressed, analyzed, and debated. And it is not enough to defend by saying that the disruptors are in the minority. Because if intellectual excellence were present, it would never abide such animal conduct.

It is one of the tragedies of our time that faculties and students sit in catatonic trance while the raucous militants destroy academic freedom.

When will they awaken?

CRACKDOWN ON TERROR FAVORED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, America's citizens are weary of acts of terror which are increasing in frequency at an alarming rate. A recent Gallup poll indicates that the majority of Americans want to see that persons convicted of terror bombings, hijackings, and inciting riots are meted out stiff jail sentences. I agree with their sentiments. It is high time for us to crack down on perpetrators of all criminal acts, and I hope that stiff sentences will be given, and upheld, in these new kinds of crimes, as well as in all other kinds.

I include an article from the April 23, 1970, Washington Post, reporting the findings of the poll as follows:

LENIENCY ON TERROR REJECTED

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., April 22.—The U.S. public is in no mood to be lenient with people who commit three types of crimes that are products of modern-day America: terror bombings, hijacking and inciting riots.

The public would crack down particularly hard on those convicted of putting a bomb in a public building. A majority of those interviewed, 78 per cent, would give "bombers" sentences ranging from 10 years to death. Only one person in eight would impose a sentence of less than 10 years.

A majority of 59 per cent would give airplane hijackers sentences ranging from 10 years to death. One person in four favors a sentence of less than 10 years.

Views are somewhat more lenient in the case of persons convicted of inciting a "serious riot," with nearly half saying the sentence should be less than 10 years in prison. However, the public's hard line is apparent here as well, with many calling for stiff sentences, particularly in the case of riots in which lives are lost.

Since January more than a score of bombs have exploded in over a dozen cities, killing six persons and injuring 15. Property damage has run into the millions of dollars.

The hijacking of aircraft became a major concern of government officials in 1968. According to the State Department, there were three successful hijackings of U.S. commercial aircraft to Cuba in the period 1961–1967, but this figure jumped to 13 in 1968. Just in the last six months, 35 new hijack attempts have been reported.

The Gallup Poll put this question to a representative national sample of 1551 adults in 300 scientifically selected areas in a survey conducted March 13 to 15:

There has been a lot of discussion as to what jail terms, if any, should be given persons 18 years of age and older who are convicted of certain offenses. Would you please tell me in the case of each of the following offenses what, in general, you feel should be the jail term:

a. For a person who is convicted of putting a bomb in a public building?

b. For a person convicted of hijacking an airplane?

c. For a person who starts a serious riot?

The following table shows the results:

Jail terms

[In percent]

Less than 10 years:	
Hijacking	26
Bombing	12
Starting riot	43
10 years or more:	
Hijacking	39
Bombing	43
Starting riot	34
Life:	
Hijacking	16
Bombing	29
Starting riot	6
Death:	
Hijacking	4
Bombing	6
Starting riot	2
Other responses:	
Hijacking	5
Bombing	4
Starting riot	5
No opinion:	
Hijacking	10
Bombing	6
Starting riot	10
Total	100

Men are far more inclined to favor the death penalty than are women for persons convicted of each type of crime. Little difference of opinion, however, is found on the basis of the age of the respondent.

THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1970, at Suffolk Downs more than 10,000 senior citizens gathered for the second annual meeting of the Massachusetts Legislative Council for Older Americans.

This gathering marks an important milestone in the efforts of the Legislative Council for Older Americans to focus national attention on the economic problems of our elderly citizens. Those who attended this affair had the pleasure of hearing Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Gov. Francis Sargent, president of the Massachusetts State Senate, the Honorable Maurice Donahue, and other dignitaries. I also had the privilege of addressing the group.

Through the efforts of the Legislative Council for Older Americans and its officers—Mr. Frank J. Manning, president; Mr. Jerry Schneider, executive vice president and treasurer; Mr. Frank Holiver, public relations—many new advantages have come to the aged. Most important of these was that the council was instrumental in the enactment of legislation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, whereby senior citizens would be allowed to keep increased social security payments without loss in State benefits.

I want to congratulate the officers of this association for the fine leadership they have shown in behalf of the senior citizens. These men and this organization have brought much happiness to our older Americans.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article from the Boston Herald and the speech given by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY:

MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS,
Boston, Mass., April 14, 1970.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOM: We are proud to have you join us and enclose a life membership.

We feel that the April 10th rally was an important mile-stone in our efforts to focus national attention on the social and economic problems of our Elders, and are happy to report that we are beginning to get outside support which I am sure will reflect itself in mail to Congressmen outside our own Commonwealth.

We know that we can count on you to do all you can in Washington.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. MANNING,
President.

[From the Boston Herald, Apr. 11, 1970]

TED SAYS CONGRESS FAILS AGED

(By Wendell Coltin)

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy told more than 10,000 elderly persons at Suffolk Downs yesterday—the largest gathering of senior citizens in the state's history—that Congress has not met its responsibilities to them.

"A country that can afford to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in foreign wars can do more spending for senior citizens," he said, adding that the elderly are "much too intelligent and concerned" to be satisfied with "glib" promises.

Kennedy received a roaring ovation from the throng, which included several busloads of Rhode Island residents. The meeting, which had "Senior Power" as its theme, was held in the enclosed grandstand at the racetrack.

The gathering was the second annual meeting of the Massachusetts Legislative Council for Older Americans.

Kennedy said the elderly should have a minimum Social Security benefit of $100 a month, instead of the present $55 to $60 for a worker retiring at 65. Medicare, he said, is a step in the right direction, but only meets 35 to 45 per cent of the medical needs of the elderly.

The senator also called for a comprehensive health insurance program for all citizens.

"There are those who say we can't afford that," he said. When you think of the amounts insurance companies spend on advertising and TV, I say we can have a program. We can start a program to gradually feed our senior citizens into the program."

U.S. Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, who traveled from Washington to address the assembly, said: "Your dollar of Jan. 1, 1968, is only worth 93 cents today. I hope we can give you a minimum of 15 per cent in a new (social security) increase and raise the earnings limitation to $3,000."

Gov. Sargent signed an executive order at the meeting establishing the governor's Special Planning Commission on Elderly Affairs. He named Louis Lyons, WGBH-TV (Channel 2) news commentator, chairman and Frank Manning, president of the Massachusetts Legislative Council for Older Americans, deputy chairman.

"This commission," the governor said, "will be the prime forum in state government for the senior citizen from now until after the 1971 White House Conference. It will serve as the vehicle for attracting our share of the federal grants specially earmarked for planning for that conference and other funds under the Older Americans Act."

He presented the pen used in the signing to Manning, who served as chairman of yesterday's meeting.

The Governor said the commission will have broad latitude to evaluate all state programs for the elderly, make recommendations to the governor and legislature, and draw up a master plan for improving state programs in preparation for the White House conference. Its 60 members will have available a paid staff to carry on its studies and day-to-day operations. The governor also said he is fighting for a $100-million bond issue to construct housing units for 6,000 elderly citizens.

Other speakers included Senate President Maurice A. Donahue, Mayor Kevin White, Sen. Samuel C. Harmon, Jack Leff of the Council of Elders, and Secretary of State John F. X. Davoren.

SPEECH BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FOR OLDER AMERICANS

I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here today. It is an impressive rally. And I congratulate you on the tremendous turnout.

Thousands of you are here. And you are here because you care; because you are active; because you are willing to get out and work for the basic rights of senior citizens.

In an age of demonstration, disruption, and discontent, you are firmly and conscientiously pressing your cause. We may be a youthful nation. But you have shown to me—and to millions of others—that "senior power" is here; it is now; it is important to all of us.

Your accomplishments in Massachusetts have been many. Last fall, for example, you rallied together at the War Memorial Auditorium. And then you went out and worked for your program.

You protected the extra $12 in benefits for recipients of old age assistance. And you did so by demanding and getting quick legislative action when the deadline approached. The result is $2.2 million more in purchasing power for 55,000 persons here in the state.

You have worked for half fares for older citizens on buses.

You have pressed for nursing home reform and tax relief.

You have met in the State House itself, when necessary, to dramatize your needs and your responsible requests.

In short you have carried the torch in these and a number of other areas affecting senior citizens. And I want to congratulate you here today. There is still a long way to go. But "senior power"—*your* "senior power"—can produce much of the needed reform.

As the nation grows, each year a larger and larger proportion of our population joins the ranks of senior citizens. Today, about one out of every 10 persons is 65 or older—more than twice as many as a half a century ago. We have 20 million seniors in the United States; and 620,000 here in Massachusetts.

The statistics are challenging. For we as a nation have failed to meet our responsibilities to older citizens.

Far too often, we find that older Americans are left behind by the process which they helped to create.

Far too often, retirement produces loneliness and frustration, when it could be a time to enjoy well-earned leisure hours.

Far too often, the continuing talents and skills of the elderly are overlooked—when they could be utilized to the benefit of all society.

We have failed millions of citizens 65 and over in the area of income maintenance. We have failed millions by not providing decent homes at a price which they can afford to pay. We have failed millions in neglecting adequate medical care.

This nation has a fundamental obligation to assist our retired men and women. They have served the country well for the better part of a lifetime. They deserve our support and consideration in their later years.

We cannot meet the basic needs by advancing timid and halfway measures. We must be bold. We must be willing to commit additional resources.

I will continue to press for responsible programs in Washington. And I would like to review today some of the areas I am particularly concerned about for the months ahead.

First, spiraling inflation continues to rob the pocketbook of every American. And no group is more badly hurt than senior citizens. Most of you live on fixed incomes. As prices go up, your purchasing power goes down. And attempts to give you offsetting income increases have been far too little and far too late.

Prices are now rising at an annual rate of 6%—the greatest increase in over 20 years. And the end is not in sight.

On several occasions, I have urged the President to take a firm lead with business and labor. In previous Administrations, strong encouragement and concern from the White House helped to persuade these groups to hold down inflationary rises. Presidents

Kennedy and Johnson called leaders together from both sides—and asked them to consider the national interest, as well as their own self interest.

The approach was successful. But the present Administration refuses to follow a similar course. Meanwhile, prices keep on rising.

Second, now is the time to modernize and streamline our Social Security system, and to tailor it to the requirements of our constantly changing economy. This means recognizing the right of senior citizens to a fair share of our ever-growing Gross National Product—which is rapidly approaching one trillion dollars.

Nearly 3 out of 10 individuals 65 and over live in poverty—in contrast to 1 in 9 among younger persons. Seven and one half million seniors are poor or near poor. Yet many did not fall into poverty until they became too old.

I supported the 15 percent increase in Social Security last December. It was long overdue. But as you here so vividly know, it was certainly not enough.

Briefly, here are some of the changes which I advocate for Social Security—now, not way off in the future:

A further, substantial, immediate increase in benefits;

Automatic increases tied to the cost of living index;

Protections against offsetting cuts in old age assistance and other programs whenever Social Security goes up;

An increase in minimum benefits to at least $100 a month—as proposed in legislation which I introduced last year;

An increase in the widow's pension from 82½ percent to 100 percent;

Contributions from general revenues to help finance an expanded program.

Social Security increases which are put in one pocket and taken out of another serve only to keep millions of our older people on a treadmill. Yet far too frequently, that is what happens.

As we move forward with Social Security, we must also recognize that today the level of payments is far behind present need. We need increases not just to catch up with inflation, but simply to get us to the starting line.

Thirty-five years ago this Nation made a commitment to support our citizens in their later years. We have not yet lived up to that commitment. I say it is high time we did. And I can assure you that I will continue to fight down in Washington for an adequate program in my duties as United States Senator.

Third, we must move forward with reform of Medicare. The program has brought assistance and peace of mind to millions of older citizens. But illness and bad health still threaten our elderly population—physically and financially. For the annual medical expenditures for each senior citizen are three times as great as those for persons under 65.

Yes, Medicare was a step in the right direction. But it still meets only 35 to 45 percent of all health care expenditures for the elderly. And there are many gaps in the program.

One of the biggest items in the older person's budget is prescription drugs, but this is not covered. The same is true of many other medical services vitally important to an aged person.

As a long-run solution, I have called for a comprehensive National Health Insurance program which will incorporate Medicare. In studying guaranteed minimum income proposals before Congress, we must also consider inclusion of the elderly.

But meanwhile, let us extend coverage to prescription drugs and other services. And let us change the law which requires periodic increases in the cost of Medicare to the recipients. Otherwise, millions of our retired persons will be priced out of this service and will have to go to charity programs for relief.

Fourth, I have introduced legislation to stimulate employment of low-income seniors in a wide range of service activities in their communities—day care assistants, teacher aides, hospital attendants, recreational counselors, companions for other senior citizens, coordinators in programs for the elderly, and many others.

My program would provide income for older persons struggling along in poverty. It would relieve the frustration which so many seniors feel at the lack of work opportunities. It would give our communities badly needed help. It would utilize the talent and wisdom and skill which our senior citizens possess. It would give them a chance to live out their later years in dignity and constructive service.

As Chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Aging, I chaired hearings on the bill last Saturday morning down in Fall River. Some of you here were kind enough to attend. Frank Manning testified as a formal witness.

The response in those hearings was truly amazing. Senior Aides from pilot projects described the deep personal satisfaction and hope and confidence which they gained from community work. Community leaders told of the great help and value of senior workers, and asked for more.

Endorsement of these programs was unanimous and I will press for early passage of my bill in the Senate.

Fifth, my thoughts now turn to the one million older Americans who are languishing in 14,000 nursing homes across the United States. The three-generation family home—with parents, grandparents, and children in one house or apartment—is a thing of the past. And even as most of our older citizens have been exiled from private industry, so many of them have been, by necessity, moved from their homes to special facilities.

Some nursing homes are doing a good job. Many are trying to become comfortable shelters in which to live, not to die.

But in far too many cases, nursing homes are dirty; their service is indifferent; their medical care is grossly inadequate.

That is why I added an amendment, which passed in 1967, requiring the licensing of all nursing homes—with minimum standards to assure proper care. These regulations are scheduled to take effect this year. I urge that the Administration publish them promptly and enforce them vigorously.

Sixth, let's talk about housing.

Because the retired person necessarily spends a great deal of time within the confines of his house or apartment, the home environment is of utmost importance to his health and morale. But today, millions of retired people are living in dilapidated homes which simply aggravate their sense of hopelessness and futility.

To add insult to injury, many tenants are forced to pay a disproportionate amount of their income for rent—often being forced to make a grim choice between paying the rent or buying a badly needed warm coat or other necessity. Even in public housing projects, many tenants are paying 50 to 60 percent of their income as rental—thus depriving themselves of adequate food and clothing.

Last year Congress passed a two-year $4.8 billion bill which included substantial support for moderate and low-income housing. But, so far, it has been funded at only a small percentage of the authorized level. We can, and we must, do more.

For all of our aging programs, we must be willing to devote adequate resources. The moon, Venus and Mars will be here long after millions over 65 have passed from this scene. Let us transfer some of the money and creativity of our space program, of our madcap highway program, of our overkill machinery of defense to the needs of those who have chronology against them and cannot afford to think in terms of long-range proposals and promises of future aid.

Let us not forget that you, our older Americans, pioneered for the 40-hour work week; for unemployment insurance; for collective bargaining in industry; and for many other current benefits which the working forces of this country enjoy today.

And so I call upon young and old alike to demand an end to the human loneliness and frustration which too often are the penalties for growing old.

And in particular, I call upon you, who are gathered here at this meeting, to keep up your dedicated, forceful, effective work.

You must continue to take the lead. *You* must continue to make your story known. *You* must continue to press for a decent life for every older American.

That is the goal I leave with you today—a decent life for every older American. Working together, young and old, we *can* achieve that goal. We will have failed, as a nation and as a people, if we settle for anything less.

AMERICANS ABROAD—THE JAIL SCENE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine recently carried an article describing Americans going abroad in search of cheap drugs.

It is a tragedy that these Americans going abroad harbor several myths; namely, that drugs are cheap, which is correct, and that the laws in foreign countries are loose compared to the United States, which is incorrect.

Because of their folly, we now have several hundred Americans languishing in foreign jails where our American consuls can do little to help these people. This must come as a traumatic shock not only to the jailed Americans, but to their families as well.

Let our Americans going abroad be forewarned of the consequences and penalties they face as the price for smuggling drugs.

Mr. Speaker, Time's thought-provoking article follows:

[From Time magazine, Apr. 13, 1970]

AMERICANS ABROAD—THE JAIL SCENE

Coming into Los Angeles
Bringing in a coupla keys
Don't touch my bag, if you please,
Mr. Customs man.

—An Arlo Guthrie song, 1970

Guthrie's lyrics celebrate a popular underground myth: that the U.S. is a tough drug scene compared with countries abroad, where the laws are loose and the hash is cheap. Though it is true that a "key" (kilo) of hashish may cost as little as $10 or $20 in Lebanon or Morocco, the price for many young American smugglers turns out to be almost unbearably high. All along the "trade routes" by which narcotics make their way back to Europe and the U.S., young Americans are filling up a veritable Baedeker of prisons.

The State Department reported last week that, as of February, there were no fewer than 404 Americans being held in foreign jails on various drug charges, compared with only 142 a year ago. And the count is rising.

Paris-based John T. Cusack, the chief U.S. narcotics agent for Europe and the Middle East, estimates that foreign police and customs agents are booking young American smugglers at the rate of 40 per month. In Morocco, five Americans have been arrested on drug charges in the past five weeks. Last week in Lebanon, Morocco's main rival as a Mecca for drug-seeking tourists, police arrested eight youthful Americans who were trying to sneak some 70 kilos of hash out of the country. The catch brought Lebanon's current population of Americans imprisoned on drug charges to 15, pushing the country ahead of Italy (12) and Greece (13), and close to the league leaders, which are Spain (about 50 jailed Americans) and West Germany (30).

Drug Scare. The prison population explosion is worrying the State Department, which calls it "a very important question." In many areas, it is rapidly becoming the prime concern of American diplomats. In Rabat, U.S. Counsul Joseph Cheevers is besieged by requests for such items as antiscorbutic vitamin C, soap and blankets from American inmates of Moroccos dank jails (40 to a room). At the same time, he is handling twice as many requests for information from worried parents in the U.S. as he was a year ago.

The surge in overseas drug arrests of American travelers is largely the result of a crackdown by foreign governments. They are disturbed at the emergence of narcotics problems in their own country. Furthermore, some widely publicized drug-connected horrors, particularly the Sharon Tate murders, have helped to erode whatever benign neglect traveling American hippies once enjoyed abroad. A few of the jailed Americans are professional smugglers, supplying the Mob in the U.S. "But most of them," says Cusack, "are not pros in the true sense. They have no records. They are users, and many of them are 'missionaries.' They want to turn others on—and if there's a profit in it, so much the better."

Busted Playmate. There are profits aplenty. A $10 or $20 "key" of Lebanese hash can fetch $1,500 or more in the U.S., and the figures tempt a wide variety of improbable smugglers. Book-of-the-Month Club Author W. S. Kuniczak (*The Thousand Hour Day*) was arrested last December for smuggling 160 lbs. of hash into Greece; he is presently serving a 4½-year sentence on the island of Corfu. *Playboy's* December Playmate Gloria Root, 21, currently graces Athens' stark Averoff prison, where she is serving a ten-month sentence for crossing into Greece from Turkey with 38 lbs. of hash: Nearly all of the amateur smugglers are under 30, but surprisingly few are drifters or dropouts. One of three young Americans who have been cooling their heels in Bierut's Asfourieh Prison Hospital since they were arrested on smuggling charges last August is Harvard Sophomore Steven Miller, 21, a grandson of a former dean of the Harvard Divinity School.

Although they are generally long on education (and long on hair), the young tourists are strictly bush-league smugglers. Says Agent Cusack: "They use methods that would make a professional pusher blush—putting the stuff in the mail or hiding it under the back seat of a car." In Algeciras, Spanish custom officers last year arrested 64 Americans as they stepped off the ferry from Morocco. If Moroccan dope peddlers have not already fingered the Americans in advance, Spanish agents have little trouble picking out probable smugglers. The giveways: hippy dress ("a long or loose anything"), and talkative overfriendliness.

At Beirut International Airport, customs men have trained dogs to sniff out drugs hidden in luggage. In Tashkent, a woman Soviet agent with a superb olfactory sense sniffed hash carried by three young Americans, who were flying via Aeroflot from Afghanistan to Finland. Two are still serving time in the infamous Potma labor camp southeast of Moscow.

Series of Horrors. Often the youthful smugglers are suckers from the start. In Lebanon, tourist guides around Baalbek's famous Roman ruins sidle up to adventurous-looking American kids and sell them not only cheap hash but identical cheap cardboard tourist suitcases to carry it in. Airport customs officials are so familiar with the suitcases that they almost yawn as they arrest the tourists who show up with them.

Arrest is only the first of a series of horrors. Beyond helping young smugglers to get a reputable lawyer, U.S. consuls can only ensure that Americans get the same treatment as the local nationals do—which is often a far cry from U.S. standards. Bail is unknown in many countries, and there are long waits in crowded prisons before cases come to trial. Beirut's notorious Sands prison, where seven Americans are currently awaiting trial, is filled with rats, homosexuals and filth.

American parents of jailed students are invariably flabbergasted at how little they can do to ease their cases. Ronald Lee Emmons, 22, a black Chicagoan and a former basketball player at the University of Illinois, was picked up in Istanbul for possession of two kilos of hash. Despite the efforts of his mother, he waited 13 months in Istanbul's Sagmalcilar prison before his case came to trial last February. He was sentenced to five years in jail, where all he can look forward to are the letters, books, money and extra food that U.S. Consul Douglas Heck brings on his twice-monthly visits. As a U.S. consular official in Lebanon confesses: "The truth is we simply can't do any more." The only American ever to be sprung from a Lebanese prison by executive clemency was a Los Angeles youth who was found to have terminal cancer. He was allowed to go home to die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, May 4, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.—Ephesians 6: 10.

Almighty God, infinite in wisdom, power and love, whose mercy is over all Thy works and whose will is ever directed to Thy children's good, humbly we bow in Thy presence as we pray for those in the service of our country, particularly those who are prisoners of war—absent from their loved ones, yet always present with Thee. Protect them from all dangers of body and spirit, grant unto them humane treatment, help them to be patient with themselves, good to their fellow men, and strong in Thee who art the strength of all Thy children.

Bless their families with the assurance of Thy presence and the comfort of Thy spirit. May they look forward with faith and hope to a safe return of their loved ones and to the end of war.

We pray for the family of our beloved colleague who has gone home to be with Thee. Grant them Thy comfort and the strength of Thy spirit as they live through these days.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 30, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965, relating to the conservation and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fishing resources, to encourage certain joint research and development projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1187. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1961, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore; and

H.R. 1706. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Pike County, Ga.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12605. An act to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 515) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11372. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Washington, and for other purposes", approved June 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 290).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1461. An act to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States;

S. 1751. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; and

S. 2362. An act to amend certain Federal laws relating to the State of Oklahoma.