

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Effects of Possible Use of Nuclear Weapons

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in October 1967, Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant submitted a report to the 22d General Assembly on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons. In presenting the unanimous report prepared by 12 professionally competent and politically responsible men from Poland, Mexico, the Soviet Union, Sweden, France, Canada, Japan, Nigeria, the United States, Norway, India, and the United Kingdom, he noted:

What makes the report particularly valuable is the fact that, in trying to reach unanimity the expert consultants have not avoided sensitive or even controversial issues.

The Secretary General might have added that the consultants did avoid the unintelligible gobbledegook often found in writings on this subject. Based on theoretical studies, most of which were related to real geographical areas, the horrors of nuclear war are stated bluntly in layman's language:

There is one inescapable and basic fact . . . the nuclear armouries which are in being already contain large megaton weapons every one of which has a destructive power greater than that of all the conventional explosive that has ever been used in warfare since the day gunpowder was discovered. Were such weapons ever to be used in numbers, hundreds of millions of people might be killed, and civilization as we know it, as well as organized community life, would inevitably come to an end. . . .

. . . there is no active defense system in sight which would prevent all nuclear weapons from reaching their selected targets.

The effects of all-out nuclear war, regardless of where it started, could not be confined to the Powers engaged in that war. . . . No part of the world would escape exposure to biologically significant levels of radiation. To a greater or lesser degree, a legacy of genetic damage could be incurred by the world's population.

Far from an all-out nuclear exchange being a rational action which could ever be justified by any set of conceivable political gains, it may be that no country would, in the pursuit of its political objectives, deliberately risk the total destruction of its own capital city, leave alone the destruction of all its major centres of population; or risk the resultant chaos which would leave in doubt a government's ability to remain in control of its people . . . the risk of nuclear war remains as long as there are nuclear weapons.

. . . The ultimate question for the world to decide in our nuclear age—and this applies both to nuclear and non-nuclear powers—is what short term interests it is prepared to sacrifice in exchange for an assurance of survival and security.

I commend to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues this clear and compelling report on the effects of nuclear war; and I ask unanimous consent that

CXIV—503—Part 6

part I of this report be printed under Extensions of Remarks.

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

QUESTION OF GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

(Report of the Secretary General on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for states of the acquisition and further development of these weapons)

1. By General Assembly resolution 2162 A (XXI) of 5 December 1966, the Secretary-General was requested to prepare, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts, a report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons.

2. In pursuance of this resolution, I appointed a group of consultant experts whose members were: Wilhelm Billig, Chairman of the State Council for Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Poland; Alfonso León de Garay, Director of the Genetics and Radiobiology Programme, National Nuclear Energy Commission, Mexico; Vasily S. Emelyanov, Chairman of the Commission on the Scientific Problems of Disarmament of the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Martin Fehrm, Director General of the Research Institute of Swedish National Defence; Bertrand Goldschmidt, Director of External Relations and Planning, Atomic Energy Commission, France; W. Bennett Lewis, Senior Vice-President, Science, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited; Takashi Mukaibo, Professor, Faculty of Engineering, University of Tokyo, Japan; H.M.A. Onitiri, Director, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Ibadan, Nigeria; John G. Palfrey, Professor of Law, Columbia University, New York, United States of America; Gunnar Randers, Managing Director, Norwegian Institute for Atomic Energy; Vikram A. Sarabhai, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission of India; Sir Solly Zuckerman, Chief Scientific Adviser to Her Majesty's Government, United Kingdom. Mr. Mullath A. Vellodi, Deputy to the Under-Secretary, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, served as Chairman. He was assisted by members of the Secretariat.

3. The consultant experts, in their personal capacities, have submitted to me a report containing their considered and unanimous views on the various and complex aspects of the subject matter of this report. The consultant experts have approached their task in the spirit of the resolution of the General Assembly and it gives me very great satisfaction that they were able through co-operation and understanding to come up with a unanimous report. What makes the report particularly valuable is the fact that, in trying to reach unanimity, the expert consultants have not avoided sensitive or even controversial issues. This is extremely significant because the value of the report lies in its clear and fair exposition of the problem. I am very pleased to be able to endorse their findings. I wish also to record my most sincere appreciation for their invaluable assistance in carrying out an important and delicate task.

4. I have therefore decided to transmit their report in full to the General Assembly as the report called for by resolution 2162 A (XXI). It is with a sense of gratification that I submit this report. As I wrote last year in the Introduction to the Annual Report on the Work of the Organization, "I believe

that the time has come for an appropriate body of the United Nations to explore and weigh the impact and implications of all aspects of nuclear weapons . . . To know the true nature of the danger we face may be a most important first step towards averting it". It is my hope that this report, and the ensuing debate by the General Assembly, will not only provide a deeper and clearer understanding of the effects of the nuclear arms race but also positively contribute to the search for ways to bring it to an end.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

OCTOBER 6, 1967.

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL,
United Nations,
New York:

We have the honour to submit herewith a unanimous report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of these weapons which we were invited to prepare in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2162 A (XXI).

The report was drafted during meetings held in Geneva between 6 and 10 March and between 26 June and 5 July, and finalized at meetings held in New York between 2 and 6 October 1967. Mr. M. A. Vellodi, Deputy to the Under-Secretary, Department of Political and Security Council Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, served as Chairman at all the sessions.

The Group of Consultant Experts wish to express their gratitude for the valuable assistance they received from the members of the Secretariat.

Wilhelm Billig, Alfonso Leon de Garay, Vasily S. Emelyanov, Martin Fehrm, Bertrand Goldschmidt, W. Bennett Lewis, Takashi Mukaibo, H. M. A. Onitiri, John G. Palfrey, Gunnar Randers, Vikram A. Sarabhai, Sir Solly Zuckerman.

I. EFFECTS OF THE POSSIBLE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS INTRODUCTION

1. The enormity of the shadow which is cast over mankind by the possibility of nuclear war makes it essential that its effects be clearly and widely understood. It is not enough to know that nuclear weapons add a completely new dimension to man's powers of destruction. Published estimates of the effects of nuclear weapons range all the way from the concept of the total destruction of humanity to the belief that a nuclear war would differ from a conventional conflict, not in kind, but only in scale. The situation, however, is not as arbitrary as opposing generalizations such as these might suggest. There is one inescapable and basic fact. It is that the nuclear armouries which are in being already contain large megaton weapons every one of which has a destructive power greater than that of all the conventional explosive that has ever been used in warfare since the day gunpowder was discovered. Were such weapons ever to be used in numbers, hundreds of millions of people might be killed, and civilization as we know it, as well as organized community life, would inevitably come to an end in the countries involved in the conflict. Many of those who survived the immediate destruction as well as others in countries outside the area of conflict, would be exposed to widely-spreading radio-active contamination, and would suffer from long-term effects of irradiation and transmit, to their offspring, a genetic burden which would become manifest in the disabilities of later generations.

2. These general propositions, whether set out dispassionately in scientific studies or

directed as propaganda, have been proclaimed so often that their force has all but been lost through repetition. But their reality is none the less so stark that, unless the facts on which they are based are clearly set out, it will not be possible to realize the peril in which mankind now stands.

3. The purpose of the first section of this report is to provide a picture of the destructive power of nuclear weapons and of the consequences of their use. It gives a brief account of the destruction wrought in Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the explosion of single and relatively small nuclear weapons. These two disasters are the only examples of the actual use of nuclear weapons in war, and they provide direct information about the kind of casualties caused by nuclear explosions. The first section also outlines some theoretical studies of the physical effects of much larger nuclear weapons on centres of population and on the civilian economy, as well as the effect such weapons would have on major military targets. It deals too with the implications of so-called tactical nuclear warfare, that is to say of field warfare in which nuclear weapons are used. To achieve a measure of realism, most of these studies were related to actual, as opposed to hypothetical geographical areas, towns or cities, that is to say cities with a particular pattern of public services, communications and food supply. In a widespread exchange of strategic nuclear weapons many cities suffer devastation similar to that of the examples studied, with a cumulative interacting effect which would greatly exceed the simple addition of the direct results of individual attacks. Accepting that an attacker could always have the advantage over a defender in terms of surprise and weight of attack, no attempt has been made to complicate the general story by analysing the extent to which an ABM defence, together with civil defence measures, might reduce the scale of damage and the number of casualties which would result from a nuclear attack. It is enough to note that there is no active defense system in sight which would prevent all nuclear weapons from reaching their selected targets.

4. Some technical details and general characteristics of nuclear explosions are set out in annex I to this section. The genetic effects of nuclear radiation are discussed in annex II.

HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI

Physical effects

5. The first atomic bomb to be used in warfare had a yield of nearly twenty kilotons, that is to say it had an explosive force equivalent to nearly 20,000 tons of conventional chemical explosive (e.g., TNT). It was detonated at approximately 550 metres above Hiroshima on 6 August 1945. On 9 August a second atomic device, with a similar yield, was detonated at about the same height over Nagasaki. In Hiroshima, destruction was concentric around the centre of a spreading city whose population was about 300,000. Within seconds, a rapidly growing fire-ball developed into a mushroom-like cloud, supported, as it were, on a column of black smoke, and the heat radiating from the fire-ball caused thousands of fires.

6. By comparison with Hiroshima, Nagasaki was a narrow city surrounded by hills and open to the sea in only one direction, with a population of about 87,000 people living within three kilometres from the centre. The immediate effects of the explosion were the same, but the area of destruction and fire differed in accordance with the different layout of the cities. In both cases the heat of the explosion was so intense that, up to a distance of about a half kilometre from the centre of the disaster, the surface of domestic ceramic roof tiles melted and firing of domestic wooden houses, by direct radia-

tion, was observed up to one and a half kilometres.

7. There are varying estimates of the casualties¹ in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and it has proved difficult to estimate the exact numbers of exposed people who may have died after escaping from the city. Available estimates are that 78,000 were killed and 84,000 injured in Hiroshima, and that 27,000 were killed and 41,000 injured in Nagasaki. In addition, there were thousands missing in both towns. Most of the immediate fatal casualties were caused by the violent disruption of residential and office buildings. In Hiroshima 80,000 houses were completely or partially destroyed. Wooden houses within two and a half kilometres radius were carried away, while brick buildings were turned into heaps of rubble. Severe damage to houses occurred as far out as eight kilometres. Walls, doors, bricks, glass, furniture and other debris hurtled through the air, crushing or damaging everything in their way. Moderately close to "ground-zero", by which is meant the point on the ground directly below the explosion, buildings were pushed over bodily, and at greater distances were leaning away from the source of the blast.

8. No exact information is available concerning the relative importance of blast, burns and nuclear radiation as the causes of fatalities in these bombings. Burn injuries constituted the major problem in medical care. People exposed in the open had been severely burned, injuries from direct radiation being incurred as far out as about two kilometres from the centre of the zone of destruction. From the day after the bombing, burns accounted for about one half of all the deaths. At the Kameyama Hospital in Hiroshima 53 per cent of the patients who received burns at one kilometre died within the first week and 75 per cent within two weeks. The peak mortality occurred on the fourth day. Another peak in deaths occurred in the third and the fourth week, when complications, especially those associated with radiation injury, set in. Twenty days after the attack it was found that, among burned survivors, the great majority (80-90 per cent) had suffered "flash" burns from the immediate absorption of the thermal radiations of the explosion on the exposed skin; some 5-15 per cent had suffered both flash and flame burns; a very few (2-3 per cent) had suffered flame burns only.

9. The explosion over Hiroshima rapidly led to a firestorm² which lasted for about six hours and which burned out an area of twelve square kilometres of the town. Within about two to three hours a wind, which started twenty minutes after the detonation of the bomb, reached a velocity of fifty to sixty kilometres per hour, blowing towards the burning city from all directions. Seventy per cent of the fire-fighting machines in Fire Brigade stations were rendered unusable, and 80 per cent of the fire-fighting personnel were unable to respond to the emergency. The loss of water pressure through the breaking of pipes, mainly due to the collapse of buildings, contributed greatly to the additional destruction by fire. But even if men and machines had survived the blast,

¹ The population and casualty figures referred to are taken from public announcements of local governments in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, six months after the explosions, based on reports by the survey mission of the National Research Council, Japan.

² A firestorm is not a special characteristic of nuclear explosion. It may be a consequence of a forest fire or an incendiary bomb attack, with high inward winds produced largely by the updraft of the heated air over an extensive burning area. The incidence of firestorms is dependent on conditions at the time of the attack, including the local availability of fuel.

many fires would have been inaccessible within one and a half kilometres from ground-zero.

10. About 45,000 of the fatal casualties in Hiroshima died on the day of the explosion, and some 20,000 during the following four months, as a result of traumatic wounds, burns and radiation effects. There are no estimates of the numbers who may have died from the effects of induced radio-activity experienced during rescue work in the city. Most of the medical facilities in Hiroshima were in the devastated area of the city, and the methods adopted for treating casualties were consequently far below standard. Difficulties were aggravated by shortage of supplies and equipment, and by the extraordinary demands made on crippled medical staffs. Next to immediate medical problems, the most serious challenge to those who had survived the direct effects of the explosion, were problems of water supply, housing and food. Electrical distribution systems suffered severely, first by damage to overhead lines, and secondly by damage to switch gear and transformers caused by collapse of the structures in which they were located. To people who were not immediate casualties these difficulties compounded the profound psychological effects of the disaster of which they were part. Even twenty years after the bombings there is an excessive sensitivity of the people to the thought of radiation hazard, leading to difficulties in obtaining agreement about the siting of nuclear power plants.

Long-term radiation effects

11. Apart from the effects which ionizing radiation had on the immediate victims of the explosions, the survivors were also exposed to the hazards of the radiation both in terms of latent disease occurring in the individual (somatic effects) and of changes in hereditary material (genetic effects). It had been suspected for some time that exposure to repeated moderate doses of nuclear radiation is conducive to leukaemia, a disease which is associated with a malignant overproduction of white blood cells. A study of the survivors of the two nuclear explosions, over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, shows that the disease can undoubtedly result from a large single (acute) dose of radiation. The incidence of leukaemia in the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was observed to be increasing in 1948. It reached a peak in 1950-52. Although it seems to have decreased somewhat since then, it still remains much higher than in the unexposed population of the rest of Japan. While the incidence of the disease increased in all age groups, it did so rather more sharply in young people. The incidence in survivors was up to fifty times greater in those within about one kilometre of the explosion than in people who were further away. It was ten times greater for those within one and one and a half kilometres than for those between two and ten kilometres from ground-zero.

12. A continuing study of the survivors of the two Japanese disasters has also suggested an increased incidence for other kinds of malignant cancer, particularly cancer of the thyroid, and not just leukaemia, which has a much shorter latent interval. There is also a hint, but as yet no more than a hint, that the average expectation of life is less in the survivors of the exposed population whether or not they suffered malignant disease. This is an effect of radiation which has been proved in experimental animals. The indications are stronger that a significantly high proportion of the babies born to women who were pregnant when exposed to the explosion, and who survived, had heads smaller than average size, and that some of these suffered severe mental retardation.

13. Insufficient time has passed since these two nuclear disasters to determine what genetic changes, if any, were induced in the survivors. In any case, although long-term genetic effects would indeed be conse-

quences of radiation in nuclear warfare, such effects are of prime concern only where the acute effects can be disregarded, i.e., in areas far removed from the immediate target areas in a nuclear war or under conditions of intense testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. Hence for the purpose of this report, it has not been thought necessary to discuss fully the present state of knowledge about the genetic effects of ionizing radiation. Some facts concerning these effects are given in annex II. All that need be noted here is that radiation from nuclear explosions can cause genetic mutations and chromosome anomalies which may lead to serious physical and mental disabilities in future generations. These effects may arise either from the radiation released in the first few instants after a nuclear explosion or from that released through the later radio-active decay of the substances contained in "fall-out" from the explosion. In this connexion it should be noted that there was no significant local fall-out in either Hiroshima or Nagasaki since, in both cases, the explosions occurred fairly high in the atmosphere.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POSSIBLE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN FUTURE WARS

14. In all wars, advancing armies have sought to capture vital enemy objectives, such as cities, industrial zones and food producing areas, as well as to command the transport system linking them. Air warfare has made it possible to attack and destroy such targets without first defeating the defending armies. The obliteration of the distinction between the "front" or the "rear" of a war zone, which came about as a result of the air offensives of the Second World War, has now been compounded by the advent of nuclear weapons. Those who defined the two Japanese targets for the first and only atomic bombs yet used in war, held that the bombs should be used so as to create the maximum psychological effect, and thus break the will of the Japanese people to continue the fight. Some present-day military theorists who write about nuclear war, speak of attacks on cities taking place simultaneously with, or even before, attacks on armed forces and specific military targets.

15. It is therefore necessary to build up a picture of what would happen if a large city were attacked not with kiloton weapons of the kind used on the two Japanese cities but with the much more powerful hydrogen bombs or fusion bombs which are available now and whose yield is usually expressed in megatons, i.e., unit yields equivalent to one million tons of chemical explosive. Because of the nature of nuclear weapons all their separate destructive effects, whether immediate or delayed, could never be maximized in a single explosion. For example, the areas affected by blast, thermal radiation and initial nuclear radiation would be appreciably smaller for a ground burst than an air burst of the same energy yield. On the other hand, a ground-burst would be accompanied by early radio-active fall-out, which would be much less for an air-burst. With air-bursts, the relative importance of the various effects would depend on the height of the burst.

16. Since every city has its own individuality, its own pattern of services, communications and food supplies, a realistic picture of what would happen cannot be derived unless one considers a real city, and analyzes the effects zone by zone, taking into account differences between them in population density, function and so on. One such study was made of a city, with a population of just over one million people, which extended in all directions for about eight to ten kilometers, (i.e., with a surface area of some 250 sq. km or about 100 sq. miles), and attacked, it was assumed, with a single one megaton nuclear weapon, burst at ground level. Using the ex-

perience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and estimating also on the basis of the results of carefully designed weapons effects experiments, the following figures of casualties emerged:

Killed by blast and fire, 270,000.

Killed by radio-active fall-out, 90,000.

Injured, 90,000 (of whom 15,000 were in the area of fall-out and thus exposed to the effects of radiation).

Uninjured, 710,000 (of whom 115,000 were in the area of fall-out).

17. Approximately one third of all the inhabitants would have been killed as a result of blast and fire or from a radiation dose received in the first two days. One third of a million dead, is approximately the same number of civilians who were killed by air raids both in Germany and in Japan during the whole of the Second World War. Practically all the inhabitants of the central area of the city, an area of about six by five kilometres, would have been killed, mainly as a result of the destruction caused by blast and fire. Any who were not immediately killed in the central area would have died from nuclear radiation. At the outer boundary of the central area the proportion of casualties in the population would fall to 75 per cent, and would then continue to fall as the distance from the burst increased. Most of the 90,000 of the city's population who would have suffered non-lethal injuries would have been serious casualties, and, for 15 to 20 per cent of these, rescue operations would have been greatly impeded by radio-active fall-out. In the part of the population who, on this particular analysis, were not counted as casualties, 20 per cent would have been subject to radio-active fall-out hazards. Only half of the total population in the city would have been both uninjured and unaffected by fall-out.

18. The scale of the physical destruction which would be associated with casualties of this order of magnitude is so great that there is no basis of experience which could serve to help describe the instantaneous transformation of a vast living city into a sea of blazing rubble. Every house or building would be damaged; about one third would be completely wrecked, i.e., with damage ranging from utter and complete obliteration, to buildings with more than half their walls down; another one third would be severely damaged, i.e., wrecked for all practical purposes, but perhaps providing some temporary shelter if nothing else were available. Only about one third of the original houses would be in any way serviceable, although they would have lost a great part of their roofs, doors and windows. In many areas, water and gas mains, sewers, and power supplies would have been destroyed. Not a single area would have retained all its essential services. Roads would have been erased and even the lightly damaged peripheral areas would very likely be deprived of their water supplies and sources of food supply. It is all but impossible to conceive of the amount of improvisation and reorganization which would be demanded from the shocked survivors in the period immediately following the attack, even though every possible plan had been made to deal with the anticipated results of a possible strike.

19. Against this background of death, injury, destruction and fire, one can see the whole life of a great city being completely disrupted by the explosion of a single megaton bomb. As an organized unit, capable of contributing to a war effort, it would cease to have any meaning. The survivors in different parts of the city would either be in a state of shocked immobility or would be wandering about trying to find some place better than the one where they happened to be when the bomb went off, searching for food, for better shelter, for relatives, for help of any kind. The problems confronting the community

would be immeasurably greater than any experience of the Second World War. In hostile circumstances of the kind we are assuming, it would be unrealistic to suppose that only one city would be struck. With many in the same desperate plight, there could be no question of any substantial help being brought to the survivors from outside. In brief, a big city of the size that has been described, a city in which more than a million people lived in an area of about 250 sq. km would for all practical purposes be eliminated by a single one-megaton weapon ground-burst near its centre. One-megaton bombs are small units in the megaton spectrum; larger weapons, much larger ones, are now stockpiled.

Radio-active contamination

20. Close to the explosion the lethal effects of radiation would be instantaneous. But nuclear weapon explosions also give rise to radio-active fission products and, in the case of a ground-burst, these become mixed with earth particles sucked into the atmosphere. The heavier particles of soil and weapon debris fall back to the ground and settle in the vicinity of the explosion, giving rise to delayed radiation hazards. These particles constitute local radio-active fall-out. For a ground-burst of the type assumed in the foregoing paragraphs, the area of intense fall-out could cover hundreds of square kilometres. Within such an area, people who were not adequately sheltered and who did not remain under cover until the radio-activity of the fall-out had decayed substantially, would be exposed to intensities of radiation sufficient to produce very serious hazards to health.

21. The picture painted in paragraphs 16-19 was derived, as already observed, from a detailed analysis of an actual city, taking into account its true layout, and the differential distribution of its population. If, instead, one assumes the general case of a single megaton explosion at a height of about 3,000 metres rather than at ground level, over a hypothetical city having a population of one million people who are evenly distributed in a built up area of twenty by twenty kilometres, the following general conclusions emerge:

(a) Within a radius of about three kilometres from the explosion, all buildings would be destroyed and 90 per cent of those inhabiting the area would be casualties (dead and seriously injured);

(b) Within a radius of three to six kilometres there would be partial or complete destruction of buildings, and 50 per cent of those inhabiting the area would be casualties. The survivors would have to be evacuated;

(c) Within a radius of between six and nine kilometres there would still be heavy destruction to buildings and about 35 per cent of the inhabitants would be casualties.

22. It is estimated that 40 per cent of the total population of such a city would be casualties as a result of blast and fire alone, and that 60 per cent of the entire city would be destroyed. In addition, direct thermal radiation might cause burn casualties and fires as far as ten to fifteen kilometres from ground-zero.

23. For a ten-megaton explosion over such a hypothetical city, the area of complete or serious destruction would cover between 300 and 500 sq. kilometres, that is to say the area of the entire city. Moreover the effects of blast and direct radiation would extend well beyond its boundaries, with heat and forest fires raging up to twenty kilometres from the ground-zero of the explosion. Half of the entire population over an area of radius of some twenty-five kilometres could be expected to die within the first few days as a result of radio-active contamination, even after allowing for some shelter provision.

24. In the case of an air-burst of a twenty-

megaton bomb the heat which would result would be intense enough to start fires as far as thirty kilometres from a point of detonation, depending on how clear the atmosphere was at the time, and could endanger the lives of people in an area with a radius of nearly sixty kilometres. It has been estimated that such a device, if exploded over Manhattan, would, in the absence of shelter or evacuation programmes, probably kill 6 million out of New York City's 8 million inhabitants, and lead to an additional one million deaths beyond the city limits. The surface explosion of a twenty-megaton bomb would result in the formation of a crater 75-90 metres deep and 800 metres in diameter.

ESTIMATE OF EFFECTS OF A NUCLEAR ATTACK ON A REGION OF A COUNTRY

25. A study was made of the likely results of a nuclear attack on a hypothetical industrial region, consisting of nine cities each with populations of over 50,000 inhabitants (some well over), and also containing 140 smaller towns of fewer than 50,000 inhabitants (about sixty of which contained elements of key industry). Assuming that a one-megaton bomb burst at ground level in each of the nine cities, the study showed that cumulative estimates of casualties provided a very inadequate measure of the overall effects of the attack. The estimates showed that 20 per cent of the total population, or 30 per cent of the urban population, or 35 per cent of the key-industrial population would be killed. The houses destroyed would be 30 per cent of total or 40 per cent of urban, or 50 per cent of those occupied by key-industrial population. But cities are not isolated entities; they are linked in a variety of functional ways, being dependent on each other for raw materials of different kinds, as well as for semi-finished and finished manufactured goods. Taking the interaction of effects into account, the study showed that the percentage of key industry in the whole region, (i.e., industry with more than local significance) which would be brought to a stop would be between 70 per cent and 90 per cent of the whole. The lower figure of 70 per cent takes account of everything directly destroyed or completely disrupted inside the target cities; the higher figure of 90 per cent includes the areas surrounding the city which would also be indirectly "knocked out" through, for example, failure of communications or supplies of raw materials and food. The more interdependent they are, the larger is the multiplying factor one has to bear in mind when estimating the cumulative effects of the destruction of single cities.

26. Another more general study envisaged a nuclear attack on a small country, extending about 1,000 km. in one direction and 500 km in the other, i.e., with an area 500,000 sq. km. and a population density of 100 people per square km. It was assumed that one part of the country was attacked with four nuclear weapons each of twenty megatons. Such an attack would affect about 100,000 square kilometres, or some 20 per cent of the country's total expanse by blast, radiation and radio-active contamination. The overall consequences of the devastation would vary according to the nature of the particular area attacked, e.g., according to whether it contained key cities, sources of electric power, raw materials or whether it was a prime food producing area. But in every case, economic life would be completely disrupted and the general devastation, including radio-active contamination from low bursts would be such as to prevent any immediate assistance being brought to the devastated areas from outside. In hypothetical studies of this kind it has also been estimated that in the absence of special protection, blast-induced deaths

alone resulting from high level 400 ten-megaton bombs aimed at United States metropolitan areas, would eliminate more than half of the total American population of some 200 million people. Even if they were all in substantial fall-out shelters the same proportion would be killed if the weapons were burst at ground level.

27. A Swedish study of the consequences of nuclear attacks against Swedish cities showed that an attack carried out with about 200 weapons, ranging from 20 kilotons to 200 kilotons in yield, would result in 2 to 3 million casualties, i.e., 30 to 40 per cent of the total population of about 7 million people. It also showed that between 30 to 70 per cent of Swedish industry would be destroyed, and that about two-thirds of the industrial workers would receive fatal or severe injuries. The weight of attack assumed in this particular study is relatively heavy, but none the less it corresponds to only a small fraction of the nuclear weapons that area already stockpiled in nuclear arsenals.

28. Swedish studies have also shown that the degree of protection against radio-active fall-out which might be provided by existing buildings in urban and rural areas in Sweden varies greatly. In no region would existing buildings provide adequate protection against the higher levels of radiation which could be experienced in the intense part of the fall-out area. But effective protection might be provided over the greater part of the fall-out area, given there had been time to construct shelters, and to stock them with food and other necessities of life. Even ordinary buildings, if they remain standing, do provide some protection from the radiation caused by fall-out.

29. In addition to a need to protect against external residual nuclear radiation, i.e., radiation emitted later than one minute after a nuclear explosion, there is the further hazard of internal radiation resulting from the ingestion of any radio-active fall-out material that had contaminated food, particularly vegetable food, and in some cases open water supplies. The amount of radio-active material which could be taken into the body by way of contaminated food would exceed that from the inhalation of contaminated air or absorption of contaminated water. The radio-activity of this absorbed material would decay by the emission of damaging nuclear radiation.

30. Urbanization clearly increases the hazard of radio-active contamination because of the concentration of increasing numbers of inhabitants in comparatively small areas. This applies particularly in Europe. An analysis of about 100 European cities showed that while the larger cities are on average about thirty to fifty kilometers from each other, the smaller cities are on average no more than ten to fifteen kilometers apart. In Germany villages are on average only from one to two kilometers apart. Radio-active contamination despite a continuous decrease in intensity, would persist for years following a heavy nuclear attack, and would create continuing problems in food producing areas and to water supplies. It has been calculated that a twenty-megaton explosion on the American city of Boston would cause such a degree of fall-out over an area with a radius of nearly fifty kilometers that half of the unsheltered people on the fringe of this area would die within forty-eight hours. Even if shelters were provided, high doses of radiation might be received which, even if not fatal, could still produce extensive radiation sickness, as well as long-term somatic and genetic effects.

EFFECTS ARISING FROM THE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN FIELD WARFARE

31. In certain quarters it is still military doctrine that any disparity in the conventional strength of opposing forces could be

redressed by using nuclear weapons in the zone of battle. This proposition needs to be considered first in the context that both sides possess these weapons, and second when the situation is asymmetrical and only one side is a nuclear weapons Power. Section III of this report deals with the latter case. In the former, where the situation is symmetrical, carefully conducted and dispassionate theoretical studies of the use of nuclear weapons in field war, including analyses of an extensive series of "war games" relating to the European theatre, have led to the clear conclusion that this military doctrine could lead to the use of hundreds, and not of tens, of so-called tactical nuclear weapons in the battlefield area, given that both sides resort to their use. Without going into the details of these studies, it can be firmly stated that, were nuclear weapons to be used in this way, they could lead to the devastation of the whole battle zone. Almost everything would be destroyed; forests would be razed to the ground and only the strongest buildings would escape total destruction. Fires would be raging everywhere. Circumstances such as these, would be incompatible with the continued conduct of military operations within the zones of devastation.

32. An offensive on the scale to which all these studies point, over a land battle area with a front of, say, 250 km and 50 km deep, would render hundreds of thousands, even millions, homeless. Such a level of destruction could be achieved with only 100 small nuclear weapons in a European battle area chosen because it did not contain any large towns. With 400 weapons, which is not an unreasonably large number if both sides used nuclear weapons in a battle zone, the physical damage caused would correspond to something like six times that caused by all the bombing of the Second World War—and all sustained in a few days rather than a few years. If one sets aside the profound, even if unquantifiable psychological effects of such an exchange, the resulting chaos would still be beyond imagination.

33. The estimates show that with 100 weapons having an average yield of thirty kilotons (range 5 to 50 kilotons) about one tenth of the assumed typical European battle area would be completely devastated, and about one quarter severely damaged. With 200 weapons about one fifth would be devastated and half of it severely damaged; and with 400 weapons about one third of the area would be devastated and all severely damaged. Even for only 100 strikes, this represents destruction on an unimaginable scale over an area of about 12,500 sq. km. In another European "war-game" study, a battle was envisaged in which the two opposing sides together used weapons whose total yield was between twenty and twenty-five megatons, in not fewer than 500 and in not more than 1,000 strikes. The nuclear weapons were supposed to have been used against military targets only, in an area of about 25,000 sq. km. In this engagement about 3.5 million people would have had their homes destroyed if the weapons had been air-burst, and 1.5 million if the weapons had been ground-burst. In the former case, at least half of the people concerned would have been fatally or seriously injured. In the case of ground-burst weapons, 1.5 million would have been exposed to lethal doses of radiation and a further 5 million to the hazard of considerable although non-lethal doses of radiation.

34. A question which immediately poses itself is whether military operations would be compatible with destruction of the scale indicated by estimates such as these. A vast civilian population would be involved unless the battle took place in desert conditions. The number of casualties, civilian and military, cannot be easily related, in any precise

way, to the population actually in the area at the time of the battle. Because the need to reduce the level of military casualties would dictate tactics of dispersal, the number of nuclear strikes necessary to produce assumed military results would go up very rapidly. Fear and terror, both in the civil and military population, might overwhelm the situation.

35. Military planners have no past experience on which to call for any guide as to how military operations could proceed in circumstances such as these. When such levels of physical destruction are reached, one might well ask what would determine the course of a nuclear battle? Would it be the number of enemy casualties? Would it be the violent psychological reaction, fear and terror, to the horror of widespread instantaneous destruction? Would the chaos immediately bring all military operations to a halt? Whatever the answer to these questions, it is clear enough that the destruction and disruption which would result from so-called tactical nuclear war would hardly differ from the effects of strategic war in the area concerned. The concept of escalation from tactical to strategic nuclear war could have no possible meaning in an area within which field warfare was being waged with nuclear weapons.

36. This picture is not altered if one postulates so-called "clean" nuclear weapons, in place of those which formed the basis of the foregoing studies. Claims have been made about the possibilities of providing for battlefield use, low yield weapons (say 1 to 10 kilotons) which would release an abnormally high proportion of their energy in blast and nuclear radiation, while producing virtually no radio-active fall-out. "Clean", in this context, is a matter of degree. These suggested weapons would basically rely on a fission reaction so that radio-active fall-out could never be completely avoided.³ In any case, the foregoing studies postulated nuclear explosions which yielded minimal radio-active contamination from normal fission weapons. The resulting chaos in the battlefield area was brought about not by fall-out, but primarily through blast effects. Thus, if "clean" weapons were available for battlefield use it is difficult to believe that similar chaos would not ultimately be produced. Sooner or later the battlefield situation must be expected to become similar to that which the foregoing studies have indicated.

Interdiction targets

37. Were such weapons ever to be used in a war it is also quite certain that they would not be restricted to the battle zone itself—even if it were assumed that there would not be what is usually referred to as a strategic exchange. It is part of the concept of tactical nuclear warfare that in a purely military campaign they would also be used outside the area of contact in order to impede the movement of enemy forces, the operation of air forces and so on. The objectives which would be attacked in order to achieve these effects are generally called interdiction targets. Theoretical studies of operations of this kind provide a picture of "deep" nuclear strikes whose effects would be hardly distinguishable from a strategic nuclear ex-

change in which both sides set out from the start to destroy each other's major centres of population. To illustrate what is implied, reference can be made to a single strike in one such study on which it was assumed that the railway installations in a major transport centre were attacked by a single twenty-kiloton bomb, or a single 100-kiloton bomb, in order to make the centre impassable to troops and supplies, and thereby to assist the land battle elsewhere. The railway centre chosen for this study was a city with 70,000 inhabitants living in 23,000 houses in an area of some fifty sq. kms. The bomb was assumed to be burst at ground level so as to maximize the effects on the railway lines. This mode of attack, unlike that used against the Japanese cities, would at the same time also maximize local fall-out damage. With the twenty-kiloton bomb, railway tracks would be demolished over a length of about 100 metres, a large amount of spoil from the crater would cover all lines in the vicinity, blockage would be caused by the collapse of road bridges, rail flyovers and buildings out to about one-half of a mile from the burst. All fuel depots and servicing sheds would be destroyed. With a 100-kiloton bomb the scale of damage would, of course, be greater; about one mile of track would be destroyed or blocked by heavy debris, and the main roads through the town would be completely blocked. The problem of reopening a road or railway would be hampered by a vast amount of radio-active debris. It would indeed be so great that it would almost certainly be easier to build a new by-pass round the town. If such attacks formed part of a general "interdiction" programme of bombing, it stands to reason that the transport communication system of a country could be totally wrecked in a very short time, and with it much more as well.

38. The estimated inescapable collateral effects of bombing a single railway centre in such a programme of attacks indicate that most of the industrial and commercial property in the middle of the town would have been destroyed. Fire would have consumed not only houses but also the larger buildings and factories not immediately destroyed by the explosion. A twenty-kiloton bomb in an "interdiction" attack on a town which was a communications centre—and few, if any communication centres are not towns—would kill about a quarter of the 70,000 inhabitants, which a 100-kiloton attack would kill about half. The survivors would have to contend with the same kind of situation as has been depicted in the case of the two Japanese cities bombed in 1945, or the larger city attacked by a one-megaton weapon which has been described above. A programme of "interdiction" attacks on targets behind the zone of contact of opposing armies, if such a programme included communication centres as well as airfields, supply depots, armament factories and so on, would be no different in its effects from those of a widespread so-called strategic nuclear exchange between two opposing Powers.

DETERRENCE OF WAR

39. Nuclear weapons constitute one of the dominant facts of modern world politics. They are at present deployed in thousands by the nuclear weapon Powers, with warheads ranging from kilotons to megatons. We have already witnessed the experimental explosion of a fifty to sixty-megaton bomb, i.e. of a weapon with about 3,000 times the power of the bomb used in 1945 against Japan. Hundred-megaton devices, weapons about 5,000 times the size of those used in 1945, are no more difficult to devise. They could be exploded just outside the atmosphere of any country, in order utterly to destroy hundreds, even thousands, of square kilometres by means of blast and spreading

fire. It has been suggested on good authority that in certain geographical circumstances multi-megaton weapons could also be exploded in ships near coastlines in order to create enormous tidal waves which would engulf the coastal belt.

40. The effects of all-out nuclear war, regardless of where it started, could not be confined to the Powers engaged in that war. They themselves would have to suffer the immediate kind of destruction and the immediate and more enduring lethal fall-out whose effects have already been described. But neighbouring countries, and even countries in parts of the world remote from the actual conflict, could soon become exposed to the hazards of radio-active fall-out precipitated at great distances from the explosion, after moving through the atmosphere as a vast cloud. Thus, at least within the same hemisphere, an enduring radio-active hazard could exist for distant as well as close human populations, through the ingestion of foods derived from contaminated vegetation, and the external irradiation due to fall-out particles deposited on the ground. The extent and nature of the hazard would depend upon the numbers and type of bomb exploded. Given a sufficient number, no part of the world would escape exposure to biologically significant levels of radiation. To a greater or lesser degree, a legacy of genetic damage could be incurred by the world's population.

41. It is to be expected that no major nuclear Power could attack another without provoking a nuclear counter-attack. It is even possible that an aggressor could suffer more in retaliation than the nuclear Power it first attacked. In this lies the concept of deterrence by the threat of nuclear destruction. Far from an all-out nuclear exchange being a rational action which could ever be justified by any set of conceivable political gains, it may be that no country would, in the pursuit of its political objectives, deliberately risk the total destruction of its own capital city, leave alone the destruction of all its major centres of population; or risk the resultant chaos which would leave in doubt a government's ability to remain in control of its people. But the fact that a state of mutual nuclear deterrence prevails between the Super Powers does not, as we know all too well, prevent the outbreak of wars with conventional weapons involving both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon nations; the risk of nuclear war remains as long as there are nuclear weapons.

42. The basic facts about the nuclear bomb and its use are harsh and terrifying for civilization; they have become lost in a mass of theoretical verbiage. It has been claimed that the world has learnt to live with the bomb; it is also said there is no need for it to drift unnecessarily into the position that it is prepared to die for it. The ultimate question for the world to decide in our nuclear age—and this applies both to nuclear and non-nuclear Powers—is what short-term interests it is prepared to sacrifice in exchange for an assurance of survival and security.

Insecticides and Declining Reproduction in Wildlife

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Mr. PICKLE, Mr. Speaker, one of the most responsible duties we have to those

³ The same would apply to larger so-called "clean" weapons used in a strategic role. In this case there would in addition be considerable induced radio-activity caused by the capture of neutrons in atmospheric carbon, thus producing very long-lived radio-active carbon-14. So far as long-range and long-term fall-out is concerned, this radio-active hazard from so-called "clean" weapons is comparable in importance to that from less "clean" weapons. (The foot-note to annex I, paragraph 7, applies also to "clean" weapons.)

Americans of future generations is to protect and conserve the natural wildlife and beauty in which this country abounds.

One of the major threats to conservation and balance of various forms of wildlife is the possible unreasoned, improper use of insecticides.

At this time, evidence is still flowing in to show the way in which improper use of certain chemicals can have a cumulative, but very destructive effect. The signs are there for those who take time to notice them, and in this regard, I would like to commend four scholars at the University of Texas in Austin who have called my attention to an article which appeared in the March 1968 issue of *Science* magazine. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to reprint the article, along with their cover letter.

Admittedly, the article is a rather technical analysis, but I believe the message it bears, even to the layman, is loud and clear.

The material follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., March 21, 1968.

HON. J. J. PICKLE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PICKLE: As biologists in the state university we consider it our obligation to call attention to a recent article in *Science*, a copy of which is enclosed.

A number of salient points have been red marked in the margin and the conclusion red underlined.

In short, the authors have shown that a species of bird is having declining reproductive success which is linked to high residues of DDT and its degradation products in eggs which do not hatch and in dead young. This bird feeds only in the open ocean, and not where any spraying has occurred. It follows, then, that the ocean has been contaminated by DDT runoff to an extent that is harmful to carnivorous animals.

A rational projection of the above results indicates the danger to other marine feeding carnivores, which include most fish and many birds. The birds and game which obtain food from DDT-sprayed areas of land are also threatened.

We are fully cognizant of the values of insecticide application. However, there do exist insecticides which decompose into harmless products after a period of days. It appears, then, to be sheer folly to allow anyone to use DDT and dieldrin, insecticides which do not rapidly decompose and in fact are accumulated in the fat stores of the animal.

It is our considered opinion that the United States should follow the lead of at least one European country (Hungary) in legislating against the use of these non-degradable insecticides as threats to the health of oceanic life, terrestrial birds and game, as well as animals which derive a measurable fraction of their food therefrom, humans not excluded.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. HANSON,
Assistant Professor.
DANIEL L. TREVINO,
Graduate Student.
JOHN A. MACDONALD,
Graduate Student.
GARY F. SHELTON,
Research Associate.

DDT RESIDUES AND DECLINING REPRODUCTION IN THE BERMUDA PETREL

(By Charles F. Wurster, Jr., Department of Biological Sciences, State University of New York, Stony Brook, and David B. Wingate, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, Paget East, Bermuda)

ABSTRACT.—Residues of DDT [1,1,1-trichloro-2,2-bis(p-chlorophenyl)ethane] averaging 6.44 parts per million in eggs and chicks of the carnivorous Bermuda petrel indicate widespread contamination of an oceanic food chain that is remote from applications of DDT. Reproduction by the petrel has declined during the last 10 years at the annual rate of 3.25 percent; if the decline continues, reproduction will fall completely by 1978. Concentrations of residues are similar to those in certain terrestrial carnivorous birds whose productivity is also declining. Various considerations implicate contamination by insecticides as a probable major cause of the decline.)

Many oceanic birds nested on Bermuda in 1609 when the first settlers arrived, the most abundant apparently being the Bermuda petrel, *Pterodroma cahow*. Within 20 years man and his imported mammals virtually exterminated this species; for nearly 300 years it was considered extinct. Several records of specimens since 1900 were followed in 1951 by discovery of a small breeding colony¹ and in 1967 22 pairs nested on a few rocky islets off Bermuda. With a total population of about 100 the petrel is among the world's rarest birds.

A wholly pelagic species, *P. cahow* visits land only to breed, breeds only on Bermuda, and arrives and departs only at night. The single egg is laid underground at the end of a long burrow. When not in the burrow the bird feeds far at sea, mainly on cephalopods; when not breeding it probably ranges over much of the North Atlantic¹.

Reproduction by *P. cahow* has declined recently. The data since 1958 (Table 1) show an annual rate of decline of $3.25 = 1.05$ percent; the negative slope of a weighted regression is significant ($P, .015$; F test). If this linear decline continues, reproduction will fall completely by 1978, with extinction of the species.

TABLE 2

Sample	Residues (p.p.m.)	Percentages		
		DDT	DDE	DDD
A, egg ¹	11.02	27	58	5
A, egg ^{1,2}	10.71	24	62	4
B, added egg ¹	3.61	15	65	20
C, chick in egg ³	4.52	33	64	3
D, chick in egg ⁴	6.08	33	62	5
D, chick brain ⁴	.57	30	54	16
E, chick, 1 to 2 days old.....	6.97	29	66	5
Average.....	6.44	31	62	7

¹ Egg showed no sign of development.

² Identity confirmed by thin-layer chromatography (11).

³ Analysis 5 months later by Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, which also detected dieldrin at 0.02 p.p.m.

⁴ Not included in averages.

⁵ Fully developed chick died while hatching.

NOTE.—Residues of DDT (10) in parts per million (wet weight) in eggs and chicks of the Bermuda petrel, collected in Bermuda in March 1967; proportions of DDT, DDE, and DDD are expressed as percentages of the total.

Certain identification were confirmed by thin-layer chromatography¹¹ as follows: After Florisil cleanup,¹² the unknown sample was spotted on a thin-layer plate with 1-ug authentic standard sample on both sides. After development, the unknown was masked by a strip of paper, and the standards were sprayed with chromogenic 1-reagent.¹³ When spots were visible follow-

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1

Year	Pairs	Chicks	Success (percent)
1958.....	6(1)	4	66.7
1959.....	5(2)	2	40.0
1960.....	13(3)	6	46.2
1961.....	18(1)	12	66.7
1962.....	19	9	47.4
1963.....	17(1)	9	52.9
1964.....	17(1)	8	47.1
1965.....	20	8	40.0
1966.....	21	6	28.6
1967.....	22	8	36.4

NOTE.—Reproductive success of the Bermuda petrel between 1958 and 1967: percentages of established adult pairs under observation whose chicks survived 2 weeks after hatching. Numbers of pairs of unknown success (not included in calculations) appear in parentheses. Data from 1961-67 are believed to represent the total breeding population; earlier, not all burrows had been discovered. The decline in reproductive success follows the linear relation $y = a + bx$ (y , reproductive success; a , a constant; b , annual percentage decline in success; x , year). The regression, weighted by numbers of pairs: $y = 251.9 - 3.25x$

Many recent reports have correlated diminished reproduction by certain carnivorous birds with contamination by chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides²⁻⁷. As the terminal member of a pelagic food chain, presumably feeding over much of the North Atlantic, the petrel may be expected to concentrate by many orders of magnitude any stable, lipid soluble chemicals, such as chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, present in lower trophic levels^{2,8}. In fact it should serve as an ideal environmental monitor for detection of insecticide contamination as a general oceanic pollutant, rather than contamination resulting directly from treatment of a specific land area⁹. When we analyzed several specimens of *P. cahow* for chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, all samples contained DDT residues¹⁰.

During March 1967 five unhatched eggs and dead chicks were collected from unsuccessful petrel burrows and stored frozen. The small size of the population precluded the sampling of living birds. Samples were analyzed for DDT, o,p-DDT, DDE, DDD, dieldrin, and endrin by electron-capture gas chromatography; the results are summarized in Table 2. No o,p-DDT, dieldrin, or endrin was detected, but an independent laboratory detected a trace of dieldrin.

ing exposure to ultraviolet light, the masking was removed, horizontal lines were drawn between the standard spots in order to locate corresponding compounds in the unknown, and these areas were scraped from the plate and extracted with a few drops of a mixture of hexane and acetone (9:1 by volume). Injection into the gas chromatograph confirmed the presence of DDT, DDE, and DDD by showing the appropriate single peaks for these compounds. This confirma-

tion procedure was employed because the electron-capture detector is more sensitive than the chromogenic spray reagent in detecting minute amounts of these materials.

Coincidental with diminishing reproduction by the Bermuda petrel is the presence of DDT residues averaging 6.44 parts per million (ppm) in its eggs and chicks. In itself this coincidence does not establish a causal relation, but these findings must be evaluated in the light of other studies. Whereas a healthy osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) population produces 2.2 to 2.5 young per nest, a Maryland colony containing DDT residues of 3.0 ppm in its eggs yielded 1.1 young per nest, and a Connecticut colony containing 5.1 ppm produced only 0.5 young per nest; the Connecticut population has declined 30 percent annually for the past 9 years.⁴ In New Brunswick, breeding success of American woodcocks (*Philohela minor*) showed a statistically significant inverse correlation with the quantity of DDT applied to its habitat in a given year. Furthermore, during 1962 and 1963, birds from unsprayed Nova Scotia showed breeding success nearly twice as great as did those from sprayed New Brunswick, where woodcock eggs averaged 1.3 ppm of DDT residues during those years.⁵

In Britain five species of raptors, including the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) and golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), carried residues of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides in their eggs, averaging 5.2 ppm; each of these species has shown a decline in reproduction and total population during recent years. By comparison, residues in the eggs of five species of corvids averaged 0.9 ppm, and breeding success and numbers have been maintained.⁶ It is noteworthy that during the last decade the peregrine has become extinct as a breeding bird in the eastern United States.⁷ Residues in bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) eggs averaged 10.6 ppm, and this species also shows declining reproduction and population.⁸ Lake Michigan herring gulls (*Larus argentatus*), exhibiting very low reproductive success, averaged 120 to 227 ppm. of DDT residues in the eggs,⁹ the suggestion being that susceptibility varies widely between species.

In most of the above instances, including *P. cahow*, reduced success in breeding resulted primarily from mortality of chicks before and shortly after hatching. Bobwhites (*Colinus virginianus*) and pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*), fed sublethal diets of DDT or dieldrin, gave similar results;¹⁰ a mechanism explaining chick mortality from dieldrin poisoning during the several days after hatching has been presented.¹¹

From studies of these birds and other avian carnivores a very widespread, perhaps worldwide, decline among many species of carnivorous birds is apparent. The pattern of decline is characterized by reduced success in reproduction correlated with the presence of residues of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides—primarily DDT. Our data for the Bermuda petrel are entirely consistent with this pattern.

Observations of aggressive behavior, increased nervousness, chipped eggshells, increased egg-breakage, and egg-eating by parent birds of several of the above species^{12, 13} suggest symptoms of a hormonal disturbance or a calcium deficiency, or both. Moreover, DDT has been shown to delay ovulation and inhibit gonadal development in birds, probably by means of a hormonal mechanism, and low dosages of DDT or dieldrin in the diet of pigeons increased metabolism of steroid sex hormones by hepatic enzymes.¹⁴ A direct relation between DDT and calcium function has also been demonstrated, and these endocrine and calcium mechanisms could well be interrelated; DDT interferes with normal calcification of the arthropod

nerve axon, causing hyperactivity of the nerve and producing symptoms similar to those resulting from calcium deficiency.¹⁵ Dogs treated with calcium gluconate are very resistant to DDT poisoning¹⁶; female birds are more resistant than males¹⁷, perhaps because of the calcium-mobilizing action of estrogenic hormones.

Of major importance, then, was the discovery that a significant ($P < .001$) and widespread decrease in calcium content of eggshells occurred between 1946 and 1950 in the peregrine falcon, golden eagle, and sparrowhawk. *Accipiter nisus*.²⁰ This decrease correlates with the widespread introduction of DDT into the environment during those years, and further correlates with the onset of reduced reproduction and of the described symptoms of calcium deficiency. These multiple correlations indicate a high probability that the decline in reproduction of most or all of these birds, including *P. cahow*, is causally related to their contamination by DDT residues.

Other potential causes of the observed decline for the Bermuda petrel appear unlikely. The bird has been strictly protected and isolated since 1957, and it seems that human disturbance can be discounted. In such a small population, inbreeding could become important, but hatching failure is now consistent in pairs having earlier records of successful breeding, and deformed chicks are never observed. Furthermore, the effects of inbreeding would not be expected to increase at a time when the total population and probably the gene pool, is still increasing. The population increase results from artificial protection since 1957 from other limiting factors, especially competition for nest sites with tropic birds.²¹

It is very unlikely that the observed DDT residues in *P. cahow* were accumulated from Bermuda: the breeding grounds are confined to a few tiny, isolated, and uninhabited islets never treated with DDT, and the bird's feeding habits are wholly pelagic. Thus the presence of DDT residues in all samples can lead only to the conclusion that this oceanic food chain, presumably including the plankton, is contaminated. This conclusion is supported by reported analyses showing residues in related seabirds including two species of shearwaters from the Pacific²²; seabird eggs²³; freshwater estuarine, and coastal plankton^{24, 25}; plankton-feeding organisms^{26, 27, 28, 29}; and other marine animals from various parts of the world.³⁰ These toxic chemicals are apparently very widespread within oceanic organisms,³¹ and the evidence suggests that their ecological effects are important.

FOOTNOTES

¹ R. C. Murphy and L. S. Mowbray, *Auk* 68, 266 (1951); A. C. Bent, *U.S. Nat. Museum Bull.* 121 (1922), pp. 112-7.

² E. G. Hunt and A. I. Bischoff, *Calif. Fish Game* 46, 91 (1960); E. G. Hunt, in *Nat. Acad. Sci.—Nat. Res. Council Publ.* 1402 (1966), p. 251.

³ J. P. Ludwig and C. S. Tomoff, *Jack-Pine Warbler* 44, 77 (1966); J. A. Keith, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3(suppl.), 57 (1966); J. J. Hickey, J. A. Keith, F. B. Coon, *ibid.*, p. 141.

⁴ P. L. Ames, *ibid.*, p. 87.

⁵ B. S. Wright, *J. Wildlife Management* 29, 172 (1965).

⁶ S. Cramp, *Brit. Birds* 56, 124 (1963); J. D. Lockie and D. A. Ratcliffe, *ibid.* 57, 89 (1964); D. A. Ratcliffe, *ibid.* 58, 65 (1965); *Bird Study* 10, 56 (1963); 12, 66 (1965).

⁷ L. F. Stickel et al., in *Trans. North American Wildlife Natural Resources Conf.* 31st (1966), pp. 190-200; J. B. DeWitt, *Audubon Mag.* 65, 30 (1963); A. Sprunt, *ibid.*, p. 32.

⁸ G. M. Woodwell, C. F. Wurster, P. A. Isaacson, *Science* 156, 821 (1967); G. M. Woodwell, *Sci. Amer.* 216, 24 (March 1967).

⁹ N. W. Moore and J. O'G. Tatton, *Nature* 207, 42 (1965); N. W. Moore, *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3(suppl.), 261 (1966).

¹⁰ Residues of DDT include DDT and its decay products (metabolites) DDE and DDD; DDT, 1, 1, 1-trichloro-2,2-bis (p-chlorophenyl)-ethane; DDE, 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis (p-chlorophenyl) ethylene; DDD (also known as TDE), 1,1-dichloro-2,2-bis (p-chlorophenyl) ethane.

¹¹ M. F. Kovacs, *J. Assoc. Offic. Anal. Chemists* 49, 365 (1966).

¹² J. G. Cummings, K. T. Zee, V. Turner, F. Quinn, R. E. Cook, *ibid.*, p. 354.

¹³ R. A. Herbert and K. G. S. Herbert, *Auk* 82, 62 (1965); J. J. Hickey, Ed., *Peregrine Falcon Populations, Their Biology and Decline* (Univ. of Wisconsin Press, Madison, in press).

¹⁴ J. B. DeWitt, *J. Agr. Food Chem.* 3, 672 (1955); 4, 863 (1956); R. E. Genelly and R. L. Rudd, *Auk* 73, 529 (1956).

¹⁵ J. H. Koeman, R. C. H. M. Oudejans, E. A. Hulsman, *Nature* 215, 1094 (1967).

¹⁶ D. J. Jefferies, *Ibis* 109, 266 (1967); H. Burlington and V. F. Lindeman, *Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med.* 74, 48 (1950); D. B. Peakall, *Nature* 216, 505 (1967); *Atlantic Naturalist* 22, 109 (1967).

¹⁷ J. H. Welsh and H. T. Gordon, *J. Cell. Comp. Physiol.* 30, 147 (1947); H. T. Gordon and J. H. Welsh, *ibid.* 31, 395 (1948).

¹⁸ Z. Vaz, R. S. Perelra, D. M. Malheiro, *Science* 101, 434 (1945).

¹⁹ D. H. Wurster, C. F. Wurster, R. N. Strickland, *Ecology* 46, 488 (1965); L. B. Hunt, unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

²⁰ D. R. Ratcliffe, *Nature* 215, 208 (1967).

²¹ D. B. Wingate, *Can. Audubon* 22, 145 (1960).

²² R. W. Risebrough, D. B. Menzel, D. J. Martin, H. S. Olcott, *Nature* 216, 589 (1967); J. Robinson, A. Richardson, A. N. Crabtree, J. C. Coulson, G. R. Potts, *ibid.* 214, 1307 (1967); W. J. L. Sladen, C. M. Menzie, W. L. Reichel, *ibid.* 210, 670 (1966); J. O'G. Tatton and J. H. A. Ruzicka, *ibid.* 215, 346 (1967); J. O. Keith and E. G. Hunt, in *Trans. North American Wildlife Natural Resources Conf.* 31st (1966), pp. 150-77.

²³ P. A. Butler, *ibid.*, pp. 184-9; *J. Appl. Ecol.* 3(suppl.), 253 (1966).

(NOTE.—Aided by a grant from the Research Foundation of the State University of New York; transportation by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. The Bermuda petrel conservation program was financed by Childs Frick and the New York Zoological Society. We thank G. M. Woodwell for criticizing the manuscript.)

Portrait of Hope

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, our Nation has never more needed words of hope and prayer for rededication to the principles that have made America great and carried her through the crises of the past.

Mr. S. B. Curiale, of Bridgeport, Conn., has expressed this well in his poem, "Portrait of Hope," dedicated to his own son, Joey.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem and its dedication be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the poem

and dedication were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POETRY OF HOPE
(By S. B. Curiale)

(NOTE.—I dedicate this to my son Joey, who, by his expressions and deeds, fortifies my hopes that he along with the millions of young Joeys throughout this nation, will grow to one day become the heartbeat of the United States of America.)

Hear me someone,
Anyone—anywhere in America.
Hear me, please, even though I am young;
This is Joey.

You know who I am.
You pass by me every day.
Maybe along some ballfield, some yard,
Or perhaps some church or street.

At times you have seen me
With black hair, brown eyes,
Or blonde hair, blue eyes,
Light skin or dark skin.

But, however you see me,
I am Joey, a young American boy;
Who at times feels forgotten,
And often neglected and ignored.

I want so to be seen,
To be heard.
I want someone to look at me
And say,
Joey, you are the future.
On you we shall rely.

But, confused are my countrymen,
For they fail to see me
As America itself,
With its dreams, desires
And ambitions for the future.

There were in our past history
Millions of Americans called Joey,
Who at a moment's notice
Rose up to defend their land.

Why did they take up arms?
Why did they leave
For places unknown, fearlessly?
Why were they willing to
Lay down their lives
Never to see their loved ones again?

My youthful mind tells me
Over and over again,
The reason why
Was to protect and preserve
This land of Liberty and Democracy.

O'hallowed are the grounds
Which caress the millions of Joeys
Who gave, so that America might live,
Grateful must we be,
For their devotion and sacrifices.
But truly we are not.

As I speak out at this very moment,
I cannot help but remember
My silent conversation
With the flag of our country.
Old Glory!

I remember,
It was on a dark and misty morning
In the playground of my school
That I noticed Old Glory
Motionless and silent.

I moved closer,
And stood beneath the staff
Which carries her proudly,
And whispered, "Old Glory, You look so sad!
Why?"

All at once,
Her stripes moved gently, and I heard,
Joey, Joey, how can I be happy?
For as I rest atop this staff,
I see darkness shrouding America.

The winds which once echoed
Across the mountain tops,
America the Beautiful, now echoes,
America the Land of Bigotry.

Joey, listen carefully,
I was fashioned by the hands
Of a lady who loved our land.
And when first I was raised on high,
I looked out over the rolling hills
And mountain peaks and said,
Blessed be this glorious nation!

Each morning thereafter,
The sun would kiss my thirteen stars,
And send her warmth rippling through
My fields of red, white and blue.

Each day, those who made it possible
That I become our nation's symbol
Paused beneath me
In silent allegiance.

When I say allegiance, Joey,
It was not really to me.
But to your valiant forefathers
Who cleared and cultivated
This once hostile wilderness.

As they stood beneath me
And pledged proudly their allegiance,
They were in effect,
Pledging their gratitude to those
Who made me a reality.

It seemed,
That I was to be for them
The saga of their struggles,
Their heartaches, their desires
And their goals.

Now Joey, this very day,
Some Americans burn me, kick me,
And tear me to shreds.
With malice, they are desecrating
America herself.

At the sight of all this,
My future vanguard of freedom,
I cry out,
Shame, you ungrateful sons of America
Shame, for you have dishonored me.

These contemptible Americans,
By their very actions,
Tarnish the memory of all those
Who fought and died
On the many blood stained battlefields.

I was there, Joey,
At every battle.
Many times I fell from the
Hands of a fallen Knight of Freedom.
And as I lay there motionless,
Their blood seeped deeply
Into my stars and stripes.

Time and time again
As the battle roared on,
One of the on rushing brave
Would pick me up.
As I proudly fluttered in the wind,
I cried out, God. God of this Universe,
Bless Thy fallen sons
Who gave, so that I
Again could rise.

Old Glory pauses a moment.
Her stars look deep into Joey's eyes.
"Joey, My Joey, please hear me,
Why do you cry?
You must be brave and strong."

Moments pass, and I cry out
In the silence of the morning,
"My flag, My flag,
How ashamed I am
For the actions of my generation."

Gently I place my hand
Over my heart and say,
"To you my star-spangled gem
I solemnly make this pledge:"

I pledge, Old Glory,
That from this day forward
I shall with devotion.
Go forth
Among the youth of this nation,
Cultivating the rebirth
Of a new and more dedicated
Generation.

A generation that will arise
With a far greater determination
Than ever before,
To sow the seeds of understanding
And rededication.
We, by our actions,
Shall let it be known to all
That we, the youth of America,
Are the self-ordained caretakers
Of this vineyard of hope.

My flag, I further pledge,
That this generation I speak of
Shall be guided by the motto
"That our nation is indivisible;
And will remain,
America the Beautiful, forever!"

Old Glory then began to wave.
Her stars which were dulled
By sadness,
Began to glitter.
"O Joey,
Go forth, my standbearer, forever
With this pledge in your heart."

So now my fellow Americans
From this day forward,
When you see me,
See in me, not just youth,
But the life-line of hope
That shall nourish this great Citadel—

The United States of America.
And when I speak,
Listen to my heralding message,
That work, sweat, and unity

Shall rebuild this torn nation.
Hear me when I say,
That prayer is America's answer.
That prayer is our bridge
Spanning the infinite distance
Between earth and Heaven.
Prayer shall guide us on
As we travel the highways
Of life,
Carrying the torch of Liberty.

As I speak to you of prayer,
When and if you choose to pray,
Pray for me
And for all the Joeys in America;
Asking God's blessing
And Guidance,
In our quest for a better America.

John Place, of Chase Bank, Structures Changing Patterns of American Banking

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the distinguished executive vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, John B. M. Place, addressed the Security Analysts Society on the subject on American banking trends in general and those of the Chase Bank—New York City's first and foremost bank—in particular.

To those of my colleagues who occasionally speculate on the economic and decisionmaking patterns of a large commercial bank, I commend Mr. Place's speech. Moreover, the speech also structures the changing tempo and operational methodology of Chase's—and general commercial—banking enterprise.

Mr. Place's excellent speech follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN B. M. PLACE, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, BEFORE SECURITY ANALYSTS SOCIETY, BOSTON, MASS., MARCH 25, 1968

(NOTE.—Charts referred to in text not printed in the RECORD.)

I appreciate the invitation to appear before you today to talk about the banking industry generally and Chase Manhattan in particular.

Let me say at the outset that this is my first experience in appearing before analysts, either financial or psychiatric.

Of the two, I much prefer the analysts like yourselves who concentrate on securities rather than insecurities; who let the patient tell his story upright from the lectern rather than reclining on the couch; and who ask questions about figures that don't depend for their appeal on either Montreuil or miniskirts!

As I understand it, both types of analysts share a professional curiosity about extracting as much information as possible, and in this respect I hope my remarks will be responsive. In view of recent market developments, I like to think that your willingness to listen to a banker reflects the current trend toward a more realistic valuation of earning power.

At your places, you have copies of our 1967 Annual Report. You also have a chart booklet entitled, "Perspective on Banking," which I'd like to refer to, from time to time, to illustrate my points.

If you'll look at Chart No. 1, you'll see that the growth of commercial bank deposits, loans and investments over the past two decades has generally paralleled that of the gross national product. Paraphrasing the famous political slogan of your New England neighbors in Maine: "As the economy goes, so goes commercial banking."

The U.S. economy has turned in a remarkably impressive performance in recent years—thanks, in part, to the New England-based technology that enables us to make more and better products with less and less effort. Our broader measures of economic activity like gross national product and personal income have soared. Since 1950, disposable personal income has grown 163% in total and GNP has increased 175%.

How has commercial banking done by comparison with these broad economic measures? As indicated in Charts 1 and 2 in the booklet, commercial banking has equalled the overall economy in some respects and surpassed it in others. Total deposits have advanced in step with the economy since 1950, as have net loans and investments. Commercial-bank earnings, moreover, have grown faster than the economy, and faster than total corporate profits over the entire period. Bank earnings have shown a long-term growth rate of close to 8% annually.

What's more, the growth in bank earnings has been more stable than overall corporate profits. Even in periods when corporate profits leveled off or declined, earnings of the nation's commercial banks generally continued to move ahead, as shown in Chart 2. Last year was a notable case in point.

How has Chase Manhattan fared relative to other commercial banks? Charts 4 through 9 show that Chase's deposits over the past decade have risen faster than those of other New York banks as a group and faster than the composite of twenty-four leading banks across the country. As shown in Chart 13, our assets have more than doubled over the past ten years, with the ratio of earning assets to the total hovering around 72%. Chase's per share earnings have grown at an annual rate of 8.2% over the seven years ended in 1961, and 7.4% over the most recent seven-year span. This growth exceeds that of New York City banks as a group, and compares favorably with leading banks across the country.

Of course, neither we nor the nation's other

commercial banks have had our progress handed to us on a platter. We've had to hustle and we've had problems along the way.

One has been the cost-price squeeze, resulting from the rapid rise in the cost of time and savings deposits. At Chase Manhattan, our interest costs have risen from \$41 million in 1960 to \$283 million in 1967. However, the upward trend of interest costs leveled off last year, the rise amounting to less than 1%.

Another problem for the major banks has been the restriction on their overseas activities, resulting from the persistent balance-of-payments deficits. Because foreign loans earn a somewhat higher return than domestic loans, this inevitably has had an impact on earnings, and has added a measure of uncertainty to the banking outlook. In our own bank, however, through disciplined planning and judicious use of resources available at our foreign branches and associates, we have been able to take care of subsidiaries of U.S. corporations as well as other overseas customers. A recent review of our 1968 projections—in light of the Government's new program—indicates that average loans by our International Department, including overseas branches, will run higher than last year, and the earnings prospects are quite favorable.

A further element of difficulty has been the vast complex of regulation and legislation, both actual and proposed, which banks have had to live with. On the regulatory front, we at Chase had some experience in this regard in our abortive attempts to acquire the Diners Club and to affiliate with a group of upstate banks in New York. On the legislative front, we have been faced with efforts in Congress to broaden substantially the lending powers of savings-and-loan associations and mutual savings banks, and put them into even more active competition with commercial banks. As commercial bankers, we don't object to the prospect of intensified competition. What we are concerned about, though, is that the competition be on an equal footing as far as taxes and reserve requirements are concerned, and that it be consistent with the broader needs of effective monetary and credit policy.

So, as I say, the banking industry has had its share of problems. But, to me, the significant—and often overlooked—point is that banks, by and large, have learned to cope with these problems and to adjust effectively to the changes that have been taking place at a swiftly accelerating tempo. Their performance under these circumstances seems to me a resounding refutation of the claims that bankers are a stodgy and unimaginative lot. I see banking not in any sense as a "mature market" but as a continuing and exciting growth area for the future, and I'd like to mention some trends which I think reinforce this view.

Certainly one of the most significant is the changing character of our business. You sometimes hear it said that bank earnings have gone up in recent years mainly because of the rise in interest rates, and that now with the prime at 6% there is not much room to move ahead. This argument, it seems to me, ignores the salient fact that bank earnings depend not only on the rate structure but, importantly, on volume as well.

Banking has shifted from a low-volume, high-markup operation to a high-volume, low-markup business. A larger portion of our money comes from time deposits upon which we pay interest. This has trimmed our markup. But this same time money has provided us with much larger resources which we have been able to use to good advantage in higher yielding loans and other assets.

Banks' net operating earnings have increased every year since 1961, as Chart 2 indicates. Last year, Chase's earnings per share rose 7%, while profit margins—that is, net after taxes divided by gross operating income—held at the 16.1% level of the year

before. It is noteworthy that profit margins on total earning assets have been relatively steady since 1965.

From the investor's standpoint, I believe the most realistic measure of profitability is the return on stockholders' equity. As you can see on Chart 21, five years ago Chase Manhattan's net operating earnings as a percent of year-end equity amounted to 9.5%; last year it was up to 10.9% on the basis of year-end capital and surplus funds, and 11.3% on average equity during the year.

In the face of a continuing capital shortage, interest rates are likely to remain high. While these rates may go still higher, most observers feel that bank earnings growth—in the future as in the recent past—must come largely from increases in activity and in earning assets.

During the past decade, Chase Manhattan's earning assets have grown at an annual rate of about 10%. Assuming that the economy continues to move forward, we would expect our assets, at the very least, to keep pace with the national growth trend.

As a low-markup business, banking has had to develop a keener cost-consciousness than ever before. With the help of computers, banks are beginning to get a much better focus on the cost and profitability of their services. They are working out new approaches to compensation which, over the longer run, should prove more equitable to the customer and more profitable to the banks.

At Chase Manhattan, for example, we are preparing to consolidate our bank operations units, including our battery of electronic computers, in new quarters that we believe will go a long way toward stabilizing our costs. These units, now scattered through five locations, will be moved next year into the largest office building ever constructed in the Wall Street area. Chase will take over the first 24 floors at the outset, with an option to buy the entire 50-story building after 15 years of occupancy. This consolidation should make possible greater efficiency and numerous economies over the longer run.

As a high-volume business, intent on increasing this volume, banking has deepened its penetration of additional markets to broaden the base of its earnings. For example, since 1960, commercial banks have increased their share of the market in installment credit from 39% to 44%. In auto loans, they have moved up from 46% to 58% of the total. They are making strong inroads into the mortgage loan market.

Until recently, many banks found that loans of small amounts were not economical because of the costs of credit investigations, handling and processing. But now credit cards and check-guarantee cards, by reducing these costs and providing greater flexibility, are changing all that. Through these innovations, banks stand to capture an increasingly larger share of the consumer loan business in the future.

Some have suggested that the credit card represents a first step toward the so-called "checkless society." In my judgment, it pays to take a hard look at this concept of a checkless society, and not be overwhelmed by it. What we are talking about, of course, is the direct transfer of funds from one account to another through the use of electronic devices and without the authorization of a written instrument, such as a check. Technically, direct transfers of this type already are possible. But they entail grave problems of cost, security and even convenience which need to be surmounted. Moreover, there remains a large question as to whether many customers would themselves prefer such a system, even if it proved to be cheaper.

All in all, the check has a lot to be said in its favor, and I don't for a moment feel that it is going to disappear altogether. What seems more likely is that the check will gradually be replaced in various func-

tions as it becomes evident that these can be performed either better or more cheaply by other means. Already many steps are being taken to economize on checks. Payroll and dividend deposit plans are a case in point, as well as plans for automatic payment by banks of utility, mortgage, insurance and other bills for the individual. In the case of corporate payments, direct transfer of large sums around the country through Federal Reserve leased wire is already growing rapidly. Personally, I'm persuaded that the move toward direct funds transfer will continue to be evolutionary, rather than revolutionary.

Another banking trend with significant implications for the future is that demand deposits have come back into style. After leveling off for several years, these old bread-and-butter standbys are moving up again, as Chart 6 in your booklet shows. For instance, from 1961 to 1965, average net demand deposits of New York banks rose by less than 1% a year. But in 1966 the gain was 1.9% for all banks and 2.4% for Chase; in 1967 it was 7% for all banks and 9.5% for Chase.

Cyclical elements, though present, do not appear to be the dominant forces behind this upturn. More lasting factors are involved. For example, the leeway that business firms have for economizing on their cash has been narrowing. For the future, even with continuing use of sophisticated financial management techniques, corporate cash needs should more closely mirror business growth.

As loans to business have risen, so have supporting balances. Much of the recent improvement in net demand deposits, shown in Chart 6, has been in business deposits. Many firms are carrying larger balances as payment for the banking services they receive. Additions to demand deposits as payment for banking services rendered also explain much of the rise that has occurred in inter-bank deposits.

Experience with tight money in 1966 has led many business firms to reassess the value of prospective credit resources in a tight-money market. In addition to increasing deposits to improve their liquidity, they are also seeking to enlarge the credit pool they can draw upon. By maintaining larger continuing deposits with a bank, they are putting themselves in a position where loans will be more readily available if another money squeeze should occur.

A third trend of significance for the future is the increasing emphasis on what might be called creative customer services. More and more corporate customers are selecting their principal bank on the basis of what specialized services it can perform.

Let me cite an example from our own experience. As you gentlemen know, understanding the technological content of industrial activity is often vital to the financial success of a business firm. Recognizing the need for evaluating technological influences that affect growth, Chase Manhattan has been supplementing its resources with highly-skilled technical specialists who work in tandem with our bankers.

Whenever one of our loan officers sees a need for expert technical counsel, he calls upon the skills of the technical director experienced in that particular field. We have directors who specialize in agriculture, chemicals, coal, electronics, forest products, metals, mining, textiles and transportation. Chase has mobilized the diversified talents and understanding of these men into a Technical Services Division offering capabilities unique in modern banking. The work of this unit complements similar expertise which has existed for many years in our Energy and Aerospace Divisions.

We are entering an era when banks must anticipate the needs of the customer—whether corporate or individual—and come up quickly with the means of satisfying these needs. Many banking services are rooted in the sophisticated use of computers. For in-

stance, corporate and agency trust services are being computerized with a resulting increase in profit potential as well as in the capacity for handling an expanding volume of business at decreasing unit costs. Computer-aided security and portfolio analysis holds out promise of improved selection and performance in the years ahead. As computers and electronic communications devices expand, so will the range of services which banks can offer their customers at a profit.

A fourth trend to bear in mind is the growing profit potential in international banking at a time when businesses are making their day-to-day decisions and long-range plans in light of the opportunities of a global market.

Commercial banks are helping immeasurably to shape the emerging world market, and they stand to benefit greatly from that market. Indeed, some of these benefits are already evident. At Chase Manhattan, the earnings from our international branches have grown impressively in the past five years. Additionally, our expanding international capabilities have given us a distinct competitive edge in going after business in the United States.

The rapid rise of international banking has dictated a flexible approach to service customers most efficiently. At Chase Manhattan, we've found that, in certain cases, direct representation through branches or representatives' offices is clearly more advantageous.

In other cases, we've preferred to become associated with local institutions. By doing this route, we are able to gain immediate access to deposits, which we would not get so quickly with a new branch. We also benefit from the existing experienced management. At the present time, we have associations with five banks in Latin America, and four in Western Europe. Through one of these European banks we have extensive interests on the continent of Africa. All in all, we have some form of representation in 50 countries around the world.

Taken as a group, our overseas associates maintain a combined total of over 1,400 locations, with combined deposits equivalent to some \$3 billion. We own varying percentages in these associates. They are beginning to return attractive dividends, and over the longer run we expect the returns—direct and indirect—to be increasingly important in our overall picture.

Over and above the trends I have mentioned, the growth of our national economy will have a key influence on the extent to which bank assets increase in the years ahead. At Chase Manhattan, our economists are unanimous in the belief that prospects for the decade of the Seventies are very bright, indeed, because they see several underlying factors working in our favor.

One is the tremendous increase in the nation's effort in research and development—an effort, incidentally, which is bringing a heavy demand for capital. R & D expenditures more than doubled between 1950 and 1955, doubled from 1955 to 1960, and have about doubled again since 1960. If one makes a rough adjustment for the rise in prices, our real effort in R & D may have multiplied five times or so since 1950.

No one can say with assurance what the explosion in technology will mean for the economy. At the very least, though, it should mean that we can maintain the growth in our overall productivity of 3%—plus of the last two decades, which is a greater growth than in the past. But it may well point to an acceleration in productivity gains, and this is what underwrites the rise in real living standards.

This huge increase in research and development is one of our basic sources of strength, but there are others as well. The very size of our economy, for example, and the fact that we have enjoyed great prosperity and growth in the period since World

War II. We have managed to provide jobs at good wages for the great majority of those able and willing to work.

A striking characteristic of the U.S. economy is the steady broadening and deepening of consumer markets. The big population surge in the next decade will be in the age group 18-to-29—those who are going to work, getting married, and buying all the things a family needs. With prospects of rising incomes, these young families will be likely to use credit heavily.

When it comes to translating these broad trends into terms of their impact on specific industries, you are far more adept than I am. My own feeling, though, is that if we can get our financial house in order with the proper mix of fiscal and monetary policies, we can restore wage and price stability and make the decade ahead one of impressive achievement, prosperity and opportunity.

As far as banking is concerned, I believe that earnings will continue to advance at least in stride with the growth of our national economy. At Chase Manhattan, our first quarter earnings have been running ahead of the comparable 1967 quarter, and we anticipate a good year.

We consider ourselves well positioned to take advantage of the developments I have outlined in my presentation. In addition to our international banking facilities, we have an expanding network of branches in New York City and adjacent Nassau and Westchester counties that now numbers 145. Over the next five years, we expect to add at least another 20 branches, and we believe it is only a matter of time when adjoining counties to which New Yorkers have spread will become available for bank branching.

We have a young management team, yet one that has been fully seasoned in the rigors of commercial banking competition. The average age of our Executive Vice Presidents is 51, and of our Senior Vice Presidents 49. Over the next five years, fewer than 15% of our principal executives will reach retirement age.

The bank has benefited enormously from a long-standing policy of rotating key executives in order to broaden the base of experience in its officer ranks. This has helped promote closer teamwork and has brought about improved communications and increased efficiency for the bank as a whole.

We are confident that the combination of experienced and creative management, plus the bank's ability to offer an ever-widening range of profitable services, plus its flexibility in designing new ways to serve corporate and individual customers at home and abroad, will enable us to realize worthwhile earnings growth in the years ahead.

A Pledge for War's End

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, one of the great challenges America faces is that of eliminating the terrible wrath poverty and despair has imposed on many of our cities and rural areas. I am sincerely hopeful that America can convert its enormous outflow of money and materials from defense to domestic uses once the Vietnam war is concluded. We must meet the enemy of poverty at home just as strategically and forcefully as we meet aggression and threats to our security abroad. I was therefore greatly interested to note that Sargent Shriver, as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, recently proposed a "plow-

share pledge" for all Americans. Echoing the Biblical aspiration that nations may one day hammer their swords into plowshares, Mr. Shriver's pledge carries a great challenge for all of us who would abide by it. Representative CARL PERKINS has already taken the first step forward. The Christian Science Monitor of February 27 editorialized on the "plowshare pledge" and I ask unanimous consent to include those comments for the attention of my colleagues.

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

A PLEDGE FOR WAR'S END

Those who are concerned that the war in Vietnam is draining off energies and dollars that could be wonderfully applied to the plight of the poor could well consider the pledge recently urged on Americans by Sargent Shriver.

It was simply a pledge that, when the Vietnam war ends, the billions being spent annually on Vietnam would be committed to solving the pressing human problems of the United States.

The hope has frequently been expressed: "Oh, if we could just expend on rehabilitation of the impoverished, and on the decayed city ghettos, the sums that are going into Vietnam!"

Simultaneously the apprehension has been expressed that, with the war's end, Congress would refuse to vote any such sum—the figure of \$25 billion is mentioned—to domestic needs. Instead, that the country would simply embark on a grand prosperity spree.

But supposing each American undertook a kind of mental resolve that, with the war's end, this unfinished business of the American poor, and the plight of the cities, would be taken up afresh and with zest!

Addressing a student assembly at Notre Dame, Mr. Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, urged such a "national examination of conscience." He further suggested that the United States embark on a national program to create new careers, not just for the poor but for the more well-to-do middle class.

"We haven't used our young people," he said. "Right now, the greatest opportunity to bring about social change belongs to the middle-class capitalists." So he urged students, when they matured into businessmen, to be "available" to the poor: Available as bankers for loans to poor men who would start businesses in the slums. Available to give a few hours a week to job training programs. Available to Negro architects who would rebuild a ghetto. Available to adult education classes. Available as legal aid volunteers.

Representative Carl Perkins, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, said in December he would seek to increase the antipoverty program for fiscal 1969 by \$1 billion if Vietnam war costs substantially decreased. This is the right beginning.

Mr. Shriver, though antipoverty boss, isn't making self-serving remarks. The fact is, when the war subsides the United States will seriously need—for both its economic welfare and its moral self-respect—to have made some very substantial swords-into-plowshares commitment.

A Civil Riots Bill

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has long been my position, which I have

stated many times before the Senate, that the provisions of the recently debated so-called civil rights bill are not in the best interests of the Nation. I believe that the legislation is unconstitutional in the extent to which it grants new powers to the Federal Government not delegated in the Constitution. I also believe that the legislation destroys the rights of some in order to promote the dubiously claimed rights of others.

The proposed legislation, which recently passed the Senate, was discussed in an excellent editorial entitled, "A Civil Riots Bill," published in the State newspaper. The editorial points out the questionable assumptions underlying passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A CIVIL RIOTS BILL

The civil rights bill that cleared the Senate probably would have zero effect on the summer riots, as the senators must have known. But they knew, too, that the President's riot commission had suggested a correlation.

In terms of political necessity, it behooved more than one senator to don the mask of statesmanship, puff out the shirt-front and appear to be impressed. Some few may even have been impressed. Nevertheless, it was the riot report, exploding like a skyrocket, that signaled the end of rational debate and gave rise to the emotionalism that was permitted to shape the fate of the bill—down to and including the anti-riot amendments, for whatever good they may do.

The Senate has not voted to extend civil rights. It has voted to exorcise evil spirits.

It was a useless enterprise, even assuming that the riot report was correct. The Senate would prohibit racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing and would provide federal protection to Negroes exercising their civil rights.

This is what the riots were all about? No such thing. Not even the riot commission was foolish enough to suggest that Negroes rioted and looted last summer and previously because (1) the police disdained to protect their civil rights or (2) Negroes were being turned away by the doorman at the Ritz.

Whatever the causes of the riots, they run much deeper than that. The commission conceded as much, laying the blame on such imponderables as "white racism" and Negro hostility toward a predominantly white society. Will the civil rights bill cure racism or make it worse? Will the Negro cease to be hostile once he moves next door to "white racists" or will he seethe with new intensity? The Senate had no time for such questions.

Some will argue, as indeed they have been doing, that the bill should have passed as a matter of simple justice. But this is to contend that there exist, first, an unconditional right to purchase or rent and, second, a federal police power in an area where it was never thought to exist. And such power would be on call not to everyone, mind you, but only to Negroes exercising their civil rights. These are dubious assumptions, to say the least.

The bill is bad law. The entire "open housing" concept is an affront to legal procedure, the sanctity of contracts, and the rights of property owners.

What the Senate has proposed is at once a sham assault on the causes of riot and a very real assault on the private right to dispose of property. In addition, the bill would undermine the federal system in an im-

portant respect; by establishing, for certain common law offenses, a national police force.

The very title of the bill is erroneous. This is not a civil rights bill at all. It is a civil riots bill, and a poor one at that. Though the Senate has capitulated, let us hope that the House will stand by the law and good sense, no matter what curious interpretations are put on the riot commission report.

A Tribute to the Late Claud F. Young, M.D.

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following eulogy taken from the official document of the M. W. Grand Lodge of A.F. & A.M. of Kansas, Topeka, Kans., concerning Dr. Claud F. Young, whose life was devoted to the service of his fellow man. Dr. Young was long a resident of Washington, D.C., where he was Secretary General of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite Southern Jurisdiction, and was known and loved by many members of the U.S. Congress. The eulogy follows:

A MIGHTY OAK HAS FALLEN IN THE FOREST OF FREEMASONRY

Death came suddenly, even when it was not entirely unexpected. Our beloved and distinguished Brother had been suffering intermittently since undergoing surgery for the removal of a foot, injured in an automobile accident several years previously.

However, he had been more active in recent days and on Monday, March 4, had paid a visit to the Clinic in Fort Scott which he had helped found in 1916 and which still bears the name of the Newman Young Clinic. On the following afternoon, he is reported to have been writing a letter while Mrs. Young had left for an errand and upon her return, found that Bro. Claud had suffered a seizure. The death of "Doc" as he was affectionately called, removes from the rolls of our Grand Lodge one of the most distinguished members of our jurisdiction. He has achieved eminence in the medical profession and was recognized as a physician and surgeon of outstanding ability. In addition he had achieved Masonic standing in the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite Southern Jurisdiction that was worldwide. As Secretary General, which office he filled from October 1952 until his retirement on December 31, 1966, he had visited extensively in the U.S.A., Canada and Europe.

His Masonic activity began shortly after he was 21 in Bowie, Texas, Lodge No. 578. He was Senior Warden of the Lodge when he moved his practice to Kansas. He took up in Rising Sun Lodge where he had left off and from there began working in all branches of Masonry, serving as head of all the York Rite bodies in Fort Scott and particularly in the Fort Scott Consistory of the Scottish Rite. He was coroneted a 33° Hon. on November 16, 1933 and was later advanced to Active Membership in the Supreme Council in 1939. He has served as the Sov. Inspector General for the State of Kansas since appointment to that post in 1938. The year 1939 was large in his Masonic life for that was also the year that he presided over the Grand Lodge of Kansas. He has for many years been Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. His death will leave a huge void in our fraternal circles.

Rhodesia: Target for U.N. Hate**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans are asking why Rhodesia must be made the hate scapegoat for the U.N. extremists and some destructive press media.

Little Rhodesia—a friendly, progressive, free nation of great men in the heartland of South Africa.

As the U.N. Security Council meets shortly to actually consider a world effort of escalated war against a dignified, civilized leadership, it behooves those of us who know the smears and lies focused on a small segment of our society to speak out in defense of truth and fairness. We must never permit the U.N. or defunct Socialist British to sell public opinion on any action to escalate war sanctions against courageous Rhodesia, just because her people believe in self-government and law and order.

I include recent news releases to show the inconsistent attitudes and double standards of the world intellectual community.

They seem disinterested in facts, but become highly incensed at having their theories proven false and their threats unheeded. Facts and truth merely confuse some intellectuals.

The material follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, Mar. 17, 1968]

A BRITISH VIEW: THE UNITED STATES COULD HELP BRITAIN GET OFF AN EXPENSIVE HOOK
(By Anthony Lejeune)

LONDON.—The Africans hanged in Rhodesia were in no sense innocent men. To treat them as heroes or martyrs—as, for example, the Indian Parliament did, observing a minute's silence "in homage" to them—is nauseating hypocrisy. They were ruthless murderers and terrorists.

The length of time which had elapsed since their conviction, however, would in Britain, though perhaps not in America, normally have been considered sufficient reason for a reprieve. The Rhodesians are tougher, though; which is natural enough in view of the bloodcurdling threats of violence constantly being leveled against them.

I doubt, therefore, whether Ian Smith would have reprieved those first three murderers in any case. But he just might have done it if it hadn't been for the British government's bombastic announcement that they had been reprieved by the queen. This made the executions inevitable.

To make the announcement in this way was flagrant politics. If the British government had been concerned primarily with the fate of the condemned men, there were several less provocative moves it could have tried.

In the end, worse than nothing was achieved. The queen's authority has been further depreciated and the sentimental regard which some Rhodesians still had for the crown has been lessened. Britain has been made to look more foolish than ever, and the chances of a settlement—if they existed at all—have diminished.

These consequences were entirely predictable. To expect otherwise was mere fantasy. But then fantasy has ruled British policy toward Rhodesia ever since this affair began.

The British government simply refused to believe that UDI (unilateral declaration of Independence) would happen—until it happened. They believe that economic sanctions would end the rebellion "in weeks, not months". The months passed, and the British government tried oil sanctions. Independent Rhodesia went calmly on, unshaken. Now new, and equally futile, twists of the screw are being planned.

Again, it was all entirely predictable by anyone with the slightest knowledge of southern Africa. But liberals notoriously believe what they want to believe and refuse to acknowledge any evidence to the contrary.

The basis of the whole dispute is equally outside reason. The Rhodesians gain nothing by pointing to the tranquility of their own country and comparing it with the chaos, the bloodshed, the Communist and nationalist tyrannies to the north. The liberals care for none of these things. Their concern is not for freedom in a general sense, let alone for order and prosperity, nor even for democracy as such ("One man, one vote—once," it has been rightly observed, is the slogan for most African nationalist regimes).

Nor do they seem to mind when one race, in Nigeria massacres another, and the northern Sudanese persecute the southern Sudanese, and the black Kenyans oppress the brown Kenyans. The liberals' wrath is reserved for one situation only—the rule of white men over black men.

Since their position is ideological, it cannot be shaken by mere facts or reasoned arguments about good or bad government, but, similarly, the Rhodesians are not going to be shaken by arguments based on an ideology which they do not share.

They have no intention of giving in, and it seems increasingly improbable that they can be made to. The likeliest long-term forecast is of closer association between the white-ruled countries of southern Africa, steadily growing prosperity and (if the outside world leaves them alone) developing and moderating racial policies.

Realism demands that we should accept this likelihood, and strive for an amelioration, not an intensification, of bitterness and old hostilities.

America could end the quarrel with Rhodesia tomorrow merely by refusing any longer to play the silly game of sanctions or to pretend that Ian Smith is not the real prime minister of Rhodesia. In doing so, she would serve the best interests of Britain (by getting her off a very expensive hook), and of all Rhodesians both white and black.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 12, 1968]

MURDER IN MALAWI

As we have told our readers before, we would prefer to bring you only good news, pleasant news, the sort of news that is nice with which to start the day or to read after supper when you are seated in your favorite chair. Alas, there are some ugly but important facts of life which should be brought to the attention of our readers so they can see the world as it really is, not as the theorists in Washington think it is.

So today at the top of our back page is the rather horrifying and dreadful account of the anti-Christian atrocities that have been recently perpetrated in Malawi, one of those new, so-called "nations" in Africa which have received such great praise from Vice President Humphrey and other members of the Johnson administration who are busily seeking to gain negro votes here in the United States.

As a matter of fact, Republican Sen. Brooke of Massachusetts was equally fatuous in his praise during his recent African trip.

You have not heard the voice of one single prominent civil rights leader in the United States or one prominent clergyman or Gov-

ernment official raised in protest against what is happening in Malawi.

Until this newspaper printed these facts, probably few other newspapers in the United States have told the story of the atrocities currently going on in this part of Africa.

In the meanwhile, our government pursues its insane policy of boycott and attack against the only two stable and orderly governments, those of South Africa and Rhodesia where they transplant hearts—not eat them, as they do in other parts of Africa.

The insanity of the official policy of our government is purely unforgivable. It is so utterly stupid.

Ten years ago, long before the atrocities of the Congo and all the trouble there, this newspaper's negro foreign correspondent, Philippa Schuyler, pointed out that while she was very proud of her race, truth and reality compelled her to say that after extensive travels through Africa, where she gave piano concerts during the inaugurations of a number of the presidents of the newly-freed nations, she was drawn to the conclusion that if the white man withdrew his rule from black Africa at this particular time we would see, not progress, but reversion to the worst type of tribal warfare, witch doctor rule, brutalities and unmentionable atrocities.

This brilliant and talented girl, although only about 24 at the time, had, as always, a rare insight into truth and reality. Philippa Schuyler could see and predict accurately what would happen in Africa. But this bit of logic eluded the great men in the White House and the State Department who, under Republicans as well as Democratic administrators, carried on hysterical pressure to make the European nations withdraw their governing powers from Africa and turn loose this group of uneducated savages, who first took out their cruelty and viciousness on any white settlers who happened to be handy.

Now, as pointed out in the article on the back page which was brought to this newspaper's attention by Mr. Stephen Konides of Bedford, news service director of Jehovah's Witnesses in New Hampshire, the newly-freed blacks are terrorizing, beating, raping and murdering other blacks whom they don't happen to like.

Freed from the civilizing effects of the white man's courts and justice, they have reverted to the full savagery of their nature.

Read the terrifying truth at the top of our back page today.

You don't hear George Romney, Richard Nixon or any other presidential candidate raising his voice on behalf of these suffering people. It might cost some negro votes, you know.

You don't hear any prominent ministers or leading civil libertarians in the United States coming to the defense of these people.

You don't even read about it in newspapers or hear about it over the radio.

If anybody is going to rescue these people, it will be through your efforts.

So do as the article suggests. Write to the people whose names are listed at the end of this article and tell them what you think of this kind of brutality.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1968]

RED CROSS FOILED IN EFFORT TO AID NIGERIA WAR VICTIMS

(By Andrew Borowiec)

GENEVA.—African passions are preventing the International Committee of the Red Cross from helping the victims of the Nigerian civil war.

The Geneva-based organization, which has braved war theaters the world over to bring help, yesterday pathetically admitted its inadequacy in coping with the African mind.

The committee has been forced to cancel the flight of a chartered plane with seven tons of medical supplies and a 10-man team

that was to fly to secessionist Biafra via the Spanish island of Fernando Po.

The rebels balked at the demand of the federal Nigerian government to inspect the cargo and subsequently the federal regime withdrew its agreement for the flight.

OTHER AIRLINES CAUTIOUS

The Balair Charter Co. working for the Red Cross is unwilling to defy the federal ban because its major stockholder provides commercial services to Nigeria. Other charter companies are unwilling to risk federal wrath—and possibly pursuit by its air force.

"We can only say that all this is regrettable," a Red Cross spokesman said. "But as long as the federal government objects, there will be no flight."

It was the second time in recent months that the Red Cross failed in its African operations.

Last fall, it was unable to evacuate some 120 white mercenaries who fled their federal Rwanda stronghold of Bukavu to nearby Rwanda. The men are still camping in Rwanda because the neighboring countries refuse to grant permission for a Red Cross evacuation plane to fly over their territory.

"It seems that the Africans are still unaware of the mandate and aims of the Red Cross" an organization official said.

FOUR-MAN TEAM ISOLATED

The ban on the Nigerian flight has isolated a four-man Red Cross medical team at the Achi Hospital southwest of the devastated Biafran capital of Enugu. There is no way to replace the men or send them fresh supplies without federal agreement.

And the supplies are desperately needed in the swampland and jungle battlefield where the number of victims is growing in staggering proportions.

"Jeune Afrique," a French-language weekly for African consumption, estimates that some 50,000 people have died in the Nigerian war in the past six months.

"This is more than in Vietnam," the magazine said. "Rarely in history have men massacred as fiercely as in the conflict splitting Nigeria."

REBELS CONTINUE FIGHT

The seizure of the rebel capital of Enugu by federal forces has not broken the back of rebel resistance. Periodic federal announcements that secession is collapsing have not materialized so far.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of homeless, sick people are wandering through the African bush and tall elephant grass, pursued by bullets and racial hatred.

The Red Cross estimates that at any given time there are some 200,000 refugees in the secessionist area, mostly Ibo tribesmen who fled from the north.

On occasion, the Red Cross says, the number of homeless has reached 2 million as entire towns and villages fled before troops zig-zagging through the area.

[From the Star Johannesburg, Jan. 12, 1968]
SOLDIER'S DEATH: CONGO BLAMED

LONDON.—Britain declared last night it held the Congolese Government responsible for the presumed death of a 22-year-old Briton who fought as a mercenary soldier in the Congo.

The man, Ian Graham Pahl, sentenced in Kinshasa 18 months ago to 12 years for armed robbery, was last seen by a British Consul in the middle of last year.

British sources said last night it was assumed he had been murdered, and so had Nicholas van Staden, a South African serving sentences for stealing a Congolese army plane.

The accusation about the death of the Briton was made officially after the Congolese Ambassador in London, Mr. Mario Cardoso, was called to the British Foreign Office.

REFUSED ENTRY

He had a 25-minute meeting with a junior Minister, Mr. William Rogers, Parliamentary Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and was told a statement presuming the death would be issued.

Though it was not mentioned in the statement, it is understood there is also concern about the Australian and the South African, for whom Britain had taken consular responsibility.

The Australian was Graham Larkin, 25, and the South African was Nicholas van Staden, 23. They were sentenced in 1965 to four-and-a-half years for stealing an aircraft.

The statement said the British Government had been gravely concerned for some months about Mr. Pahl's fate.

Last July, the British Consul in Kinshasa was refused entry to the prison where Pahl was held. Since then, representations for access had been renewed numerous times without result, it said.

WHAT NEXT?

In addition, Britain had received no satisfactory reply to inquiries about Mr. Pahl made in the Congolese capital, Kinshasa, and in London.

The statement added: "Her Majesty's Government have no alternative but to conclude that Mr. Pahl must be presumed dead. They hold the Congolese Government responsible for the fate of Mr. Pahl, and reserve all their rights in the matter."—Sapa-Reuter.

RBC COMMENTARY

(By Mr. P. Hanson, deputy head of combined news)

Yesterday three convicted murderers were hanged. Today the world has had its say. Newspapers, radio and T.V. stations in every continent have given their opinions.

Not all of them were particularly careful of their facts. Radio Moscow gave a graphic description of the three Africans being shot. This broadcast said that at the wave of an officer's hand several triggers were pulled. Thus perished, declaimed Radio Moscow, three freedom fighters at the hands of the racialists.

The left wing Daily Mirror also described these three convicted murderers as freedom fighters, and so, perhaps more naturally, did the Tanzanian press.

Such papers chose to ignore the evidence given before the courts, the description of the murders given by the judge, which was repeated in the Rhodesian government's statement last night. In the case of two of the condemned men they had constructed a roadblock and proceeded to attack the first persons who came along, they did not stop to find out whether those people were for or against any freedom. They were not freedom fighters attacking a military target. They were murderers, attacking a farmer returning home after spending the day in Umtali. They were brutal murderers, who stabbed their victim 16 times and then tried to burn his wife and child to death. The Daily Mirror was not concerned with the supreme courage of Mr. Oberholzer, who, even as he was dying, forced his car through the roadblock and thereby saved his family. It was far more concerned with political implications that do not in fact exist.

This paper, and many others, chose to highlight the fact that the murderers had been hanged despite a purported royal reprieve, but they ignored the fact any appeal for such action should have come from Rhodesia, and that when the executive council did in fact consider six cases last August those of the three men hanged yesterday were the ones where no case could be made out for clemency.

The Royal prerogative of mercy was invoked by the British Commonwealth Secretary of State, Mr. Thomson, and his advice

was acted upon, despite the fact that he could not possibly be in possession of all the evidence and facts. Yet not so many years ago a massive appeal was submitted on behalf of Mr. Peter Poole. He was a professional man, an engineer in Kenya. He had no criminal record. His dog was stoned by an African, and he was threatened by the same African. Mr. Poole shot the African who later died, and Mr. Poole was found guilty of murder. One of the most massive petitions ever was sent to the Queen, signed not only by Kenyans but by people from Rhodesia, Australia and Canada. Was the Royal prerogative exercised? No, Mr. Poole was hanged.

The execution of three murderers yesterday has proved an excuse for one of the biggest ways of hypocrisy the world has ever seen. Mr. Harold Wilson is reported as speaking of his deep sense of shock and outrage. Did he record any sense of outrage at the time Mr. Oberholzer was murdered?

The Indian Parliament stood in silence after Mrs. Gandhi had spoken of "a barbarous act and monstrous deed of a white racist clique." Did the Indian Parliament stand in silence for each of the millions of their countrymen who have died in race riots between Hindus and Moslems?

The truth remains that the three men who were hanged were murderers, and every Rhodesian voice is needed to hammer home this truth, or the versions put out by Russia, Tanzania, India and the rest will prevail.

Let each and every person who calls these three Africans "freedom fighters" stop and ask themselves what sort of freedom they were fighting for. These three convicted men wanted freedom to murder without punishment. But the freedom that Rhodesia has achieved in the past two years is something different, and something that Rhodesians are determined to maintain.

It is the freedom for any man, of whatever race, to return to his home, whether it be in Melssetter or anywhere else, along any quiet Rhodesian road, in peace and safety.

North Carolina Pushes Its Outdoor Recreation Plan

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

MR. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Gov. Dan Moore, of North Carolina, recently reported on the State's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan and what it means to North Carolinians and visitors in terms of relaxation and enjoyment.

A brochure published by North Carolina summarizes the status of State outdoor recreation planning, which was given impetus in 1964 through passage of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. That act requires that a State must develop a comprehensive plan for outdoor recreation to establish eligibility for matching acquisition and development grants.

North Carolina, along with all the other States, has benefited greatly from the land and water conservation fund. That fund administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, already has provided \$2,380,287 in matching assistance for North Carolina outdoor recreation projects. President Johnson urged Congress to approve the land and water bill

a short time after he became President. His approval has made this recreational expansion possible.

Money from the fund has gone for a variety of projects, all designed to make available more needed outdoor recreation opportunities. Grants from the fund helped the State prepare its first comprehensive plan and later update it. Grants from the fund helped provide camping facilities at Morrow Mountain State Park, a 65-acre addition to Mount Jefferson State Park, protection for a watershed area at Neuse State Park, development of Caswell Wildlife Management Area, improvements at Mount Mitchell State Park, plus numerous swimming pools, tennis courts, ball fields, picnic areas, trails, boat docks, walking, and play areas in many cities and towns.

It is a pleasure to make special mention of North Carolina's extensive effort in outdoor recreation. The Federal Government and State and local governments are working cooperatively to make this a successful program. I believe they have succeeded admirably and will continue to do so.

No matter how involved we get in other problems, we should always remember that recreation takes its place with education, health, religion, welfare, and work as an essential part of our life.

Strong Support for President Johnson

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I note with deep personal satisfaction the number of loyal Democratic colleagues who have spoken out recently in support of President Johnson and the Democratic program.

I wish to say that I am giving my wholehearted support for Lyndon Johnson.

Our President is our candidate for 1968. He is not only the best candidate we Democrats can offer the people this year, but he is also the winning candidate.

Lyndon Johnson has presided over the affairs of this Nation during one of the most challenging and turbulent eras in our history. Yet, the record shows that he has led us wisely, compassionately, and surely.

He has proved, beyond doubt, that he has the courage and determination to meet the tests of the times, at home and abroad.

And, above all, he has proven that he has the strength to withstand enormous pressures to stampede him into extreme and unwise positions.

Our President has already assured himself an honored place in history by his leadership in behalf of scores of landmark legislation.

It was the Johnson administration which gave the people Medicare, voting rights, the war on poverty, model cities, aid to higher education, consumer pro-

tection, and numerous other vital programs.

It was the Johnson administration which guided our people through the longest economic expansion in American history. Inflation has been kept within reasonable bounds, related to the increase in national production.

And it is the Johnson administration which has developed programs to implement almost every campaign plank in the 1964 platform.

I support President Johnson because I share his commitment to a Great Society for all Americans.

We Democrats have a great record and a great leader.

Let us proudly support Lyndon Johnson and help bring victory in 1968.

Privately Funded Mount Vernon Square Project for District of Columbia Is Commended as Is National Visitors Center

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 12 of this year, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-264, an act to authorize the modification of the Union Station building so as to provide a national visitors center. This project will meet a longstanding need for adequate and centralized facilities for the Nation's visitors to our Capital. The site is advantageous; the new use for the Union Station is appropriate for one of Washington's outstanding architectural structures; and the modification of the station will be done without expense to the Federal Government.

This is in accord with the President's state of the Union message of 1967, in which he emphasized the need for private capital to play a prominent role in the rehabilitation of our cities.

Equally, I am favorably impressed by the proposal of a group of prominent citizens and civic organizations of Washington to build a useful project just south of Mount Vernon Square. They provided testimony before both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Buildings and Grounds, at the hearings on the visitors center bills, H.R. 12603 and S. 2391.

Their concept complements the visitors center, in no way duplicates its facilities, but provides equally urgently needed improvements. It would consist of a permanent industrial exposition above ground, underground interstate and suburban bus terminals, parking and passenger interchange concourses, including one to the subway station at Eighth and G Streets. The remarks of Representative FALLON in the House, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 25, page 33744, regarding the advantage and benefits of the Mount Vernon Square project were pertinent and have elicited much interest. I will not repeat them here, but I concur in them.

However, there are other advantages which I should like to bring to attention.

The site selected, for very practical reasons, lies in a dilapidated section of downtown Washington. The great new buildings planned would have a profound and beneficial impact on the appearance and the economy of the whole downtown business area. Immediately adjacent to low-rental housing, it would provide several thousand permanent jobs for our more needy citizens who can thus walk to work. The site itself is sparsely populated; therefore, there is no material relocation problem. Built with commercial funds, this \$200 million improvement requires no Federal subsidy. Conversely, it should return \$3,500,000 in additional real estate taxes alone to the District government and, conservatively estimating, about the same amount in retail sales and income taxes. Seven million dollars of additional revenue will be most welcome to the District. This project also would serve as an example to other cities, as it is precisely the type of major rehabilitation to which the President referred in his state of the Union message.

This is an eminently practical and advantageous undertaking. While no legislation is required, I urge that it be given every encouragement by the Congress and appropriate Government agencies so that it, and the visitors center, can go forward simultaneously.

Men's Job Corps: A Total Program of Human Renewal

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a former English teacher, I was interested to read an article entitled "Men's Job Corps: A Total Program of Human Renewal" in the February edition of Audiovisual Instruction. Today our attention is very much drawn to domestic unrest caused in part by the problem of unemployment. The Job Corps seeks to make deprived youngsters employable, and recognizes that in order to achieve this, it must motivate its enrollees to raise their educational level to that level contingent to their being capable of handling even entry-level vocational training. As the article states, "more importantly, he—the Job Corps member—will be able to reap benefits from company-sponsored, on-the-job training programs, most of which require proficiency in reading." Faced with a multitude of outside problems, the Job Corps candidate simply has not been able to achieve at the expected rate in school. The Job Corps program not only responds to the individualized needs of these youngsters, but also has been responsible for the development of materials suitable to its objectives when these were not already available. Through constant evaluation and revision, the Job Corps will continue to find materials and methods to best meet the needs of its population, and pass these

on for application in school systems through the Nation.

I think that this must be considered as one of the potentially important long-range contributions of a program which serves as one approach to alleviating the unemployment problem with which we are confronted.

I include this article at this point in the RECORD so that my colleagues might have the benefit of sharing with me an enlightening summary of the Job Corps basic education program:

MEN'S JOB CORPS: A TOTAL PROGRAM OF HUMAN RENEWAL

(By Alexander M. Haddon and William J. Jacobs)

"Hey man! You wanna watch me read? Jus' look while I zip down this page."

Sam Watkins is one of over 40,000 young people in Job Corps Centers throughout the country who emerged from the public school system relatively untouched by its efforts to help kids acquire all the essential skills necessary to "make it" in the world of work.

Sam reads now. He didn't three months ago when he arrived at a Job Corps Center in the Midwest. He scored at the second-grade reading level and immediately was plugged into a programed reading system which can quickly build his reading skills to a third-grade level. Beyond that, over 2,000 reading selections will expand his word recognition and comprehension to a seventh-grade level. With this basic skill, Sam will profit from occupational training in one of several Job Corps vocational programs, be placed in a job, and become a tax dollar earner rather than a tax dollar burner.

Job Corps is a total program of human renewal. To accomplish its purpose, Job Corps provides a program which, in part, compensates for important years lost through social, educational, and economic deprivation. Job Corps teaches reading, arithmetic, and communication skills to youths 16 to 21 years of age, some of whom cannot read a sentence or do the simplest arithmetic calculation. Job Corps offers guidance to young men and women whose backgrounds provided little adult supervision or control. Job Corps offers medical and dental care for its enrollees, the majority of whom had no previous contact with a doctor or a dentist. Job Corps teaches vocational and employment skills to youths who have never held jobs and who lack the skills to find employment. Job Corps teaches the importance of respect and responsibility to youths who have internalized bitterness and hostility as a result of their deprivation. Job Corps shows young people that differences and problems are better resolved by democratic processes than by violence. Job Corps provides the basis for productive and responsible citizenship for thousands who might otherwise have known continued poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, welfare, and delinquency.

These are more than one million American young people who fit the profile of a Job Corps enrollee. They have completed 8.9 years of school, but 42 percent of them read below the third-grade level. Nearly a third have a record of minor antisocial behavior and ten percent were involved in one serious incident. The typical Job Corps enrollee is a school dropout whose reported earnings averaged \$639 per year. Of those enrollees eligible for induction into the Armed Forces, 47 percent failed to qualify. Nearly 80 percent had seen neither a doctor or dentist within the past ten years. Sixty-four percent of Job Corps enrollees had been asked to leave school! Since its inception three years ago, Job Corps has served as a residential training program for over 110,000 rejects from public school systems in all 50 states.

There are Job Corps Centers for men, women, and there is one coeducational Center. Urban Centers operated by private corporations or nonprofit organizations have enrollments up to 3,000 and offer more advanced programs of vocational training than do Conservation Centers. Located on federal lands and operated by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, 88 Job Corps Conservation Centers, for 100 to 200 men, emphasize basic education and useful outdoor work experience. The planned Instructor/Corpsman ratio in Conservation Centers is 1:15; in Urban Centers, 1:20. In practice, learning groups are somewhat larger since Job Corps faces a shortage of over 200 instructors.

WHAT DOES A CORPS MEMBER LEARN?

Job Corps has a mandate from Congress. It is to increase employability and provide tools for good citizenship. To fulfill this goal, Corpsmen may learn to drive, improve their health habits, overcome speech irregularities, take on leadership responsibilities, learn to cope with their personal problems, explore new leisure time interests, and develop other skills leading to employment. But at the very heart of the Job Corps experience at all Centers is a program of general education. This includes reading, mathematics, language and study skills, and prevocational training. According to Job Corps policy half of the Corpsman's time is to be spent in educational programs.

Reading, of course, is crucial. Typically, a Corpsman will spend an hour a day in the reading program. He is tested on arrival at a Job Corps Center and placed at a specific level of the Beginning, Intermediate, or Advanced Reading program. The goal is that when he leaves the Center the Corpsman will read on the seventh-grade level, as measured by standardized tests. If he succeeds, he will be prepared to read the average newspaper or magazine with understanding. More importantly, he will be able to reap benefits from company-sponsored, on-the-job training programs, most of which require proficiency in reading.

The Beginning Reading program quite literally can change a Corpsman's life. It consists of a series of programed texts and supplementary materials designed specifically for those whose reading skills range from complete illiteracy up to approximately the fourth-grade level. On their arrival at the Centers, some 40 percent of all Corpsmen fall into this category. Many are routed into a pre-reading program intended to introduce them to the letters of the alphabet, some initial sound-symbol relationships, and the format of programed texts. It is the first step in learning how to read.

A Corpsman who enters the Intermediate program (either by passing a placement test or completing the Beginning program) finds over 2,000 carefully graded reading selections from which he may choose. These are short, highly appealing articles drawn from commercial publications or written specially for the Job Corps, and arranged by topic and level of difficulty.

Finally, the Advanced Reading program, consisting of vocational and high interest library materials, is designed to develop the reading skills of Corpsmen from approximately the seventh grade to advanced high school levels. Corpsmen reading at this level (along with VISTA Volunteers) are often assigned to help Job Corps instructors working with nonreaders. From the above description it is apparent that a cardinal principle of the reading program is *individualized instruction*, getting the right exercise to the right corpsman at the right time.

The Job Corps reading program succeeds where schools have often failed. Corpsmen register gains of 1.5 grade levels in reading every ten months, as opposed to 0.6 for the average deprived youth in school. Why is this? An important factor is programed instruction. The materials used in Job Corps

Centers are superior tools for "cracking the code" of English, instead of just accumulating a storehouse of remembered words. Moreover, as Douglas Porter, Harvard consultant to the program, puts it, the entire system of programs is "tight," in the sense that one activity leads logically into another. Hence, the Corpsman is able to advance on an individual basis, according to his ability to master the work. At this point another factor comes into play, contributing to the success of the Job Corps reading program—motivation.

The Job Corps instructor issues no classroom marks; none are necessary. Each trainee evaluates himself and decides when he is ready for the next work. Instead of seeing reading as a chore, he takes pride in his accomplishments, knowing full well the importance of developing his reading skills as a necessary step toward the goal of getting and keeping a good job.

The same practical emphasis holds true in the mathematics, language, arts, and prevocational programs of the Job Corps. After diagnostic tests in mathematics pin-point a Corpsman's areas of weakness, he is provided with programed materials designed to teach him specific computational skills and concepts—the skills and concepts he will need to perform on the job and to manage his personal finances. Similarly, he is helped to develop his communications skills through self-instructional programed texts, often work related. Word usage, composition, grammar, handwriting—these are the components of a survival kit for the disadvantaged youth in modern American society.

"Having" the kit is not enough. A Corpsman must know how to use it, and this is the role of the "World of Work" or prevocational curriculum. All Corpsmen, regardless of achievement, are helped to develop positive attitudes toward work (perhaps something as fundamental as appearing on the job regularly); they are taught how to fill out job application forms; they are taught how to buy wisely and handle their money. Middle class children grow up with these notions—Corpsmen often must learn them from scratch.

The Job Corps educational program undergoes continual evaluation and revision. For example, one new program emerged from the realization that without a high school diploma many Corpsmen could not get jobs—even when their reading level was beyond that of high school graduates. Now with the cooperation of the American Council on Education, a unique set of materials is being readied to help Corpsmen prepare for the GED test of high school equivalency, an important step in opening job possibilities for them.

Another new program was spurred by recognition of the serious problem of poor speech. This handicap is especially emphasized when competing for jobs, particularly at the time of a job interview. As a result of its findings, Job Corps is developing a "Standard English" curriculum. This involves the use of tape recordings and programed workbooks to first isolate, then treat, a Corpsman's speech problems. Here, as throughout its educational program, Job Corps has moved to identify the barriers that prevent young people from playing a meaningful role and then to apply modern educational techniques to remove those obstacles. When suitable commercial materials have been available to meet program objectives, Job Corps has used them. But when nothing satisfactory exists (as in the case of preparation for the high school equivalency exam and intermediate-level, graded reading selections), there has been no hesitation to contract for their creation. Once developed, these materials become available for general use in the nation's schools.

THE JOB CORPS AND THE SCHOOLS

The atmosphere of a Job Corps Center bears little resemblance to that of the

usual school. Corpsmen come and go informally. Smoking is generally permitted, and the Corpsmen may take coffee breaks, or bring coffee to their various work assignments. They work independently in the classroom. Since heavy emphasis is placed on programed materials carefully written to reward a Corpsman's successes, he is less fearful of failure and of personal prejudice against him. Whether he is ready to move to a higher reading or mathematics level is a decision reached jointly by the Corpsman and his instructor, based upon performance.

Although the problems encountered by the Job Corps are not identical to those of the schools, there is much to be learned from the experience of Job Corps Centers. This is particularly true of the role played by Job Corps teachers. In a Center, the instructor is freed from repeated and generally unproductive confrontations with conventional classroom groups. He acts rather as a resource person or consultant. In this capacity he uses tests, like a doctor, to diagnose a pupil's difficulties and then prescribe a specific remedy. The teacher, then, adjusts to the needs of the learner instead of the reverse. Marshalling the materials at his disposal, he uses his judgment to maximize their use with an individual student. There is nothing new in this approach; educational leaders have recommended it for decades. But Job Corps is actually doing it—doing it successfully, moreover, in some 100 Centers across the country with students who failed to "make it" in the conventional academic setting.

To advance its goal of individualizing instruction, Job Corps is understandably eager to mobilize the vast array of new educational "hardware." From the onset, films, filmstrips, recordings, and television have been used extensively. Each Center provides, as a supplement to the basic reading program, a reading pacer for speed drills, and an audio recorder for speaking and listening exercises. The overhead projector finds considerable application. The new Standard English program is based on the use of tape recordings to provide models of good speech, and for student drill. A newly proposed social studies program envisions the presentation to Corpsmen of simulated social situations by video tape or a sound-slide combination; the Corpsmen's responses—as they engage in role playing—would then be recorded on video tape. Indeed, during the short history of the Job Corps only the lack of funds, not of imagination or commitment, has prevented an even greater reliance on audiovisual instruction techniques.

Nor has Job Corps experience gone unnoticed in the educational community. Job Corps-developed educational materials are currently used by some 2,000 public school systems throughout the United States. As part of Project Interchange—a joint NEA and Job Corps venture—Job Corps Centers have been opened to classroom teachers from a number of key urban school systems. Counselors and social workers from Europe, Africa, and Asia are regularly placed in the Centers. There are VISTA workers on hand, work-study programs, college credit internship programs, and student teaching programs.

Endorsement of the Job Corps educational program has come from a flood of professional organizations, including the Council of Chief State School Officers, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS), National Association of Secondary School Principals, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The phenomenal educational effort mounted by the Job Corps is predicated on the belief that if young people are given a second

chance to become productive citizens—to escape the chains of poverty and ignorance—they will take it. There is an assumption here that the overwhelming educational task assigned to the Job Corps actually can be accomplished. So far, the Job Corps experience tends to show that it can.

Problems in Education of the American Indian

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Mrs. Iola Taylor Hayden, director of Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity, has rendered dedicated and effective service to American Indians and has exerted great and good influence in their behalf. She recently testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, meeting in Oklahoma. I believe her statement will be of great interest to Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF MRS. IOLA HAYDEN, DIRECTOR, OKLAHOMANS FOR INDIAN OPPORTUNITY, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 19, 1968

I appreciate the opportunity to be able to testify, as I have noticed I am the only "wild Indian" who has testified among our "civilized" friends. I will not pretend to speak for all Indians, but I do represent OIO, an organization for Indians in Oklahoma, and we do know the education situation and feel quite strongly that we can offer some suggestions and some alternatives.

Because of the time factor, I would like to focus on what could be called one general problem area, the use, or misuse, depending of your point of view, of Federal funds in the area of education in regard to American Indians. I will give a few illustrations of the general nature of the problem and then attempt to move on to suggested alternatives.

The first situation which I would like to call your attention concerns the transfer patterns of certain Indians. In just one school in one county in the state there are, according to August 1967 statistics, roughly twenty-three (23) Indian students being picked up in town by two rural school teachers and transported to a country school. These Indian students comprise at least ¾ of the entire enrollment in this particular school. In that same school district there are eight (8) non-Indian students who are transported into the town schools. Statistics in this area are rather difficult to obtain as you might suspect, but to some of us it seems that Federal funds are being utilized to perpetuate inferior education for Indian students.

The second situation pertains to school lunch programs funded under the Johnson O'Malley Act. I would like to describe a meal served at one of these rural schools on November 10, 1966—hamburger meat with gravy, boiled potatoes, green beans, rolls, jello with canned fruit, and one carton of milk. There was exactly three pounds of hamburger meat (this was verified by the cooks) for sixty-seven (67) people. There were no seconds allowed. Again, these are Federal funds.

I would now like to suggest a few alternative approaches to some of the present problems of education in regard to the American Indian. These suggestions are, of course, not

original, and they are not new, but we feel like they have not yet been seriously considered by relevant policy-making organizations.

I strongly believe that schools with substantial numbers of Indian students should have representation on school boards. We have in the state at the present time one school which receives Federal funds under various titles (such as, 874 funds, Johnson-O'Malley funds, and various titles under the Secondary Education Act) with a 100% Indian student enrollment and a three (3) man non-Indian school board. There are, of course, no Indian teachers in the school and there is no utilization of teacher aides at this particular school. There have been various estimates (but no concrete information) as to the drop-out rates of Indian students leaving this particular school to go into a larger school system, but it is generally conceded that very few of these students graduate from high school. We realize that Indian representation on school boards and Indian teachers and teacher aides will not miraculously solve the problem of education which faces American Indian students today. However, we strongly feel that the involvement of such people is essential in a sound educational system. Another way which we feel that this Sub-committee could serve the public interest would be to take a careful look at what I call, for a lack of a better term, the lack of quality controls on much of the Federal legislation dealing with education of American Indians. One of the most consistent issues throughout the history of government relationships to Indians has been whether the Federal government or the state and local governments shall have the authority to administer programs to Indians. At almost every turn, the Federal government has yielded control of various programs dealing with Indians to the state and local level with few or no strings attached. I have already described very briefly the results of this policy in just two areas, that of school lunch programs and transportation of school students. I would suggest that if this Sub-committee wants to get a clearer picture of the general situation it should send a competent, "fact finding" team to look at all aspects of the problem. Since Oklahoma does have the second largest Indian population in the country, and no reservations, it constitutes a somewhat unique and important aspect of educational problems of the American Indian. In the meantime, however, I would like to briefly share with you some of the implications of Federal funding with few or no strings attached in terms of quality of education for Indian students.

Here are now some instances described in this state. A Head Start Program project director refused to hire teacher aides because, "There isn't anyone qualified around here and besides if one would get the job, the others in the neighborhood would be jealous." A school principal proudly states that he has an Indian committee determining eligibility for free school lunches and "they're" harder on the Indians than he is. Free lunches and other assistance should not be "hard" to get for anyone in need. A more sympathetic and humane attitude is needed for the already rejected individual.

Let me make it quite clear at this point that all or even a majority of school personnel are guilty of such practices. It seems clear to me, however, that more quality controls are necessary in order to prevent situations such as those just described from occurring. Perhaps a more specific illustration will more clearly illuminate my concern. Recently a Bilingual Education Bill was passed in Washington, D.C. Section 705(a) of this bill states "A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or agencies, or to an institution of higher education applying jointly with a local education agency, upon application to the commissioner at such time or times in such man-

ner in containing or accompanied by such information as the commissioner deems necessary."

Recently at an education conference sponsored by OIO, an eastern Oklahoma public school administrator expressed grave concern for the future of America in response to the suggestion that perhaps English should be taught as a foreign language in certain sections of eastern Oklahoma. In spite of the fact that this gentleman's area is probably the largest non-English and/or bilingual speech areas in the state, he blindly insisted that only "American" be taught in schools. Some of us Indians might want to raise an argument as to just exactly which language that would be. The utility or validity of a bilingual approach in the education of minority groups, of people who speak a language other than that of the dominant group, should, even in the United States, be a dead issue. Unfortunately, in those areas where such teaching is most needed it is often rejected.

Within the past few months a school principal refused to accept books about Indians which our organization distributes, apparently on the grounds that they were subversive. Some of the titles of these apparently subversive books are: *The Osages*, *The Cherokees*, *The Kiowas*, and *The Seminoles*.

Some of the information on educational problems, particularly linguistic problems, as I am sure this Sub-committee is well aware, and that this Sub-committee has received, has been obtained from social scientists and foundation projects which are regarded by many local people, educators among them, in all probability, as being somewhat subversive—which usually means to them, any change in status quo.

In light of the above very brief description, we feel that if educational problems of American Indians are going to be successfully resolved there is going to have to be (a) carefully drawn legislation to eliminate practices such as those described above; and to avoid the situation of state and local education authorities preventing the implementation of Federal legislation such as the Bilingual Education Act.

(b) In addition, we feel that Federal funding agencies should build in a "consumer oriented" component whose duties and responsibilities would be explained to all related state and local agencies and to the general public.

Neither of these suggestions is particularly new or radical. As Daniel Moynihan, among others, has stated, "driver licensing, traffic laws, emergency medical services, driver training, all these previously exclusive state concerns fell under Federal control. It was surely the largest single transfer of authority from the state to the Federal level of this generation, indeed one of the largest in American history. . . ."

We feel, and we hope this Sub-committee feels, that we have had enough demonstration schools, education studies, research project, etc., to provide us with enough general information to greatly improve the education of American Indian students. The central question to us is if the Federal government is going to assume the responsibility of seeing that what we already know is competently implemented.

The second suggestion about utilizing "consumer oriented" personnel is, of course, in wide use by various business concerns and governmental agencies although perhaps not quite so openly as suggested here.

We also feel that the Federal government through this Sub-committee, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the other governmental agencies could encourage book companies to produce text books a little less slanted in favor of the white eyes and perhaps a little more historically accurate. They should also be encouraged to provide current literature on American Indians.

We feel that those teachers who are teaching in schools with substantial numbers of

Indian students should receive special training in regard to the behavior patterns of the people they will be teaching. We further feel that Federally funded programs should require mechanisms to be established where prejudicial treatment of students would result in public hearings, and if proven, make provisions for such staff to be reassigned to other schools. (In other words we want a reversal; for a change we would like to have the best teachers.) We should also like to see the scholarship program for Indian students through the Bureau of Indian Affairs be expanded to meet the demand. As far as we know, there is no valid information concerning the number of qualified and eligible Indian students for the available scholarships. The Bureau openly admits, however, that the number of scholarships has never kept up with the demand. Surely this society's experience with the G.I. Bill in terms of economic benefits alone makes the expansion of the scholarship program both in terms of numbers and reduction of restrictions, mandatory.

Also, we would like to ask for some assistance from the Sub-committee in obtaining various materials relating to Indians in order that they could be utilized for various educational purposes. There have been a small number of television productions dealing with Indians which incredibly to some of us, has treated Indians sympathetically. One of our staff members naively assumed that since the three major networks were utilizing public property, we as a non-profit organization could obtain these films for educational purposes. We were informed by one network that they kept no history of such films, another network informed us in response to a specific request that no prints were available for preview, but if we wanted to purchase the film, sight unseen, we were free to do so. The third network cited legal difficulties in releasing some of the films, but they would let us know when they got the problem worked out. That was in October 1967. We feel that such behavior on the part of the three major networks is slightly incredible and suggests that this Sub-committee could greatly serve the public interest if they could persuade the networks to catalogue their materials on Indians and make them available to educational and non-profit organizations on a loan basis.

Finally, I would like to say to this Sub-committee, Indian people all over this country are waiting to see what the Great White Father is going to do about improving the education of the American Indians. Our ancestors waited before us. I would suggest that it is the responsibility of this Sub-committee to educate its members in Congress and the general public. That the present situation is an economic liability which this society, Indians and non-Indians, can no longer afford. I would further suggest that there are rather large numbers of people in other countries, the majority being non-white, who are quietly observing American Indians (among the other minority groups) to see how they fare in a democratic society. We are all waiting.

Action Needed To Curb Draft Evaders and Deserters

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, while more than 80 American crewmen from the ship *Pueblo* languish involuntarily in a North Korean prison, other Americans are voluntarily leaving the country for Communist and neutral lands.

The actual number of draft evaders and deserters from our Armed Forces is small. The overwhelming number of young Americans are answering their country's call today, as did their fathers and older brothers in years gone by.

Nevertheless, although there are relatively few draft evaders and deserters, we cannot afford to ignore the anti-American propaganda exploitation being given their illegal actions.

I am reminded of the story of Philip Nolan, the fictional "Man Without a Country," about whom every American youth once read. This story used to be recommended reading for grade school Americans. However, it would seem that a more sophisticated age disdains such fundamental lessons in favor of a more progressive and permissive approach to duty and love of country.

Whatever the case, it is deeply disturbing to read that a large percentage of the senior class of one of this country's leading universities are considering refusal to serve in their country's Armed Forces. Perhaps the students surveyed are no different from the British and American college students in the late thirties. Those pre-World War II students, it may be remembered, were violently opposed to military service. But upon the outbreak of World War II, when their countries called, they helped meet the aggressive challenge of nazism and fascism.

I am not talking about legitimate dissent or disagreement with the Johnson administration's Vietnam policies. As I stated last week, I myself have serious differences with the Johnson administration's conduct of policy in Vietnam.

The draft evaders and deserters of today fall into a radically different category from legitimate dissenters, however. In fact, draft evasion and desertion from military duty has in some respects become an organized affair.

Not too many days ago, a National Capital newspaper published a sympathetic in-depth feature story concerning one such deserter, the newspaper agreeing to withhold publication until the subject of the story was safely ensconced in Sweden.

It is also my understanding that there is now a New York City telephone number that draft-eligible men are invited to call for information as to how they can avoid military service. And there are other examples of encouragement being given to evading or deserting military duty.

It therefore seems to me that whatever the Johnson administration may or may not be doing regarding the *Pueblo* crew, it ought to be taking firm and decisive action to crack down on the growing traffic in draft evasion and Armed Forces desertion.

Certainly, an administration that can commit more than half a million young Americans to Vietnam ought to be able to curb or discourage such flagrantly illegal activities. Perhaps nothing can be done to prevent a man who intends to desert his duties from doing so. But perhaps, too, it is time to consider action toward stricter penalties against the draft evaders and those deserters who, after a sojourn in a Communist or neu-

tral country, try to reenter the United States.

I urge President Johnson and his Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, to take such firm and decisive action immediately. Their failure to do so reflects the unfortunate policy ambivalence that has led to public confusion about our purpose in Vietnam.

Our Stake In Asia

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when most of America has been concentrating on the personalities supporting and opposing our efforts in Vietnam a very calm and clear mind has written a perceptive column, not on the personalities, but on the issues. For a long, long time, Roscoe Drummond has possessed such a mind and it would not harm any Americans to have the benefit of his thinking. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although I am not greatly given to putting inserts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel an obligation to insert the following article printed in today's Washington Post:

FREE WORLD GAINS IN PACIFIC ARE BEST ASSURANCE OF PEACE

HONG KONG.—Three significant conclusions emerge from a month-long tour through the Western Pacific:

1. The peace of the world will be determined more by what happens in Asia than in Europe.
2. There are many valuable Asian assets and allies on the side of the Free World—and they're growing stronger.
3. The United States can draw useful lessons from Vietnam about how we can best avert future Vietnams.

The Pacific era is upon us and the United States is inevitably an essential and almost certainly a benefited participant in it.

Let me develop these points:

STAKES

They couldn't be higher. In the great arc from Japan to Pakistan, lives more than half the world's population. Whether in the next few years these people make solid economic progress or sink into economic decay will be decisive as to whether the rest of the world can live in peace.

Whether the non-Communist nations of Southeast Asia can achieve political stability to make them more secure from externally directed subversion, this too is at stake. The Soviet Union, Red China, and the United States all face the Pacific and it will be here where the success or failure of Communist expansion-by-force will be settled.

ASSETS

Looking through the anxious mists of Vietnam, you will see that the Pacific assets on the side of the Free World are greater today than they looked as though they would ever be two years ago. The foremost is Japan's dynamic achievement of becoming the world's third industrial power—an accomplishment which rests upon a maturing parliamentary democracy and an animate, venturesome, free-enterprise economy Japan is America's trustworthy and stalwart partner, and each provides the other with its most profitable overseas market.

But the most startling and unexpected asset is that virtually all the non-Communist

nations of the Western Pacific are achieving such steady economic development. Progress is uneven but visible everywhere.

South Korea and Taiwan are outstanding examples. Thailand, too. In Singapore, Malaysia, and even in Laos, economic development is encouraging.

Political institutions are being strengthened. Moderate political leadership is gaining. And on top of it all, the superb turnaround of Indonesia—from Sukarno to Suharto, from pro-Communist to anti-Communist, from pro-Peking to pro-Indonesia, from an economic shambles to economic sanity.

U.S. Role—There doesn't have to be another Vietnam and almost certainly won't be if we stay the course and prove that Communist expansion-by-force cannot succeed.

The American military presence in the Pacific has been an essential part of what has already been accomplished in preserving the independence of the non-Communist nations.

It shouldn't and won't be withdrawn, but the United States cannot and should not alone assume a guarantee to rush troops to the aid of every Southeast Asian government faced with Communist insurgency. The U.S. presence is a guarantee against nuclear blackmail or attack by Red China.

But the United States should only protect the nations which show that they are ready to join with others in the same region to protect themselves. This regional coherence is appearing. The future defense in Southeast Asia must be a mutual responsibility, not a lone American responsibility.

And the economic burdens of providing the necessary economic aid to the developing Asian nations must be accepted by all the developed nations—the United States, Japan, and Europe.

We need to encourage Asian initiatives. We are already seeing the fruits of Asian leadership.

The United States, in its own interests, will be a major participant in the emerging Pacific era—and a major beneficiary.

Tombstone Territory

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Arizona is rich in the lore of Americana, particularly the legends of the Old West. Today, when the Senate is so often confronted with problems and crises that arise from the challenges of a modern world, we often forget that in times past Americans faced up to challenges and hardships just as great in their times as the current problems appear to us.

In my State, a distinct service has been performed to preserve the perspective of the past so that we may more accurately meet the needs of the future. I refer to the work done by Mr. Wayne Winters, editor of the Tombstone Epitaph, in Tombstone, Ariz.

Mr. Winters took over the ailing Epitaph in the "town too tough to die," and has increased its circulation from 300 to almost 3,700. Some of the special quarterly editions of the Epitaph run to 30,000.

I commend Mr. Winters and his backers for the service they have performed for Tombstone and for the Nation. I

think the interest shown in this unique publication is indicative of the value Americans place on their heritage of freedom, law, and order.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the magazine editor and publisher of March 23, 1968, giving the account of the revival of this newspaper, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOMBSTONE TERRITORY

(By Bruce Itule)

TOMBSTONE, ARIZ.—Tombstone, "The Town Too Tough To Die," is far from being dead, but three years ago its newspaper almost was.

Wayne Winters, the present editor of the weekly *Tombstone Epitaph*, took over the paper in 1964 after its editor died in a plane crash and the circulation had dwindled to almost nothing.

In the three years Winters has been the editor, the Epitaph has come alive again and once more is a thriving weekly.

Soon after the death of the previous editor, the Epitaph suffered from lack of management and the circulation dropped to 300.

Another problem was faced by the widow of the editor. She couldn't afford to run a newspaper.

Finally in 1964 the dying Tombstone Epitaph was put up for sale.

TO RESCUE

To the rescue came a group of men from Detroit and New York who formed the Historic Tombstone Adventurers. They already owned several other Tombstone attractions including the Lucky Cuss and Oriental saloons, and here was their chance to get one of the oldest newspapers in Arizona.

They bought the Epitaph but were faced with the problem of getting an editor.

Winters, 52, said he was working for Tucson Newspapers Inc. as a machinist and weekend foreman when the Detroit concern contacted him about the job of editor. He had a lifetime of experience in the newspaper business and had owned several papers before coming to Tucson.

His list of newspapers included the *Valley Morning Star* in Texas and weeklies in Grants and Gallup, New Mexico.

Before coming to Tucson, he maintained linotype machines at the Yuma (Ariz.) *Daily Sun*.

Winters said he didn't know how the Tombstone Adventurers learned about him, but when they offered him the job, he was quite surprised because they asked him if he had a college education.

"I was too smart to go to college if you know what I mean," Winters said.

Winters was interested in being the editor of the Epitaph so the investors flew him to Detroit for an interview.

According to Winters, the owners agreed to pay him well and leave him alone if he agreed to operate the newspaper as if it were his own.

"To this day, they have never told me what they wanted. They have religiously left me alone," Winters said.

LIKE ORIGINAL

When the new editor took over the newspaper, he was faced with the problem of rebuilding a paper patterned after the Tombstone Epitaph founded by John P. Clum in 1880.

"We spent weeks and weeks reading old copies of the Epitaph because we wanted the paper to be exactly like Clum's," he said.

The new editor finally came across an 1887 issue of the paper and decided that would be the one from which to copy the new Epitaph.

Winters said he wanted the new paper to

look exactly like the original throughout, including the use of old Roman lettering for the masthead.

The first thing Winters said he did was shelve the modern type faces that the editor before him had used.

"We purchased, for the linotype machine, old faces for our headlines," the editor said while reclining in his chair which looked like it was made in 1890.

"For our new paper we went back to wide columns of thirteen picas each and six columns to the page.

"We used no borders in our ads. We also photographed some of the earlier ads and had engravings made of them to use as fillers, particularly on page one.

"And we decided to never speak of last Tuesday, it's Tuesday last."

So the operation of the new Epitaph began, and today Winters has a paid circulation of 3,689. The paper has subscribers in every state in the union and many foreign countries including Vietnam.

Winters has been lucky because almost everyone in the world has heard about the Tombstone Epitaph, immortalized in a weekly television series several years ago.

Besides the weekly Epitaph, Winters does private publishing work along with releasing a quarterly Epitaph to help with expenses.

The quarterly is never less than 24 pages and is designed for the person interested in Arizona history. It sells for a quarter.

"Currently we're publishing 20,000 copies of the quarterly each time," Winters said.

SWITCHED POLITICS

He added that during the annual Hell-dorado days in Tombstone, when the 1,500 residents put on their cowboy outfits and relive the old west, 30,000 issues of the quarterly are published.

The weekly issue of the paper is eight pages and sells for a dime. The paper, which has an annual subscription rate of \$4, is released Wednesday.

Winters said the newspaper never has a picture on page one because the original paper didn't have them.

The front page is usually decorated with old and new ads and concentrated mainly on local news.

Winters' editorial views are now Republican, but before going to the Epitaph he was a Democrat.

"I used to consider myself . . . well, I've never believed in going straight down a party line," Winters said. "But recently, due to the activities of the brothers Udall and some of their ideas, I've clashed head-on with them."

Winters was speaking about Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz., and Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall, also a Democrat.

Winters dislikes the Udall ideas of a proposed national park between Yuma and Ajo, Ariz.

"At any rate, I've become so fed up with them and their ideas, I have changed my registration to Republican.

"I also have a very bitter fight going with the Forest Service now. I have offered a \$1,000 reward for anyone leading to the arrest of a Forest Service employee who destroys mining property on national forests."

PROSPECTOR

Winters spends much of his free time in the mountains near Tombstone searching for valuable mining claims which could explain his respect for mining property.

Although Winters has rebuilt the Epitaph and has strong political convictions, he insists that being the editor is just a job. "I am interested in history, but I can't say I live and breathe for Tombstone because I don't," he said.

"All it is is an interesting job. I'm certainly not going to spend the rest of my life here."

Brutality: Past and Present

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the parallel existing between the pre-World War II response to Nazi imperialism and the policies many espouse toward Communist imperialism today is striking. If a study of history is to be a benefit to this Nation, it must be because we can examine the mistakes of the past and learn how not to repeat them. Too often we look backward at past outrages with horror but refuse to see that present dangers are a repetition of similar catastrophic occurrences.

A case in point is examined in an editorial of the State newspaper entitled "Brutality: Past and Present." The editorial discusses the recent three-part television documentary of William L. Shirer, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich." It points out that there is justifiable disgust that such a thing as the appalling rise of nazism could occur in the thirties and forties. Many Americans fail to be concerned with a similar threat to peace and decency from the Communists. Many believed that Western policy toward Hitler actually helped his rise to power. Today we trade extensively with Communist nations in spite of the fact that we are engaged in a war with these same forces in North Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial of March 14, 1968, entitled "Brutality: Past and Present," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BRUTALITY: PAST AND PRESENT

Last week, William L. Shirer's epic work, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, was shown in the form of a three-part film documentary on nationwide television. All three programs were sobering.

The concluding installment took us into conquered Germany, to the sites of concentration camps and execution chambers. Most Americans, and even a few Germans (in 1945), were appalled by discoveries made by the allies. Again and again, the question was posed: "How could this be? How could it happen?"

Yet, for some reason, the same sort of wide-eyed ignorance prevails today, in some quarters. What is going on right now, in 1968, in Soviet Russian prison camps—if known—would shock a few folks to the roots of their hair.

Shirer complains that in many ways, the West helped Hitler rise to power. He wrote *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* to be a lesson to us all.

Still, we treat and trade with today's Communists; ship them food, equipment and other necessary supplies. We exchange fire with them in Korea and Vietnam; we exchange ballet dancers with them in New York and Moscow.

And, if the masters in the Kremlin should somehow be toppled tomorrow, and should Russia's borders be thrown open to Western newsmen and photographers, we'd suddenly see the real face of our enemy up close. And probably we'd look at one another in amazement and say, "How could this be? How could it happen?"

It's happening, that's all; it's happening all over again. And we're still wringing our hands over the brutalities of a power that's been dead for 23 years.

H.R. 13541

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the House voted upon H.R. 13541, a bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers. The Record will show that I was not present for this vote. It will also show that I was paired against the bill. The purpose of this statement is to explain my absence and my opposition to the bill. Urgent business required my presence in my congressional district on Monday, March 25. I regret very much not having been present for the debate, but in all truth, after reading a portion of the commentary of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, it would appear that the bill is not quite as important to the farmers as we had been led to believe. Indeed, the chairman had occasion to say that "there is little involved with reference to this particular bill." Moreover, he took pains to point out that the bill has nothing to do with the farmer's bargaining rights. I think the bargaining position of the farmer ought to be strengthened. It was for that reason that I introduced in January of 1967 H.R. 6172, a companion bill to H.R. 5305. As we all know, H.R. 5305 was supplanted by S. 109, a bill so grossly deficient that it was repudiated by virtually all of the farm organizations. In subsequent hearings the Committee on Agriculture made a number of changes in S. 109 and reported H.R. 13541.

On December 5 of last year, I wrote to eight farm leaders in my State expressing my reservations with respect to certain provisions of H.R. 13541. However, I advised each of the gentlemen to whom I wrote that if upon reflection they felt that "on balance the bill would benefit the farmer" I would support it. I went on to say:

I want to help improve the bargaining position of the farmer and I shall be pleased to support this bill if you think it would be helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I received only one reply. That correspondent left no question that he thought the bill would improve bargaining power of the farmer. From the facts that I have set forth here two conclusions suggest themselves. First, that support among farmers in New Jersey for H.R. 13541 is restrained to say the least. Second, the bill does little, if anything, to improve the bargaining position of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, I think the farmer's bargaining position ought to be strengthened. There is legislation pending that would accomplish that end. I shall be pleased to support that legis-

lation should our Committee on Agriculture report it to the House.

Thank you.

Education for the Disadvantaged

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to the remarkable effort being made in Cleveland to attack the problem of school dropouts, unemployment, poverty, and manpower shortages.

Recently, the Cleveland Board of Education and Cleveland area business, commerce, and industry announced that they would undertake with Federal and State assistance an inner youth job training project aimed at breaking the poverty and welfare cycle of the inner city residents in providing job training for immediate placement in productive work.

General Electric donated to the city a multistory building for conversion into a job training and general education center.

As the article states, the partnership between industry and education is believed to be without precedent in any major American city. It offers the best possibility for the private and public sectors to work together toward the promotion and betterment of human development. I hope that many similar arrangements will follow suit in what I hope is a movement to meet the most pressing needs of our less fortunate and too long neglected citizens—the disadvantaged workers of this country.

The Cleveland experiment is concerned with applying the cooperative education concept in providing occupational training and basic education to disadvantaged youth and adults.

Charles F. Kettering, the inventor and long-time director of General Motors research, said of cooperative education:

What gives cooperative education its strength is that it lap-welds theory from the classroom with practice on the job. It creates a weld that is much stronger than the butt-weld of a college degree followed by employment, the two touching only at one point of contact.

The concept of the cooperative then is the integration of theory and work in practice.

Cooperative education programs have been a success in vocational and technical education and college level programs. Work experience, work study, work training, internship, cooperative part-time training, job practice, and similar programs connote the idea of the learner obtaining actual job experience concurrent with classroom instruction.

The Cleveland experiment—cooperative occupational training—is an adaptation of the cooperative education program that uses the business and industrial community as a training laboratory so that realistic work situations can weld theory and practice for more effective learning.

Cooperative occupational training—

the MDT co-op—can provide the advantages that have accumulated in more than 60 years of cooperative education, which enrolled 65,000 college students in 1966, and about 150,000 vocational students in federally aided programs in 1967.

Co-op programs are efficient and effective education and training programs. Dr. Asa Knowles, president of Northeastern University in Boston calls it a superior-type education. The trainee finds the program highly motivational since he is gaining experience in the job for which he is preparing. Holding power of the program is greatly enhanced by the part-time class, part-time job feature, since the trainee can see the direct relationship between his study and his work.

Cooperative programs are more economical than many other programs providing similar educational services. Two trainees may be used for each school-work slot; expensive purchase of classroom equipment is not necessary; MDT allowances would be saved during the work periods where the trainee is earning comparable wages.

The employers and the communities benefit in helping develop a local manpower supply and employers get to observe trainees prior to their completion of training. Employers have the opportunity to participate in school training program planning and they can make unique contributions to the training resources of the community. Most important, the employers can count on the educational facility to closely supervise the trainee and to provide him with the orientation, basic education, remedial work, and the vocational instruction needed in the job learning situation.

The advantages to the trainees are the greatest of all. The trainee can acquire an understanding of a real-life situation while he is learning and not expected to perform as well as full-time employee. A much broader preparation for employment is possible since trainees may be rotated on jobs and may take more broadly based subject matter in the occupational areas of their interest.

There are many advantages for schools operating MDT co-op's. Communications with employers are vastly improved. Co-op advisory committees weld a closer working relationship between education and business. The school can keep abreast of business and trade trends and make changes in its curriculum to make its program more effective.

The disadvantaged worker usually has many personal and social problems that mitigate against success in full-time employment. The poor, the older worker, the educationally deficient, the ghetto resident, the physically or mentally handicapped, the person with a prison record—these and many others, find entry to employment difficult and the exit from employment early and often. The poor have life patterns that make success in formal education and training programs difficult: anticipation of failure; little value on academic achievement; fear and distrust of the unknown; tendency for abrupt transition to independence; little verbal communication, especially of an interactive, conceptual, flexi-

ble kind; and limited freedom for exploration. The designing of occupational education and training programs for such persons is particularly difficult and complex.

In considering the development of a co-op program for disadvantaged trainees, several benefits become immediately apparent. Some of the fear and frustration can be overcome as the trainee is able to observe and assess the importance of personal traits so necessary for employment: punctuality, dress, regular attendance, and responsibility for completing assigned tasks.

The disadvantaged individual has greater opportunity in both the study and the work phases of his training program. In the co-op program, he does not have to acquire all his institutional training needs prior to having the opportunity to apply principles and practices in a real life situation. Since the administrative responsibilities for directing the individual education and training program lie with the public or private school facility, the individual trainee is assured that guidance and counseling, instruction, and other personal and education services will be uniform, timely, and effective. Adjustments can be made immediately with the input, whether classroom or work activities. For example, if the individual is checking stock and immediately needs improvement in arithmetic skills, the school can adjust the individual training program to bring him back to the classroom for a longer period of time until this particular requirement is met. If the individual makes rapid achievement during the prescribed institutional phase and there is greater opportunity to move ahead in the work learning assignments, the adjustment can be made at once. The cooperative program makes a maximum effort to meet the individual needs of each manpower trainee.

To date, unfortunately, traditional methods of job development, education, and skill training have not met the needs of this country, either in terms of supplying manpower needs in tight labor markets or of removing significant numbers of low-skilled, undereducated, underemployed and unemployed people from a state of poverty and economic dependence. In spite of our vastly increased efforts on the part of both the Federal and State Governments, unemployment and substantial underemployment remain high as job openings continue to multiply. Mr. William Raspberry, in his usual perspective reporting, focused on just how serious the problem is here in Washington in his recent article entitled, "Jobs Going Unfilled Despite the Jobless."

I am absolutely convinced that both the public and private sectors must be involved in manpower development if this Nation's manpower and poverty problems are to be solved.

During the past two Congresses I have authored and sponsored what has become known as the Human Investment Act which would provide tax credits to business and industry which conduct training programs to assist in developing the skills among the unemployed and upgrading those of the employed and underemployed. This approach to training increases the wealth of the poor of

the Nation and permits them to become gainfully employed without the stigma which inevitably is attached to any make-work program.

What is more important, Mr. President, the human investment approach provides the incentive which we must have if we are to overcome the great reluctance which business has to hire and train middle-aged persons. I am well aware that there are programs going on in American industry today in which older persons and others are being trained in order to fill empty jobs which are now going begging. But, I am convinced that industry and, indeed, our entire commercial structure, can and will expand this type of training very substantially if provided with meaningful inducement.

Last year Senator SCOTT and I introduced the amended version of the Emergency Employment Act which was accepted by Senator CLARK as floor manager of the antipoverty bill, but was subsequently defeated in a Senate rollcall vote of 47 to 42.

Our plan proposed to create public service jobs for the hard-core unemployed with the Government as an employer of last resort. The main emphasis and thrust of the Prouty-Scott plan was to train such people when and where they are trainable so that they can obtain the necessary skills to fill and keep productive jobs in the private sector of our economy.

Despite our efforts to make the Emergency Employment Act as originally introduced more fiscally sound and more workable in terms of meaningful employment opportunities for the hard-core unemployed, the Johnson administration saw fit to oppose it.

Unfortunately, the disadvantaged citizen has not been able to realize the American dream, mainly a job, decent housing, education for himself and for his children, and a place in the decision-making process which affect his life. It is appalling to think that today we have 1 million more recipients on the welfare rolls than in the depression year of 1936.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates 2 million job vacancies at any given time—yet we have over 4 million unemployed.

For a nation that keeps a larger percent of its children in school longer than any other nation, we still have the paradox of a higher rate of youth unemployment than other industrial nations—youth from poverty-stricken families have a marked 18-percent unemployment rate.

Although the unemployment rate is still decreasing, the numbers of unemployed are growing at the rate of about 100,000 per year.

One million two hundred thousand heads of families did not work in 1965.

Four million disadvantaged Americans live in slums in urban and rural areas and do not have the education, the job skills, and the motivation to find steady employment to make a decent living for their families.

Mr. President, until now the most important and most successful of our training programs have been those projects conducted under the Manpower Development

and Training Act. Their results have been valuable because they have permitted the poor to make advances which they otherwise would not have made.

With this in mind, last December I introduced the Manpower Development and Training Act amendments so that these worthy programs might continue uninterrupted. My bill was copied almost exactly by the administration and introduced as the Manpower Development Training Act Amendments of 1968. Imitation is the sincerest flattery. However, I feel that the time has come for us to act, for I think it is fair to say that we have reached a point that while promises are plentiful, meaningful results have fallen far short of expectations.

We must assure that all able-bodied Americans who form a part of the working force have the skills, training, motivation, and opportunity necessary for securing and keeping employment in a job which will provide sufficient income for existence above the threshold of poverty. There must be a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Federal, State, and local governments; and, above all, the private sector of the economy and organized labor must become fully involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have alluded be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Jan. 10, 1968]

GE GIVES PLANT HERE AS SCHOOL FOR JOBLESS (By Marjorie Schuster)

The General Electric Co. will give the Cleveland public school system a huge former factory at 4966 Woodland Ave.

The building's 4½ acres of usable space will be converted into a job training and general education center for unemployed inner-city young people.

GE's Lamp Division and a number of other industrial firms are expected to lease and equip office and light manufacturing space in the building, and to pay students for part-time work.

The school system will provide basic education, citizenship lessons and intensive counseling in a program that will lead to full-time, permanent employment, but not necessarily to a high school diploma.

Based on current tax valuations, the gift is worth about \$1,000,000. But school officials say it would take many times that amount to duplicate the air-conditioned three-story structure at today's building prices.

The planned partnership between industry and education is believed to be without precedent in any major American city.

The project, in the planning stage for many months, was announced publicly in New York today by Cleveland School Supt. Paul W. Briggs in a luncheon speech before an urban problems session of the National Industrial Conference Board.

He told the gathering of prominent leaders of industry that the plan is "a joint effort aimed specifically at breaking the poverty and welfare cycle of the inner city."

In an interview before today's talk, he told The Press that enrollees in the new training center will be mostly recent or potential dropouts in their upper teens, as well as some young men and women in their early 20's.

A survey by the school system last year showed that as many as 50% of inner-city residents in these age groups are unemployed,

but that eight of 10 of these would welcome a chance at job training.

The program in the GE building is expected to start by June and to be in full swing next fall.

Briggs told The Press that Educational Facilities Laboratories of New York has agreed to contribute \$20,000 of its Ford Foundation money toward the cost of remodeling the building, and that other private funds are being sought. Offices would become classrooms, an existing auditorium would be used and the cafeteria would also be a training center.

The superintendent said federal vocational rehabilitation funds will finance about 75% of the operating cost.

The building will not have bells, regular class periods or other routine school features. Its chief executive will be a "manager," not a "principal." It was learned that assistant superintendents of two major urban school systems and a former state vocational education specialists have been interviewed for the pioneering post, although present school staffers have not been ruled out.

The Woodland Ave. building, with 207,000 square feet of floor space, will be the school system's second largest facility, exceeded only by the \$5,750,000 West Side High School now under construction.

The GE Structure had been for sale for some time. Catalyst in bringing the parties together was Ralph Besse, chairman of the Illuminating Co. board and of the Cleveland Inner City Action Committee. Besse predicted the project "will be heartily endorsed by the Cleveland business community."

Robert V. Corning, general manager of GE's Lamp Division, said the program will help solve a major industrial problem.

"The economy has more jobs than qualified workers," he said. "The disadvantaged unemployed often are not qualified for industrial jobs."

The remark was echoed by Briggs in his speech. He said, "I am convinced that the greatest unused and undeveloped human resource in America is to be found in the deteriorating cores of its urban centers. There is no time for a second chance. Before the riot season comes again, there must be evidence of real progress in attacking the ills of the city."

POTOMAC WATCH: JOBS GOING UNFILLED DESPITE THE JOBLESS (By William Raspberry)

In the last two weeks, I have had complaints from a printer, a cabinetmaker and a supermarket manager concerning their difficulties in recruiting young people for well-paid, if not glamorous, jobs.

All three made the same central point: We keep reading news stories about the hard-core unemployed. But here, we have well-paid work that requires very little education and that can be learned on the job. We need people, and we're willing to pay them; but our efforts to recruit them are almost always an absolute bust. Why?

The printer runs a small shop just north of downtown. He has had to turn down a good many jobs because he can't get help. This limits the capacity of his small business to grow and, thereby, produce still more jobs.

The cabinet-maker now works for an out-of-town firm. He had his own business at one time but had to give it up because he couldn't get help.

The supermarket manager is desperate for people to train as meatcutters. Trainees could start at around \$120 a week and work up to substantially more after they've learned the trade. The trouble is that he can't find the trainees.

Dozens of employers, ranging from corner-store merchants and small contractors to grocery chains and other big businesses, make similar complaints. There's all this talk

about unemployment, they said, but where are the people who want to work?

A part of the answer, of course, is that Washington is a white-collar town where a GS-3 Government clerk is the counterpart of Detroit's auto factory worker. Many a young man will pass up a good-paying, dirty job in favor of a clerk's job that pays less but permits him to wear a suit and tie to work.

But there is more to it than that. The supermarket manager, for example, overlooked the fact that labor unions control most of the apprenticeable trades, including meatcutting. And the unions, particularly the craft unions, haven't made it very easy for Negro youths to get in.

"In order to get into the apprenticeship programs, an applicant has to be screened and tested," Frank Hollis, manpower director for the United Planning Organization, points out. "After the subjective part of the screening process, he has to take the general aptitude test battery and he has to score well on it. Not many of the non-college-bound youngsters are able to score high enough."

He pointed out, too, that many applicants "bomb out" during the interview, before they even get around to taking the test. Others are eliminated on the basis of "moral character."

Relatives of union members are able to short-circuit the so-called grandfather clauses. It also helps if the applicant "knows somebody."

The reasons why some of the trade unions have such rigorous screening may be partly racial prejudice, but they also have to do with the unions' vested interest in keeping the ranks small. So long as there are fewer craftsmen than jobs, union members are guaranteed work and overtime as well.

UPO has found it almost impossible to short-cut the system. Even when the manpower division is able to work out an on-the-job-training program for jobless youths, the contracts for apprenticeable trades must include guarantees that the employer will provide a training program tailored to the union's apprenticeship set-up—which includes the general aptitude test.

While this assures that any trainee placed in such a program will receive adequate training and pay, the assurance becomes meaningless if the great bulk of those who are interested in the training can't get past the test barrier.

In many trades, even an experienced non-union man must come in as an apprentice if he wants to work on a union job, Hollis said. Thus, a meatcutter who has worked for years in the trade could go to work for Safeway only by beginning as an apprentice.

"Unless we can get relaxation of these obstacles," Hollis said, "there isn't much we can do to convince our young people that they really do have a future in the crafts."

Officers Die Death of Heroes

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a valiant police officer in my congressional district has succumbed to gunshot wounds suffered in the line of duty.

Officer Charles Wayne Thomasson had fought bravely for his life for 2 months after being shot down by members of a suspected forgery gang on January 16.

Another officer, Mr. Thomas E. Johnson, was shot to death in that gun battle.

Officer Thomasson was fatally wounded as he came to the aid of his fellow officer.

Officer Thomasson was a young man, only 29 years of age. He had served his Nation honorably in the U.S. Air Force. He was married and the father of three small daughters.

He had accepted his responsibility to his Nation, his family, and his community. All of us are indebted to him for the supreme sacrifice he willingly made in the defense of those things we most treasure—our Nation, our families, and our community.

Tribute was paid to this dedicated law officer in an editorial in the Nashville Tennessean, and I include this editorial in the RECORD at this time:

OFFICERS DIE DEATH OF HEROES

Metro policeman Charles Wayne Thomasson, 29, is dead of gunshot wounds which he suffered in a battle with a suspected forgery gang in North Nashville Jan. 16.

Another officer, Mr. Thomas E. Johnson, 38, was shot to death in the battle.

Five men have been charged in the slaying. Two have been arrested and are now free on bond and the other three are objects of a nationwide search.

The community mourns the loss of these two courageous officers, whose names will be inscribed on the roll of honor along with those of other policemen who have given their lives in the call of duty.

Mr. Thomasson had hung between life and death for two months after the shooting, and it was fervently hoped that he would recover. However, the nature of his internal injuries was such that successful treatment was impossible. His family and friends, and his comrades on the police force, deserve the community's most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Thomasson and Mr. Johnson were the first officers to reach the deadend where the suspected forgery gang was cornered. The officers died because they had no hesitation at taking direct action to carry out their duty of protecting the lives and property of the community.

The hero who dies on a foreign battlefield is no more deserving of honor than these. The sacrifice of Officers Thomasson and Johnson will long be remembered and respected in this community.

Money Crisis Spells Bankruptcy

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the international monetary crisis is not a sudden development. It did not come as a surprise to anyone who has been observing the fiscal policies of this Government in recent years. Our Government, striking a head-in-the-sand posture, has refused to heed the numerous warnings indicating that this crisis would occur if our policies were not changed.

There is no question that this crisis could have been averted had a policy of restraint on Government spending been in effect. A policy of budget deficit after budget deficit coupled with extensive spending abroad was bound to result in a day of reckoning.

In an excellent editorial entitled "Money Crisis Spells Bankruptcy," published on March 18, 1968, the Greenville News discusses the delayed and perhaps ineffective response of this administration to the perilous world financial situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MONEY CRISIS SPELLS BANKRUPTCY

Only a few experts understand the inner workings of the national and international monetary markets, and many of them do not agree and can't explain it.

But everyone, especially those who work for a living at a fixed wage or salary, can understand the meaning of inflation when it hits them in the form of less value for their dollar.

And that is what all of the gold speculation, the upward pegging of interest rates, the controversy over the proposal to free more of America's dwindling gold supply for sale, the demands for higher taxes and lower government spending and the discouraging of business investment and travel abroad is all about.

The United States went off the "gold standard" during one of the early Roosevelt administrations. The advocates of "hard money" have been saying it was a mistake ever since and may yet be proven right. It started the era of "printing press money."

For international monetary purposes, the United States had to hold on to a certain amount of gold to guarantee the value of its dollar abroad among the nations whose money value is based on gold.

This is the "gold cover" that some of President Johnson's financial advisers have been suggesting that he get Congress to remove. They say it is necessary to keep the price of gold from rising much higher. If that happens, "gold standard" or no, the value of the dollar will decline in its purchasing power abroad. If it does, it will decline at home, too.

One can argue until he is breathless that gold of itself has no value—except the artificial value that men and governments place upon it. That may be true, but gold is still recognized as the basic medium of international exchange and of internal exchange in many nations. It also is argued that the real value of money, be it metal or paper, is what it will buy—but it will buy only as much as the almost mystic workings of the national and international market place make it worth.

When the United States was on the gold standard, it meant that the holder of a dollar bill could, if he chose, exchange it through banking and governmental channels for a dollar's worth of gold. With the Rooseveltian change, this no longer was true; the gold certificate went out of existence. It is illegal to possess gold coins, except as numismatic collectors' items, or even to possess gold bullion.

Silver and silver certificates presumably replaced gold as the basic monetary element. But silver certificates are now scarce, if not almost non-existent, and most of the bills in the reader's pocket and in his bank are Federal Reserve or Treasury notes which he can only exchange for more of the same.

All of this is leading up to the statement that a world monetary crisis, long developing, has within the last two weeks reached an acute stage. The United States has already, overnight, taken emergency steps, such as raising the Federal Reserve prime interest rate from 4½ to 5 per cent, thus raising interest rates generally and tightening credit and slowing spending.

Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee and Chairman George H. Mahon of the Appropriations Committee are reported to be reconsidering the 10 per cent income tax surcharge and contemplating drastic cuts in proposed federal spending.

But these, both of them, are measures which will be slow in taking effect—if Congress, indeed, dares to raise taxes and reduce domestic or non-war spending, which is the only place it can make drastic cuts, in an election year.

Meanwhile, representatives of the international gold pool, consisting of the United States and some of its foreign friends (which probably should read nations which stand to lose if the United States goes broke) have been meeting in Washington over the weekend to consider strategy for stopping or controlling the wild speculation in gold.

By the time this is read, they may have announced at least some preliminary steps. But at best they are likely to be emergency measures of only immediate effect.

It will take time to get at the basic causes of the international inflation, for which most nations blame the United States, and correct them, thereby removing the opportunity for the speculators to make money buying and selling gold at continually rising prices.

Gold speculation began many months ago as the United States began to run ever higher chronic deficits in its international balance of payments and in its domestic budget. It came to a head when the British economy was about to topple and Prime Minister Wilson was forced to devalue the pound sterling.

Some of the speculators are governments, France being the chief one. President de Gaulle simply seems bent on wrecking the monetary systems of both England and the United States. Due to American generosity, France has possessed large balances of dollars which it could convert into American gold upon demand. Russia is playing an almost unseen part in the deadly game.

Some, of course, are individuals and national and international financial combines whom we have not yet seen named, who are in it merely for the profit to be made.

But, whoever they may be, they are trading on the possibility of British, American and, perhaps, world bankruptcy. There simply isn't enough gold in the possession of the nations concerned to meet the potential demand. As the price of gold goes up, the value of national currencies goes down.

The United States might have headed off this crisis if, a year or more ago, it had taken strong enough action to balance its budget, mainly by reducing its rate of spending to be really effective, and to wipe out its international trade and foreign spending deficit.

But, instead, the administration proposed more spending, only partly offset by a request for a tax increase.

It may now be too late.

Judy Wilkerson: Winner in Voice of Democracy Contest

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent speech, written by Miss Judy Wilkerson, a senior at North Vernon, Ind., High School, and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Wilkerson, Route 2, North Vernon.

Miss Wilkerson's speech, entitled "Freedom's Challenge," was adjudged the

winner of a recent Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the North Vernon Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Miss Wilkerson's expression of "Freedom's Challenge" reads as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Freedom's challenge? Many would say it was Communism, war, or even the draft card burners; it is none of these! The real enemy has encircled us. He is a small, quiet enemy, one that is easy to overlook and he grows bigger each day. This enemy is disrespect! He stands at our very doorstep knocking. Will you let him enter?

Our forefathers had respect and loyalty for this new country. They realized that its future depended on them. But times have changed! Respect and loyalty have given way to criticism, not a constructive criticism, backed by a willingness to sacrifice for the good of America, but a destructive disrespect.

We laugh at our president and belittle him and other government officials. Cartoons don't stop with simple exaggeration but become off-color jokes for trite people. Yes, forgetfulness of why America was founded and what America was founded for, is today's trend.

Freedom is endangered because we forget to take pride in the America of 1968. The emphasis is not on the United States; it is on a prosperous and lazy self! We must reverse this attitude and remind ourselves that America is of the people, by the people, and for the people only if we as Americans do our part.

To instill pride in the United States of America; this is the job of every adult and teenager. To make all the people appreciate our heritage and to realize that this is a wonderful place to live; this is freedom's challenge!

Consumers Get Advantage of Farmer Efficiency

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent article published in the Jacksonville, Ill., Journal of March 17, points up the cost-price squeeze under which farmers labor. It also highlights the advantage in the form of consumer prices which have resulted from the increase achieved in production per farmer in recent years. Here is the text of the article:

TAKE A BETTER LOOK AT FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

(By Dick Smith)

We hear a lot of pros and cons about federal government subsidies—but has it ever occurred to the American consumer of 1968 that farmers and ranchers have been subsidizing him for the past 20 years?

Hard to believe? Take a look at it . . .

When the early West's cowboys drove cattle over the Chisholm trail to market after the Civil War, there was little concern for the "cost of production."

The wages of the cowboys themselves were probably the largest expense. Range grass, at moderate or no expense, comprised virtually the entire ration.

Not so today. When we settle down in front of the television set to watch the adventures of those legendary cowboys, we've frequently just finished a dinner including beef that cost vastly more to produce than did the beef of five or six generations ago.

It's also vastly better! In fact, today's consumers, accustomed to modern high quality, but, at some pretty old-time prices, wouldn't accept the beef from cattle herded in by "The Virginian," or the "folks on the Ponderosa."

Today's modern beef animal is on only the first leg of the journey to market when it comes off the range.

For most cattle, there's still three months to a year for "finishing" in a feedlot with grain and feed concentrate.

And the costs of ranchers and finishers have increased tremendously while the prices they receive for their meat animals have shown little increase in fact, have actually decreased when compared with some past periods, according to David H. Stroud, acting general manager of the National Live Stock and Meat Board in Chicago.

Here are examples of what has caused production costs to increase:

Farmers are paying nearly \$1.8 billion annually in real estate taxes—twice the amount paid in 1954. As inflation mounts, this figure will get larger and more burdensome.

Many farm equipment items increased five percent last year alone, attributable to increasing wage rates to factory workers.

A midwestern cattle feeder recently noted he paid a little more than \$400 for a new corn planter a few years ago at a time he received \$37 per hundred pounds for steers.

A few months ago, he paid more than \$1,400 for a new corn planter and sold steers for \$24 per hundred pounds.

Soybean meal, a prominent ingredient in modern cattle rations, has increased from a price range of \$51.25-\$54.20 per ton in 1960 to recent quotations of \$74-\$80, despite a bountiful harvest of soybeans.

All along the line there have been increases in the prices of labor, goods and services farmers buy and in the costs of marketing the products they sell.

What the agricultural family could buy for \$100 in 1957-59 costs about \$117 in 1967 . . . 17 percent more!

Yet what farmers and ranchers receive for their products shows no such increase. In 1967, the top on cattle in Chicago, for instance, generally stayed below \$28 per hundred weight. Five years ago, the top was \$33, and in the early 1950's peak prices ranged from \$33.50 to \$42.50.

The top price on hogs in Chicago has been around \$21 recently. As far back as 20 years ago, hogs brought \$27.50 per hundred pounds.

Producing a better but less expensive product with higher costs of production has been accomplished by increasing output per man, per acre, per animal and per unit of beef. But farmers' profit per unit of output has decreased.

"Thus, in effect, the farmer-rancher has been subsidizing to a degree, the higher standard of living of the average consumer, since increased agricultural efficiency and decreased farm profits have been major factors in diminishing the proportion of consumer income now required to purchase food," Stroud said.

Outstanding Work of Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Tex.

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a fine editorial about the progress and status of Lamar State College of Technology, in Beaumont, Tex., was recently published in the Beaumont Enterprise. So that other Senators may be advised of outstanding work of this college, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, Mar. 24, 1968]

LAMAR TECH ON THE MOVE

The astonishing growth of Lamar State College of Technology is reflected in plans to open bids on Tuesday for a \$4.4 million construction and improvement program.

President Richard Setzer supplies other figures for this story of plant expansion: Awarding of these contracts will bring total construction on the campus to more than \$11 million within an 18-month period. Completion of the buildings in the fall of 1969 will give the college a record of construction of 34 buildings at a cost of \$23.1 million since 1959.

It is gratifying that consistent efforts are being made by the Lamar Tech administrators and faculty to match the growth of physical plant with equally impressive strides in academic excellence. The latter progress is, of course, harder to come by.

We trust that appreciation of the school's contribution to Beaumont's economic and cultural life increasingly finds tangible means of expression. Kind words about the college are not enough.

Lamar Tech is this community's most potent selling point. There are untold benefits in the contacts it makes for us in the outside educational and scientific world. For instance, praise of the college administration, and expressions of surprise at the institution's growth, came from a number of the hundreds of scientists who attended the recent sessions on campus of the Texas Academy of Science and affiliated and related groups.

What is good for the college is, truly, good for all of Beaumont. It has been suggested that we strive for the attitudes and atmosphere that would make us known far and wide as a college town. That is a splendid objective.

Vietnam—Address by Representative Silvio O. Conte

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech of the Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE, on Vietnam, at a meeting sponsored by the Berkshire Committee for Ecumenical Action and the Social Action Committee of the Pittsfield Area Council of Churches, South Junior High School, Pittsfield, Mass., Sunday, March 10, 1968. Congressman CONTE is the able and distinguished Representative of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts in the House of Representatives.

Proceeding from an excellent review of the past involvement of the United States in Vietnam, and the present situation, Congressman CONTE argues persuasively and with force that the administration must "realize that the only solution to the Vietnam war is going to have to be a political one worked out at the negotiating table." He then proposes means to open the avenues toward negotiations "to bring peace to a country which has been ravaged by war for more than two decades."

His speech is reasoned and eloquent in its simplicity and honesty. It offers constructive solutions toward negotiations, and an honorable end of the war.

I am glad that I can ask that the speech of our respected and distinguished colleague be printed in the RECORD. I am sure that it will be read with interest and benefit by many of our fellow citizens.

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

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE SILVIO O. CONTE AT A MEETING SPONSORED BY THE BERKSHIRE COMMITTEE FOR ECUMENICAL ACTION AND THE SOCIAL ACTION COMMITTEE OF THE PITTSFIELD AREA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, SOUTH JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, PITTSFIELD, MASS., SUNDAY, MARCH 10, 1968

Prior to our military involvement in South Vietnam, it had been the view of practically every major military leader in our country that this nation should avoid becoming bogged down in a land war in Asia.

Today we have over 500,000 American troops fighting on the Asian Continent.

In early 1964 then Secretary of Defense McNamara stated he hoped to pull out all of the men we had in South Vietnam by the end of 1965.

At that time we had 15,000 men there; today, some four years later, we have over 500,000.

In 1964, prior to that year's presidential election, Lyndon Johnson said in effect that he would not send American boys to fight a war that Asian boys should be fighting. Today, he has sent over 500,000 American boys to fight in Vietnam.

Last fall, General Westmoreland reported that the enemy was on the run and that he expected the United States to begin to "phase out" its operations within two years. Today over 500,000 Americans fight in Southeast Asia, and General Westmoreland has reportedly just requested between 50,000 to 100,000 additional troops, a request which President Johnson has under consideration.

These are but few examples of a pattern which we have seen repeated time and time again with respect to the Vietnam War, a conflict which today represents the longest war in which this country has ever been involved.

I believe it would be worthwhile for us, at the outset, to take a brief look at what has been the impact of this conflict on Vietnam, on America, and on the world.

One source has estimated that since 1961, close to a half million Vietnamese people have been killed in the war.

But I think it would be more accurate to say that it is literally impossible to know just how many hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese fighters and civilians have been killed and how many millions have been injured since 1961.

South Vietnam is a country of some 15,000,000 people.

We have not been given reports by the Saigon Government or the Administration dealing with total civilian casualties and injuries. The figures are undoubtedly massive.

Over 18,000 Americans have died in Vietnam—nearly 120,000 have been wounded. During the week of February 10, 1968, a week in which the communist cities offensive was occurring—a record 543 U.S. troops were killed in action. The enemy suffered much greater casualties during the same period but it is questionable whether we can really tell just how high these figures run.

The World War II average of American dead amounted to 1,400 men a week—in a war, I do not have to remind you, that was fought all over the globe.

In Korea, it was 210 men a week. The average U.S. losses so far this year in Vietnam have been 320 deaths a week—double that of 1967.

Materially, we will have spent, at a minimum, more than \$50 billion on this war for the three-year period running from July 1965 to July 1968. An additional \$26 billion is

projected for the period from July 1968 to July 1969, an amount which will constitute approximately one-third of our total defense expenditures for that period.

Our allies in Vietnam number close to 800,000—some 700,000 of whom are South Vietnamese. South Korea has deployed a force of 48,000, Australia 8,000, New Zealand 550, Thailand 2,200 and the Philippines 2,000.

We, however, have borne the brunt of the military effort in the war and our men, I would add, have performed magnificently in the role they have been assigned, with valor and courage of the highest order.

We have also borne the brunt of the cost of this war. With the exception of Australia and New Zealand, we have totally financed and supplied the allied commitment.

Australia has recently announced that she will not raise her troop force in the future. South Korea has again threatened to withdraw her fighting men—presumably because of her fear of a crisis developing with North Korea. Thailand, with a standing army of over 70,000 says she will increase her commitment if our foreign aid goes up proportionately.

Our European allies have not contributed a single soldier or a single dollar to our fight in Vietnam. Although we are the leader of the free world, we have little following from our European allies for this war in Asia.

It has been a major contention by some that the world role of the United States would greatly suffer if we decided to negotiate the Vietnam conflict. A recent analysis by the New York Times in Europe found just the opposite position—the view that if the U.S. successfully brought to an end what they in Europe consider to be a hopeless war—it would show maturity and real strength.

It was also felt in Europe that because of the war and the vacuum it has created in the Mediterranean and Middle East—the U.S. was forfeiting its leadership in these areas to the Russians by default.

In any war, the real victims are the people—their homes, their land, their possessions, their existence. Such has been the case in the Vietnam conflict.

From 1965 through 1967 we have dropped some 1,750,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam.

During all of World War II, we dropped but 640,000 tons on Germany.

We dropped on the entire continent of Europe during World War II, 1,550,000 or 200,000 tons less than have been dropped on North and South Vietnam.

During the Korean War we dropped some 635,000 tons of bombs or 1/3 the amount that has been dropped on North and South Vietnam.

It has been estimated that we have dropped twelve tons of bombs for every square mile in North and South Vietnam.

The cost of bombing the North has been enormous. As of February 8, it was estimated that we had flown more than 200,000 flights over the North.

Over 800 of our planes have been lost in bombing missions over the North at a cost, in addition to the American pilots lost, of over \$1.7 billion.

Systematic air attacks have taken place in the South in Viet Cong-controlled areas.

Many small towns and hamlets have been completely destroyed. Despite warnings, many civilians, refusing to leave their ancestral lands, have died from these bombings.

Viet Cong terrorism and vicious brutality has been responsible for the murder and execution of tens of thousands of civilians.

Prior to the recent communist cities attack—an attack that took place all over South Vietnam—some 2,200,000 South Vietnamese had registered as refugees since we began keeping these figures in 1965. Countless more were qualified to be registered as refugees but had not done so.

This is out of a total population, as I stated before, of some 15,000,000 people.

It has been estimated that up to 500,000 additional refugees were created by the recent attack on the cities.

The measures taken to deal with this enormous refugee problem have been completely inadequate.

Those who live in the refugee camps exist under miserable conditions. Many live in the streets.

We have given some \$30-\$35 million a year recently to South Vietnam for refugee relief. It has been estimated that no more than half of the supplies ever reach the refugee.

Senator Ted Kennedy, Chairman of a Senate Committee on Refugees, after a recent trip to Vietnam, estimated that nearly 80 percent of the hundreds of refugees he spoke to in many different refugee camps, claimed they were either deposited in refugee camps by the Americans or fled to camps in fear of American planes and artillery. "Only a handful," Kennedy stated, "claimed they were driven from their homes by the Viet Cong."

The recent Communist cities attack provided another example at Hue of what is tragically becoming the underlying theme throughout the entire country of South Vietnam. This theme perhaps was best illustrated by a U.S. Colonel who in describing the destruction of the City of Bentre, stated—"We had to destroy the city in order to save it."

Paradoxically, the impact of the recent communist cities offensive has been far greater felt in the countryside than in the cities. I am referring here to the great damage that has been done to what is often called "the other war" or the pacification program.

The Communists have effectively cancelled, by their attack on the cities, whatever progress had been made by this program to win the backing of the peasants for the government. It became necessary to deploy from the countryside over half of the revolutionary development teams used to implement this program, in an effort to give relief to the cities and to assist in the care of the newly displaced refugees.

On February 20, Vice President Humphrey conceded that the Viet Cong offensive had stopped this vitally important program. "The countryside" one U.S. official reportedly said, "has again gone to the Viet Cong mostly by default."

Recently, arrests of South Vietnamese political leaders outside the existing Saigon Government has become a habit.

More than 50 such political figures have been arrested by the Saigon Government "for their own protection" since the Viet Cong cities offensive began on January 31.

In the United States the impact and effects of the war may not be as apparent, but they are none-the-less very real and very far-reaching.

To put it very simply, we are at a critical period of our history internally.

We are faced with great domestic needs and requirements which must be dealt with—which cannot be put off.

Yet we are not dealing with them.

We are not meeting these needs because we do not have available the resources necessary to deal with them.

We will not have these resources available, furthermore, until we have solved the Vietnam conflict.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have had the opportunity to witness first-hand the critically damaging impact of the war on our domestic programs, our fiscal policies, our balance of payments deficits, our appropriations bills.

The impact of this war pervades our entire country; it is felt by every American today and it is the concern of every citizen.

These factors which I have set forth concerning the impact of the war, on Vietnam, on America, and on the world give just some

idea of what the cost of this war has been so far.

Tragically, we are no closer today to finding a solution to this struggle than we were four years ago.

Why are we no closer?

Well, for one reason in looking back at the past, we will find too many misconceptions and too many inaccuracies, too much false optimism and too much illusion associated with this war.

What we will not find and what is desperately needed today is an approach by our government that is based on realities—the realities of Vietnam and the realities of our involvement there.

I would like, at this point, to deal with what I believe are today's realities concerning Vietnam, realities which must be accepted as the framework for future action if we are to bring this terrible war to a just and honorable conclusion.

Whatever have been the objectives in Vietnam it must now be apparent that they are not going to be achieved by a military victory in that country.

This is not because we cannot defeat the Viet Cong on the battlefield.

We can.

It is rather because such a military victory can only be achieved at a totally unacceptable cost—the destruction and complete breakdown of South Vietnam, the country whose interests and integrity we are supposed to be protecting, not to even mention the far greater amounts of U.S. men and money and lives that would be necessary.

We can win the military struggle there. But we will have to "destroy Vietnam in order to save it."

Why is it that the only way that military victory can be achieved in Vietnam is at this unacceptable cost?

This perhaps can best be understood by looking to something President John Kennedy said in 1963.

He stated, "I don't think that, unless a greater effort is made by the government to win popular support, that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war, they are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment; we can send our men out there as advisors, but they have to win it."

Today, some five years later, and with many different leaderships having tried, the government of South Vietnam still has not been able to win the popular support or the confidence of the people of South Vietnam.

The power structure of that country has repeatedly failed to take those steps which would have or could have evoked from the people the desire to have their interests and their destiny determined by the Saigon Government.

We, too, have failed here in not influencing the Saigon Government to take those steps.

What kind of steps am I talking about.

I'm talking about elimination of the absolutely incredible corruption and profiteering that has pervaded the South Vietnamese governmental structure.

I'm talking about economic and land and social reforms throughout the country and especially in the rural countryside areas.

I'm talking about a full mobilization of available resources to meet the communist challenge.

I'm talking about fighting the ultimate struggle—the struggle to win the support of the people.

The failure of the Saigon Government to meaningfully deal with these basic political problems has created a vacuum in South Vietnam, the kind of vacuum which cannot be filled by American military and economic presence and involvement.

And while the Viet Cong's inhuman methods of terrorism and brutality have done nothing to win the popular support of the

people, they have taken other steps to achieve just what Saigon has failed to accomplish.

Just this week, the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives released a report stating that the Viet Cong were making a greater appeal for countryside support through land reform than the Saigon Government is prepared to do.

According to the committee majority, the Viet Cong has eliminated landlord domination in areas which they control and reallocated government and absentee farmland to the landless. "They have thus given the people living in areas under their control" the report continues, "A stake in continued Viet Cong dominance and established a built-in popular resistance to the resumption of control by the existing government."

There can be little doubt that Viet Cong activities are deeply entwined with and for the most part directed by Hanoi today.

Similarly, there can be little doubt, contrary to the Administration's position, that the war in South Vietnam has a substantial civil war aspect to it.

One just cannot reasonably deny that the Viet Cong is made up in large part of South Vietnamese who object to the present government in their country.

The recent simultaneous and well-coordinated city attacks which took place all over the country and which obviously included local assistance, should have dispelled once and for all, any doubts which remained about this.

Few people dispute the fighting capabilities of the Viet Cong. Time after time we have heard that the Viet Cong is a tough and strong soldier.

These same characteristics have not usually been attributed to the South Vietnamese soldier.

Why is this so?

Because the Viet Cong fights with a sense of national purpose while the South Vietnamese too often does not.

He does not because his government has not given him cause for national purpose.

It has not created or attempted to create a nation for which he is willing to undergo the extreme sacrifices and hardships that man must endure in the struggle for power.

Given this set of circumstances, where do we go from here?

For four years, when the Administration has been faced with the question, where do we go from here, their answer has always been the same—increase the military pressure.

For four years this has been the Administration's answer and we are no closer to a solution today than we were four years ago.

It is time for the Administration to realize that a different and more flexible approach is required.

It is time for the Administration to realize as I said earlier that we cannot achieve a military victory except at an unacceptable cost—the destruction of Vietnam.

It is time for the Administration to realize that the only solution to the Vietnam War is going to have to be a political one worked out at the negotiating table.

It is time for the Administration to realize that the first steps toward achieving this political settlement must be taken.

The obvious first step in attempting to begin a dialogue for peace among all of the parties involved is the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

This is an action which I favor today—it is an action which I called for last August.

In favoring an end to the bombing of the North, let me note that this certainly should not apply to any areas in the North adjacent to the DMZ from where our soldiers in South Vietnam, such as at Khe Sanh, are being attacked.

In February of this year and on many earlier occasions Hanoi has indicated the

position that negotiations would begin with the end of the bombing of North Vietnam.

On February 24, U.N. Secretary General U Thant reported after meeting with North Vietnamese representatives that meaningful negotiations would begin "perhaps within a few days" if American planes stopped bombing North Vietnam.

I am aware of the argument of those who maintain that bombing the North is necessary to effectively stop infiltration to the South.

I would point out that a report made for the Pentagon and disclosed recently said that "The level of infiltration has not been reduced efficiently to prevent North Vietnam from helping to maintain a combat force in the South strong enough to deny the prospect of a decisive military victory to the U.S. and its allies in the foreseeable future."

I would further add that if the barrier that I proposed last August across Vietnam and Laos to cut off infiltration from the North had been carried forward, it could be nearing completion today, and the argument that bombing was needed to prevent infiltration would be gone.

Nevertheless, I am aware that there is risk involved in our stopping the bombing of the North.

There is military risk.

There is also political risk—the Viet Cong and Hanoi may not be seriously interested in sitting down at the conference table to attempt to work out a negotiated settlement.

But what is critical for all of us to realize today is that the risks associated with continuing to bomb North Vietnam and continuing to escalate the war are far, far greater than the risks associated with stopping the bombing in an attempt to seize the opportunity to begin a dialogue for peace.

What are these greater risks?

The risk of completely destroying Vietnam.
The risk of untold future loss of U.S. lives.
The risk of continuing to divert substantial resources vitally needed at home.

The risk of an expanded Asian war.
The risk of the final war.

These are the risks which far outweigh any risk involved in stopping the bombing and attempting to work out an honorable and just political settlement of the conflict.

For too long we have only been willing to take the risks for war.

It is now essential that we take a risk for peace.

I reject the Administration's assertion that it is capable of determining in advance that fruitful negotiations will not begin following the end of the bombing of the North.

The Administration seems almost to believe that once we have gone to the negotiating table we will have given up Vietnam.

I disagree. Negotiations do not and will not mean surrender by this country.

We can and must make clear at any discussions that we will not leave Vietnam until a just political settlement has been worked out at the negotiating table.

Such a settlement is going to take considerable time to achieve.

It is incumbent upon us today to at least make the effort to begin negotiations towards that end—it is incumbent upon us to show the necessary flexibility in dealing with this conflict that has been decidedly lacking in the past.

At the same time it is essential for us to make clear to the government in Saigon that a total effort will have to be made on their part to bring about necessary reforms.

Without such an effort, without these vitally needed reforms being accomplished, it is doubtful that the existing governmental structure in Saigon will be capable of maintaining a position of responsibility in the future of South Vietnam.

There are many, many factors that would have to be worked out at the negotiating table in achieving a political settlement.

Our ultimate goal must be to provide the opportunity for all of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own political future by free elections.

Intermediary objectives would include achieving a cease-fire, establishing the framework for eventual free elections, establishing means of supervision of the entire structure, and many others.

We cannot know for sure whether all or any of this can be accomplished.

What we can know, however, is that it can never be accomplished if we don't take the steps to try to bring it about.

It is our responsibility to help bring a peace to a country which has been ravaged by war for more than two decades.

It is also our responsibility to get back, as soon as we honorably can, to the business of putting our own house in order.

It has often been argued that a major objective underlying our military involvement in Vietnam was that we had to prove to the Communist world that we would not stand for or permit so-called wars of national liberation.

It is going to be one of the great ironies of our times, that we will have established just the opposite by the time that this war is brought to a conclusion.

For, whatever the result of the war in Vietnam, it seems clear now, that there is almost no chance that our nation will ever become involved in a situation of this kind again.

Antipoverty Advancement

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's attempted rape of a young female law student by an antipoverty official attending a U.S. Office of Education function should awaken many to the subsidized orgy being forced upon our people.

If the assailant is the director of a taxpayers-supported community action program, as reported, it begs the question of just what kind of action we are buying for our dollar.

I think all our colleagues are entitled to see for themselves what programming is being made with poverty funds and I include the Evening Star account dated March 26, 1968, as follows:

POVERTY AID CHARGED IN NORTHWEST ASSAULT

A Morgantown, W. Va., anti-poverty official was charged with assault with intent to rape a young Washington woman today about four hours after the woman reported being attacked in Rock Creek Park.

Police said they found the suspect in some bushes under the Taft Bridge in Northwest Washington.

He was identified as Maurice Alexander Davis, 35, of Clarksville, W. Va., who directs a community action program from an office in the Morgantown County courthouse. Davis was staying in a hotel here while attending a U.S. Office of Education sponsored program.

The woman, a 22-year-old George Washington University law student, had attended a meeting and shortly after midnight was walking north across the bridge on the west side toward her home in the 3800 block of Connecticut Avenue NW.

She was grabbed from behind and forced down a hill and under the bridge, where she was hit four times on the head, knocked to the ground and had her underclothing ripped, she told police.

Struggling and screaming, the girl, who is white, managed to knock her Negro assailant's glasses off, she said. While groping for his glasses, the man then dropped his wallet, she continued. The girl jumped up, grabbed her books and ran to a nearby carry-out restaurant, where she called police.

As she was dialing she found the man's wallet among her books, police said. Inside were identification papers which led police to check hotels in the area. The suspect was registered at the Windsor Park Hotel, 2300 Connecticut Ave. NW. But he was not in his room. He was later seen and arrested under the bridge.

The woman was treated at George Washington University Hospital for bruises, scratch marks and a cut on the side of her mouth.

Reflections on Segregation, Desegregation, Power, and Morals

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a small book which I believe will help give them a great deal of understanding and new insight into one of the most critical problems of our time.

The book is "Reflections of Segregation, Desegregation, Power, and Morals."

Written by Dr. William T. Fontaine, associate professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, the book is a monograph in the American lecture series in philosophy. It represents one of the most brilliantly organized and incisive analyses of America's racial problems I have ever read.

Perhaps because Dr. Fontaine is a long-time and dear friend, it might be possible to permit friendship rather than scholarship to influence my judgment. But there is no substitute for careful dialectic or disciplined reason. The greatness of a work stands on its ability to compete in the marketplace of ideas and survive in the arena of intellectual challenge. I sincerely believe that this is indeed a great work and also believe my colleagues will agree with me after they have read this marvelous little book of wisdom on American racial relations.

"Black power" is still a phrase that occasions fear, multiplies misunderstanding and causes tensions. In one of the most objective analyses ever made of this multifaceted doctrine, Dr. Fontaine explains with forceful logic why black power will eventually run its course in American race relations. These are some of his comments:

1. Semantically considered, the phrase, "black power," is ill-chosen because it provokes in most whites the kind of resentment felt by Negroes when they hear the phrase "white supremacy". Instead of reducing fear and hate, it magnifies these emotions.

A slogan like "we shall overcome" has universal appeal. But most white persons react to "black power" as if the intent of the speaker is to incite feelings of contrast and challenge. "Black power" thus consolidates the aggregate of white minorities into one opponent. In Royce's terms it makes the Negro-white relation dangerously dyadic.

On the other hand, there is the danger that many Negroes will consider the slogan "black power" and its anticipated political plums to be substitutes for the hard work, dedication and sacrifice necessary for building up stable families and educating children.

2. Instead of producing black unity and black power, attempts to realize it will result rather in white unity and division and weakening of blacks. Carmichael's separatism polarizes the racial groups, alienates former friends and sympathizers and exacerbates relations.

America is headed, Dr. Fontaine authoritatively proves, toward a realization of the family of man and any doctrine, white or black, which contravenes this aspiration cannot succeed.

Dr. Fontaine documents this position by describing in scholarly detail the many contributions of famous black and white Americans who have contributed so much of their intellectual energies and their time to a totally integrated family of man. Some of the Negroes whose lives he discusses in detail are the poet, Paul Lawrence Dunbar; the scholar Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Negro Renaissance writers such as Rhodes scholar Alain Locke; Richard Wright and his Marxist flirtations, and finally, the brilliant novelist, Ralph Ellison.

An interesting chapter, "White Americans for Desegregation," places in proper focus the efforts of some prominent white Americans to bring Negroes and whites together: the distinguished philosopher Josiah Royce, some of the white organizers of the NAACP such as Oswald Garrison Villard, Joel Spingarn, and John Dewey; the white Southern Methodist Minister Will Alexander, and a small man from Missouri who became a big man in his vision, President Harry S. Truman.

White power and what it means and how it shapes the direction and velocity of the Negro's problem is minutely examined by Dr. Fontaine. He is as critical of white repression as he is of black violence. As he points out in the first sentence of the book, "The Negro revolt will never be settled by flight, force, or falsification."

By flight, he means those who would run to the suburbs. By force, he means "the violent actions of individuals or mobs, and the existence or passage of ad hoc laws empowering police to set upon and arrest citizens seeking freedom of speech, assembly, and movement." By falsification, he means the labelling of any honest effort to achieve integration as "Communist-inspired," and so forth.

My colleagues may also be interested in Dr. Fontaine's unique breakdown of what he calls "atomization of segregation by race" or five kinds of racial separation: First, categorization—the lumping of a group of people into one category by generalizing about them; second, spatial distance—residential segregation; third, temporal distance—the superior-inferior relationship of whites and Negroes; fourth, social distance—the refusal of whites to indulge in any kind of interpersonal relations with Negroes such as bathing together, dancing together, intermarrying, "exchanging erotic advances," et cetera; and fifth, ceremonial distance—the etiquette in the treatment that labels Negroes as "boy" or "uncle"

or "auntie" or their first name while whites are always "Mr." or "Mrs." or "Miss."

In the final chapter "Moral Power Plus Massive Economic Power: Notes for Architects of the 'Great Society,'" Dr. Fontaine is at his cerebral best.

He proposes a comprehensive program for achieving a fully integrated and free society through the establishment of the Organization for an Open Progressive Society—OOPS.

He outlines a series of economic assistance programs designed to stabilize neighborhoods—a benign quota system, for example, that would maintain a predetermined ratio of whites to Negroes—financial assistance to Negroes to enable them to purchase homes in previously all-white neighborhoods, a program of "paired buyers" of homes, mortgage and rent subsidies, community involvement of universities, a system of family "exchange-ins" and a very novel suggestion, discount buying for Negroes and whites living in desegregated blocks.

For those who were appalled by the astronomical \$2 billion a month recommended by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, Dr. Fontaine's program administered by the Organization for an Open Progressive Society—OOPS—would call for a funding of \$50 million, and he is able to point to specific programs and projects for this money's use.

Whereas Dr. Fontaine does not indicate whether the \$50 million would be an annual or monthly expenditure, let us assume that it is monthly. That still is a paltry 2 percent of what the President's Commission recommended and Dr. Fontaine's program has both the merits of definitively improving the economic condition of Negroes while improving the social climate between Negroes and whites. This, we must never lose sight of—that there still exists a reservoir of good will between many Negroes and whites and those who would flood this reservoir with the waters of brotherly love and sound economic programs must be encouraged and commended.

It has sometimes been said that great wisdom comes in small packages. In this very small book of only 149 pages, Dr. William T. Fontaine has indeed offered us all a great wisdom. I heartily commend it to my colleagues in the earnest expectation that it will broaden their vision as it has mine and at least provoke them into an honest reassessment of many of the developing tendencies in today's Negro-white crisis.

**Representative John Culver, of Iowa,
Looks at Foreign Aid**

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I recently had the opportunity to read a penetrating and thoughtful article on the present status and future prospects of

foreign aid written by Representative JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa. As an active member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, JOHN CULVER has given vigorous and clearheaded leadership to the cause of a well-grounded and effective foreign assistance program. His article illustrates both the sweep and the realism of his thinking on this vital aspect of national policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "U.S. Foreign Aid: Life or Death at 21?" published in the Harvard Law School Bulletin of January 1968, be printed in the RECORD. I commend it warmly to all Senators and to all others who are concerned with the administration of foreign aid.

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

U.S. FOREIGN AID: LIFE OR DEATH AT 21?
(By JOHN C. CULVER)

(NOTE.—Congressman JOHN C. CULVER, a native of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, represents the Second District of that state. Upon graduation cum laude from Harvard College in 1954, he was awarded the Lionel de Jersey Harvard Studentship to Emmanuel College, Cambridge University. He then served as an officer in the United States Marine Corps for three years. Following graduation from Harvard Law School in 1962, Congressman CULVER served for a year as Legislative Assistant to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and practiced law for a brief period in Cedar Rapids.

(Elected to Congress in 1964 and re-elected in 1966, he is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and its subcommittees on Africa, Europe, and Foreign Economic Policy. This year, he was Chairman of a Study Mission to the Soviet Union and Scandinavia, and he has traveled widely in Africa and Southeast Asia. Congressman CULVER is a member of the Anglo-American Parliamentary Conference on Africa and Latin America.)

It is now twenty years since the United States committed itself to a collaborative and planned program of foreign assistance. The financially generous Marshall Plan was launched with confidence and wide public acceptance. Goals were clear; progress was visible. The new program was able to draw not only on a reservoir of support but on the talents of countless Americans in professional and public life, and thus basic decisions could be made and enacted even with a Congress controlled by the opposition party at a time when President Truman's political popularity was low. The five-year projections of the Marshall Plan were closely adhered to despite the stringent claims and unanticipated interruptions of the Korean War.

Twenty years later, public support for foreign assistance is shallow and declining. Enactment by Congress of reduced aid commitments becomes more and more arduous. For several years now, the President has requested less, yet the short-fall between what is asked and what is granted has become greater.

During this fiscal year, the amount voted by Congress represents the historic low in both absolute and relative terms. And even a much reduced appropriation has thus far survived Congressional scrutiny by the closest of margins; this past fall the very existence of foreign assistance was sustained in the House of Representatives by only four votes. Never since World War II has foreign aid been more a political orphan or been subjected to more child abuse.

Here are the facts:

During the coming year we shall not even be spending .5 per cent of our gross national

product on economic aid—a sharp contrast to the 2.75 per cent we devoted to this purpose in 1949 and the 1 per cent that was set as an objective for the Development Decade drawing to a close.

The total appropriation for foreign aid in the current fiscal year will be only \$2.3 billion. This compares to \$4.3 billion in 1961 and \$3.25 billion in 1965. Though other related programs raise the total to some degree, even these are at a low ebb. Surplus agricultural disposal is cramped by the absence of large surpluses in principal commodities. The IDA—the soft loan window of the World Bank—is almost closed by an exhaustion of funds and the inability to obtain replenishment this year. The Asian Development Bank request has not yet been acted upon. Even commercial transactions under the Export-Import Bank are more tightly restricted than ever before. The decline in the value of the dollar, and the tying of almost all aid—for balance of payments reasons—to purchases in the United States, accentuates the loss of impact and momentum in our foreign aid program.

If a loss of enthusiasm for foreign aid is growing in the United States, this is equally true in most other industrial nations. Genuine aid has not been increased very much during the decade of the Sixties. Most European countries and Japan have raised their efforts only slightly; others such as the United Kingdom have had to reduce their share. Only a few countries, such as Canada and Sweden, have significantly enlarged their contributions. Though the developed countries have added close to \$350 billion to their combined gross national product since 1961, the flow of official aid to the developing nations has increased only slightly. Private capital flow has only increased by \$1 billion and is mostly concentrated in a few developing nations.

Debt servicing of prior foreign aid is rising steeply—about 13 per cent a year. India in 1966 had to divert \$22 for every \$100 earned in exports to debt payment; Brazil, \$29.40 for every \$100. The World Bank estimates that amortization, interest and dividends today take about \$7 billion in reverse flows from developing to developed countries. This figure is close to half of the gross flow of public and private funds from rich nations to poor, and the situation may become even worse in the years just ahead.

International trade does little to offset these burdens in most developing countries. Exports from these nations have so far risen 50 per cent during this decade to a figure above \$40 billion, but their share of world exports has fallen a few percentage points to less than 25 per cent. Moreover, there are serious fluctuations in the prices and volume of trade in major commodities. Despite the completion of the Kennedy Round, the benefits to developing countries are small. At the moment, this country has no new trade negotiating authority, and a heavy barrage of support for quota restrictions and other protections is clearly audible. There are echoes of this in Europe as well.

Foreign aid is suffering from temporary seizures as well as a deep-seated malaise. Diagnosis and possible therapy depend on an understanding of causes—those that are general and those that are unique to this interval in our foreign relations and politics. The ingredients of a poor public climate are not hard to perceive.

First, foreign aid has almost no domestic political base. Its beneficiaries have never enjoyed voting power in the United States or found representation in the halls of Congress. Its flanks are always exposed, and it receives very little cover support from domestic lobbies or large voting blocs. This makes the mobilization of popular support for its large objectives and adequate funding of the program very difficult.

Those segments of foreign aid which have the highest threshold of tolerance are precisely those which have recognizable American constituencies. The Peace Corps draws strength from colleges, churches, and communities across the country, and in addition it has active alumni. The Alliance for Progress has a relatively receptive environment, in part because it has regional support in states such as Florida and Texas and in part because the public accepts a special market and historical relationship with the countries of this hemisphere. The World Bank has considerable institutional popularity because of its ties to American banking and business and because it seems to meet business criteria. Multilateral participation in small UN social programs also still carries appeal.

A second continuing reality fortified by the passage of years is the disillusionment with foreign assistance that has seized both Congress and the public. At least some of this disenchantment has resulted from the way in which the program is generally presented and "sold." Most often it is depicted as an inconvenient but necessary burden of limited duration rather than as a persuasive and proper priority in the context of our enduring national interest and welfare.

The efforts to obtain year-by-year approval for aid have been characterized, too, by inflated slogans and simplifications and a profusion of study committees and reorganizations which have all added to a sense of futility rather than coherence. By seeming to promise too much too soon, disillusioned criticism has become more intense and destructive, and public confidence has eroded.

This underscores a third and paradoxical reality. The remarkable and rapid success of the Marshall Plan, our formative national experience with foreign aid, has now proven most costly in maintaining popular support for the more challenging, frustrating, and protracted task of aiding the less developed world. The earlier experience, when our aid was essentially financial and applied to an area with an abundance of human and political resources, was much more congenial to the American temperament. It had a beginning and end, and there appeared to be a clear validity to what we were doing. By contrast, aid today seems shapeless, endless, and diffuse.

But beyond these relatively fixed obstacles, there is also today a special conspiracy of circumstance which adds to the bleakness of recent performance and future prospect.

The disparities between defense and foreign assistance spending is constantly and rapidly widening. The ratio is now approximately 25 to 1. To activate the battleship "New Jersey" for service in Vietnam will have cost \$25 million. This is as much as all the technical assistance contemplated for India and Pakistan in the next fiscal year. The cost of the new aircraft carrier, "John F. Kennedy," is 50 per cent more than all the funds requested for Africa for the coming year. Yet the Congress has further cut the sums for technical assistance and for Africa.

It would, I believe, be a mistake to assume that, if an end to the conflict in Vietnam comes, the amounts saved on defense could be applied to foreign aid and domestic needs. Such a transfer of funds is most unlikely under present political conditions. Foreign aid simply does not now possess in the public mind the tangible values of bigger defense. A \$12 billion supplemental bill for defense can gain almost automatic passage; a \$½ billion supplemental for aid would be a slow ordeal unless a crisis situation were involved. Never has there been such a distortion of relative amounts between aid and defense, and never has there been such a disproportion of effort in these two areas of national policy.

What has added most to these strains in the last two or three years is the evaporation in the intensity of commitment of many liberals who formerly espoused a vigorous

foreign aid program. Though it is not easy to take an X-ray of public feelings about foreign aid, it is a fact that public opinion polls have registered a slow and steady decline in support. Barely 50 per cent of those queried now feel that a foreign aid program is desirable. Every poll and sounding draws dissatisfaction with at least some aspect of the aid program and increasing doubt about its total efficacy.

To measure public attitudes is to sense more and more that foreign aid in the public mind has come to embrace a myriad of tangential issues. Foreign aid soaks up just about every grievance about our international position. Its consideration in Congress has become a vacuum cleaner of every old bone of controversy and every bit of debris that may have been deposited on the political premises. So, too, among the public there is much indifference to economic assistance in the abstract, but there are strong convictions about aid to Nasser, or trading with certain communist states, or war in South Asia, or mercenaries in the Congo. For some, foreign aid becomes the breeder of crises and foreign aid bills, the spreaders of contagion. Almost always, therefore, aid legislation is considered in a highly emotional atmosphere, and it is a magnet for restrictive amendments.

The politician is as responsible for this as is an unguided public mood. What foreign aid has increasingly suffered in the last three years is a double assault from traditional foe and disillusioned friend. The motivation of a conservative reductionist in the House of Representatives or a concerned liberal in the U.S. Senate is not the same, but the end result is often similar. The old, conservative fears of wasting precious assets and underpinning generally unfriendly and radical regimes are now accompanied by the new fatalism of liberals who feel that aid is the handmaiden of military commitment and the chief auxiliary of impacted involvement in the inner affairs of countless countries. The Vietnam war has done most to provide the occasion for these new fears, but there are any number of other well-springs to nourish them if that conflict subsides.

The new critics, most notably in the Senate, have performed some service. They remind us that there are no certain cures through aid, that aid programs inevitably affect the dynamics of domestic politics in recipient countries, and that there can be an overinvestment of hope in short-term or crash programs of foreign assistance. They properly remind us too that our aid should not just be a counter-punching exercise against Soviet or Chinese initiatives. Indeed, the record of communist failure in their aid programs well exceeds our own—especially in Indonesia and Africa in the case of China, and in the Middle East, Cuba, and China itself for the Soviet Union.

But these opponents have surely weighted the aid program with a burden of responsibility it should not have to bear. They vastly distort by depicting aid as a ruthless underdog which sweeps away our political options abroad and destroys opportunities for social action at home. In turn, Congress has tended to exacerbate this critical mood, since foreign aid bills are generally the only concrete opportunities for legislative influence to be exerted on the conduct of foreign affairs.

To an unusual degree, foreign aid support is also being eroded by counsels of perfection. Purity of doctrine often supersedes all other considerations. To demand from recipient countries a too rigid adherence to prescribed political forms and standards of administrative efficiency, long-range planning, tax and land reform, social equity—greater even than would be demanded in a domestic program—is to hamper prospects for progress. If preconditions are too numerous and onerous, a recipient will either have to refuse aid or find itself ineligible. These conditions are, in fact,

the end products which aid is intended to foster—not the fixed prerequisites. Transformation should come with the support of aid, not the reverse.

Discussions of military assistance are vexed by a similar perfectionism. The debates in Congress in the past two years have sharpened an awareness that some military programs endure by mere inertia and some add fuel to local arms races, thereby eroding stability and draining scarce resources from the task of nation-building. But to say, as some erstwhile friends of foreign aid have said this year, that it would be better to have no aid at all rather than see the Department of Defense engaged as an arms broker to poor nations is equally dangerous. To remove all discretion from the executive and to dogmatize universally about the evils of military assistance is to smother the national interest rather than define it.

A final example of false perfectionism is the tendency of Congress to over-extol the virtues of continuous oversight and review. Self-criticism and accountability to Congress are highly desirable but, unrelieved, they can also be oppressive and unproductive, not only for our own aid administrators but for those in recipient nations as well. Almost all parts of the foreign aid program are now subject to annual review by the foreign affairs and appropriations committees of both Houses of Congress. There has usually been little mesh between the views of the parallel committees in House and Senate or the two in each body. Moreover, the consideration of the Foreign Aid Bill usually extends to the furthest extremity of each session of Congress, so that a new bill must be sent to Congress only weeks after the previous one has been enacted.

President Kennedy and Senator Fulbright strenuously sought to raise the authorization period to several years to permit adequate planning, but their proposals failed to get Congressional approval. More recently, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has tried unavailing and without echo in the Senate to obtain a two-year authorization. With a two-year cycle, the whole battle would not have to be fought all over again year after year. Yet each new Congress would not lose the opportunity to make needed changes and evaluate progress.

Here again counsels of perfection in fact hinder public understanding. The excessive debate and maneuvering over foreign assistance give the public the impression that the program is much bigger than it is and make it difficult for success and progress to receive attention. The atmosphere is too litigious for good public policy. There is too much overhead—in energies absorbed and time consumed—necessarily applied by the administrators of foreign aid to the defense of the program. Accountability in excess can be as sterile as complacent neglect.

Finally, the over-all decline and the very narrow margins of tolerance in Congressional support for the program have also increased the temptation of friend and foe alike to force the administration to accept irresponsibly restrictive or crippling amendments. By each threat the already vulnerable program is put in peril, and small dedicated groups in Congress are able to extract the maximum price for their support of the final aid package in exchange for their favorite "Christmas Tree" amendment.

If there are to be new beginnings in aid—rather than the painful perpetuation of the bare minimum—it will require all developing nations in concert to mount a fresh strategy. By any reckoning, the combined flow of both public and private assistance to developing countries must be greatly increased—perhaps doubled by 1975, if there is to be an adequate rate of real growth in developing countries. During this next interval we must have a new statement and assessment of the potentials and sources of international assist-

ance. This must not be just another structural reordering of our aid administration. Such administrative permutations are secondary, and there is real question whether the patient is now too weak to survive major surgery. Any new reorganization should flow from a new level of effort, not be a substitute for it.

We should now maturely understand that 1967 is not 1947 when we could devise a five-year program of economic regeneration. But President Woods of the World Bank has aptly pointed out that "we may be back to a sort of 1947, a time of decision in which we may either turn toward our problems or away from them." Mr. Woods recommended a "grand assize" by experts from the developing countries similar to the panoramic studies made under the direction of Sir Oliver Franks and Averell Harriman before the Marshall Plan took final form. "Today," said Mr. Woods, "it is high time to work out a similar perspective of the problems of growth in the less developed countries, and to draw for all to see, a generally comprehensive, objective and expert picture of where we are and where we can go from here." There is now a basis of experience and a perception of previously buried issues which would make such a reconnaissance more than a stale rehearsal of old facts. There is also a more sober realization in many recipient countries of what can realistically be achieved by their own resources as well as by aid.

The notion that such a moment for an international strategy has come is enhanced by Mr. McNamara's selection as President of the World Bank. Not only does he have the stature and capacity to mobilize such a venture, but he has always had a clear and forthright view of the inadequacy of military means as the only basis of security and stability. In his remarkable speech last year in Montreal, he pointed out that poverty and violence are partners in poor countries, just as in poor ghettos at home. By his analysis, the belief that economic development is more unsettling than continued stagnation does not hold. There is much more evidence to sustain the argument that security progresses with development and that economic growth will be more likely to prevent military involvement by Western nations than promote it. There is, in his view, an "irrefutable relationship between violence and economic backwardness," especially when, in a few years, the total number of restless young people under fifteen in the Southern half of the planet will equal the total population of the developed countries in the North. "We have come to identify 'security' with military hardware," he said. "But it just isn't so. . . . And we need to accommodate to the facts of the matter if we want to see security survive and grow in the Southern half of the globe."

At a time when military budgets the world over exceed \$160 billion, and when the real national income of most developed states is rising at least 3 to 4 per cent annually, there is neither logic nor wisdom—but clearly great danger—in the deceleration of aid. Whatever one's position on Vietnam, whatever one's sense of limited progress in other areas of the world, we cannot neglect the basic threats posed by the economic division between rich and poor. We act too often as if we lacked any capacity to meet this threat.

"We may," says Mr. Woods, "have stolen the Promethean fire but at present we do little more than complain that it is burning our fingers." The Vietnam confrontation is a serious one that must be resolved, but what would its solution in terms of world security achieve if India or Indonesia slip into hopeless chaos in the interim? To opt out of international assistance would be just as crippling a blow to our influence as would be a defeat on the battlefield.

The hard facts of life concerning aid to developing nations—its duration, its scale, its inevitable errors, its crucial importance

to the American people—must be forthrightly set before us and dramatically redefined. It is a sad commentary that disillusion with a reduced program compounds the damage, because it comes at the very time that a good number of recipient nations are finally reaching the stage where aid is showing effective and growing impact. It is senseless that of the two main instruments for the conduct of foreign policy—arms and aid—we throttle down the least costly and the most humane.

We must condition ourselves to the fact that, as David Rockefeller has said: "The shaping of viable political, social and economic institutions in the backward areas is a plodding process at best." To such a candid portrayal public opinion will not be resistant. If aid policy has forthright clarity, and if it is a part of an international strategy of growth, and if other countries seize the occasion and raise their contributions, then there is a chance for reestablishing a commitment in this country to new enterprise and an infusion of new talents. At the very moment that prospects are gloomiest, the ingredients of a new development strategy may be forming. However, time is short.

Hon. Bernard A. Grossman Comments on Theater Subsidies

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Hon. Bernard A. Grossman, the distinguished former president of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, is now chairman of that organization's Law of the Theater Committee. In such capacity he has conducted some of the outstanding symposia in recent years on matters theatrical, including, among others, one that became a best seller on the subject of "Financing a Theatrical Production."

A recent edition of *Variety*, the "theatrical bible," carried his comments on subsidies as follows:

We are now in an era where "take it easy" follows closely after "hello"; where the one-time 40-hour workweek is on the way down to 30 hours; and where, mirabile dictu, man's mental work, as well as his physical will soon be done for him by machines.

This will be the death of many of our sacred epigrams about the nobility of labor. Average-man, in ever growing numbers, will no longer do any appreciable amount of work. He will have a heretofore unimaginable leisure.

Yet behind this "idyll" there will be uneasiness and tensions. Man will not find it easy to live in a society in which he has few of the old responsibilities; where the task of improving himself is optional, and where a citizen can choose to do little or nothing, or just sit on a park bench.

The idea, and the appeal of subsidies to theatre is based on this world-to-come. Government and industry are planning to solve the inevitable. It is their aim to fill the workweek with a substitute with social significance.

The fundamental theory behind this is good. This Committee on the Theatre, of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut supports it, in principle.

Mr. Grossman has written me that he "notes with regret that Congress has cut

subsidies for the arts and humanities program, and, therefore, for the theater."

After presenting his usual cogent, concise and comprehensive analysis of the need, with which I certainly concur, he concluded:

Hopefully, our United States poverty programs will not be directed at low income, alone, but at low culture, too; and colleges across the country will continue to be able to use theatre as an inseparable part of education.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will be keenly interested in the views espoused by Mr. Grossman, and, I trust, persuaded thereby.

The Negro Urban Slum

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in the city of Chicago in my State of Illinois, a unique, privately initiated ghetto renewal program is getting under way. Called "toward responsible freedom," and sponsored by the Community Renewal Society which is an 85-year-old organization devoted to serving the inner city, the program seeks massive renewal of a ghetto area of about 50,000 population through community organization, rehabilitating homes, raising earned income levels, improving education, training, health and welfare, and offering legal assistance.

Primarily "toward responsible freedom" seeks business involvement, and business is in many instances seeking counsel as to what form its inner city involvement shall take. Donald L. Benedict, executive director of the Community Renewal Society and one of the knowledgeable white men in America on ghetto conditions, set forth some fresh and provocative guidelines for business in a recent address before a national public relations seminar at Palo Alto, Calif. Because of their relevance in the current urban situation, I ask unanimous consent that this address may be included in the RECORD.

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

THE NEGRO URBAN SLUM: AMERICA'S NO. 1 DOMESTIC PROBLEM

(By Dr. Donald L. Benedict, executive director, Community Renewal Society, Chicago, Ill., before the 18th annual social science seminar for public relations leaders, Palo Alto, Calif., February 14, 1968)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset I must be boldly frank about my own ability to comprehend the present urban crisis. For 28 years I have lived and worked in the ghettos of American cities—in Harlem, Newark, Detroit, East Harlem, Cleveland and now Chicago—but I must confess that the longer I have been involved, the more massive and complex have the problems appeared. This feeling has led to neither despair nor paralysis, but it has led to a deep conviction that the urban slum ghetto is the most difficult and serious problem ever to confront our nation. I would go so far as to say that our very survival is dependent upon

its solution. The seriousness of the current crisis and the accompanying black rebellion was underscored by John Gardner who said as he left the Cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, "No society can live in constant tumult. We will have either a civil order in which discipline is internalized in the breast of each free and responsible citizen or, sooner or later, we will have repressive measures designed to re-establish order." (Reported in Time magazine, February 2, 1968.)

Ever since the riots of last summer, our predicament has become clear. The black people of America are convinced that rioting does seem to produce change. Yet at the same time rioting is creating a deep and hostile backlash that could lead to repressive measures against the black community. We are therefore confronted with the question of whether basic changes in our social, economic and political system can be made with sufficient speed to head off the collision course we are at present pursuing. One of the most encouraging signs on the horizon is the emerging response of the business community to the urban crisis.

No doubt the private corporation has much to contribute to the solution of this crisis. However, even with the help of business, this will not be easy. Ghetto residents are not necessarily filled with trust and admiration for the business community. Companies will have to win their way. Even business may have some built-in limitations, such as the maximization of profits, that will make dealing with the ghetto increasingly difficult. What if the ghetto turns out not to be a profitable market? How far can profit-oriented corporations go with such ventures of good works? I suppose that each company will have to decide this question for itself, but there is some validity to the argument that unless appropriate action is taken by all of us, there may be no society left from which to seek profits.

In attempting to point to some possible courses of action for the business community, I have divided this talk into three related parts. First, some assumptions underlying the definition of the problem; second, some guidelines for action by business organizations; third, a proposed concrete model for action called "Toward Responsible Freedom."

I. ASSUMPTIONS BASED ON THE DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

When one looks critically at the urban crisis, there are certain basic assumptions which emerge from a careful definition of the problem. First, the current plight of the urban black poor is quite unlike that of any other group that has made its way on to the American economic escalator. This group of poor people is black and in a country filled with deep hostility toward people of color, this presents a continuing problem in their drive for upward mobility. Whether we like it or not, we have to face the fact that there is a tight system of racism in America which makes this problem more than a personal individual problem. It is a corporate problem. Any long-term solution of the urban crisis means that the corporate system of racism must be destroyed. This necessitates corporate or collective action as well as individual initiative.

Second, the problem is not just one of being poor. While it is true that the black poor receive the poorest education, the worst housing, inadequate representation before the courts and, in general, the least in the way of city services, they are confronted with an even deeper problem. One might call this the people problem. Basically the black poor are also afflicted with a destructive self-image brought on by years of facing a discriminatory system. They characteristically possess a deep sense of alienation and rage accompanied by a feeling of hopelessness which destroys internal confidence and appears as

apathy. We have seen the expression of this self-rage in the recent rioting. Any program which does not adequately deal with this people problem is doomed to failure. Houses and schools can be built and jobs offered, but unless the people problem is realistically faced, there can be few solutions to the ghetto crisis.

Third, many people are now coming to realize that the problems inherent in the urban crisis are interrelated. In the past, people concerned with the urban crisis often sought solutions on the basis of their own interests. Many companies, because their handle was jobs, saw jobs as the prime target. Others saw education as the sole answer. Still others have been convinced that housing was the key to the solution of the urban crisis. One might also add that some who have sensed the people problem advocate marching on City Hall so that "Mr. Charlie" would become aware of the problem and fix it as he has always done in the past. A recent editorial in Fortune points up clearly this new awareness of the interrelatedness of urban problems. "The new wisdom about the cities begins with an awareness that race and housing and jobs and education and welfare all interact. Coping effectively with any one of these generally requires coping with several others at the same time. In place of experts, then, we need the kind of systematic thinking that is accustomed to tackling problems with many variables." (Fortune, page 128, January, 1968.) The fact is that the urban slum ghetto is an interrelated system created by the breakdown of a variety of social forces. Such an understanding leads one to the necessity of a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the problem.

Fourth, there is an obvious lack of technical skill available in the slum ghetto. By and large, those with functional skills have made it out to greener pastures. Therefore, there arises not only the problem of skill and know-how in dealing with ghetto problems but also the accompanying problem of getting slum people to accept such advice and training from outside sources. Ghetto residents find advice by whites almost completely unacceptable and find it difficult to accept the word of their black brothers if these brothers live outside the area and are associated with what is looked upon as the establishment. New and creative ways must be found to make the skill and know-how of the broad community acceptable in the ghetto.

Along with, and closely related to, technical know-how is the lack of what one may call problem-solving or decision-making machinery. Often ghetto groups can be organized to exhibit great hostility and militancy but do not possess the problem-solving or decision-making structure to creatively find necessary solutions. This lack must also be defined as part of the problem.

Fifth, it should be obvious to all that the urban slum ghetto lacks investment capital. Like an underdeveloped country, it is seen as a high-risk area where greater profits will be required to make investment profitable. This becomes clear in terms of higher housing rentals, higher insurance rates and a double standard of prices at grocery stores. Now many corporations are beginning to see the ghetto as a great untapped market for their products. This may well be the case but if we merely continue to allow capital from outside the ghetto to cream off the profit, we will not have brought the ghetto into participation in the economic system. We must find a way for money invested in the ghetto to circulate there and to increase the investment potential of the ghetto residents. The ghetto must be seen as an undercapitalized, underdeveloped country which must itself amass some capital investment in order to compete in its own market. Lack of high-risk seed capital is a basic part of the ghetto problem.

There may well be other and even more important facets in the definition of the problem of the urban ghetto. However, any corporation hoping to make a contribution to the solution of this crisis would be well advised to have a clear definition of the problem before setting out to solve it.

II. SOME GUIDELINES FOR ACTION BY BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

A. Guidelines for administration

Given the above definition of the problem, I would suggest certain guidelines for action by business organizations that might prove helpful. The first such guideline seems so obvious that it should not need to be stated. Yet I discover that business firms, like social agencies and the churches, have great difficulty in the human relations field when following effective principles of business administration. Quite simply, the criteria used in business administration must be used as far as possible in determining the validity of ghetto programs. Namely the questions of efficiency, result orientation, performance and evaluation must be built into ghetto programs just as they are in other business enterprises. It is true that some of the human variables may be more difficult to evaluate but there is a surprising number of new techniques of evaluation that must be injected into current and proposed programs. I find that company policy in relation to corporate gifts is often based on past political consideration. I will give to your charity, and you give to mine. Emotional attachments to certain institutions which now may be the most paternalistic and damaging often dictate company giving. The relatively small amount of money available for corporate giving must be used in the most effective and efficient way possible. In other words, evaluate the results of your current contributions with a view to results. Remember that the emerging urban crisis will take sophisticated programs. The problem has changed, which seems to indicate that programs to meet the problem may well require radical change in emphasis and orientation.

For this reason every corporation should set aside some of its corporate gifts for demonstration and exploration with high-risk programs. Research and development will be needed as much in the solution of the urban crisis as it is in your own business. Some of the major foundations are seeing this clearly and are reorienting the direction of their grants.

B. Guidelines for program planning

Beyond the normal criteria for effective administration of programs, there are special criteria related to effective ghetto programming that should be delineated. There are at least six such guidelines that may prove helpful.

1. Develop a Total Strategy

Often business concerns base their total corporate gifts program on proximity to their plant or workers. No doubt these are basic factors that must be taken into consideration, but I would plead for the development of a total strategy. We have to see the metropolis as a unit. The most explosive and needy ghetto area may not possess sufficiently strong corporations to develop an effective program. It may be that groups of companies should turn their attention on certain difficult areas whether their plant is directly involved or not. Likewise, companies must be alert to promising demonstration programs whether they happen to be in their neighborhood or not. In fact, with the current trend of companies moving out of the ghetto neighborhoods, a policy of strictly neighborhood giving may not get at some of our most explosive areas.

2. Recognize the Interlocking Circle of Urban Problems

As I indicated in the definition of the problem, there is no simple answer to the

urban crisis. Jobs, training, motivation, housing, education, legal assistance, and health and welfare needs are all interlocked. They constitute the culture of poverty. It is at this very point that some companies may be most helpful in seeking solutions to the urban crisis. Some systems engineers are beginning to see the city as a total systems complex, attempting to interrelate all its demographic, economic, social and physical components in a search for integrated solutions.

Perhaps it is too early to assess the value of this approach, but certainly the attempt to interrelate the complex variables of the city organism should be encouraged. It would seem that the infinite variables of human behavior might make this systems approach impossible but then, a few years ago, a trip to the moon seemed impossible, too. Indeed, if Americans would work at the ghetto problem with the same innovation and ingenuity used in the space program, we might soon expect some reasonable solutions. At any rate it is apparent that the urban crisis is not going to be solved by just more jobs or the lowering of employment standards. We are in fact faced with a highly complex and interlocking set of factors which have produced the urban crisis. Consequently, solutions may well appear to be complex and interlocking.

3. How the Money Is Spent May Be as Important as How Much

Given the prevailing mood of the ghetto black man, money spent in the ghetto will have to have as few strings as possible. Black Americans are on a radical "do it yourself" kick. The "white establishment" has told them how to do things for too long. Indicative of this mood was the rejection of \$500,000 by Detroit black militants when they were told they could get the money only if they cooperated with the black moderates. It is going to be increasingly difficult for business groups as well as foundations to determine the use of their money in the ghetto. Likewise, we must be prepared to see funds used against the self-interest of the donor. Gifts by companies to ghetto groups seeking solutions to urban problems are not going to deter such groups from being critical of corporations or even in taking action against them. To accept the use of company funds in this manner will require a high degree of maturity and sophistication on the part of company boards of directors as well as stockholders.

4. Self-Help and Self-Determination Are Cardinal Principles for the Solution of the Urban Crisis

The economic and social development of the ghetto will require absolute self-help and self-determination. This will require great skill on the part of American companies. Even Fortune with all of their know-how drops back into the old paternalism syndrome when in an editorial they say: "A single contract might, for example, involve designing as well as building houses for slum dwellers and providing them with social services, ranging from child care to vocational training. . . . What mainly has to be done for urban Negroes right now concerns jobs." We are not used to taking seriously the wishes and desires of people who are powerless. Yet if ghetto people are going to turn the cycle of poverty they are going to have to participate in decision-making. There is a vast and comprehensive management training program needed in the urban ghettos. Such a program must be based in on-the-job problem solving. It must take with seriousness the necessity of self-help and self-determination. Perhaps this will be one of the most difficult adjustments for companies to make. Managers are so enamored with their own decision-making that they may approach the ghetto as a department of the company rather than as an autonomous division.

Ghetto neighborhoods themselves must form autonomous development organizations capable of creating a human environment through corporate action. In essence the goal of urban ghetto programs should be the creation of black indigenous neighborhood organizations capable of enlisting the whole community in decision-making processes so that ownership and therefore control of the community will be in the hands of local residents. This, after all, has always been the American dream. The question is: Will American businesses give of their money and skill toward the development of this kind of self-determining organization? I think they will because they are pragmatists enough to know that this is the only type of development process that will work in the sense that it will enlist local residents in the battle of the slums. People will participate if they are responsible for the decisions.

5. Business Corporations Should Establish a New Pigeonhole for Urban Giving

Many companies, foundations and churches have already recognized the urban crisis by establishing a special gift category to be used in the urban crisis. This has meant, at least on the part of the churches, that many of our old programs related to the urban ghetto were not effective. Just to be giving to worthy causes is no longer acceptable. Christmas baskets and old clothes or company parties for the neighborhood poor may be intensifying the problem. This will require that business be flexible and imaginative as it looks at urban programs. No group or agency should be ruled out on the basis of their sponsorship. It is their program protection and performance that is crucial. I would be so bold as to suggest that even some churches agencies might have program proposals and a record of performance that may make a real contribution to the ghetto problem.

6. Business Centered in the Ghetto Will Require a Staff Buildup

In order for companies to effectively move into the arena of the urban crisis they will need to develop expert urban specialists who have had practical ghetto experience as well as being capable of strategy and program formulation. Dealing with the urban crisis requires a new kind of expertise. As Murray Lincoln, former President of Nationwide Insurance Company, indicated by the title of his autobiography, every company needs a "Vice President in Charge of Revolution." All of this is to say that companies through their giving policy and the detachment of men with specialized skills can make a real contribution to the solution of the urban crisis. However, it will take a major staffing job in most companies to make this a reality. I might add that the best sources of manpower I know are the large numbers of inner city pastors, many of whom have considerable expertise in slum problems but are leaving the church because it has not yet adequately redirected its priorities to move with power into the urban scene.

I hope that these suggested guidelines have indicated to you that business must be as innovative and adventuresome in applying its technical skills and resources to the ghetto crisis as it has been in the space program. What is required here are things as bold and progressive as business research and development units have produced, and as complex as the systems approach to long-term planning. Corporations have a habit of making long-term plans and getting results. This is what is needed in the attack on the ghetto, rather than just turning on water sprinklers at the last minute to cool the hot summer.

III. "TOWARD RESPONSIBLE FREEDOM" AS ONE GHETTO MODEL

In order to build a model program based on the five original assumptions, let me

briefly explain the "Toward Responsible Freedom" proposal of the Community Renewal Society in Chicago. This proposal has emerged out of 85 years' experience in the low-income areas of Chicago, especially with our recent work in community organization and the development of a low and moderate income housing program.

"Toward Responsible Freedom" is a \$3.5 million demonstration project to be developed in a neighborhood of approximately 50,000 people. We have researched the seven poverty areas of Chicago and have developed three major criteria for selection: duplicability, representativeness and size. The seven potential site communities are now being closely examined in relation to their physical renewal potential, resources potential—what kind of help could we expect from local business, churches and other agencies at work in the neighborhood, and receptivity potential—will the local leadership actually negotiate with us to develop this program? In short, do they want us?

When we are assured of a major portion of the organizing funds, we will begin negotiations with existing groups in a potential site community. If negotiations are successfully concluded, a contract spelling out the duties and responsibilities of the temporary organizing committee and the Society will be signed by both parties and an invitation will be extended to the Society to designate that community as the target area for TRF. At this point the community organization process will begin.

We have used the term "saturated community organization" to describe this process. The concern is to saturate the neighborhood with units of participation in which local residents can plan and act together on issues of common concern or around felt needs, even as existing organizations and institutions shall be enlisted and cultivated. After some nine months of intensive organizing effort, it is expected that the various organizational units will come together to create a Council of Community Organizations which would be the permanent decision making body and the most representative voice of the community. The precise structure of the Council will be determined by the residents of the neighborhood.

The emergence of the Council makes possible the next step in the process, i.e., the development of resource boards. These boards provide the means by which technical resources are generated and become acceptable to the Council. These resource boards operate as technical consultants to the Council with only advisory powers. We anticipate five resource boards—in earned income, housing, education and training, legal assistance and health and welfare.

The third major component of the Toward Responsible Freedom proposal is seed money or seed capital. While the proposal makes ample provision for program funds in the several areas represented by the resource boards, we have provided almost \$1 million to be used as a revolving investment fund by the Council for the purpose of development. Present budget estimates provide \$650,000 for business development, most of which will probably be done in cooperation with the Small Business Administration, and \$250,000 as seed capital for housing development.

As these funds are invested by the Council, using the appropriate resource board to test feasibility of a given proposal, and as the capital is returned or paid back, the money would be placed in a permanent revolving capital fund for community development by the Council.

Thus Toward Responsible Freedom proposes to build an indigenous development corporation which represents the people of the community and is equipped in terms of capital investment and technical skill to increase the ownership of the businesses and homes by the residents themselves. While I

do not have time here to develop all of the aspects of Toward Responsible Freedom, it is clear that this program can be seen as an advance risk program which may make possible a community stable enough to receive further investment of funds in the future.

This program will require a great deal of trust. Blacks will have to trust that whites will honor their word about self-help and self-determination. Whites will have to bury their myths that blacks cannot manage their own affairs.

But the real question is whether foundations, corporations and individuals will make finances available to ghetto residents so that they themselves can tackle the problem of the slums. We have witnessed a great deal of rhetoric lately, from all sectors of our society, proclaiming new programs aimed at alleviating the ghetto. There is no doubt that all sectors are awakening to the challenge. Yet here again I must ask the hard questions of all job training, business development, housing, education and legal programs. Are these programs developing indigenous, self-determining neighborhood organizations, and are they aiding local residents to build up equity in their community? Are they moving people toward self-help? Stated more graphically, the question might be simply: Will white power invest green power in black power in order to develop neighborhood power?

This is the critical question that must be faced by foundations and corporations. Today in every American city, we stand at a demonic and creative moment. Demonic in the sense that if we do not hear the cry of desperation from the ghetto, the whole fabric of our society may be rent asunder. Creative in the sense that ghetto leadership, with a new sense of confidence in blackness, is reaching out to deal constructively with complex and intricate problems which can lead to the fulfillment of the original American dream of equality and justice for all.

Hazards of Hard Pesticides

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a superb editorial appearing recently in the Trenton, Mich., Times setting forth the extraordinary hazard of hard pesticides to man and life on this earth.

While pesticides are necessary for man's survival on this earth, it becomes equally plain that wise and careful use of poisons this deadly are equally important to man's survival. Failure to take the care to lay out the orderly plans for the wise and careful use of DDT and other hard pesticides may have a result more disastrous to mankind than to the plant and insect enemies that they are used against.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE CASE AGAINST HARD PESTICIDES

Michigan has come to a point in its history when it must outlaw the use of highly destructive pesticides such as DDT, Dieldrin, Aldrin, Heptachlor, Endrin, Lindane, Chlordane, and other "hard" or persistent chemical compounds.

Threats of fire, pestilence, and plague against our natural resources are as nothing compared to the pervasive and sinister attacks of such chemicals. They have now polluted our environment to the extent that

we no longer eat any food or drink any fluid without swallowing at least minute quantities of these chemicals.

DDT is found in the waters of the Arctic and Antarctic Oceans, thousands of miles from any area where it has ever been used. It is found in fish life of the deep oceans. It is found inside the eggs of hawks and ospreys and falcons—eggs which do not hatch for birds whose numbers are now in decline. We kill robins, our state symbol, and prevent the birth of bald eagles, our national symbol, with these pesticides.

Two years ago, a U.S. Public Health Service study showed that the average American has gathered 12 parts per million of DDT into his human fatty tissue. Nursing mothers now impart .08 parts per million of DDT in human milk given their infants.

Frankly, no one knows what 12 parts per million fatty tissue means. But we know it's going to stay there and that DDT in far smaller concentrations has awesome consequences for many small or simple forms of animal life.

We have already allowed ourselves to be carried much too far down this hazardous road. We have until recently condoned use of such chemicals even in the Department of Conservation, and we have in the past used them to reduce forest insects, park pests, and fish and game problems. We are all sheep in the same herd, and the real fight is not against some distant state or federal bureau, or lone farmer, or crop-dusting pilot.

The real fight is against ourselves. Are you, as an urban, or suburban householder, willing to pay twenty-five cents a pound for apples where you now pay twenty cents? Will you accept higher prices when crops come home in short supply?

Individually and collectively, we enjoy big, luscious wormless fruits and vegetables available at every market, and we fail to question the individual farmer or rose-grower when crops and flowers are dusted, several times each year. But we should question them, and we should question ourselves. The weight of evidence against these hard, or persistent chemicals is now so overwhelming that there is no longer any doubt of the need to end their use.

These chemicals are mainly used in agriculture to control insect pests, and without question they appear to be highly effective. Generally they are spread as dust or in a fine spray that blankets an entire area. Unfortunately, this blanket keeps slipping off the bed.

One study shows that up to half of all DDT spread by crop-dusting airplanes does not settle, but escapes instead into the atmosphere. If not spread by airplane, such chemicals are carried from croplands by the runoff of rainwaters or melting snow, or by any vagrant breeze.

As a result, DDT and other similar chemicals are now found in every major river system of the United States, in all the Great Lakes and all our inland lakes, in soil organisms, and in virtually all human and animal life on which studies have been carried out.

Saddest of all, DDT, the most persistent of the bunch, loses only half its potency over a period of 10 to 15 years. If all further use of these chemicals were halted right now, we would still have to live with the effects of our past excesses for more than a generation.

Crime and Civil Disorders

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Honorable Herbert T. Jenkins, chief of police

in Atlanta, Ga., rendered great and valuable service to this Nation as a member of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. I was honored to work with him and the other members of that Commission.

Chief Jenkins spoke to the Atlanta Rotary Club on March 11, 1968. I believe his remarks will be of great interest, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ATLANTA POLICE DEPARTMENT
(By Chief Herbert T. Jenkins)

1967 was not a particularly bright and happy year from the standpoint of law enforcement.

Crime and civil disorders increased over the nation last year at an alarming rate.

Crime and civil disorders have one thing in common—they are both a violation of the law.

There is no common cause for crime—therefore, there is no common cure, but a combination of many things.

The same thing applies to civil disorders and riots.

Generally crimes are committed by repeaters . . . the same person committing the same crime month after month, and year after year.

They are released on bond—parole—appeal bond—or they have escaped from the penitentiary.

If a robbery or most any other major crime is committed in this building or in the street, the odds are about ten to one that when the perpetrator is caught and identified, it will be a person who has committed the same crime previously and has been caught before.

Crime increased 17% across the nation last year.

In Atlanta crime increased 4% and the clear-up record here is much better than the national average.

Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. and the Atlanta Commission on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency chaired by Federal Judge Griffin Bell, have declared that Atlanta must be the most crime free city in the nation.

I wish to assure you that the 1,007 full time employees in the Atlanta Police Department are trained to try and achieve these goals.

Law enforcement is extremely expensive and is becoming more complex and complicated every day.

The cost is about \$8,000.00 annually in Atlanta to select, train, equip and assign one police officer.

In New York City it is about \$12,000.00 annually.

There are many who believe that police salaries are still inadequate and when we consider the hazards and demands made on a police officer, we must agree.

It is not possible to furnish every American citizen 100% security and 100% freedom at the same time, for the simple reason, when security is strengthened, freedom is weakened, and vice versa.

Maximum security for any single location, restricts the freedom of movement, and requires constant police guard, often armed with a shot gun.

Such security not only creates the problem of inconvenience, but it is extremely expensive.

For one police officer to be on duty, around the clock, seven days per week would require the services of five police officers, and the annual cost is in excess of \$40,000.00.

On July 27, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson by executive order, appointed a National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The Commission consisted of eleven members—a governor, a mayor, four members of Congress, a business man, a labor union leader, a civil rights leader, a lady, and a chief of police.

Governor Otto Kerner was appointed Chairman.

Mayor John B. Lindsay was appointed Vice Chairman.

Mr. David Ginsburg was appointed Executive Director.

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to have served on such a distinguished commission.

This was the greatest honor and the greatest challenge that ever came my way.

The Commission held its first meeting with President Johnson at the White House on July 29, 1967.

After administering the oath of office, President Johnson informed the Commission of the seriousness of the civil disorders that the cities had experienced in the last two years.

This was supported by all the information and reports that the President had received.

The President said this commission was to take top priority over all other commissions and that all the facilities and personnel of the Federal Government would be made available to assist.

The President also said that civil disorders can be stopped—they must be stopped—and they will be stopped.

The President instructed the Commission to determine: What happened, why it happened, and what must be done to keep it from happening again and again. And to furnish him a report with recommendations.

I left the White House that day with a very strong feeling that this nation is extremely fortunate in having Lyndon B. Johnson as Commander in Chief during these very trying times.

It was—and it is my belief—that he is a very dedicated and able man, and tough enough to do the job.

Again this belief was confirmed when President Johnson made a very fine and timely speech to the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Kansas City on September 14th.

The Commission started holding meetings immediately in Washington and visited several of the cities that suffered the greatest damage.

Mr. David Ginsburg established a very fine organization to do the staff work.

Most of the staff personnel was drafted from other agencies and numbered more than 100.

The full commission questioned more than 130 witnesses for twenty full days, that included governors, mayors, chiefs of police, rioters, and everyone else concerned with civil disorders.

The Commission heard conflicting reports from many sources as to what happened—why it happened—and what must be done to keep it from happening again and again.

Most of the witnesses were well qualified to give expert testimony in their respective fields.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was one of the first witnesses before the Commission.

He testified that the FBI does not have any evidence of a conspiracy in last summer's disorders.

This was reconfirmed by letter, signed by Mr. Hoover, dated February 27, 1968.

All of the testimony and reports given to the Commission were recorded.

They were re-read and studied many times by the commission and the staff.

It was necessary, for obvious reasons, for the commission to receive much testimony off the record and in confidence.

This confidence has been completely honored and respected.

But since the report has been completed and printed, all of the reports and files are

being turned over to the Federal Archives and they will be opened for public inspection in accordance with the rules of the Archives.

What happened last summer?

The facts are—more than 100 American cities were threatened with civil disorders.

Fifty-two American cities suffered civil disorders, street fighting and riots that caused widespread death and injuries to the population and the police of these cities.

Looting and burning was responsible for property damages that cost many millions of dollars.

The local police in most of these cities kept the situation under reasonable control and held property damages to a minimum, but there were many arrests and some deaths or injuries, and damages in all of these cities.

The local police in some of these cities failed to maintain law and order, and when the situation had gotten out of control, it was necessary to call on the State Police and the National Guard to restore order, and in one city it was necessary to call on the U.S. Army to come in and restore order.

Most witnesses appearing before the commission gave their version as to why it happened.

To simply say that it was debatable and controversial is an understatement.

It was apparent from the beginning, that of all the many contributing factors, racism was the most prominent cause, and racists come in only two colors—Black and White.

It was also apparent from the beginning that law and order, with equal justice for all, must be the first order of business, and that there are no greater priorities.

Senator Everett Dirksen was quoted recently as saying, "the first responsibility of government is to protect itself."

The Commission said, "preserving civil peace is the first responsibility of government, and unless the rule of law prevails, our society will lack not only order, but also the environment essential to social and economic progress."

Whatever words are used, I believe this is one point that we can all agree on.

It was obvious from the beginning, that whatever the commission recommended, would be very expensive and to do nothing, perhaps would be much more expensive.

Most of the hearings were completed by December 1st.

The Commission made the decision at this point: Not to try and make an interim and a final report, not to try and make a long range and a short range report, but for the report to be most effective it must be a single report, and it must be completed by March 1st if it was going to be helpful in preventing civil disorders next summer.

The commission and the staff started working towards these goals—a complete report with a March 1st deadline.

The commission spent 24 full days between December 1st and March 1st, writing, reading, discussing, and rewriting the report.

Every chapter, every section and every paragraph was read, discussed and rewritten.

Every member of the commission had an opportunity to read, object, approve, amend, or rewrite every sentence and every word in the report, and some sections were discussed and rewritten as many as six times.

Most of the meetings were held in the Executive Building, adjacent to the White House, except for the last few weeks, they were held in the Capitol so that those members of the commission who were also members of Congress, could vote on important matters before the Congress—without being absent, except for just a few minutes.

By 2 P.M. on February 28th, the report was completed, with 17 chapters, plus the summary, the supplement, and the index.

This report contained more than 1000 pages and more than 200,000 words.

All members of the commission, without

hesitation, promptly signed the report and there was no minority report.

This was the most complete and conscientious investigation and report that I was ever privileged to participate in.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the ability and the sincerity of the other ten members of the commission, without exception or reservation.

This is especially true of David Ginsburg, the Executive Director, and his assistant, Victor Pomier.

Special attention should be given to the short range recommendations of the report that will be most helpful in preventing civil disorders and does not require additional funding or financing.

National legislation to control fire arms and a federal open housing law does not require any money.

The first two recommendations that the commission made, was for special riot control training for the National Guard and the local police departments.

This is now being done with very little extra cost.

135 chiefs of police and their city managers or mayors, have been meeting in small groups for one week during the month of February, in Washington, to discuss plans and training to prevent civil disorders next summer.

Regional training sessions for police captains and watch commanders will be held all over the nation for the next two months for all police departments that are interested in receiving such special training.

The report speaks for itself and places special emphasis on prevention.

The record will show that if riots are to be prevented, they must be prevented by local communities.

The only way to control a riot is to prevent it.

The alternative is battling in the streets with great loss of property, with death and injury to the participants, and great loss in local business.

Civil disorders simply paralyze local business.

The National Guard or the U.S. Army cannot prevent a riot.

They can stop it for sure—but they do not have the training nor the opportunity to prevent them.

The prevention of riots rests squarely on the shoulders of local police departments and they must have the full support of all public officials and all law abiding citizens, both black and white, if they are going to be successful.

Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., has already appointed a committee of city officials from all departments of the city, to study this report and to do everything it recommends, that we are not already doing, and that we can do.

Atlanta Police Department is doing the same thing.

The question most frequently asked is "what will happen to the American cities this summer?"

Well, no one knows for sure.

I have expressed a personal opinion: The riots this summer will be fewer in number, of shorter duration, but much more bloody.

I am much more optimistic about Atlanta.

Atlanta has some advantages over most cities, because: Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. and Judge Griffin Bell, and the Atlanta Commission on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency had the foresight more than two years ago, to study these problems and design a plan of action that has received very fine support from Atlanta's citizens.

The Atlanta Commission stated, among other things, that poverty and crime are twins that cannot be separated—one could not be improved without improving the other.

The Commission also found serious conflict and abrasions between the residents of poor Negro neighborhoods and the police.

They recommended that the police should employ police-community officers to improve these conditions, and that the over-all police training program should move rapidly in this direction.

We have followed these recommendations. You will find that the general thrust of the Atlanta report is included in the National report.

To outline our plan of action briefly here in Atlanta, I would like to report that we have 20 to 50 officers, predominantly Negro, assigned to the Crime Prevention Bureau, who work every day and night in EOA Centers in Negro neighborhoods.

They are getting acquainted with all the residents.

They are answering all of their complaints—including police complaints.

They are providing a social service and assistance, as well as police service for the community.

We have a Task Force of 40 predominantly Negro officers, that is commanded by a Negro Captain.

They are assigned to these same neighborhoods from 2:30 P.M. to 10:30 P.M. every day, and are furnishing a good tough police service for the law abiding citizens of the community.

We will increase the size of the Task Force as the weather gets warmer.

At the first signs of a tense situation, or any incident that might cause trouble, we will move the entire Crime Prevention Bureau into the neighborhood, followed by the Task Force.

We believe that they will be able to cool any situation quickly, but if they fail, we will move the Riot Squad right in behind them with helmets, night sticks, tear gas and shot guns.

At this point all other city departments will be activated and the police department will go on extra duty, 12 hours per day, seven days per week.

This act alone will more than double the police personnel on duty, so that we will not interfere with all the officers who are patrolling the other parts of the city, and it will give us an equal number of officers in the troubled area.

Retired U.S. Army General William R. Woodward is Director of Atlanta's Civil Defense Division.

He is the city's liaison with the Georgia National Guard and the U.S. Army.

He is a very important part of the city's over-all planning and training program.

He keeps the Adjutant General, George J. Hearn, and his staff briefed on all developments and activities.

We are planning for the worst, but working and hoping for the best.

Incidentally, Lt. General John L. Throckmorton, the general who commanded the Federal Troops in Detroit last summer, is now the commanding officer of the Third Army and stationed at Fort McPherson.

In conclusion I would like to say—the more I visit other cities and the more I talk with other officials, the more I appreciate Atlanta—Atlanta's citizens and Atlanta's Mayor.

Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. has a better understanding of all police problems, is better informed—and better prepared to do the job, than any other Mayor in America today.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 65th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Congress Should Investigate Chemical and Biological Warfare Activities

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, poison gases and other aspects of chemical and biological warfare are an extremely emotional subject producing understandable and predictable public outrage. Unfortunately, the hysteria often cloaks more substantive issues and tends to discourage the kind of detailed scrutiny which ought to be applied to such serious matters.

The New York Times, in an editorial of March 27, addresses this grave subject in a sober and important way. It calls attention to the dangerous and damaging effects that continued testing of such elements may have upon our own society. It points to the grave implications of two recent experiences—the recent death of 6,400 sheep near the Army's Dugway Proving Ground in Utah, and the likelihood of man-induced earthquakes in Denver following waste disposal of poison gas byproducts in deep underground wells—and the possibilities of further disasters in this secret and unseen area.

The New York Times editorial concludes:

A prompt Congressional or Presidential investigation of these dark military corners is much in order.

I certainly wish to underscore the Times position on the need for prompt investigation. I do not see how Congress can ignore this responsibility. I hope that this upsetting editorial will be read by all of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1968]

POISON GAS BOOMERANGS

The tight secrecy with which every country normally surrounds poison gas research, production and testing has recently been broken in the western United States by two terrifying disclosures.

One is the revelation that some seismologists believe Denver is threatened by a serious man-made earthquake in the next few years. This threat is posed by the changes in subsurface conditions produced since 1962 by 160 million gallons of poisonous waste water. The water, a byproduct of poison gas production, was poured down a well drilled more than two miles deep at an arsenal in the city's outskirts.

The second involves the mysterious death in Western Utah of some 6,400 sheep. The circumstances suggest strongly that their deaths were the unplanned consequences of chemical warfare tests a few days earlier at the Army's Dugway Proving Grounds.

Earlier this decade worldwide concern about radioactive pollution from nuclear weapons tests helped provide much of the push behind the limited nuclear test-ban treaty. In the wake of the Denver and Utah reports the question must arise of whether similar prohibitions are not required for poison gas production and testing as well. Certainly the extraordinarily dangerous qualities of these substances is testified to by the sheep slaughter and by the fact that the Army felt it necessary to drill a well two miles under the ground to dispose of the waste water generated during poison gas production. Unfortunately the commendable

zeal to avoid pollution of immediate subsurface waters in the Denver situation was not matched by adequate consideration of the cumulative geological impact of infusing such vast quantities of liquid into the deeper rocks.

The dead sheep cannot be revived and the problem at Denver is complicated by fears that efforts to pump out the waste water may actually increase the earthquake danger. Both incidents are merely the latest of the many serious warnings society has received in recent years about the extraordinary new environmental perils—many of them initially unrealized—flowing from modern technology. In this age of nuclear weapons, moreover, we wonder what benefits the nation receives from poison gases that could compensate for the boomerang effects already suffered and those now looming on the horizon. And if poison gases raise these dangers, what potential menaces lurk behind the screens that now shield biological warfare preparations from public scrutiny? A prompt Congressional or Presidential investigation of these dark military corners is much in order.

**Sandee Greaves Wins Seymour, Ind.,
Girls Club Citizenship Award**

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this excellent essay, written by Sandee Greaves, a Seymour, Ind., high school student who has been named winner of the community's annual Lucile M. Wright Citizenship Award.

Miss Greaves' essay will be submitted in regional competition sponsored by the Girls Club of America.

Miss Greaves, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Merle Greaves, has written an excellent expression of citizenship in which she outlines the kind of adult she is planning and working to be. It reads as follows:

ESSAY BY SANDEE GREAVES

As an American citizen I want to enjoy the privilege I have of living in the United States. I am proud in the realization that America didn't become such a wonderful country over night, but that it took the faith and hard work of many generations to build our democracy. This pride demands I show respect to national, state, country and city officials for the job they are trying to do.

"I hope to be a person who will take a few minutes to think before I speak in haste or anger, for words hurt more than any weapon, and are not soon forgotten. Accepting criticism isn't always easy to do, but I hope to be able to try and accept criticism with an open mind, realizing I will always have room for improvement. I hope I can be a citizen who stands up for my own ideals and standards. I want to be strong enough to say "no" in the face of pressure from others to join the crowd when I know what they suggested is wrong. I feel that to conform is the easy way out, but I must be strong to be an individual.

"I want to become a person who can accept responsibility, knowing once I accept a duty I can't quit before even trying my very best to see it through. In helping my community while teaching classes at the Girls Club, I have learned responsibility grows as an individual grows. I have become aware of how younger children look up to the older

ones for help, security, and comfort. As these future citizens are watching me I try to remember this. I hope the example they will see in me is someone who is well mannered, neat in appearance, helpful, and understanding of their childhood problems. I want to be a citizen who has enough faith in herself to use my opportunity to attend the college of my choice and attain a degree in speech and hearing therapy, a field I feel offers a chance for me to help others.

When I reach maturity and marry I want to be the type of parent who will welcome the responsibility of having children and raising them to know the difference between right and wrong. In giving my children a good sense of values it will be easier for me to trust them with the future of our country."

House Republican Policy Committee Statement on the Proposed Code of Official Conduct

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee urges the prompt consideration and enactment of House Resolution 1099. This resolution establishes a permanent Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, proposes a code of official conduct and requires the filing of certain financial data by Members and employees of the House of Representatives.

At the outset of the 90th Congress, the House Republican policy committee urged that a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct be established. We also urged that this committee be empowered to formulate a code of ethics and recommend rules and regulations to insure proper standards of conduct by Members and by officials and employees of the House.

On April 13, 1967, by a vote of 400 to 0, the House of Representatives established a temporary bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. This committee has held numerous hearings and conducted an exhaustive study into the matter of standards of conduct and a code of ethics for elected officials. As a result of these hearings and studies, it has submitted a detailed report and recommendations. These recommendations have been placed in the form of a House resolution—and this resolution—House Resolution 1099—is presently pending before the Rules Committee.

The provisions of House Resolution 1099, if enacted into law would:

First. Establish the present Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as a permanent standing committee of the House with powers to issue subpoenas, hold hearings and enforce standards of conduct.

Second. Require Members, officers, principal assistants to Members and officers and professional staff members to list the name and position of management held in any company doing a substantial business with the Federal Government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies in which such person has an ownership in excess of \$5,000 or from

which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. Also requires a listing of any professional organization in which the person reporting or his spouse is an officer, director or partner from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year, the source of any income for services rendered or any capital gain exceeding \$5,000, and any reimbursement for expenditures exceeding \$1,000. This information shall be maintained by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and shall be available for public inspection.

Third. Require Members, officers, and employees to list the fair market value and the income derived from each item or source that has been listed in a report and filed with the committee. This information shall remain sealed unless the committee determines that such information is essential in an official investigation. The committee may make public any portion of the information unsealed which it deems to be in the public interest.

Fourth. Establish the following code of official conduct:

Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives shall—

First. Conduct themselves at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House.

Second. Adhere to the spirit and the letter of the rules of the House and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof.

Third. Receive no compensation nor permit any to accrue to their beneficial interest, the receipt of which would occur by virtue of influence improperly exerted from their positions in the Congress.

Fourth. Accept no gifts of substantial value from any person, organization, or corporation having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress.

Fifth. Accept no honorarium for a speech, writing for publication, or other similar activity, from any person, organization, or corporation in excess of the usual and customary value for such services.

Sixth. Keep campaign funds separate from personal funds. No campaign funds shall be converted to personal use in excess of reimbursement for legitimate and verifiable prior campaign expenditures.

Seventh. Treat as campaign contributions all proceeds from testimonial or other fundraising events if the sponsors of such affairs do not give clear notice in advance to the donors or participants that the proceeds are intended for other purposes.

Eighth. Retain no one from their clerk-hire allowance who does not perform duties commensurate with the compensation he receives.

The enactment of House Resolution 1099 is an important step in meeting the criticism that has stemmed from the highly publicized allegations of misconduct against a few employees and Members of Congress. While it avoids undue restriction and provides procedural safeguards, it would establish a well-organized and reasonable set of standards of conduct for the Members and employees of Congress.

Public confidence in the legislative process and in the integrity of the Members, officers, and employees of Congress must be maintained and strengthened. We believe that this can be aided through the adoption and implementation of the proposed code of conduct. Such a code will play an important role in insuring that those who are elected and serve in positions of responsibility are in fact, as well as appearance, men and women of personal integrity who regard public service as a public trust.

What the Constitution Means to Me

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Wahkeena chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution conducts an essay contest in some of the schools of Portland, Oreg.

The winning essay this year was written by Miss Constance Dougherty, an eighth-grade student at Abernathy School. The essay shows that Miss Dougherty has a profound insight into the spirit of our Constitution and its relevance to our continuing national goals.

It is certainly heartening to me to see such an outstanding expression of our national spirit springing from one of Miss Dougherty's age group. Our youth today has been called rebellious and alienated, but if many can retain the insight into the meaning of our country's most precious document and the national spirit that swells from it, as expressed so well in Miss Dougherty's essay, then perhaps this rebellion and alienation can be channeled into a sense of rededication and purpose toward furthering the goals so eloquently set down by our Founding Fathers.

At this time I insert in the RECORD Miss Dougherty's prize-winning essay, "What the Constitution Means to Me":

WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME

(By Connie Dougherty, Abernathy School, 8th grade, Portland, Oreg.)

The Constitution is more than words written on paper. It is more than a document of State, signed by our brave forefathers and preserved for posterity.

The Constitution is the result of many brave and adventurous people who dared hope and dream of a better way of life.

It means breathing free air, speaking free thoughts and the right of freedom in choosing a special place of worship.

The Constitution is built upon firmness, equality and the rights of the common people. It sets forth laws for a basis of living—not just for the rich or the highly intelligent but for all Americans.

Being an American citizen the Constitution means to me the American Flag; "Old Glory," the Star Spangled Banner, the Fourth of July, and the Spirit of '76. It is Grandma Moses and Little Abner. It is the World Series and hot dogs with mustard. It is picnics in the summer and snowball fights in winter. It is one word; "freedom," for all. Freedom of the heart and body for all of us living in this great land.

The Constitution protects my rights and the rights of my fellow Americans. It is the code of ethics upon which America became a strong and great country. It is worth fighting for and in these days of communist oppression in many parts of the world, the Constitution should be held close to each American's heart and defended without thought of oneself. If America is to retain the precious gift of freedom which our Constitution gives us, we must never "let it perish from the earth."

The United States Must Lead, but Can't Stand Alone

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the United States since World War II has had to keep pace with the realities of an often rapidly changing world. One of the factors which seems to have had little recognition but which necessarily creates new problems for the Nation is the withdrawal of British power and influence from much of the world, particularly Asia.

This withdrawal creates serious problems for this country because power vacuums exist for a short time only. The well-documented expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union and Communist China are always present to replace the influences of any pro-Western nation which retreats from any position in the world. However, much we might prefer to isolate ourselves from such developments in farflung corners of the world, it is imperative that we insure that communism does not fill the voids left by the collapse of worldwide British influence.

An editorial published in the Greenville News of March 24, 1968, discusses this problem with great insight. It makes the point that the international responsibilities of the United States are great and that it is essential that we enlist the strong support of our allies in this endeavor. I believe the editorial is particularly timely in view of the fact that many in the Nation are included toward an isolationist policy which could only be harmful to the interests of the United States and of the entire free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The United States Must Lead, but Cannot Stand Alone," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE UNITED STATES MUST LEAD, BUT CAN'T STAND ALONE

Since publishing his letter to the editor on March 10, we have reflected several times on the suggestion of Dr. Colin F. Baxter of the Furman University history faculty that the United States form an alliance, a power bloc if you please, of a permanent nature with Great Britain, Canada and Australia along with other English-speaking nations and, perhaps, Israel.

It was not a complete proposal, insofar as many details were left out perforce, but Dr.

Baxter was aiming toward a possible solution to a little recognized American dilemma.

It lies in the fact that, with the British pullout from Asia almost complete and with her African ties mostly broken, the United States is or soon will be standing almost alone as the defender of freedom and the keeper of the peace "East of Suez."

Dr. Baxter was kind enough to credit The News with being one of the first publications to take notice and call attention to the existence of this power vacuum, its dangers and the necessity for the United States to fill it in one way or another or suffer.

The so-called peaceful periods in history have been those during which a single great power, usually a more or less benevolent one, was dominant and filled the role of world leader. Thus, history speaks of "Pax Romana" and more recently of "Pax Britannia."

Britain began her pullback as her post World War II weakness became apparent and the drive against colonialism in any form began to gather momentum.

Until the peace-keeping effort in Vietnam developed into a particularly nasty war, some people referred to "Pax Americana." In that brief era, the United States was clearly the economic bulwark of the free world, busily engaged in helping friend and foe alike to rebuild their war-shattered economies, and deterring Soviet Communist aggression with a near-monopoly on nuclear power.

Without seeming to do so consciously or deliberately, the United States was, after a fashion, gradually filling the developing power vacuum and assuming the role of world leadership which time and events had thrust upon it.

He was not given credit for it, but we think in retrospect that President Eisenhower, with his background in World War II command and NATO leadership, did understand the necessities of the times and, after a fashion, measured up.

Since then the neo-isolationism of the New Left, the liberal dominance, preoccupation with development and expansion of the welfare state on the domestic front and a fumbling foreign policy based on dangerous compromise and material handouts, has tended to obscure the central issue.

The agony and the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam and civil strife in the cities, have just about cinched the diversion of national attention and resources from the issue of international survival and the best possible path to peace.

The central fact, however, still stands forth:

The United States must lead the world, or be swallowed up in military and economic chaos stemming from continuation of the power vacuum, or the explosive filling of the vacuum by Communist imperialism.

But the United States no longer can fill that role alone. It must have overseas allies upon whom it can rely. And it must have civil order at home.

Dr. Baxter alluded more or less directly to the option between expedient or temporary alliances formed by the United States to meet a particular situation and a permanent arrangement among this country and like-minded nations around the globe.

In some ways this may resemble the "Atlantic Union" promoted since about 1939 or 1940 by Clarence Streit, a confederation of sovereign states facing upon the Atlantic. Each would surrender a little sovereignty to the union in order to achieve mutual defensive power, a common currency or medium of fixed rate of exchange and free trade to produce common economic strength.

This may now be out of the question, what with the attitude of France. Germany may prefer the European Common Market from which De Gaulle has willfully excluded England.

But the idea planted by Dr. Baxter (and we hope we are not embarrassing him by extending his brief remarks) gains substance in our view from two recent reports from Australia.

In one of these, the official news agency referred to a speech by Lord Casey, the Governor-General, in which he said Australia would continue to support the United States and South Vietnam against aggression and toward a just peace. Then came this significant passage:

"The Governor-General said that since the last session of the Australian Parliament the situation in South-East Asia had changed rapidly because of Britain's decision to speed up its military withdrawal. He said Australia could not fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal.

"However, Australia would be prepared to discuss the size and role of a combined defense arrangement on a joint basis with Singapore and Malaysia. This would be in addition to providing technical and economic assistance and training to help Singapore and Malaysia build their own forces."

The second item reported the remarks of Prime Minister John G. Gordon on the occasion of the opening of a new cigarette plant which he said represented a joint venture of American and Australian capital. He went on to make a strong case for Australian-American cooperation in the field of industrial development.

Canadian-American economic ties are so strong that the Canadians actually are resentful of what they feel is too much domination of their economy by American capital. But there is room for adjustments and mutually beneficial negotiations and future cooperation there.

Great Britain is floundering on the edge of bankruptcy, and may not survive unless either the United States or the former Commonwealth nations come to her rescue. This could be done in such a way as to rebuild Britain, if the British are willing, to the benefit of the assisting states as well as England herself.

More to the point, we simply don't believe the United States can allow Great Britain to go under.

Yet the present international monetary, or gold crisis simultaneously places the United States in economic peril and, hopefully, forces her to assert leadership through actions at home and abroad to restore confidence in the methods and media of international exchange. To save herself, America must again assist others, but in a different way.

All of this, of course, presupposes the ability of the American people and their leaders to see what is at stake and their willingness to accept the burdens of leadership which they forfeit or bypass by default to their ever greater peril.

It certainly will require new policies, and possibly new leadership—but not the kind that is challenging President Johnson from the Kennedy-McCarthy left, or that he was giving-up to a few days ago.

Fair Practices Act for Agricultural Producers

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I supported the amendment to substitute the original S. 109 for the House-approved committee bill, H.R. 13541. I was one of the 58 authors of the original bill during the

first session, my bill being H.R. 5275, introduced on February 9, 1967. That bill, S. 109, when heard in the Senate Agriculture Committee, made history in that all major farm organizations and the Department of Agriculture supported it. It seemed that utopia had arrived. But before the bill came from the Senate it had been altered to the point that it was too much a processor protection bill and a bill to protect one farmer from another. It had strayed almost 180 degrees from its original intent.

When the House Agriculture Committee held extensive hearings on S. 109 we were able to improve it by the adoption of 12 amendments on September 26 and October 4. These amendments restored the bill to a more acceptable Fair Practices Act for agricultural producers in that it bolstered the rights of the farmers to belong to any organization of producers without fear of price or market discrimination from processors or handlers. Thus, with the addition of the many amendments made today, this bill is even further strengthened for farmers to be able to use collective or bargaining means to improve their income. It does this in that it clearly maintains that long-held belief of Congress that cooperatives are charged with certain responsibilities and privileges in providing service to their members; and also that individual farmers cannot be coerced to join any organization, nor be denied his right to a market by virtue of his membership in any association of producers or cooperative.

As amended now, H.R. 13541 does lay the groundwork for improving the much needed ability of producers to build up their strength in the marketplace. Therefore, I supported the final passage of H.R. 13541.

Shriver Supports Agricultural Fair Practices Act

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the House passed on Monday, March 25, the Agricultural Fair Practices Act, H.R. 13541, by an overwhelming vote. There were some important modifications made by the Committee on Agriculture, but the measure adopted by the House was similar to one which I introduced on August 28, 1967, in cooperation with the gentlemen from Kansas, my colleagues [Mr. SKUBITZ and Mr. WINN]. The other two gentlemen from Kansas [Mr. DOLE and Mr. MIZE] also sponsored similar bills.

This legislation will help strengthen the competitive marketing system for agricultural commodities by creating several new legal remedies designed to prohibit certain unfair trade practices.

We are well aware that the farmer in Kansas and farmers across the Nation have experienced serious declines in commodity prices. Prices received by farmers in the marketplaces dropped to the low-

est level in 33 years during the past year. The parity ratio has been fluctuating at a low level too.

At a time when the United States has declared a "war on hunger," we are dependent upon a strong agriculture. We cannot have it unless farmers can at least hope to get enough for what they produce to pay for what they put into its production.

National policies are needed to assure fair pay for the people who produce our food and fiber. This legislation is one part of a national policy directed toward better farm prices.

This legislation will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government, according to information from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, as farmers develop the means by which they can voluntarily join together to bargain for price and market conditions with processors and handlers, it is important that we provide both parties with a set of ground rules. A number of States have taken similar action on this, but much of our agricultural production is not defined by State lines, and that is why this Federal legislation is desirable.

A Misdirected Lecture on Austerity

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the plea has gone out across the land from high places for the American people to entertain austerity.

But it should be remembered that austerity is a two-way street, and it will accomplish very little good if while the people tighten up on their spending, the Federal Government opens the floodgates of deficit financing.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government should set an example for the people by engaging in prudent economics, and from this would flow benefits which would encourage the people to follow suit.

The Philadelphia Inquirer carried a very appropriate editorial on this subject in its March 19, 1968, issue. Because of its timeliness, I insert it in the RECORD:

A MISDIRECTED LECTURE ON AUSTERITY

When President Johnson, speaking in Minneapolis Monday, called on the American people to "join in a program of national austerity" he aimed the appeal in the wrong direction.

It is the Government that needs to be austere. Taxpayers already have been forced into a position of painful austerity, with no relief in sight.

There is no cause for Americans to be lectured on the virtues of austerity. The wage earner who sees the tax reductions in his pay check get larger and larger, while the purchasing power of what is left gets smaller and smaller, as inflation grows worse and worse, does not have to be reminded about austerity. It has become virtually a way of life.

With the Federal Government dipping deeper and deeper into taxpayers' pockets, and with State and county and municipal and school taxes also on the rise almost

everywhere, the American people are up to their necks in austerity right now. Keeping one's head above water, to avert total submersion in rising tides of taxes, has become a constant struggle.

When are the profligate spenders in Washington going to adopt a program of austerity?

When are they going to start practicing what they preach?

That is what the American people would like to know.

Serbian Freedom Day

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today, March 27, is held in high veneration by all Serbians, Croats, and free Yugoslavians as their day of national freedom.

March 27, 1941, is remembered as a day of liberty when the Serbian people rejected a dummy government collaborating with the Nazis and installed a free, pro-Western government.

In the ensuing defensive against the Nazi Socialists an estimated 1,600,000 Serbians lost their lives.

But the free Serbs remained our allies to the end. Their great national patriot General Dragoljich—Draza—Mihailovich led his peoples resistance to the end—the end of nazism and the beginning of the sellout by our leaders of free Serbia to the Russian conspiracy over free minorities.

Because Mihailovich was a Christian—and an anti-Communist—repulsive to the bloody Bolshevik dictatorship, he could not be tolerated at the head of a free nation on the border of Russia.

So, in the name of peace under communism, our old friend and compatriot, Mihailovich along with thousands of his Christian followers, was permitted to be murdered to keep Yugoslavia fertile for communism—a stooge buffer state on the border of Russia.

Today all liberty-loving Americans rejoice as we pay our respects and offer our encouragement to those gallant Serbs in exile as they await the day of liberation when they can return to a free Yugoslavia—free of the Communist dictator, General Tito.

All who value individual liberty and freedom from oppression and tyranny join in wishing our Serbian friends well. As the bondage and falsity of communism is unmasked, their waiting may not be long now.

Mr. Speaker, several letters to the editor from Serbian patriots which appeared in the Chicago Tribune follow my comments:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 1961]
EUROPE AND FREEDOM

CHICAGO, June 2.—President Kennedy said yesterday in Paris, "The United States cannot look forward to a free existence if western Europe is not free." I believe that the United States cannot look forward to a free existence if eastern and southeastern Europe are not free, also.

If the United States and other free countries improve relations with soviet and other communist dictatorships, the people in the

captive nations of the soviet empire cannot look forward to a free existence. The majority of patriotic people in the slave camps of the Soviet Union cannot understand the silence of American leaders concerning the plight of the soviet colonies. We have even failed to demand free elections in these countries. Free elections in the captive nations are the key for the future peace of the whole world.

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 1, 1965]

WAR IN VIETNAM

CHICAGO, November 28.—The American Association of War Veterans of the Former Kingdom of Yugoslavia, now American citizens, victims of the nazi-communist conspiracy for conquest in World War II, strongly support the United States policy in Viet Nam, and ask for these further acts: blockade North Viet Nam immediately and give an ultimatum that unless North Viet Nam ends aggression to the south the United States will occupy that country and put it under the United Nations for as long as is needed for the security, freedom, and independence of southeast Asia. We strongly oppose any more aid or help to, or any better relations with, any communist regime before the ending of communist tyranny. The free world asks freedom for all.

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH,
Public relations officer.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 27, 1966]

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO IN YUGOSLAVIA

CHICAGO, March 24.—On March 27, 1941, when most of Europe lay prostrate under nazi Germany and the small part of the continent remaining free shivered in its boots, the Serbian people hurled the bit back in Hitler's teeth. Overnight, in a bloodless revolution, they cast out the regime that had signed a pact of collaboration with the axis and installed in Belgrade a prowestern government. Members of all classes took part; the only dissenting voice came from the Communists. Winston Churchill, stirred to the depths of his being, triumphantly proclaimed, "Yugoslavia has found her soul."

This courageous act probably turned the tide of the war. Certainly, it delayed Hitler's invasion of Russia by six weeks. It deprived Rommel of reinforcements for the conquest of North Africa. Most important, it opened up a new war zone within the depths of occupied Europe with the subsequent rise of the guerrilla leader Gen. Draza Mihailovich.

On April 6, 1941, Palm Sunday, without a formal declaration of war, Belgrade and other parts of Serbia were bombed by Hitler's and Mussolini's mighty air armada. Tens of thousands were killed. In subsequent weeks, traitors and axis elements massacred hundreds of thousands. The number of victims, by the end of the wars that ensued, came to 1.4 million people, out of a population of 10 million. No other nation paid a price so dear—only to be betrayed in the end.

Mihailovich was sold down the river, his country delivered to the Communists. The free world has remained blind, deaf, and mute to Yugoslav appeals since.

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH.

[From the Chicago Tribune, April 1965]

THE REAL MILOVAN DJILAS

CHICAGO, March 29.—I wish to extend my earnest praise to THE TRIBUNE's Mr. Clyde Farnsworth for his objective discussion of Milovan Djilas. As Mr. Farnsworth correctly observed in his first article, the real Milovan Djilas, the one behind the bars in Sremska Mitrovica, never renounced communism as such. He merely renounced the doctrine as it was preached by his rivals for power in communist Yugoslavia—Tito, Kardelj, Rankovich, and others.

Far from being a miraculous convert to the ideas of freedom and democracy, Milovan Djilas was the ideological creator of the tyranny of darkness, banishment, arrest, and murder, which characterized his era of grace. Milovan Djilas was instrumental in the liquidation of thousands of freedom loving Yugoslav writers, editors, and intellectuals, having delivered additional thousands of ordinary people into the clutches of the regime's executioners.

Today Milovan Djilas is himself locked up in the ill-famed Sremska Mitrovica prison, one of the infamous institutions he helped create. He is there not as a victim of sudden enlightenment and political conversion, but as the loser in the internal party squabbles and power struggles his ambitions embroiled him in. The case of Milovan Djilas is the living proof that in tyranny no one prospers, neither the oppressed nor the oppressors.

D. S. KARGAN.

DJILAS THE MARXIST

CHICAGO, April 19.—Milovan Djilas is introduced in today's Voice of the People as an "imprisoned Yugoslav writer." This is a grievously misleading introduction for a man like Djilas. One usually sympathizes with an imprisoned writer, and one could be led to believe that such a person may be the last hope of Christianity in its confrontation with communism.

However in addition to his literary exploits, Djilas also happens to have been the vice president of communist Yugoslavia and a member of the Communist party since 1927. The salient fact of Djilas' writings in his undying devotion to Marxism-Leninism and his castigation of Tito is based on Djilas' own Marxist orthodoxy, not on his rejection of the Marxian analysis.

D. S. KARGAN.

[From the Chicago Tribune, April 1966]

RED WEAKNESS IN YUGOSLAVIA

CHICAGO, April 4.—Last month the Communist party of Yugoslavia held a plenary session in advance of the party congress in Moscow. The speeches at the plenum were most revealing of the situation which exists both in the country and within the Communist party itself.

Tito sadly confessed the failure of his regime to win any support from the people even after 20 years of uninterrupted rule: "We have had an overabundance of dry, sterile, unimaginative, dogmatic phraseology and sloganeering. Instead of coalescing the fires of popular enthusiasm for socialist construction, it only exposed our party and her socialist legacy to sneer and ridicule."

"And, comrades, this result has not been achieved by imperialist propaganda, or by local reactionaries, but by our own party propagandists. We need a fresh, imaginative approach to the masses."

The party's chief ideologist, Edward Kardelj, painted a gloomy picture of its ideological preparedness: "We are not a party of cadres. The party members care first for the advantages of membership—for exploiting the prestige and esteem [sic] enjoyed by our Marxist-Leninist fraternity—and last for the actual struggles and responsibilities associated with party membership. Our ideological foundations are being eroded. Our front against the neo-reactionaries is weakening."

The chief of secret police, Alexander Rankovich, was distressed at some ominous manifestations which he didn't like: "In the recent times, there have been some strange phenomena in our midst. Certain people have alienated themselves from our socialist reality. They are propagating some foreign concepts of liberal democracy which are totally unrelated to our socialist democratic development. These manifestations are dangerous. They must be checked in time."

These excerpts speak for themselves. This dark portrayal of the political weakness and ideological disintegration of the Yugoslav communist regime has been made by the ruling clique in its mildest and most favorable form. It should be noted that the above situation exists after over 3 billion dollars in American aid. Without massive American financial and political support, would there still be a Tito regime? S. K.

President Johnson Affirms His Pledge To Build a Bigger, a Better, and a More Prosperous America

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in a fighting speech before the 13th international conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, President Johnson called upon the unions to join this administration in helping build a bigger, a better America. He said:

Our fight—yours and mine—is to make life better in this country not just for some, not just for most—but to make life better for all the people.

The President noted that today our will and our strength are being tested at home and abroad, and we must meet both tests. At home we cannot slight those programs we fought so long and hard to obtain. Particularly we cannot fail those millions of Americans still forced to live in poverty. These efforts must continue. In the President's words:

I see the great milestones of our progress only as a starting point. Everyday—in a hundred ways—we are reaching out to those Americans who are still lost in the dark corners of American society. Let there be no cruel delusion that this job is an easy one. Let there be no false hope that the solutions are going to be quick. For we are cutting through a century of neglect. But we are cutting through, we are moving on, and we are not going to be stopped.

Nor can we fail abroad. The President stressed that we can build a better America only if we continue meeting "our commitments in a world where freedom is under attack." He noted that the history of America is one of prevailing when tested—in World War I, World War II, Greece, and Korea. And we can do no less today in Vietnam.

The President said:

But everytime we were tested, we were not found wanting—and we are not going to be found wanting this time.

I am convinced that the people of this country agree with the course their President charted for America, at home and abroad. They want a good, a decent America where they can raise a family and point with pride to its accomplishments. They want to live in a peaceful country—a peaceful country built on a strong America, not a weak America. This is the America our people want and this is the America that President Johnson is working hard to build.

I include the President's excellent remarks to the building and construction trades conference in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE 13TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT OF THE AFL-CIO, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL

President Haggerty, President Meany, Presidents of the Internationals—I met so many Presidents out here this morning.

When I awoke, I heard some sounds of hammering in my ears this morning. I turned over and said to Mrs. Johnson, "Is that another campaign headquarters going up across the street?"

She said, "No, dear, this is a good Monday. Your friends from the Building Trades have come to town."

It gives me a great deal of pleasure and pride to come here and stand with the builders of America.

We share the same pride in our country's past. We hold the same great faith in our Nation's future.

That future depends on the sons of labor—working men like you—who roll up their sleeves and do the job.

We are at work in this Nation—building a bigger, a better and a more prosperous America.

If anyone doubts this, you—the warriors of progress—know the answer, because you have been there with me every step of the way.

Over the last several years, 12 million Americans have risen from poverty—and that's progress; 16 million school children face a better future because of the educational breakthroughs—and that is progress; 20 million older Americans—your mothers and your fathers—no longer fear the crushing burden of medical bills in their old age—and that is progress; 41 million American workers are protected by a higher minimum wage—and that is progress; 75 million Americans are today working in better jobs at better wages, at higher pay, than they have ever worked before in all American history—and that is progress.

These are the mighty foundations that we put in place. We are not going to sit by and let them be torn down in a partisan political election year.

We are going to build on them—we are going to help shape a better future for the working people of the country and for their families.

We are pledged to bring safety to the workbench and to bring safety to the jobsite to protect our fellow human beings.

It is a shocking and, I think, a shameful fact that: Every year, 15,000 American workers die in job accidents—15,000 tragedies, 15,000 heartbreaks.

Every year, 2 million workers are injured on the job. How can we ever replace a lost eye, or how can we ever substitute for a severed hand?

Every year, a billion dollars are lost in wages. More than 200 million man days are wasted because of accidents.

This year, I asked the Congress for a Worker's Safety Bill to protect you. I ask you this morning to give me your help and join with me to help us make this the law of the land this year.

We are pledged to make your hard-earned dollar more secure when you buy an automobile or a refrigerator on credit.

We are going to do away with the hidden interest charges.

With your help, we will—at long last—put truth into lending and pass the Truth-in-Lending Bill this year to protect American workers.

We are pledged to make sure that every one of your sons and daughters who wants a college education has an opportunity to get one.

The day is passing in this America when only the children of the rich can go to college.

So I ask you to work with us as we strive to pass the Economic and Education Oppor-

tunity Act of this year and to pass it through the Congress before we go home for the election.

These are some of the measures that will benefit the working people of America. They not only benefit the working people, but their neighbors as well.

Our fight—yours and mine—is to make life better in this country not just for some, not just for most—but to make life better for all the people.

I see the great milestones of our progress only as a starting point.

Every day—in a hundred ways—we are reaching out to those Americans who are still lost in the dark corners of American society.

Let there be no cruel delusion that this job is an easy one. Let there be no false hope that the solutions are going to be quick. For we are cutting through a century of neglect.

But we are cutting through, we are moving on, and we are not going to be stopped.

And when you look back over the history of our glorious past and you see the record of achievement, instead of the record of promises, you men of the AFL-CIO and you men of the building trades are going to be proud to say to yourselves and say to your children that during the decade of the sixties—from 1964 to 1968 that we wrote upon the statute books of this Nation 24 far-reaching health bills to protect our minds and our bodies, that we wrote 18 education bills to protect our children—from Head Start at 4 years old until adult education at 72—that we did move forward, that we did make progress, and that we did adopt a program of social justice for all Americans that had never been written into law by any Administration at any time in all the history of America.

So I came here to say thank you. I came here to tell you that you are the Nation's strong right arm as we tackle the work ahead.

We are going to break new ground in a massive housing program for the poor. We have submitted to the Congress blueprints for 6 million new homes over the next 10 years.

This will wipe away—we hope once and forever—the shameful backlog of crumbling tenements and the shacks where families now live.

Next year we have a goal of starting 300,000 new homes. That is a pretty big order for this first year. In all the last 10 years put together, we have only built 500,000 new homes.

And you are the men who must lead the way, not only to pass this legislation, but to build these houses.

We are setting out now to try to find work for hundreds of thousands of men and women who have never before in their lives earned a steady pay check.

You know—better than anyone else—the dignity of a decent job.

And I know what you are doing to help open new opportunities within your own ranks.

I thank you. I tell you that I will appreciate your doing everything you can to help us meet this vital problem that not only confronts me as your agent, your President, as a manager of this great Nation, but that confronts all the people of this Nation—because smallpox down the street works its way up to your block, too, and poverty, homelessness, hunger, disease and crime cannot be quarantined. It will get to your block, too.

So the hour is here. Now is the time. You are the people to help us get this job done.

We have a program to build that better America in a climate of law and order. And we are going to build it even as we meet our commitments in a world where freedom is under attack.

This is not any new experience for us. We have had our will tested before. We had it tested across the waters in World War I—and

many of you wear the badges of honor of service of that day.

We had it tested in World War II when we had enemies in both oceans that were trying to bring democracy, freedom and liberty to its knees.

We saw it tested when the Greek guerrillas were seven miles out of Athens and President Truman brought into force the Truman Doctrine.

We saw it tested in Korea when we were there on that little Pusan Peninsula and most of the folks were asking about "What did Korea and all of those mountains mean to us?"

We have seen it tested over the skies of Berlin when the people of that desolate city were hungry and we had to feed them with our courage, with our planes, and with our cargoes landing in, many times, zero-zero weather.

But every time we were tested, we were not found wanting—and we are not going to be found wanting now.

Now, the America that we are building would be a threatened nation, if we let freedom and liberty die in Vietnam. We will do what must be done—we will do it both at home and we will do it wherever our brave men are called upon to stand.

This is the America that we have faith in—this is a nation that is building. This is a wonderful country that is growing.

I hope you men are determined to help us meet these problems. I hope you men are determined to see us help get justice, not just for ourselves, but for all the people of this nation and for all the people of the world.

I sometimes wonder why we Americans enjoy punishing ourselves so much with our own criticism.

This is a pretty good land. I am not saying you never had it so good. But that is a fact, isn't it?

So I say that the Average American does not ask for much. He is entitled to equal opportunity and equal justice. His ancestors have come here from all the lands of the world seeking liberty and freedom. They are not only here to protect it, but they are here to preserve it.

The average fellow—about all that he insists on having—and he must have a lot of drive and desire to get that—is a roof over his head; he would like to have title to it. He wants clothes to cover his naked body and the bodies of his family, food to give him strength and sustain him as he produces a better country, a decent school for his children to attend so they can prepare themselves to be good citizens, a church to worship in where he can go and worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, and maybe a little recreation now and then—maybe taking Molly and the babies in the car for a ride on Sunday afternoon, or to a movie once in a while, or to watch a television program if the politicians are not monopolizing it.

That is about all he asks—not much, a roof over his head, clothes on his body, food in his stomach—and that is what you builders are helping us get.

I want to say that there has never been a period in American history when the State House and the White House, when the Congress and the Capital, had more and better and more cooperative support from the working men of America than they have had the last four years.

We wouldn't have had the Education Act. We wouldn't have had the College Higher Education Act. We wouldn't have had Medicare where your fathers and your mothers no longer have to worry about what their sons-in-law and their daughters are going to do—they can go and show their card and be taken care of.

We have all of these things because George Meany, President Haggerty, Andy Biemiller, Lane Kirkland and you men back home supported us in those efforts.

They laughed at you when you said "All the way," but we have gone all the way and we are still going.

Thank you very much.

Comments on Kennedy-McCarthy Race

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has run an interesting dialog on the interplay of the candidacies of Senators ROBERT F. KENNEDY and EUGENE MCCARTHY in its "Letters to the Editor" column. For the interest of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert it at this point:

PEACE PRIME ISSUE

NEW YORK, March 18, 1968.

To the EDITOR:

The young and not so young who berate Senator Kennedy's "opportunism" seem to be confusing idealism with sentimentality. Senator Kennedy's chances of defeating President Johnson for the nomination are small at best. And yet, on the basis of the sentiment generated by the drama of the New Hampshire primary, there seems a willingness among some to lessen even that small opportunity by supporting Senator McCarthy, who does not have the political resources which Senator Kennedy can muster.

One may turn the charge of "ego in the place of issues" in the other direction: Senator McCarthy's largely symbolic campaign has been so successful that it has laid the groundwork for a real political challenge to the President.

Should the Senator not accept the fruits of his success as graciously as he would have accepted defeat? Idealism would seem to dictate cooperation with the Kennedy candidacy which might, with work and a good deal of luck, set us on the road to realizing some ideals.

Whatever else one might think of the proposed "deal" for a war commission, it indicates that Senator Kennedy thinks stopping the war is more important than his election to the Presidency—hardly the act of someone who puts personal ambition above everything.

One of the "McCarthy kids" said, just after the primary, that she had been brought to New Hampshire by the peace issue, and stayed to work for Senator McCarthy. I can admire her loyalty and the power of Senator McCarthy's appeal, but I wonder about her priorities. I wonder what happened to the peace issue.

MARTIN WENGLINSKY.

POLITICAL OPPORTUNISM

NEW YORK, March 13, 1968.

To the EDITOR:

The vote for Senator McCarthy in New Hampshire is not simply a protest against our policy in Vietnam. It is a victory for a man of courage, decency and principle. It is a signal that after five years of Lyndon Johnson the people have had enough of the kind of leadership that would make cynics and nihilists of us all.

It is for this reason that Robert Kennedy's apparent post-New Hampshire availability must be rejected. For Kennedy to make his move now, after carefully preserving his neutrality during McCarthy's lonely ordeal, is, to say the least, less than admirable.

If he succeeds it will be a triumph for the kind of political opportunism and expediency that is so conspicuously absent from the McCarthy candidacy.

McCarthy for President, Kennedy (perhaps) for Vice President.

PEYTON HARRISON JR.

KENNEDY'S EXPERIENCE

WHITESTONE, N.Y., March 16, 1968.

To the EDITOR:

Senator McCarthy has unquestionably rendered the nation a great service by undertaking so courageously a campaign to demonstrate the degree of public dismay with the policies and actions of the Administration. But most of us who admire McCarthy know that by the hard realities of politics he cannot win the Presidency.

Senator Kennedy also represents a voice of protest against this disastrous and immoral war and against the Administration's tendency to deal with racial crisis by fulsome platitudes and faint-hearted programs. But Kennedy's candidacy adds a vital new ingredient—he has the possibility of winning. He is a better known political figure, has greater political experience and skills than McCarthy, and can muster meaningful support from broader sections of the American community.

By delaying his decision to run until the nation saw in New Hampshire the extent of disenchantment with President Johnson within the Democratic party, Mr. Kennedy has made himself less liable to the potential charge of disloyalty to the Democratic party. It would be a pity indeed if Mr. Kennedy's political wisdom in this respect were to cause disaffection among some of the people whose cause he cannot only advance, but quite possibly make successful.

SYLVIA BALDINGER.

MCCARTHY'S INTEGRITY

YALE LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, March 14, 1968.

To the EDITOR:

With many others who campaigned for Senator McCarthy in the New Hampshire primary, we are stunned and dismayed by Senator Kennedy's recent reassessment of his political position.

The brouhaha created by Kennedy's announcement should not be permitted to obscure the personal victory that Senator McCarthy won in New Hampshire. The New Hampshire campaign was inspired by opposition to the war in Vietnam, to be sure; but Senator McCarthy's presentation of the anti-war position was enhanced by his courage, candor and integrity.

We students went to New Hampshire to oppose the war through the democratic process. We returned with a profound respect and allegiance for our candidate. He won the volunteers as he won the voters.

There is no more current instance of what Senator McCarthy has called America's need for "moral strength" than Robert Kennedy's recent "reassessment." We are supporting Senator McCarthy in the coming primaries, at the convention and in the fall election. Senator Kennedy might do the same.

ALLEN BENTLEY.

STEPHEN SHIFFRIN.

ONLY WINNER

BROOKLYN, March 14, 1968.

To the EDITOR:

Clearly the New Hampshire primary indicated strong anti-Johnson sentiment. Only in retrospect and amid the victory could McCarthy supporters claim that it was a show of strength for the Minnesota Democrat.

Robert Kennedy's entrance into the Presidential race, on the other hand, will give primary voters and convention delegates a candidate for whom they can express a positive preference.

There will, I suspect, be a diminishing number of students and voters who would berate Senator Kennedy for entering the race "at this late date." Those who would accuse him of cowardice and opportunism, I am

afraid, would probably be more vehement against a Kennedy who, through efforts to deny Johnson renomination, would split the Democrats and elect Nixon.

Frankly, it matters little at this point except that Kennedy is the only man who can beat Johnson in Chicago.

Rather than self-indulgent and presumptuous wariness toward Robert Kennedy, it is most important that he is supported by students and voters who do not want Johnson or Nixon.

JERRY GOLDFEDER.

No "WELCOME GAIN"

ALSTEAD, N.H., March 17, 1968.

To the Editor:

When Robert Kennedy ran for the Senate The New York Times rightly opposed his candidacy, using as one argument the fact that he had not lived in the state long enough to vote, even for himself. This blatant disregard of the concept of representative government for the sake of personal gain has now been compounded by what you correctly call hitchhiking "on another man's work and courage."

It is regrettable that you think his entrance is "a welcome gain" for some voters McCarthy might not reach (Editorial March 15). Senator McCarthy was not well known in New Hampshire, but the results did prove that his political stand and respect for his integrity and courage could gain many votes.

SAMUEL E. STOKES, Jr.

R. F. K. GROUNDSWELL

NEW YORK, March 19, 1968.

To the Editor:

As one seriously interested in finding "a Democratic alternative" to President Johnson, I am encouraged by the entrance of Senator Robert F. Kennedy into the Presidential race. I am at the same time thankful for the effort of Senator Eugene F. McCarthy in New Hampshire, which awakened my hope on the night of March 12.

The pique of many loyal McCarthy supporters at Kennedy's announcement is understandable. Yet in the long run the success of the effort to deny the nomination to President Johnson probably depends on the Kennedy candidacy.

The most important consideration is that Senator Kennedy should be able to take with him a wider segment of the American electorate than Senator McCarthy. Additionally, Senator Kennedy brings to the effort his zeal and energy, which could prove indispensable in producing the ground swell that will turn the heads of a sufficient number of party delegates.

ROBERT A. HARMS.

LONELY DECISION

NEW YORK, March 16, 1968.

To the Editor:

These comments are addressed to my fellow-Democrats who oppose the policies of the present Administration. I feel strongly that we should back the man who had the courage to take on the task of trying to open up the Democratic convention at a time when his action seemed like folly or even suicide. As long as Senator McCarthy stays in the race I think he deserves everything we can give him, because he acted completely as a matter of principle in the face of desperate odds—and proved to be a winner besides.

With both Senator McCarthy and Senator Kennedy running in primaries, the voters will have ample opportunity to decide which is the stronger candidate. Senator McCarthy has publicly stated that if he sees at the convention that he cannot win he will release all the delegates pledged to him. So those Democrats who believe now that Senator Kennedy will be a more attractive candidate are losing nothing by honoring at this

time the man who made Senator Kennedy's candidacy politically possible.

There will be plenty of time for all good Democrats—along with independents and liberals and anyone else—to unite after we have seen a little more of what all the possible candidates have to offer. For now, the people who are disillusioned with Mr. Johnson should support the man who made that first, lonely, difficult decision.

LOIS R. CHEVALIER.

WISE DECISION

MORRIS PLAINS, N.J.,

March 17, 1968.

To the Editor:

Much has been said and written during the past days concerning the "opportunistic" aspects of Senator Kennedy's announced candidacy. I suggest that the real opportunist is Senator McCarthy.

Everyone will recall that Senator McCarthy announced his entry in the New Hampshire primary in December 1967 at a time when Senator Kennedy deferred his personal ambition in favor of avoiding a personal confrontation with President Johnson. It seems logical to assume that the astute McCarthy recognized Kennedy's immobility and subsequently seized this opportunity to take over the leadership of the anti-Johnson movement.

In the long run, Kennedy's decision to run the risk of overcoming the "opportunist" hangup in March 1968 rather than facing the "personal feud" charge in December 1967, may well prove to have been a wise one.

His road ahead will be rocky for more reasons than one, but I believe he has a good chance to go all the way.

HUGH CARVILLE.

STALKING HORSE?

COLLEGE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Philadelphia, March 15, 1968.

To the Editor:

I am sickened by the fact that Senator Robert Kennedy is now considering a race for President on the grounds that Senator McCarthy cannot win and he can.

The bald fact is that Senator McCarthy has won seven consecutive elections since 1948, five for Congress and two for the Senate. The only victory Senator Kennedy has ever scored was one on L.B.J.'s coattails in 1964.

Not only has McCarthy demonstrated an ability to win, but he has won as many general elections on his own as have Robert Kennedy, Nelson Rockefeller and Richard Nixon combined. Such is the record of a loser only if Kennedy decides to become a stalking horse for President Johnson by splitting the peace vote.

MARK B. COHEN,
Parliamentarian.

Pfc. Elgie Hanna Vietnam War Victim

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform my colleagues in the 90th Congress today that the Vietnam war has claimed its first victim from the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home located at Eaton Rapids, Mich.

Pfc. Elgie Hanna, a member of the 1st Cavalry Division, was killed by sniper fire while on patrol in Vietnam during recent fighting.

Many of my friends here are aware of my long association with the VFW and the fact that it is my privilege to serve as president of the board of trustees for the VFW national home.

This is the home that is sponsored by the VFW and its ladies auxiliary for the children of VFW members.

Elgie Hanna was a resident of this home from July of 1955 until about a year ago when he graduated from high school and joined the army.

Elgie, who was born January 23, 1949, came to live at the VFW home with three older brothers, Richard, Duane, and Gary and a younger sister, Angela. She is still living at the VFW national home and is in the 10th grade.

While at the national home, Elgie was a quiet, well liked young man who was always willing to carry his share of any detail. He worked for several years at the home's grocery store and was considered a mainstay on that staff. He was an average student and well liked at school.

Elgie's older brother, Gary, is presently in the Army, and is a veteran of Vietnam.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy today to the members of Elgie's family, and join those of the staff at the national home who mourn the loss of this fine young American who has given his life on foreign soil for the United States.

Where Has Commonsense Gone?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems as though commonsense had left our Government. Things that have been done and said in the guise of "progress" have really been less than sensible. We have squandered our wealth, catered to our enemies, compromised our principles, and sacrificed our traditions. And now the chickens are coming home to roost.

Once again the Warner & Swasey Co., in an advertisement appearing in U.S. News & World Report, in the issue of April 1, 1968, makes the point that we seem to be rejecting most of the things that made America great.

I hope that the American people realize that there are many of us in the Congress of the United States that want to see real progress for America once again.

I commend the Warner & Swasey message to the careful attention of concerned Americans as follows:

WE SEEM TO BE TURNING OUR BACKS ON EVERYTHING THAT MADE AMERICA GREAT

We pamper criminals and hamper police, when the police are all that save us from anarchy.

We spend billions to pay people not to work—when we need the workers, and haven't got the billions.

Devoted men in uniform spend their lives, underpaid and in jeopardy, fighting to keep our nation safe. Then, for political advantage, we sweep aside their gravest advice.

Companies which provide millions of the best-paying jobs in the world were built out of profits made by ambitious men who plowed those profits back, to make more. Now Government and unions call such men

selfish, and tax and destroy the profits vital to tomorrow's jobs.

We spend billions to get to the moon, for some ridiculous "prestige", instead of using those billions to reduce our debt and make us safe and solvent again.

For voters at home we placate our enemies abroad and attack our friends (and how we need those friends!).

We concentrate more and more power in a central government (too often of little people) and so weaken the local governments—which are the very essence of democracy and freedom.

We spend billions for foreign aid and let prosperous foreigners who owe us billions spend our money to deprive us of our dangerously-needed gold.

Commonsense used to be the outstanding trait of Americans. In Heaven's name, what has happened to it?

Gen. William McKee Addresses Airlines Management Conference

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, when the management of United Air Lines convened recently in Chicago it took an in-depth look at its 10th jet year ahead and the long-range future of aviation. The Nation's largest carrier, it has progressed in 42 years from single-engine aircraft flying Western mountainous routes to four-engine jetliners carrying almost 200 passengers.

The fastest growing segment of commercial aviation is the air cargo business, and on April 2 United will introduce new DC-8F all-cargo jet service between Baltimore and the Pacific coast. The DC-8F, with a capacity of 46 tons, links Baltimore with Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco.

With the mushrooming growth of air travel and jet fleets, the questions of airport capability and air traffic control are of paramount importance. At the United Air Lines annual management conference held in Chicago on March 14, Gen. William McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, devoted his address to those important questions.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics which must consider these problems, I invite the attention of my colleagues to General McKee's remarks and include them in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM F. MCKEE, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, AT UNITED'S ANNUAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 14, 1968

I have two messages today. One will be in a film we'll show at the end of my talk. That will tell its own story.

The other begins with praise. I am delighted to have this opportunity to commend United's farsighted executives for pioneering airport planning studies. This is foresight at its best. This is the vital "long look ahead" that separates the true managers from the paper shufflers and meeting goers. The best tribute, of course, is that the rest of the industry has followed suit. This is great work.

And I want to commend, too, the spirit of working together between United and our FAA airport people that has come out of these studies.

This mutual reviewing of facts and the exchange of data is the way I'd like to see us work right down the line. We are a service organization. This is a good way to serve.

I was impressed again this week with the tremendous need for aviation to get ready. Shortly, we will issue our annual aviation forecasts for the next ten years. They are staggering. The forecast book should be a best seller among airline executives. It tells a very happy story. I quote: "By 1979, the United States' airlines are expected to fly in scheduled domestic and international service a total of 342 billion revenue passenger miles and 444 million passengers." In the year ending mid 1967, those figures were 86 billion revenue passenger miles and 126 million passengers. That's 86 billion to 342 billion—126 million to 444 million.

You're all going to live happily ever after. But, as always, there is a morning after. This spectacular future of air travel is going to require a vast and expensive improvement, modernization and expansion of all the supporting systems. This I can tell you will be a task of staggering proportions. And it's going to require a whole lot of talent, energy, funds and time.

There is no question about whether or not this should be done. The safe and orderly operation of the aircraft fleets of the future will require it. And the key word is safety.

This job of improving and modernizing our aviation system breaks down, on examination, into many problems. The first of these is the sheer competition for attention.

There are, at every level of government, many tasks that are seemingly more urgent. To the uninitiated, it appears this program can be postponed for a few years—postponed with little apparent penalty to the general public . . . It cannot. It cannot be postponed without heavy penalties to all who fly as well as heavy penalties to the Nation's economy. This must be publicized. It must be widely known, and it must be understood.

There is, too, a requirement for solid agreement by all elements of aviation on the manner in which we are to meet our problem. The key is, of course, financing or—"who's going to pay?" In this matter, President Johnson's letter to Secretary Boyd is most pertinent.

He wrote to the Secretary concerning the expansion as follows: "Those who will benefit most from such expenditures, the aviation industry and the flying public, should pay their fair share of the costs of the system needed to handle the increase in air traffic while maintaining a high level of safety. I do not believe the general taxpayer should be asked to shoulder this burden."

If the various segments of aviation choose to wade into a donnybrook on the degree of their separate responsibilities, then we are defeated. We are going to meet opposition. If we cannot come out united and strong in this matter, we better not come out at all. Senator Monroney put it very succinctly in a recent speech. He told the Aero Club of Washington, "It is time for a little statesmanship and moderation."

"We are more interested in hearing sensible proposals from the airlines as to what is reasonable for them to pay and from General Aviation as to what is reasonable for them—not what the other should pay. Congress needs advice and assistance—not arguments and anger."

One of the critical elements is time. There is a widespread assumption that once financing is arranged, everything will take care of itself. It will not. The financing is but the beginning. Then begins the long task of research and development. Then begins the long work of bringing together through-

out the country local, State and Federal officials—the work of referendums, raising funds and selecting contractors. All this comes before the first move in airport modernization, expansion and improvement can be made. Meanwhile, other competing elements are moving ahead.

Land is being swallowed up every day. Prices are rising and the bidding for engineering talent and resources increases. At the same time, new aircraft are being delivered and the demand for air travel continues. The truth of the matter is that we are going to have to move very fast just to get caught up. Let me give you one small insight into the size of our problem. I want to read you the first paragraphs of two letters in last Sunday's New York Times. They both deal with Kennedy International . . . The same thing could be written about other terminals.

"To the editor . . .

Once more I wish to protest the deplorable conditions for international arrivals at Kennedy International Airport. In my opinion, they are a National disgrace . . ."

The second one reads:

"To the editor: upon my last arrival at Kennedy International Airport, I could not even get near a cab. The terminal was chaos and pandemonium. Pushing, shoving and yelling. Cabs and private cars were intermingled, weaving in and out in complete confusion. People were grabbing door handles trying to get a cab, cursing at the same time. . ."

I don't wish to throw rocks at Kennedy International, or blame anybody. I know what the problems are. I read them, rather as an introduction to a fact. The high capacity Boeing 747's come into service in 1970. Two of them arriving about the same time will require some combination of 250 taxis and/or 700 private cars.

That's just two years from now. It is, of course, the magnitude of the job—and the consequent magnitude of funds needed—that gives urgency to my remarks. The real estate need is not cheap. The "black boxes" are intricately contrived and complex in structure. They, too, are expensive. And the radars, and the communication systems, and the runway lighting—all are costly. And great amounts are needed because the workload will be great. Our forecasts anticipate that aircraft operations at airports with FAA towers will rise from 47 million in the 12-month-period ending last summer to an estimated 167 million ten years from now—an increase of about 250%.

In the same period, instrument operations will jump from 12 million to 41 million.

Our FAA centers will be equally busy. The number of IFR aircraft handled—which we use as a measure of workload—will jump from 15 million in fiscal '67 to about 45 million in '79. In the next three years alone, we expect an increase of more than 80%.

It is not the sheer increase in numbers alone that poses the problem. It is the fact that the aviation fleets of the future will have such a diversity of aircraft. Small 20 passenger mini-liners . . . vast high capacity jets . . . supersonics and a large fleet of turbine-powered general aviation planes. And these diverse fleets will increasingly be operating in relatively closer geographic concentrations. In 1965, 21 major metropolitan areas accounted for 66% of all airline passenger enplanements.

About ten years from now they will account for 70% of all total passenger enplanements.

These same hubs, moreover, serve as focal points for general aviation. I note, for example, that the two busiest general aviation airports, Van Nuys, California, and Opo Locka, Florida, are both within two of the busiest hub areas—Los Angeles and Miami. It is indicative of the future, too, that these

two airports are the busiest of all in the country.

All these factors—the increasing higher speeds of the fleets, the diversity of aircraft and the increasing concentration of operations—are going to require more precise air traffic control. This, in turn, is going to require expanded and improved navigation and communications.

But our problem consists of more than just serving aircraft. These 400 or so million passengers aren't going to be standing still. They're going to be buying tickets, waiting for baggage and meeting friends and relatives. We estimate that under present arrangements to service two departing 747's would, for example, take all the ticket counters in the Atlanta terminal.

And these two 747's could also mean handling 1000 pieces of luggage.

I think the best picture of the future is in a report we issued last fall on the expansion needed at the large 21 hub areas through 1980. This book translates passengers into gate positions, terminal space, ticket counters, parking lots, etc.

Let's look at one hub area—Miami—and list a few of the projections. The Miami area study includes 6 airports in addition to Miami International.

In 1965, these seven airports accounted for about 3,300,000 enplaned passengers. In 1980, they will account for nearly 19 million enplaning passengers. To accommodate this tremendous growth, the Miami hub area must increase its total air carrier terminal space 5 times. It must increase the apron area for air carrier passenger aircraft 4 times. Four times the present cargo building space—6 times the amount of existing cargo apron area.

I mentioned earlier the demands of safety that underscore our need to move ahead. There are other requirements, too. Air transportation is a true public service.

It must not be curtailed or limited or the public is denied. Air transportation is also an important element of the economy. Its greater significance, however, is the dependence of the national economy on the availability of air travel itself. It brings the economy together. If air transportation is limited or restricted, the whole economy will feel its effects. This is the very important national interest in the continued expansion and growth of aviation.

Now I am aware every proposal involves "either" and "or." I want to mention briefly the ominous "or." A failure to modernize our national aviation system means one thing—more and more regulations—regulations needed to insure safety. Whoever sits in the chair of the FAA thinks first and always in terms of safety.

If the present system is not improved, he will have no choice but to issue regulations as they are needed. He will be compelled to permit only those operations which the system can properly handle. These and no more. If this means 400 or 500 passengers sitting on the ground in a very expensive airplane, we're going to have to live with it. If, later, it means that certain bread and butter flights cannot even be scheduled for lack of system capacity, we're going to have to live with that, too.

In addition to its responsibility to develop the air traffic system, the FAA is responsible for its efficient regulation. The FAA already possesses regulatory powers to restrict traffic flow to safe limits, but if congestion continues to mount because of a lack of system capacity, the public will demand that we contain it with whatever tools that are necessary.

This may mean regulation of air carrier schedules. It may mean regulation of use of aircraft types at particular airports or on particular routes. It may, in fact, force involvement of government regulation in many economically sensitive areas of your business. This we do not, repeat not want to do.

We would much prefer to build an efficient air traffic system meeting the capacity needs of all of our air commerce. We believe this is well within the state of the art and that the resulting system can be self-supporting. To improve this system requires hardware and people and these require money. To achieve these requires all the support from the aviation community we can muster.

Starvation in Mississippi

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following editorial from today's New York Times in the RECORD. This eloquent testimony to our neglect should not go unnoticed by my colleagues.

The President's Commission on Rural Poverty has concluded that the rural poor are more deprived, more destitute, more helpless than their urban brothers. The poor in our cities respond to their condition by taking to the streets. This method of expressing grievances is not available to the silent sufferers of Mississippi and Appalachia. It seems as though we are consigning these people to hopeless misery merely because they do not resort to demonstrations.

As chairman of the Rural Development Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, I held hearings on the effect of Federal programs on rural America. The Federal programs do have an effect on rural America but not for those people who are starving.

In one Florida town, for example, the second largest business is the production of coffins for migrant children. What are Federal programs doing for these children? The hearings make it all too clear that the agricultural establishment would rather deal with hogs and sugar quotas than with people.

Let me underscore the sense of urgency expressed by the New York Times. While massive Federal efforts are being carried out in the area of urban planning, there is no agency directing any comprehensive effort toward planning in the field of rural human development.

It is common knowledge that urban ills have their roots in rural America. As the Times concludes:

A greater investment of money and a keener sense of commitment are urgently needed.

The editorial referred to follows:

STARVATION IN MISSISSIPPI

It is a disgrace that, in this richest nation in the world, babies are dying of hunger and children are growing up sick and stunted. The conditions among impoverished Negro families in the Mississippi Delta, documented for the thousandth time in a story in this newspaper yesterday, are a challenge to the conscience of every Government official from President Johnson down, every member of Congress and every private citizen.

In one Mississippi county, of every thousand Negro babies born, 51 die in infancy, a figure three times as high as that for white infants. Malnutrition during pregnancy and the first year of life has irreversible effects on a child, harming the quality of his teeth,

his bone structure and probably the functioning of his brain. Older children are kept home from school because they have no shoes or they go to school wearing rags wrapped around their feet. They grow up in shacks with no running water and no toilets. Their mothers are overburdened and undereducated; their fathers are too often unemployed. None of this is necessary and should no longer be tolerated.

As a court suit concerning the administration of the food-stamp plan in Alabama has made plain, too many county and state officials outside Mississippi as well as in it are shockingly indifferent to the hunger and privation of their own neighbors. It may be as Secretary of Agriculture Freeman contends—and as a Federal judge ruled yesterday—that the laws governing the food-stamp plan and the distribution of surplus commodities provide Federal officials with no leeway to intervene on behalf of hungry people if local officials refuse to cooperate. If that contention is upheld by a higher Federal court, Congress should move promptly to establish uniform Federal standards for these programs and make certain that they are available to all who need them everywhere in the nation.

This desperate, degrading poverty is not limited to Mississippi or to the rural South or to Negroes. Scandalously high infant mortality rates and hidden malnutrition exist in every big city slum. Poverty stunts bodies and snuffs out hope among many whites in the mountains of Kentucky and West Virginia.

These intolerable conditions indict the Federal farm housing program which does not get rid of these rural slums. They indict the Federal agriculture program which subsidizes the price of cotton and ignores the landless farm laborers. They indict Federal education and manpower programs which fail to reach these ignorant and untrained people. They indict the economists in Congress, many of them white Southerners, who want to slash antipoverty and social welfare programs. Most of all, these conditions assail the conscience of all who dwell in affluence, whether in Mississippi or New York, while fellow human beings rot and starve and die.

None of the Federal programs from Head Start to hot school lunches to farm housing to manpower training is big enough or working well enough. A greater investment of money and a keener sense of commitment are urgently needed. Similarly, private foundations and private charity on a local and personal basis can do more.

Population planning is an example. India and Latin America are not the only places where population is exploding out of control; obviously, there are families in the Mississippi Delta and in every other part of the United States where mothers need more information and more help in family planning.

Two centuries ago, Oliver Goldsmith wrote, "Ill fares the land, where health accumulates and men decay." As children die and men decay, is that to be the epitaph of affluent America in this supposedly enlightened twentieth century?

Congressional Questionnaire

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to my constituents to sound them out on the important issues facing the Congress and the country. For the interest of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert herewith my questionnaire:

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Problems: Which of the following problems do you consider most important (mark no more than 3):			
☐ Inflation	☐ Vietnam	☐ Older people's needs	
☐ Crime	☐ Urban decay	☐ Housing shortage	
☐ Race relations	☐ High taxes	☐ Public transportation	
2. Voting age: Do you favor reducing the voting age to 18?	☐	☐	☐
3. Police: There seems to be general agreement throughout our area that added police protection is needed. Do you think the Federal Government should assume part of the added cost?	☐	☐	☐
4. Drugs: Do you think use or possession (as distinct from sale) of the following drugs should be a criminal offense?			
LSD.....	☐	☐	☐
Marijuana.....	☐	☐	☐
5. Transit: The Federal Government continues to help highway construction at a rate 20 times as high as that provided for mass transit (such as subways and buses). I favor permitting use of some of the highway aid for mass transit. Do you agree?	☐	☐	☐
6. Immigration: The 1965 immigration law made many good changes but it has worked a hardship on citizens of some countries by instituting stiff standards for the first time. I favor easing these requirements temporarily for those countries that were not previously covered. Do you agree?	☐	☐	☐
7. Travel: The President has proposed a tax on travel to reduce our international balance of payments deficit. Do you favor such a tax?	☐	☐	☐
8. Middle East: If the Soviet arms aid to the Arab States continues, should the United States make needed weapons available to Israel?	☐	☐	☐
9. Vietnam:			
(a) Do you believe the Vietnam conflict can and should be brought to a conclusion by:			
Military victory.....	☐	☐	☐
Negotiated settlement.....	☐	☐	☐
Withdrawal by the U.S. forces.....	☐	☐	☐
(b) If you had to decide, would you accept a negotiated settlement in South Vietnam which provides:			
Internationally supervised elections in South Vietnam in which all parties, including the National Liberation Front, would be free to participate.....	☐	☐	☐
A coalition government in which the NLF would be included but would not have control.....	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify).....			
10. The draft: Last year the President proposed a lottery system with 19-year-olds being taken first. Would you favor this over the present system?	☐	☐	☐
11. Medicare: There are a number of suggestions for additions to this program. Please mark the 2 you think are most desirable.			
☐ (a) Include cost of prescription drugs as part of basic coverage.			
☐ (b) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay the first \$40 of the hospital bill.			
☐ (c) Eliminate requirement that senior citizen pay \$4 per month for the medical insurance (hospital insurance is free).			
☐ (d) Increase the number of days of hospitalization permitted.			
☐ (e) Extend coverage to persons under 65 who are receiving social security benefits.			
☐ (f) Other (specify).....			

Adm. D. J. Ramsey

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last month Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey passed away after suffering a heart attack. I was deeply saddened by the death of Admiral Ramsey, whom I had the good fortune to know through his many years of outstanding service on behalf of the Silver Users Association.

Admiral Ramsey was well known on Capitol Hill as legislative counsel and treasurer of the Silver Users Association for more than 20 years.

He was a man of great talent and understanding and his loss is not only a great loss to his friends and loved ones but also to the legislative processes and to those of us who worked with him.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a short summary of the life of Admiral Ramsey which appeared in the Washington Post following his passing:

ADM. D. J. RAMSEY

Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, who became legislative counsel and treasurer of the Silver Users Association after retiring from the Navy in 1947, died Saturday at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda after a heart attack. He had lived at 11709 Admiral's way, Potomac.

Adm. Ramsey graduated from the Naval Academy in 1924. He was a destroyer commander in the World War II Battles of Midway, Guadalcanal and Santa Cruz and was

decorated with the Navy Cross and Silver Star.

In the last years of the war he was named to the staff of the commander-in-chief of the Pacific Fleet. From 1943 to 1955 he served as legislative counsel and liaison officer with Congress and Government agencies.

While in the Navy he received a law degree in 1939 from George Washington University.

Survivors include his wife, Pamela; three daughters, Elizabeth Ramsey, of Fremont, Calif., Mr. J. P. H. Kern, of San Carlos, Calif., and Mrs. William Cravens Jr., of Arlington; two sisters, Mrs. J. Stark, of Quincy, Mass., and Helen Ramsey, of Sturgeon's Bay, Wis.; a brother, Allan Ramsey, of Berwick, Maine, and seven grandchildren.

Byelorussian Independence Day, 1968

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, each year, on March 25, Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussians residing in the United States commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. I am proud to join in marking this 50th anniversary of an act of courage, of determination, of national purpose.

In 1918, after centuries of waiting in the shadows of oppressive foreign rulers, the people of Byelorussia proclaimed their independence. But their freedom

was to be tragically short lived. Before a year had elapsed, the Russian Bolsheviks had annexed the newly pronounced republic and freedom for 10,000,000 White Russians died.

Yet even now, after five decades of Soviet suppression, purges, executions and terrorism, Byelorussians continue their struggle to regain the freedom that was so briefly in their grasp in 1918.

Today, let us reaffirm our moral support and respect for those tormented people. Let us pray for the day when Byelorussia—and indeed all nations—can once again exercise sovereign independence.

Remarks of Mayor Hugh V. Addonizio

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a guest of honor at a reception and dinner given on March 10, 1968, at the Military Park Hotel, Newark, N.J., by the Italian Executives of America, Inc. The notable event was marked by the presentation to the city of Newark of a tableaux on which are inscribed in gold the names, States, and dates of service of the 40 present and former Members of the U.S. Congress who are of Italian heritage.

The tableaux, which was suggested by Mr. Raymond P. Stabile, chairman of the organization's 514th birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, was accepted by the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, mayor of the city of Newark. Mayor Addonizio, who is my distinguished predecessor as Representative of the 11th Congressional District in the House of Representatives, delivered a most stirring address in support of the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

I know that our colleagues, many of whom are his friend, will be interested in reading Mayor Addonizio's remarks and I am accordingly pleased to insert the full text at this point in the RECORD:

Your president, Mr. Garamella, officers, members of the Italian Executives of America, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen.

In accepting this tableaux this evening on behalf of the city of Newark, I am filled with great pride and deep humility because I am mindful of the many distinguished names hereon and the contributions these individuals have made to our great country.

Particularly do I want to make mention of Pete Cavicchia, a distinguished American, and native Newarker, in whose memory this presentation is made. He represented in the Congress many years ago, when I was a young boy, the district that I later had the distinction and honor to represent for fourteen years.

I admired him greatly and had a close friendship with him and it is for that reason that I am happy to accept this tableaux for my city.

We are here tonight because all of us are proud of our heritage and proud of the contributions Italians and Italian Americans have made to the world and to America.

The list of those who have made outstanding contributions to our Nation is a long one

and certainly we have good reason to believe that this shall be vastly expanded in the days and years ahead. For the influence of our people is only now beginning to be felt in our land.

Nevertheless, there are many who continue to believe lies about us that they would otherwise reject as slander.

And there still remain people who continue to see Italian-Americans only in terms of those few who bear our name, but betray our heritage.

Attacks on Italian-Americans are, of course, old and deep rooted stories.

The accomplishments of the Tonti's, the Verazzano's, the Toscanini's, the Fermi's, and the thousands upon thousands of others are brushed aside.

All those men—this fine heritage—the heritage of Italy—as well as the heritage of Italian-Americans in our own nation—are forgotten.

Our job is to dispel these old stories—to attack slander and bigotry—and to drive them out of our society once and for all.

For if we are not to be defamed, we must not defame. If we are to avoid discrimination, we must not discriminate, and if we are to avoid bigotry, we must not be bigots.

Therefore, let us judge every man in this room and every man in this world by his performance as an individual and not by his religion, race, or station in life.

Let every person here show our outrage when political, race, or ethnic slanders are leveled at any man, not only Italian-Americans.

For by doing so we protect not only ourselves but American society.

Unfortunately the purveyors of hate and slander are heard loudly and clearly throughout the land, but the voices of moderation and reason are all too still.

During the past decade our nation has been plagued with extremism on all sides and with those who use hatred to attack the strength and vitality of America.

This hatred, regardless of which groups are affected, has cast a shadow on American life, for we must remember that prejudice, bias, and hatred, are the children of ignorance and the allies of violence.

So let us resolve here and now that this type of conduct be the targets of all of us, for Americans must retain their common destiny.

I'm sure all decent people agree that each one of us has a right to be different. Yet there is a togetherness that binds us. It is a togetherness which has been tested in the War of Independence, in the great Civil War, in World War I, in World War II, and now it being tested again in the very streets of our cities.

Therefore, what does it matter if our national wealth reaches the moon and our spiritual values crumble to the ground?

So, let us resolve—each of us—in our own way—with courage, with humility, and with a sense of purpose, to perform in our daily lives the elemental tasks of democracy.

We must never be tolerant of intolerance. We must learn to respect those with whom we differ.

We must in essence treat all men as equal men.

For, my friends, we are all equal before the one who created us.

We must be responsible citizens.

We must be good neighbors.

We must still—by lawful means—those who seek to destroy the foundations of this country.

We must not encourage by our silence or our inaction those who try to build their own power by destroying other men's lives.

As Italian-Americans we must remember that the test of responsibility that we face is doubly difficult for vast numbers of people will study our actions with special care, always ready to emphasize the worst and forget the best.

But we can—and we will—move forward.

And tonight—as we stand together—let us bear in mind our special responsibility.

The doors of opportunity are swinging open, my friends, so let us take care to walk through them with the dignity and pride that our heritage demands.

Let us walk forward with the firm conviction of the glory of our past and the promise of our future—and with thanksgiving to Almighty God, in the knowledge that He always has been and is at our side.

Thank you.

Gov. Ronald Reagan Interviewed by U.S. News & World Report

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, an exclusive interview with our able Republican Governor of California, the Honorable Ronald Reagan, is reported in the March 25, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report. Governor Reagan sets forth his views with clarity and force. His intelligence and integrity are easily discernible. His sense of duty toward the people of California, his party, and his country are obvious to any reader. He deserves the general praise that his governorship has received. A public servant who has given enlightened leadership to the government of a great State, Governor Reagan's insights into the problems of our time merit attention.

U.S. News & World Report is to be complimented on its editorial policy of reporting at length such candid interviews with important public figures. The text of the reported interview with Governor Reagan is as follows:

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW: REAGAN TALKS OF THE ISSUES AND HIS PLANS

(NOTE: A name that keeps coming up in political talk of 1968 is that of Ronald Reagan.)

(Where, exactly, does he stand in the race for the Republican nomination? Is he running? Would he take second place on the ticket? What is his position on Vietnam, taxes, other major issues?)

(All this and much more is explored in this exclusive interview with the California Governor.)

Question. Governor Reagan, how does your position differ from that of Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York with regard to seeking the Republican presidential nomination?

Answer. I think it differs now in that he's changed his position, and I haven't. A short time ago he was saying he didn't want to be and would not be a candidate in any way. Since then, he has indicated that, yes, he would be a candidate if that was the feeling of enough people in the party—that he is open to a draft.

I haven't changed my position—I'm not a candidate.

Question. Is Governor Rockefeller a favorite-son candidate, the same as you?

Answer. No, I think the movements that seem to have started with regard to him—and his willingness to accept—are different from my own position, in which I have been trying regularly and repeatedly to turn off the people starting such things in my behalf.

Governor Rockefeller says he will not actively campaign unless or until a draft movement takes place—this, of course, is very soon after the withdrawal of Governor Rom-

ney. I don't know that he'll be able to hold to that. I think there is going to be great pressure on him to campaign actively.

Question. Do you intend to campaign in any of the other primary States?

Answer. No, no.

Question. Would you accept the vice-presidential nomination on the Republican ticket under any circumstances?

Answer. No. People tell me there have been records of others who have said the same thing, but that here and there party pressure has been invoked to make them change their minds. But, in this present circumstance—I didn't get into this because I wanted a political career, anyway. I believe very strongly in what we are trying to do in California.

I have an opportunity to try to do the things that I believe in. I wouldn't have that opportunity even if I were in that other job.

I don't mean that anyone has pressured me to say anything about that other one. But I think that this job, in California, is one that offers the greater opportunity for the things that I believe in—a kind of "show-casing" of them.

Question. Will your decision be influenced in any way by whoever happens to be the choice at the top of the Republican ticket?

Answer. No, it's the job itself. It isn't a case of whether I would or would not want to be on a ticket with some individual.

It's just a plain case that, as I say, we've got an opportunity in California, in the most populous State, to see once and for all whether common-sense business practices in the running of the nuts-and-bolts part of government can work, to see if the people can join in and help solve some of the most vexing problems.

I think there has been an indication—even in just this one year—that we are right, that these things can take place. I want to keep on with that—and I don't think you'd have an opportunity to do it as Vice President.

Question. Do you mean that the Vice Presidency is a sort of stand-by post without real authority?

Answer. That's right. The Vice President certainly is not going to establish policy.

Question. Do you believe Republican Governors around the nation, who now control a majority of the States, will give their wholehearted support to the ticket and platform chosen by the party at the Miami Beach Convention?

Answer. I think they will. I've been at enough Governors' conferences to talk with them—and heard them talk—to realize that, like most Republicans today, they want a victory. They believe that only through a unified support of all the party can we have it. And I think they're ready to do that.

Question. What do the Republicans have to offer the American people in order to win the 1968 presidential election?

Answer. I don't know that the Republican Party has to deal in actual specifics or mechanics as, let's say, the great failures in the poverty program. But I think they have to offer a clear-cut difference in policy in all major areas.

The Republican Party has to stand for something more than just saying: "Well, we'll do the same things, but do them more efficiently."

I think the party has to take a stand on all major issues, and it must be a stand that's based on policy—on a difference in policy.

For example, the approach to welfare—the old accusation that's made that the Republican Party objects to welfare because they don't want to help those who are in need—this isn't true.

What the party has to stand up and say is that our great objection to what's going on is the failure of welfare, the creation of a dependency cycle in which people are not getting off welfare—they are now inheriting

it. We have people in the third generation of their families who are living on public assistance.

The Republican Party is going to have to say that it will present a program to break this dependency cycle, to reestablish once again that charity isn't good unless it makes the people who receive it independent of it.

WHAT BOTHERS PEOPLE MOST

Question. Do you sense any one overriding issue in the public mind?

Answer. Yes. If I had to name one, even in spite of the war, I would say—I hate to start out by using the word "crime," I'd rather use the word "morality." And I think crime is the most dramatic expression of this. The people of this country are terribly concerned about what seems to be a lessening of standards, a loosening of morals, a drifting away from tried-and-true principles. This involves not only misdeeds in high office, but crime in the streets—the tendency to settle things by violence, taking the law into our own hands. It gets to the most dramatic part when it comes to the actual incidence of crime—the fear of people to walk down the street after dark in their own neighborhoods.

And I think this is uppermost in most people's minds. In talks that I've made throughout the country, this particular subject seems to get the greatest response.

Question. What causes this lessening of the moral fabric?

Answer. I think that it's come down, in recent decades, from a gradual—and probably well-intentioned—effort to find answers to wrongdoing. We've turned to a kind of permissive attitude—to the idea that the individual doesn't have so much responsibility, but that society is to blame for his misdeeds. And we've had a great many judicial rulings that fit in with this. In our effort to protect the rights of the accused, we've gone beyond what I believe is reasonable, to the point that Government has drifted away from its prime responsibility of protecting society from the lawbreaker, instead of the other way around.

It's a permissive attitude—a softness on the part of our society today, an unwillingness to fix blame and individual responsibility.

WORRY OVER THE ECONOMY

Question. What other issues seem to stand out in the minds of the people today?

Answer. I would say that No. 2, ranking almost up with this other one, would be the economic issue. Here again, it's not just a dissatisfaction of people with their rate of salary; it ties in with the concern that people feel about the value of their money—the gold outflow, seeing our once-silver money disappear to be replaced by copper, the rising inflation that seems to be keeping ahead of our ability to earn, the way this has reduced the savings, the pensions, the insurance of people.

There's more than just the concern of hard times that we've known in the past, where people said:

"Well, things aren't good right now. We want someone who will stimulate things."

There's a real lack of confidence today on the part of the people. They want a restoration of their confidence in the American system and in our money.

Question. Is there any present candidate, or any prominent man who might be considered as eligible for the Presidency, who's facing up to these problems?

Answer. I think there's been a pretty good speaking-out on the part of the potentials.

One candidate that we do have declared—Dick Nixon—has spoken out, although it's true that in his schedule of issues to discuss he has dwelled more on the international situation and on the Vietnam conflict. But recently he has begun to speak on these other issues, too.

I think that Republicans—let's say, Republican leaders, those who aren't even potential candidates, but, like myself, who have

been out speaking at fund-raisers—I think most of us have been attempting to deal with the problems. I know that I, in my own speeches, have touched on these two issues that we've just mentioned, as well as several others, in assessing what we think are the failures of the present leadership, and our belief in what the principles of our party should be.

Question. What is it that the people want most of all? Is it strong leadership at the top?

Answer. Yes, they want strong leadership at the top. They want someone, I think, who has the courage to tell them not only the bright things, but tell them exactly what they are up against. I think the people have lost faith in what they're being told by public officials.

I don't think it's just a credibility gap in Washington. I find it right in California. We've tried to tell the truth. I've gone on television with 15-minute special reports to the people. And yet, the people are so used to being fooled that when someone on the other side counters and issues a public statement disagreeing or challenging some of the figures, you'll find even the knowledgeable and prestigious papers in the State editorializing to the effect that: "Well, if we only knew what was really going on—we can't believe anyone."

Let me turn to the war for an example: I think the people of this country would feel a lot better if the leadership in Washington would put this country on a war footing, and tell the people that they should be matching the sacrifices of their sons who are over there fighting—tell the people we are going to do without a little butter in this time of national emergency. I believe the people would feel a great deal better.

Question. In the event that you happened to be elected President, how would you propose to deal with this war?

Answer. I hate to answer it in that context. Let me answer it in the way of what I think some hypothetical person should do and could do if he were in that position. I think he should come to the people and make no secret about it—we're in a war.

This thing today of trying to pretend that we've never had it so good, that we have prosperity at home, and sort of tuck off into a corner of your mind that half a million young kids of ours are over there getting shot at—that's bad.

I think we should ask the people to do away with some of the things that are so pleasant in today's living until this war is over.

We should mobilize the power of this nation on a war footing to bring the war to an end.

I don't believe in the policy of gradualism in fighting a war. I think once the shooting starts there is a moral responsibility on the part of a nation to do everything that it possibly can to bring that war to a conclusion as fast as possible. And we're not doing that.

Wars of attrition are more costly in men and treasure. As we go on—year in and year out—in a war of this kind, the casualties may come in at a slower rate than they do in the quick thrust, but in the long run they add up to a greater total.

For this country to stand here and pretend that we can't bring this war to a close when we are up against a nation of about 15 million people with a little "water buffalo" economy just doesn't make sense to the American people. Somewhere along the line, I think a leader of this country has to stand up, give the people the facts of life, and set a policy.

Question. Why, in your estimation, has this war gone on so long without a satisfactory solution?

Answer. It's the theory of limited war—the idea that it isn't being fought for a victory.

The argument for a couple of years was over escalation. It was the argument during the 1964 election: whether to escalate or not. Well, that's a specious argument now because we have escalated. We've escalated beyond the point that caused some people to be called "warmongers" just a couple of years ago for advocating it.

The fact is, though, if we had this amount of escalation in a shorter period of time—an immediate escalation—the war very well could have been over. The military wanted that. The Air Force, for example, recommended some 94 targets to be blitzed in a 16-day blitz. Almost all of those targets are now on the target list. But it took two or three years for them to get there.

If this had happened all at once, I think it would have been more than the enemy could have taken. First of all, the evidence of our willingness to go all out would have revealed to him a long time ago that he wasn't going to achieve his objective.

But when, day by day, reluctantly and over a period of years, you crept up in this, it's sort of like the frog in the boiling water: You know, if you just heat it up a degree at a time, he'll stay there till he boils.

Question. What needs to be done now to bring about a successful, satisfactory conclusion?

Answer. Well, No. 1, I think we should close Haiphong harbor. I think it has to be closed. Just the other day the press of the nation carried the story that suddenly guerrilla activity in Cambodia, in Laos, in Thailand has stepped up, that the enemy is not just guerrilla-sniping now from the bushes, that the enemy is using Russian-built rockets in those areas as well as in Vietnam. I think that a great deal of that war matériel—most of those supplies—have to be coming in through Haiphong. I see nothing wrong with closing that harbor. This would stop about 85 per cent, according to the military, of the supplies that are making the war possible.

And then the second thing is: If we don't actually invade, certainly at least we should pose the threat of invasion of North Vietnam to the point where they've got to pin down some of their forces up there on a defensive basis, instead of turning everything loose with our guarantee that they don't have to guard the store at home because no one's going to hit them there. I don't think anyone should ever attempt to fight a war while giving the other army complete freedom to move, with no threat to his source of supply and his base of operations. And, of course, I don't see anything wrong with invasion of North Vietnam.

Question. You mentioned guns and butter on the home front. What needs to be done here? Are you talking about controls, fiscal expenditures, regulations—

Answer. I would think whatever is necessary in that regard. I don't know that we need the complete regimentation that we knew in World War II. Here again I would want the advice first of all of military men with regard to what is lacking and how much more they need. Based on this, and based on the facts which aren't available to anyone outside of the executive branch of the National Government right now, I think you would express to the people a willingness to do whatever is necessary. And I would think right now that the budget that's been presented at the national level could well reflect, in some reductions of home spending, that we are tightening our belts, that there are some things we can't afford until the war is over.

Question. Speaking of the home front, some people have said we are approaching a point of guerrilla warfare in the cities of America. What do you think should be done about this?

Answer. Let me make it plain when you say this, we're talking about crime, we're talking about violence such as the anti-Viet-

nam-war demonstrations, we're even talking about the growing tendency in legitimate disputes of labor, or whatever it is, to resort to violence more quickly or as a regular adjunct and part of the negotiation, instead of as a last, desperate gamble.

I think that we must try to solve the problems that may be the root causes of some of this disturbance. But we continue to do this not because of the threat of violence; we should solve them because it's morally right to solve them. But then I think we should stiffen our spines with regard to those who take the law into their own hands. We must make it perfectly plain that there will be no toleration of lawbreaking of any kind, that we will meet, with whatever force and power is necessary, those who do take the law into their own hands.

Now, when we get to actual crime, I believe there are some tools that could be given to law enforcement, which is mainly a local responsibility. Some of those tools have been taken from local authorities by recent judicial decisions. I think the legislatures of our States and of our nation could do more in some instances to make it perfectly plain what is the intent of the law, and this would result in changing some of those judicial decisions that have been made.

I know that at the State level I have been trying to give back to local communities some of the things that have been preempted by the State. All that happened was we created a limbo. Our State doesn't have the power to enforce the law or the supervision in some areas, and yet we, by some legislation and by some judicial decisions, pre-empted some fields from the local communities. Now they're forbidden to operate in those fields, and yet we don't have the facilities to operate, and we've just thrown it open.

Question. What relation is there between the race problem and the crime problem today?

Answer. There is an involvement by way of men like Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown. The root causes—the lack of equal opportunity, excess unemployment, inferior education and housing—these are things that it's morally right for us to be doing our best to solve and to correct, without doing it because someone's threatening to riot.

At the same time—and this is where I take issue with the President's commission on this racial problem and the riots—I don't think they made it plain enough that there is an element that is using this excuse to foment riot and disorder. I don't believe that the goal of these people is equal opportunity, or civil rights, or human rights. Whatever their goal is, whatever ax they're grinding, it's in a different area.

They're capitalizing on the dissatisfaction of people who can be made militant and aroused because of past and present grievances—dissatisfaction with their lot. But to ignore those militants, to believe that, if you suddenly could convince everyone that you were going to start out and cure the root problem, to believe that those militants would stop what they're doing—that's pretty naive. I think their goal of a "hot summer" would continue anyway. And I think you have to be willing to stand up and say, "This we will not tolerate."

PROGRESS ON RACE

Question. The President's commission blamed riots on what they called "white racism." Do you agree?

Answer. No, I don't. Let me make it plain:

Of course, there's prejudice in this country. Man has been bothered by prejudice as long as there has been man. And in our country, of course, we have a history of it. But to continue to talk about this prejudice as if there's been no change in it, no progress made in the hundred years since the Civil War—that is to ignore reality.

If you want to talk about the first 75 or 80 years, yes, we didn't make enough progress. But if you want to start talking of what began to happen with World War II, you have to say there is less intolerance, less bigotry, less prejudice and discrimination today than there's been at any time in our history. So, if this was the cause of the riots and racial disturbance, why didn't we have them 10 years ago, why didn't we have them 20, 25 years ago? Why now? You could almost be excused for suspecting that someone has stepped up their pace in fomenting disorder, maybe because we were making some progress.

In my adult lifetime, my first career was as a sports announcer. I broadcast major-league baseball at a time when "The Spalding Baseball Guide" said baseball was a game for Caucasian gentlemen. It's amazing how many grown-up people today have forgotten that just a few years ago there were no Negroes permitted in organized baseball, that a university like the University of Illinois—not in the Deep South—a State, tax-supported university, had a gentleman's agreement that no Negro would play on a varsity team.

World War II made great changes. Buddy Young, a Negro who was there as a part of the officer-training program, became an all-America at the University of Illinois during the war. And, of course, that policy was destroyed once and for all. And we know what's happened in major-league baseball.

We've made fantastic progress in the last few years, and the militants who took to the streets with Molotov cocktails have done nothing except slow that down and harm the very people they profess to be rioting for. For that, I hope heaven can forgive them, because I have difficulty forgiving them.

PLIGHT OF MANY NEGROES

Question. Isn't there a large element of substantial, stable, decent, respectable, patriotic Negroes in America who feel they're not getting protection of their own rights and security from activists and radicals in the black-power movement?

Answer. Now you've touched a nerve. This to me is the great problem, and if there's anything that we're overlooking, this is it. We forget that living in communities in the minority areas—you said a large, substantial proportion; I'd put it at 98 per cent at least—that this 98 per cent, living like the rest of us live, not used to violence, not bearing arms, living in their homes or apartments in these areas, are faced with a threat from the militants in their own midst, who tell them that they will go along with this or at least hold still for it, or, when everybody goes home, it will be their house that starts burning in the middle of the night, or their children who don't get home from school.

And what I think has to be done—we have to move with that responsible sector, and find an answer to that problem, so that the responsible white community and the responsible Negro community stand shoulder and shoulder against the militants of either race, and let them know that there is a united front.

Now, in Sacramento—and I don't mean that we turned to a vigilante type of organization or anything—but in Sacramento last summer, responsible Negro citizens formed a kind of neighborhood and block program. It was almost like the air-raid system of World War II. They were the ones who suddenly stood together as a majority and said to the minority in their own midst:

"If you do these things, you're going against us. You're going against the Negro community, and we're not going to let you get away with it."

And there was almost no disorder. They made it work.

Question. What do you think should be

done about our federal fiscal and economic situation?

Answer. I doubt in this inflationary spiral now that we can solve the problem without increasing taxes, which has always been one of the weapons of curbing inflation. But I don't like it the way it is proposed by the Federal Government, because they're only suggesting raising the taxes so that the Government can go on spending more money.

If the Government were to go as far as it could to start reducing deficit spending and get into an austerity program of its own, and then found that an increase in taxes was needed to balance the budget and look toward a day of beginning to reduce the national debt, this, I think, is the answer to inflation.

Then I would support an increase in taxes.

Question. Are there specific areas where federal spending should be reduced?

Answer. Yes, but it's a little bit like our own State problem. I think the Government kind of fosters this: To anyone who wants to practice economy, they say, "What program would you eliminate first?" I think the logical answer to this is: Before you start looking at programs to eliminate, let's start putting the programs that we now have on a sounder basis, a sound fiscal basis with better business management.

This is what we found in the State of California. We've begun to make some sizable savings simply by employing business practices in the programs that now exist. If we come to a program that we believe is an unnecessary service—that the people not only don't want it, but don't want it at the price they're paying—then we'll not hesitate to recommend its elimination.

A pretty good hatchet job has been done by some of the opposition on our Medi-Cal program, claiming that we overestimated the spending, and that we've had to keep altering the figures. This isn't true. We didn't overestimate the spending at all.

We started administratively making reductions and economies in the program. And we've been able to come, every few months, back to the people and give them a new figure of what the year's spending will be in that program. By dint of our own economies, the cost has gone down. Last year was an example: We started with a figure that it was going to cost 810 million dollars, when it had been budgeted at 600 million. We've gotten that 810 figure down to an estimated 693 million. This was a saving.

Many of our automotive departments and all of our highway building in California come out of the gasoline tax. Now there's no way to reduce the budget in that. Whatever comes in from gasoline taxes must be spent for highways. But what we can do is get more miles of highway for the dollars. The latest figure I have is that this year we're starting 194 million dollars' worth of highway projects a year ahead of schedule. Over half of that 194 million dollars are economies that we had made in the administration of the program. In other words, we translated red tape into miles of paving.

Question. What about inflation and the cost of living?

Answer. I think the biggest single factor causing inflation is Government deficit spending. It's a sophisticated way of turning on the printing presses. It makes the supply of money greater. And, of course, it just compounds the crime, because inflation, like radioactivity, is cumulative.

It may not be going up as fast as it did in Germany at the end of World War I, but each year adds a few more pennies of inflation.

Question. A new phenomenon in the labor-relations field seems to be strikes by public servants—schoolteachers, sanitation workers, transit workers and so on. What do you think about this trend?

Answer. Being a Neanderthal man in the eyes of some of the more liberal gentry, it's easy for me to say I still believe that it's wrong for public employees to strike.

I think that perhaps we've waited too long in setting up good, trustworthy machinery in government to offer these people a forum for their grievances, and for a solution to the problem of wages and hours and working conditions. And I've given orders in our government that the State shall turn to that. We're starting to study what could be good machinery in our State to provide for adjudicating these problems. But I do not believe public employees have a right to strike.

Question. You're a former union leader—Answer. That's right. I was six times president of the Screen Actors Guild.

Question. Do you have any particular views on whether union power has grown too big in our economy?

Answer. I have one view that's long been a pet of mine. The union of which I was president for a number of years has in its constitution and bylaws a provision that nothing that is a matter of union policy can be decided without a secret ballot. And our members are given the right to vote on these policy matters in secret ballot in the privacy of their own homes—to vote by mail. I don't say it has to be done that way, but the secret ballot is my answer to a lot of things. I have the greatest faith in the working men and women of America. I think the union member is just as fair and patriotic a citizen as you'll find anywhere.

I don't have the same faith in the union hierarchy. I think that they have fallen into the trap that many governments fall into: They have begun to think that they know what's best for the rank and file, and they're making the decisions without inquiring whether those decisions meet the favor of the rank and file.

That's why I would like to give back to the labor-union member in his own union this right to secret ballot. Most people don't realize how difficult it for a union member in many unions to stand up on the floor and be counted in a vote, when he knows that the leadership on the platform opposes his view. It's very difficult for the boss of a company to fire anyone in America any more, but a union can keep a fellow from working. The secret ballot would be one step to reduce this hazard that many working people must feel.

Then I think that we really should sit down and study if there isn't a need for certain antitrust provisions to be applied to the unions.

HANDOUTS VERSUS JOBS

Question. Governor, we hear a great deal today about the so-called hard-core unemployed—the Government should become the "employer of last resort" in providing jobs. What do you think about this problem?

Answer. I've often wondered what the people who say that so glibly envision, and what they mean. We could be the employer of last resort right now in Government. All we'd have to do in return for a welfare check is say to the person that he had to contribute some service to the Government. We could organize work pools and call the compensation not a "welfare check" but a "paycheck." They're not doing it in the Federal Government.

We have a plan at work in California, headed by one of our industrialists, Mr. H. C. McClellan. It's working very well. We have thousands of industrialists who are lined up in the State participating. This is to go into the minority areas, the poverty pockets of the State, on a straight business basis. We're not asking any employer to lower his requirements for the job. But through co-operating with the Government and with our own administration, through job training, we're bringing the people up to the level of the jobs.

Now, if we can eliminate, by way of private employment, all those who are unemployable with job training, we then will get down to the really unemployable—the social problems, the people who are totally illiterate and therefore can't even be given job training because they can't read the instructions. This is a social problem that can't be foisted off on private industry alone. This is one that really involves the Government.

There will be some people who will be unemployable by reason of, say, criminal records; some by reason of health. When we get down to those who cannot work through no fault of their own, due to age or disability, I don't think there is anyone in this country who doesn't want to accept the responsibility for caring for those people. And I think we could do a better job of it if we weren't dividing our wealth so much with people who can be made useful citizens.

With those who can be made employable—those who are not too old and not disabled, but who are illiterate and so forth—I say, we should go to work on a hard program of bringing them up to the level of employment.

When you get down below that level I see nothing wrong with Government doing its part, as we did once back in the depression days—of providing jobs for people who could do them. But it must be a real job. One thing that WPA had in old depression days was that—outside of some boondoggling that was the fault of the local individuals involved—a great many WPA projects were worthwhile projects. They were things that needed to be done.

Now we have a program going this summer for youth employment in California. The overwhelming majority of these young people are going to get jobs in private enterprise. But we also have a State program. We're going to put several thousand to work. They'll be jobs that are there to be done—firebreaks, trails up in our wilderness areas. Now, it doesn't mean that if those young people didn't do it, we'd find a way to do the jobs. These are jobs, that, otherwise, would be waiting their turn on a schedule. We'll just step the schedule up to get these things done.

One of the great faults in so many of the poverty programs is the invented job—it doesn't exist. The kids are too smart for this. It's like the old winding-the-clock-in-the-gym job before the days of athletic scholarships. The fellow that's handed this assignment knows that he isn't really being given a job, that it doesn't matter whether he does it or not.

So you not only don't get anything done; you actually destroy something in his character. This is why, I guess, they switched to the athletic scholarship. They thought it was a little destructive even of college athletes to do this.

Question. Governor, do you think the time has come to re-examine American foreign aid and defense commitments around the world?

Answer. Well, you've tied two things together there. It's pretty hard for anyone in my position—not privy to all the information—to know the defense requirements. But I do think perhaps we haven't done enough to make some of our allies abroad pick up their fair share of the burden.

On foreign aid in general, I believe it can be reduced, but I'd rather use the word "reformed." In the food situation, for example, I'd a lot rather see America exporting our know-how and our farm technology and the means of production to hungry countries than just sending them a boatload of wheat, because every time we send them a boatload of wheat we just set back that much further their inability to feed themselves or learn how to feed themselves. But the know-how and the means for making themselves self-sufficient—this should be the kind of foreign aid that our country extends.

WEAKNESS OF U.S. POLICY

Question. What do you consider the vital interests of the United States in the rest of the world today? Have you refined that out in your thinking?

Answer. Yes, I don't know how refined it is, but I believe it's something again where we're lacking leadership in Washington. This thing of waking up and every day taking the temperature of the Russians to see how warm their smile is and then gleefully saying, "Oh, the cold war is thawing," and then next week they happen to wake up on the wrong side of the bed and now we're back in trouble again—I think this is the wrong approach. This country must take a position. Our record is clear. We're not an aggressive nation. We've never set out to make territorial gains in any of the conflicts we've been in in this century. So we don't have to defend ourselves on that score.

I think this nation should have a master plan, if you want to call it that, based on what we believe is the enemy's master plan. We should have catalogued all of the potential hot spots in the world, and what we're going to do about them with regard to our own best interests. Maybe here's one where we say, "No, we're not going to extend ourselves to that one."

Perhaps we should also have a counterplan that says that maybe part of the answer in a hot spot such as Vietnam is to give the enemy something else to worry about in another corner of the world. Maybe the way to fight in some of these hot spots is not allow the enemy to drag us and focus us on that one spot, while he sits back rickshacking nothing. Maybe he ought to have some unrest in some corner of his realm to worry about.

Question. Some people think that the Communists are doing that to us in the Middle East right now, don't they?

Answer. I don't think that we can pretend that we have no involvement there. We've been involved, and that's why the Sixth Fleet is in the Mediterranean. This is one of those places where there should be a type of American leadership that walks up to the two protagonists and offers its services and says, "Let us sit down and find a solution to this problem that is fair to all." One of the things that could justify our doing that without being a busybody in the world scene is that we could offer help in solving the greatest problem for all of them—which is the need for water.

This is similar to the proposal made by President Eisenhower. I think this is a way in which we come in. I think the refugee problem in the Middle East has to have a solution—you can't just pretend it'll go away. I think the boundary disputes must be settled, and settled in a way that's fair to all. I believe that the United States could, as its price of admission to getting them at a table to solve these problems, offer to help in nuclear desalting of water that would give them fertile acres they need and the ability to feed themselves, which they don't have.

Question. Earlier you mentioned judicial decisions when you were talking about crime here at home. What kind of appointments do you think should be made to the Supreme Court and federal judiciary?

Answer. I have a proposal that I'm trying to get passed in California for taking the appointment of judges out of politics, to insure that, instead of a judgeship being a patronage plum for a Governor, the judges would be picked on a basis of their qualifications, experience and character. I don't see any reason why this should not be the rule with regard to the United States Supreme Court.

I would think that, regardless of politics, a man should only be appointed who has had the greatest experience on the bench and in a judicial capacity. This has not been true in the appointments of recent years. Some judges are lawyers who never practiced law.

I've made more than 60 judicial appointments this last year, and none of them has been a reward for any political favors. In every area where judges were to be appointed, we've named a committee of citizens and the bar and the judiciary, and each one of these three committees is given every name that has been proposed for a judge, the names that come to us from legislators, the names of lawyers who have applied and said they wanted to be a judge.

All of these go to the various committees and they screen and send back their evaluation of this whole panel. We put the three evaluations together—from the fellow lawyers, from the judges, and from the laymen. On the basis of the highest score, we make our judicial appointments.

I would feel very safe in having you go out and check with the bar, the judiciary, or anyone on these 60 appointees. I think you'll find they have been exceptionally high quality.

As a matter of fact, take men who may not want to leave the practice of law to go to the bench because of the economic sacrifice they had to make. You'd be surprised how many under this system now are making themselves available and are willing to undergo that sacrifice because of this approach. We're trying to get this made a part of the constitution so that, for all time to come, Governors will base their appointments on merit and not politics.

Question. You've talked of citizen participation in government. What do you mean by that?

Answer. Here in California, we have in the last year set out to involve the independent sector—the private citizen—in the government of his State. We've succeeded beyond anything I'd believed was possible when I started. Oh, I thought it might be possible in four years, but I didn't believe that it could succeed as rapidly as it has. We've had almost 300 of the most successful people in the State serving on task forces. They've gone into 60 areas of the State Government and come back with almost 2,000 specific recommendations as to how we can make government more efficient, more economical. Already we have implemented 137 of their recommendations and approved another 604.

We've found people who are willing to give up a couple of years from their business and professional careers to take assignments in government—administrative positions. They have no desire to make a career of government. They have done it a great personal sacrifice, giving up \$90,000 or \$100,000-a-year incomes to take \$25,000 and \$30,000 jobs. We know that they'll return to their own careers very shortly and then we'll try to find someone else to do the same thing.

But we've discovered that in America—because I'm sure it's not just true of California—government of and by, as well as for, the people will succeed. And we've found that for everything that needs doing and every problem, there are 10 people out there who are willing to take a hand in helping solve it, if only someone will ask them or someone will say they're welcome or they're needed.

It's been a great satisfaction to me, a great source of pride. I would hope that—in spite of election year and all of the partisanship that gets involved—I would hope that the word could be spread to more people.

Some of our people have been invited by 20 Governors to come to their States, both Democrat and Republican, to tell them about this plan and how it's operating. The same thing is happening as a result of our task forces. Some people who participated in them are getting invitations to go tell other governments of the other 49 States how to set up such a thing.

The only reason that I want the word spread is because I believe that in a lot of those other States there must be people who have found answers to some of the most vexing problems in their local communities.

CXIV—506—Part 6

And I think that, if we all begin talking to each other about these things, we're going to discover that maybe some of the gigantic federal programs aren't needed, that at a community level and at a people level there have been answers found to every one of the problems, if we can just spread the word, and the rest of us can do what someone else has been doing.

Marshes: Why Save Them?

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1968, the House passed the estuarine areas bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to inventory and to conduct a study of the Nation's estuarine areas. In reporting to the Congress, the Secretary is to recommend what actions, if any, he feels are necessary to protect these estuaries. A great majority of our citizens are probably unaware of just how vital a resource an estuary is.

An article that appears in the March 20 issue of the Presto Press of Mattapoisett, Mass., entitled "Marshes: Why Save Them?" discusses the value of these vital areas. In summing up the contribution of marshes to our store of natural resources, the article states:

At all seasons, marshes are factories of basic animal and plant nutrients contributing the organic wealth to coastal waters that support much of our fish and shellfish resources.

The article also points out many require up to 5,000 years to develop, yet can be destroyed in a few days.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we all may be exposed to the need for preserving our estuarine areas, I am inserting the article "Marshes: Why save Them?" at this point in the RECORD:

MARSHES: WHY SAVE THEM?

In recent years, the local Conservation Commissions have acquired tidal marsh lands through purchase to hold for Conservation purposes. The value of these lands to the future of towns is beyond calculation. To those who are not very clear on its function, here is a short story of the marsh.

WHY SALT MARSHES?

Of all outdoor problems confronting the public, why do conservationists select salt marshes as one of the most urgent? The salt marsh is not a playground. To many unknowing people, a salt marsh seems a murky wasteland. Then, why do those persons most experienced in the outdoors concentrate their efforts upon saving salt marshes? The answer is the most unselfish that ever prompted a conservation program.

WHAT GOOD IS A MARSH?

Often conservationists must answer the "what good" challenge with another, like "what good is a flower?" But not when it comes to marshes. The marsh has value even to those who never go near it. The fish that have crossed the family table were, in part, the product of a marsh. The shellfish that provide both food and employment are marsh-fed. The abundant wildlife. The beauty of many coastal towns—and, as a result the value of land and attractiveness to summer visitors—often rests heavily upon marshes.

FIRST, WHAT ARE SALT MARSHES?

Marshes are delicately-balanced complexes as fragile as eggshells. Their most obvious

element is the grasses that flourish along the salt creeks and inlets. At high tide, marshes are a watery world of fiddler crabs, fishes, waterfowl. At low tide, they are the mud flats fat with shellfish and often flush with shorebirds. At all seasons, marshes are factories of basic animal and plant nutrients contributing the organic wealth of coastal waters that support much of our fish and shellfish resources.

WHAT MAKES A MARSH?

Time and the ocean. Geologists estimate that the balance of forces that create a marsh require up to 5,000 years. Thus, the only marshes that future generations will know are those that now exist. Each acre is irreplaceable within our lifetimes and the lifetimes of generations yet unborn—indeed, within any practical future. What we save now is all that ever will be saved!

WHO OWNS THE MARSHES?

Colonial families knew exactly where they held the right to swing scythes and stack marsh hay. The marsh was the most valued asset of many colonial coastal towns. With the passage of years, the exact location of many colonial holdings has grown hazy. A major problem in protecting our coastal marshes lies in determining ownership of some thousands of unprotected acres. For despite the wild appearance, almost every acre of marsh is held by some landowner.

THE VALUES OF MARSHES?

Biologists have described them as among the most productive acres on earth. Decomposing plants and minute animals that thrive there wash from the marshes into coastal waters to feed both shellfish and finfish. The richness of coastal waters depends heavily upon the marshes. Of value to owners? Not really. The owner of a salt marsh becomes a public servant. The richness of his marsh flows into the sea—and is harvested by the public.

WHY NOW A THREAT?

For three centuries coastal residents have left their marshes relatively undisturbed. Suddenly, technology has made the marshes vulnerable to exploitation. Dredges turn them into parking lots, housing lots, boating marinas. Aren't these things of value to citizens? Yes. But there are other sites suited to them. The salt marsh can exist nowhere else. Its function cannot be replaced. Why trade the destruction of the long-term value inherent in our coastal fisheries and waterfowl resources for short-term gains? Why, especially, since the marsh and its values never can be restored?

Who benefits from preservation of salt marshes? Everyone. You who now read this benefit as directly as any individual or organization involved in the program.

WHAT'S EXPECTED OF YOU?

As a citizen, you naturally are concerned—not just for yourself, but for your children and grandchildren as well. You might profitably acquaint yourself with the salt marshes of your area, or those of your favorite coastal town. Your role is that of the concerned citizen in any free society—to inform yourself, to weigh the real issues, to assess long-term values, and to express your views to your fellow citizens and representatives of government so that the public interest in our coastal fishery, wildlife and scenic resources will be defended.

Vietnam Proposal

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote President Johnson

requesting that a positive and visible effort be made to indicate this Nation's willingness to enter into discussions to bring an end to the war in Vietnam.

The text of the letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1968.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The record is clear that you have long and diligently sought to negotiate a settlement of the war in Vietnam.

The record is clear that your sincere and tireless efforts have repeatedly been rebuffed by the officials of the North Vietnamese Government.

Respectfully, I request that you consider the following proposal: That the North Vietnamese Government and the entire world be informed that on an immediate date at a specified time and in a specified city, such as Geneva, that representatives of our Government will be there to meet with representatives of the North Vietnamese Government to discuss a peaceful settlement to the hostilities in Southeast Asia.

This would once again prove to the world that we truthfully desire peace.

Respectfully,

RICHARD FULTON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, while I have consistently supported bills and resolutions before this body to support our men in Vietnam I have also continuously urged that every possible effort be made to bring this war to the conference table. I believe the course recommended in my letter could aid in this effort and I request that those of my colleagues who may be so inclined join me in this endeavor by forwarding their views to President Johnson.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are one of the oldest ethnic groups in the vast Soviet Union. I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which was proclaimed on March 25, 1918.

The Byelorussians, who had lived under the czars for several centuries, had their own sovereign and independent state before the birth of the Russian empire. During the period of foreign rule over their country, they carefully guarded their national traditions and looked forward to the opportunity to assert their freedom. They seized upon the chance provided by the Russian Revolution of 1917 and formed their own democratic government in their capital city of Minsk. Their independence was short-lived. Before the year was out the Red Army overran Byelorussia, and annexed it to the Soviet Union.

The Byelorussian spirit of nationalism, nonetheless, remains undimmed. Its culture has not been plowed under nor tarnished by intensive efforts by the Soviet

Union to "Russianize" this small nation of 8 million people. Homage must be paid, concern must be shown to a country displaying the dignity and continued strength of this nation.

I know the U.S. Congress will continue to sympathize with the situation of the small borderland nations between Russia and Europe who wish to assert their independence. Freedom is a precious goal, and one we should like to see all nations aspire to achieve.

Administration Supports United Nations Double Standard Censure Resolution Against Israel

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday evening, March 24, the Security Council of the U.N. unanimously adopted a resolution on the recent outbreak of violence in the Middle East. The effect of the resolution is to unilaterally condemn Israel for its reprisal raid on Jordan's east bank territory. This resolution parallels the condemnatory, unilateral resolution against Israel in April 1962, which was introduced by Ambassador Stevenson following attacks by the Syrians and a reprisal attack by Israel. A similar censure resolution against Israel was passed by the U.N. with U.S. support in November 1967 in connection with the Es-Samu incident. The only difference between those resolutions and the recent one was that the latter contains some innocuous verbiage deploring acts of violence. The March 25 issue of the New York Times states:

Diplomats considered, on the whole, that the resolution comes down far more heavily against the Israelis than against the Arabs.

Considering the text of the resolution, its interpretation as reflected in the statements of Arab representatives at the Security Council hearings and the reaction of many of the people to whom I have spoken, it would seem that the resolution condemns Israel but does not deal with Arab provocation and, in a sense, is a capitulation to Arab guerrilla warfare and sabotage. In statements made by Arab spokesmen at the Security Council meetings they unequivocally interpreted the resolution to mean that Arab guerrilla raids are justified and legitimate and that military sanctions should follow only in the event that Israel retaliates.

Far and away from acting as a force for moderation and peace, the passage of this resolution supported by the Johnson administration stimulates and encourages Arab intransigence and will create further turbulence and violence in the Middle East, necessitate Israeli's retaliation and may result in raising the specter of another world war.

It should be pointed out that the approach taken by the administration is another in a long series of equivocal and

vacillating attitudes which have encouraged the Soviets and permitted their ominous extension of influence in the Middle East. It seems obvious to me that the insistence by the Soviets in threatening sanctions—acquiesced in by the administration—is a deliberate attempt to provide a basis for future and further penetration by the Soviets and further opens the door to them for political and military involvement in the Middle East.

Censure resolutions against Israel exculpating or minimizing Arab involvement in acts of force and terror induce and encourage the Arabs to further violence and are detrimental to all efforts to establish peace and stability in the area.

The entire record of the administration regarding the situation in the Middle East has lacked courage and imagination. For example, no executive action has been taken on Senator BAKER's resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the Eisenhower-Strauss plan for a nuclear desalting plant in the Middle East as an approach to join Israel and the moderate Arab States in a cooperative enterprise. This resolution passed the Senate unanimously. In my judgment a Republican administration would assume active and imaginative leadership in the international community and in the United Nations to secure a political statement in the Middle East based on the following principles:

First. An end to the state of belligerency between the Arabs and Israel and recognition by all states in the area of Israel's right to live and prosper as an independent nation.

Second. As an essential part of a permanent settlement in the Middle East, the United States should insist on, and aid in, the rehabilitation and resettlement of the more than 1 million Palestine Arab refugees who have been displaced over the past 20 years.

Third. The United States should join with other nations in pressing for international supervision of the holy places within Jerusalem.

Fourth. The United States should insist on an international guarantee of innocent passage through international waterways, including the Straits of Tiran on the Red Sea and the Suez Canal, as an inalienable right of all nations.

Fifth. A Republican administration would propose a broad scale development plan in the framework of the Eisenhower-Strauss plan for all Middle Eastern states which agree to live peacefully with their neighbors.

Sixth. A Republican administration in furtherance of peace in the Middle East would strive with other nations for agreed limitations on international arms shipments to the area; but failing such an agreement the United States would under a Republican administration be prepared to supply Israel sufficient arms necessary to defend itself and to serve as a deterrent to renewed open warfare.

Seventh. Outstanding legal problems such as boundary settlements would be referred to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for adjudication on the basis of principles of international law.

Another Voter for Peace

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that a group which deserves special attention for the work it has done during the past year in reminding us of the immorality of war and, in particular, the need to bring an end to the war in Vietnam, is the group called Another Mother for Peace.

Started by a few talented, energetic, and dedicated ladies in Beverly Hills, Calif., their efforts have grown to nationwide proportions. Most of us will immediately recognize their clever trademark, which is highlighted by the slogan: "War is not healthy for children and other living things." We have all received Mother's Day cards and Christmas cards from mothers in our respective districts carrying messages indicating the sender's desire for peace.

In a perfectly natural and logical move—and desirable, I might add—the group would like to make a stronger impact and, in this election year, is turning some of its efforts toward the political scene.

In fact, their new name is now Another Voter for Peace.

They have chosen to support a number of Congressmen who, they feel, "have taken a realistic stand against the war in Vietnam by voting against war appropriations."

I am pleased to see that another voter for peace recognizes the fact that a vote against war appropriations is not a vote against the young men who are serving in Vietnam. It is, rather, a vote designed to help bring those young men home and to prevent hundreds of thousands more from being sent into a bottomless pit.

The Members of Congress they are supporting include Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California; Representative PHILLIP BURTON, Democrat, of California; Representative JOHN CONYERS, Democrat, of Michigan; Representative JOHN DOW, Democrat, of New York; Representative DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California; Representative DON FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota; Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Representative CHARLES MOSHER, Republican, of Ohio; Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Representative BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York; and Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

In order to more clearly call to your attention the feelings of these Members of Congress, I would like to include in these remarks a brief statement indicating, in part, the position each one has taken.

First. Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska:

Our military involvement in Southeast Asia constitutes the worst mistake our na-

tion has made in our entire history. No good whatever can come of it—only ever greater disaster. The United States was not attacked. No vital U.S. interest was at stake. The official reasons advanced for our being there are false; we were not asked—as alleged—by a friendly government to help to repel aggression; we asked ourselves in. And when we sent our troops into combat and started bombing north and south, it is we, the United States, who became the aggressor. In doing this, we violated all the treaties to which we are signatory; United Nations Charter, the SEATO Treaty and the pledge to respect the Geneva Accords.

The other justification for our being there, to stop Communism, is equally unfounded. On the contrary, we are helping Communism. To date, neither the Russians nor the Chinese Communists have committed a single soldier to combat, yet we are bogged down fighting a primitive peasant people, getting in deeper and deeper with ever mounting casualties. Indeed, by destroying North Vietnam, we are destroying the greatest potential buffer against Chinese Communist expansion.

Meanwhile, our pressing domestic programs are going down the drain. The war in Southeast Asia is one that we cannot win and should not want to win. We are facing civil strife at home, in large part the result of our military involvement in Southeast Asia and our home problems should be our first and major concern.

We should get out of Southeast Asia before we sacrifice any more fine young American lives which, as of mid-March, 1968, totaled 18,000 killed and over 125,000 wounded, some of them horribly crippled for life. These boys have died in vain. Finally, the official allegation that we are there to establish democracy is a farce. We have supported ever since we have been in there, a succession of dishonest, grafting, oppressive military regimes which would not last 24 hours without our massive military and financial support. It is to keep these crooks in office that our boys are dying.

Second. Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon:

The war we are waging in Vietnam is destroying South Vietnam at a cost to the American people of \$30 billion a year and currently 500 American lives a week. It is also costing us prestige and confidence abroad. It deserves to be liquidated as quickly as possible.

Third. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin:

Current proposals for increasing our troop level in Vietnam by 200,000 are not in the national interest. This is just the first draft on a military blank check for at least a million more American troops in Vietnam.

At the end of this road lies disaster and devastation in Vietnam and disillusionment and tragedy at home, for no amount of bombs and bullets will suppress the political revolution there.

No matter how massive the military pressure we apply there it can only temporarily suppress the military insurgency, not destroy it; and it can only result in increasing the political insurgency.

The only sensible course to follow is the route of political negotiations in Vietnam and on the international level.

We have stopped the takeover of the South in accord with our originally stated mission there. We should now take the initiative to de-escalate the war by offering a mutual cease fire, by stopping the bombing of the North and offering to accept United Nations or other acceptable international supervision of the cease fire and agreeing to freely held elections throughout the South, province by province.

Fourth. Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat of California:

I believe now that the President has accepted in fact and by his actions the position of those advisors who urge a military victory and the continuation in power of our hand-picked generals as the government of South Vietnam. I believe his political strategy is to seek to win the war, thus justifying his course of action and his tremendous commitment of U.S. resources, or failing that, to intensify Vietnam to a full-scale war in the hope that he will survive as a war-time President—none of whom have ever been defeated—according to his research.

I would rather retire from politics than support this course.

I now call upon the President to reverse his position and take the following steps:

(1) Order our half million troops, our massive air and naval fleets, to cease fire and stand fast. Announce to the enemy and to the world that our soldiers will fire only if fired upon, but if fired upon will take all steps necessary for their own defense.

(2) Ask the Geneva Powers to re-convene, under call of the co-chairman, to a neutral site in Asia, with the National Liberation Front participating as a belligerent.

(3) Participate in good faith negotiations as long as necessary to reach a settlement, making clear that he will be guided by the basic principle that the future of South Vietnam shall be determined by the freely expressed decisions of its own people.

(4) Insist that the final agreement be guaranteed by the great powers, and adequate enforcement machinery provided.

Fifth. Representative PHILLIP BURTON, Democrat, of California:

The kind of war we have drifted into is an open-ended war which is capable of producing costs beyond our most imaginative estimates.

We spent \$20 billion for 1 year of destructive war in Vietnam, yet the most imaginative program of the New Frontier, The Alliance for Progress, has assisted the 240 million people of Central and South America for the past 5 years with an expenditure of only \$2.3 billion.

The war on poverty falters while the war in Vietnam grows.

The impulse of the New Frontier and Great Society has deadened. Dollars that could relieve hunger, provide housing, education, job opportunities and training are being diverted to destruction.

Sixth. Representative JOHN CONYERS, JR., Democrat of Michigan, and others:

The bombing of targets close to the Chinese border, and of the port cities of Cam Pha and Haiphong conflicts with the carefully reasoned and factual analysis presented prior to those steps by Secretary of Defense McNamara on August 25, 1967. We refer particularly to the Secretary's contention that "our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results."

Obviously the risks to which Secretary McNamara referred are catastrophic involvement with Communist China and the Soviet Union, including the possibility of nuclear war.

The policy of bombing in the North has been tried and has failed to accomplish its objectives of stopping the infiltration of men and supplies into the South and of bringing the Hanoi government to the negotiating table.

We hold, therefore, that the time has come for the United States to terminate the bombing of North Vietnam.

Seventh. Representative JOHN DOW, Democrat of New York:

The United States has made a sad mistake by its military involvement in Vietnam. We are opposing the revolution of rising expectations which is manifest in scores of other nations. We are countering the efforts of many peoples to abolish colonialism. We are demonstrating contempt for the nationalism of others. We should ourselves take the responsibility to reduce and end our woeful part in the Vietnam hostilities.

Eighth. Representative DON EDWARDS, Democrat of California:

We must halt the spiraling escalation in Vietnam which only deepens the morass in which we find ourselves and heightens the danger of world war. Only de-Americanization and de-escalation will open alternatives for a political settlement which is urgent for our nation to obtain. A cessation of bombing raids is unquestionably a first step toward negotiations through which all factions of Vietnamese society might be recognized and open elections conducted.

Ninth. Representative DONALD FRASER, Democrat of Minnesota:

I have opposed the administration's conduct of the war since intensified bombing of North Vietnam began early in 1965. I intend to keep speaking out against present administration policy, voting against supplemental appropriations that will finance continued escalation of the conflict, and doing whatever I can to help bring about a negotiated settlement.

Tenth. Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, Democrat of Wisconsin:

I cannot support a measure that promises only to continue the present course which will send still more troops to Vietnam, widen the land war in southeast Asia, and further increase American casualties.

I take this action reluctantly, because in the past I have been constrained to vote for defense appropriations on the understanding they were necessary to support American soldiers already there. Instead, they have resulted in doubling our troops there and deepening our involvement in the war.

The hope for peace does not lie in bombings and more war but, rather, in a realistic pursuit of a political settlement in the south. To this end, I have joined a number of my colleagues in proposing a four-point program which holds greater promise for the early resolution of the conflict.

Eleventh. Representative CHARLES MOSHER, Republican of Ohio:

It is now increasingly argued that our war in Vietnam is necessary in order to halt the spread of Communism, rather than previously more limited emphasis on protecting or creating a free South Vietnam. Obviously, this new emphasis lays the basis for rationalizing an expanding war. But I continue to believe that right and reason, and our own national interest, demand that we honestly, vigorously and effectively seek any and every feasible means to de-escalate the war. I will support that emphasis, and every such effort.

Twelfth. Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin:

Americans are being told by the Administration that the only alternative to our present policy in Vietnam is either to scuttle and run, or to massively escalate into an all-out Asian war. These are false alternatives. A more sensible alternative would be this: while continuing such material force as is needed to deny victory in South Vietnam to our Communist adversaries, we should de-escalate and concentrate on areas which can be made secure for peaceful peasant life.

This means de-emphasis on "search and destroy" missions, such as our vainglorious attempt at Hill 975, aimed at killing Viet Cong rather than primarily at seizing and

holding territory. The fourteen Asian experts whose December 20, 1967, statement was widely described as justifying Administration policy as much as admitted this when they said, "Nothing would do more to strengthen American support for our basic position than to show a capacity for innovation of a deescalatory nature."

Changing our posture to a much more limited war would result if we took an honest look at the relative costs and benefits of what we are doing in Vietnam. Subtracting \$5 billion from the up-coming budget on Vietnam would cost us very little. Transferring that \$5 billion to an attack on the problems in our cities—obsolescent, torn by racial strife, financially bankrupt—would benefit us very greatly.

Thirteenth. Representative BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York:

Until we accept than an independent, completely anti-Communist South Vietnam cannot be assured by the exercise of American power, this country will remain mired in Asia—displaced, frustrated, lost.

Fourteenth. Representative WILLIAM RYAN, Democrat, of New York:

In June 1964, I told the House that the military course might require us to spend as much as a billion and a half dollars a year in Vietnam. That seemed like an enormous sum then. Our expenditures on the war are now 20 times that, and we are no closer to solution.

This war has drifted into the fourth most costly conflagration of our history, with little decisionmaking by the Congress. Each year Congress has been presented with the fait accompli of new escalation, and save for a small band of protest votes, Congress has voted the funds to "support our boys in Vietnam."

Mr. Speaker, there is a better way to support our boys in Vietnam, and our boys in New York, Newark, Detroit, and Watts, for that matter. It is to end the war and to bring our boys home alive.

We have finally reached a crossroads in the war. We can escalate to new senseless heights of destruction, or we can draw the line here. And that decision cannot be left to the administration alone. The administration is a prisoner of its own rhetoric. The Congress must assert itself to prevent a new acceleration down the road to disaster.

Salute to a Distinguished Citizen

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in these days of protests and demonstrations opposing our firm resolve to keep our commitment to the people of South Vietnam so little is heard about those who are unstinting in giving of their time and energy to support our cause and our brave fighting men. I would like to cite an example of one such individual in my district whose generous and imaginative efforts in behalf of our GI's have been truly outstanding.

I recently learned through friends of the fine work being done by Mrs. Anna Seidenberg, of Garden Grove, to help our servicemen through a volunteer correspondence service she organized known as GI Mail Call. Her campaign to collect stamps and Christmas cards for use as tools by occupational and recreational

therapists in rehabilitating hospitalized veterans was a great success. Mrs. Seidenberg was recently commended by President Johnson for her work with our GI's. This kind of unselfish devotion to the cause of her fellow men has long been a trait of Mrs. Seidenberg and she has received much honor and recognition in the past. These have included "Mother of the Year" at Fort Ord, Calif., San Pedro's "Woman of the Year" in 1956, and citations by California's Federation of Woman's Clubs, the USO, the B'nai B'rith, Gold Star Mothers, and many others. I am extremely proud to welcome Mrs. Seidenberg to Garden Grove, Calif., I know that the many servicemen who have benefited from Mrs. Seidenberg's good work, join me in congratulating her for a job well done.

Escalation to Disaster—III

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post carried two very significant items on its editorial page. Both items revolve around the theme of the pitfalls of prophecy. Last August I wrote a letter to President Johnson indicating my sincere doubts about the course of the war to date. At that time I said:

I firmly believe we have escalated to no place. In the face of continuous recommendations from General Westmoreland that the war will go on indefinitely, I have failed to understand the theory of escalation. When we in the States have assumed that our force level at 150,000 or 250,000 was at the outer limit considering that a \$750 billion economy was fighting a \$1 billion economy without modern transportation, a Navy or airpower, we have always assumed that the large buildup had some kind of foreseeable victory in mind . . .

While we stated a year ago that we needed to beef up our troops because there were 10,000 North Vietnamese troops in the south and that we needed at least a 10-to-1 overkill ratio to handle guerrillas in the bush—today while the United States has raised its level by 150,000 the North Vietnamese raised its level to better than 100,000. While we were fighting 225,000 solid core enemy a year ago, we now admit their numbers to be 278,000 and we frankly admit also that there is no magic in these numbers . . .

I would say then that the better part of valor at the present time would be for the administration to be deadly serious with itself as to where we have been and where we are going. *It will profit us little as a nation if we exhaust ourselves economically on North Vietnam only to find that our curtailment and lack of attention to the rest of the world, including the Americas, has allowed a Communist foundation to be dug on our hemispheric mainland.* While our policy in Vietnam at one time was a matter of choice, at the present time it is monumentally compulsive.

We criticized last year the U.S. AID program in South Vietnam as a conglomeration of confusion. If the situation is any better today I am unaware in spite of a major AID effort at reorganization. The south Vietnamese revolutionary cadre system of 30,000 men has suffered high casualties over the last year and is now reputed to be ineffective. What this all really means is that the war

on poverty for the world's deprived and underprivileged must be fought offensively through effective AID programs at a time of peace rather than defensively at a time of war. Because people are bound to wonder if the United States does not care for my political future at a time of peace, why do they care at a time of war with communism? I sincerely hope that one day we will realize that American wealth was given to us for a purpose. If we would help our neighbors but 25 percent of the magnitude of our military assistance, there might truly be a hope for peace in our time. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I might also add that implicit in the editorial is a theme reminiscent of the story about the "Emperor's New Clothes."

I commend my colleagues to both the story about the "Emperor's New Clothes," and the following articles:

THE PITFALLS OF PROPHECY

The catalogue of comments by General Westmoreland on the course of the Vietnam War, appearing elsewhere on this page, is not presented as a complete chronology, and still less as an effort to make him out to be a poor prophet. What it does seem to show, however, is the peril in any prophecy about a struggle against an enemy whose capabilities and resources and resolve have proved beyond our capacity to measure from the very start.

This is a thought worth keeping uppermost in mind when the generals are calling for still more troops and the optimists are loudly insisting that the last enemy offensive was a desperate, decisive, "go for broke" affair. If it truly was, so much the better. But the record over the nearly four years of General Westmoreland's command does not encourage hard and fast conclusions of this, or any, sort. Our intelligence on enemy strength is not that good. Our estimates of what it would take to crack Hanoi's will have been consistently bad.

Moreover, a persistent and powerful demand from Washington, in general, and the White House in particular, for "progress reports" has the inevitable effect of distorting official assessments by encouraging subordinates down the line to look just as hard as they can for progress to report. It is no doubt frustrating, in this strange war of insurgency and subversion, for the Government not to be able to present the public with clear front lines on a map, showing steady gains. Hence the flood of statistical data that gushed forth last fall, in a calculated effort to show more hamlets under Saigon control, more defectors, more captured arms, more dead Vietcong, more wells dug, more roads open—more progress. Hence also the optimism radiated by General Westmoreland—and just about every high official—last November.

The results, as measured by the polls, were gratifying—for as long as they lasted. According to the Harris Survey, "basic support" for the war policy shot up from 51 per cent last October to 74 per cent in February. Then came the Tet offensive, and with it a slump back to 54 per cent this month. Concurrently, General Westmoreland's public "job rating" slid from a figure of 68 per cent, who graded him "good to excellent" last December, to 52 per cent this month, while the number who find his performance "fair to poor" has grown from 16 per cent to 35 per cent over the same period.

What this suggests is that a deliberate effort to demonstrate progress in the war can usually find some evidence of it, which will influence public support for Vietnam policy—for a time. Certainly, General Westmoreland's statements last November played a significant part in this. But the pitfall in such an effort—however important a part it may claim in projecting the right impression to North Vietnam—was dramatized all too

forcefully by the events of February, when the enemy revealed strengths and capabilities far in excess of anything the public had been led to expect—or anything most officials had privately thought possible.

For almost four years, General Westmoreland and others have consistently planned as well as talked in terms of a war in which our expanding effort was making steady headway while the enemy, at any given time was standing still. In fact, the enemy's capabilities have not proved constant, its resources have not turned out to be finite, its menace has never been readily measurable. At the least, this suggests that it might be wise for the next field commander to be a little less outspoken and a little less positive about the state of the war.

More important, what the General has been saying over the last four years has to a large extent reflected what was believed—that the enemy would run out of resources and resolve. This, in turn has been the basis for war plans based on steady escalation to wear the enemy down. It may yet. But a record of continuous, persistent overoptimism on this count ought to be reason enough to search for strategies and tactics that rest less on escalation of force levels or "graduated" air power against the North, or the maneuvering of "main force" units in the hinterlands on the edge of sanctuaries, and more on the need for security, stability and social and political reform in those parts of South Vietnam where the people are.

WESTMORELAND ON THE WAR'S COURSE

SAIGON.—The progress of the Vietnam war as charted in statements of Gen. William C. Westmoreland:

June 20, 1964, the day he became acting commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam: "I don't see any reason for expansion of the U.S. role in Vietnam. I am optimistic and we are making good progress."

June 23, 1964, to the troops under his command: "We approach our task with enthusiasm but we should not allow this ardor to affect our objectivity. We must keep in mind that the campaign will be won at province, district, village and hamlet levels where battle is being waged for hearts and minds of the people."

July 8, 1964, to the staff of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam: "This is the place where history is being made. This is the place where the reputation of the United States and its armed forces is on the line. At the present time I believe the whole operation is moving in our favor."

Feb. 7, 1965, on the third anniversary of the Military Assistance Command (MACV): "As we begin the fourth year of sharing with the Vietnamese armed forces in their struggle to obtain and secure the freedom of their land, let us remember we have the opportunity to teach the meaning of democracy and those military skills which are essential to establish and maintain a free nation."

April 14, 1965, to Vietnamese troops in Phuoc Thanh Province: "Your country is beginning to win the war. American bombing in the north will not win the war. You have to win it in the south by carrying the war to the Vietcong. This is the time to be more aggressive and take the offensive."

July 9, 1965, to newsmen in Honolulu: The Vietcong "are less confident of success than they were earlier. It is doubtful if we will ever have anything in the way of opposing land forces as in the Korean war, or in the World War I and World War II sense."

Aug. 15, 1966, in Johnson City, Tex., when asked about reports that U.S. troop commitment should be raised to 750,000: "I understand there is an alleged study coming to such conclusion. The study was not made by my headquarters. Our strength is destined to increase. It depends upon the conduct and actions of the enemy. There is no indication that the resolve of the leadership in Hanoi has been reduced."

April 14, 1967, in an interview: "We'll just go on bleeding them until Hanoi wakes up to the fact that they have bled their country to the point of national disaster for several generations. Then they have to reassess their position."

April 24, 1967, in New York: "What we have is not a civil war. It is a massive campaign of external aggression from Communist North Vietnam. Although the military picture is favorable, I emphasize the fact that we have no evidence to indicate that the enemy is slowing his invasion from the north or that he is breaking up his major units and scattering them about, or that he has given up his plans to try to inflict major defeat upon us. So the end is not in sight and we must be prepared for more bitter fighting in the days to come."

April 28, 1967, before a joint session of Congress: "When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success."

He said the North Vietnamese would continue to build up troops along the DMZ and the borders of Laos and Cambodia to "attack us when he believes he has a chance for a dramatic blow." He concluded his speech to Congress: "Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over the Communist aggressor."

May 1, 1967, in Honolulu returning to Vietnam: "I came away with a much better understanding of the American people about the war in Vietnam. Based on what I saw and heard, I'd say 95 per cent of Americans are behind us 100 per cent."

July 13, 1967, in Washington: "If we have additional men, the result would be a greater pressure being brought to bear on the enemy. We have achieved all our objectives, while the enemy has failed dismally."

Sept. 23, 1967, in Saigon: The South Vietnamese Army "is not fully effective, but they're better than they were a year ago. Now that I've got enough troops here to do the job, we're much closer with the ARVN than ever before."

Nov. 22, 1967, in Washington: The battle at Dakto is the "beginning of a great defeat for the enemy."

Nov. 23, 1967, in Washington: "The end begins to come into view. The enemy's hopes are bankrupt. I am absolutely certain that whereas in 1965 the enemy was winning, today he is certainly losing. We are winning the war of attrition."

Feb. 1, 1968, in Saigon after the Tet offensive: "This was a deceitful and treacherous act by the enemy . . . I am confident that any further initiatives can be blunted."

March 12, 1968, in Phubai: "I anticipate more very heavy fighting. The enemy has built up his strength to about five main force divisions. These forces are formidable and we intend to confront them."

March 23, 1968, Saigon: "I must, of course, admit to a feeling of regret at leaving my present command—a natural feeling on the part of any commander. This feeling is particularly true in my case since I am leaving before the battle is over and peace is restored to the people of this beautiful land which has been so torn by Communist aggression."

The National Exchange Club

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, today is the 57th anniversary of the founding of

the National Exchange Club, a service organization dedicated to the successful fulfillment by patriotic citizens of their obligations to their communities, States, and the Nation.

The National Exchange Club is strictly American in principle and province. It, and all local Exchange Clubs, manifest an intense and sincere loyalty to the United States of America, its traditions, and its ideals. The National Exchange Club always has had a strong educational program functioning to expose and combat all elements endangering the precious freedoms characterizing American life.

Exchange Club members study and practice the covenant of service as their inspirational philosophy:

EXCHANGE CLUB COVENANT OF SERVICE

Accepting the divine privilege of single and collective responsibility as life's noblest gift, I covenant with my fellow Exchangites:

To consecrate my best energies to the uplifting of Social, Religious, Political, and Business ideals;

To discharge the debt I owe to those of high and low estate who have served and sacrificed the heritage of American citizenship might be mine;

To honor and respect law, to serve my fellowmen, and to uphold the ideals and institutions of my Country;

To implant the life-giving, society-building spirit of Service and Comradeship in my social and business relationships;

To serve in Unity with those seeking better conditions, better understandings, and greater opportunities for all.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the National Exchange Club and all Exchangites on the occasion of this anniversary and commend their covenant of service to all Americans who seek to serve our country.

Meeting the Challenge of Space Can Lift Us From Our Depths of Gloom

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the challenges and opportunities inherent in the exploration of space remain fascinating to our people. Not long ago, the Rochester Times-Union, a Gannett newspaper, published a thoughtful piece by Calvin Mayne on some of the issues and historical precedents involved in the current recommendations on space exploration. It is a useful and helpful discussion of one aspect of our national budget, and I include it to be printed in the RECORD so that it may be available to all Members:

NEW AGE OF EXPLORATION: MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF SPACE CAN LIFT US FROM OUR DEPTHS OF GLOOM

(By Calvin Mayne)

However deep the credibility gap may be about President Johnson's zeal in cutting some parts of his budget, there is no doubt that he has slashed deeply into space spending.

His proposed space budget for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, totals \$4.6 billion. That is \$230 million under the current year and more than \$1.3 billion less than in fiscal year 1966. And a savings-hungry Congress may well trim even more.

With all the earthly demands on the taxpayer, it is not easy to make a case for space. After all, what does it matter if we reach the moon a few years later than now planned, if we never land on airless Mars or develop a new generation of powerful nuclear rocket engines?

Ever since Sputnik and the first U.S. probes into space, I have been convinced that it matters a great deal. I believe that space spending deserves a high priority.

More is involved than U.S. prestige, important as that is in a time when the American image is plummeting worldwide.

More is involved than the continuing health of the giant space industry—that multi-billion-dollar difference between prosperity and recession during much of America's long industrial boom.

And there is more of value in probing the heavens than the beneficial byproducts of space technology on earth, ranging from communications satellites to tiny medical monitoring devices, or even the ungauged mineral riches which await space miners on the moon or distant planets.

The truly vital reasons for exploring space are the upsurge of human spirit that accompanies the blast-offs from Cape Kennedy, the potential victories of man over the unknown that would lift us from the gloom of our times, the revelation of secrets of life that will emerge from the opening universe.

SECRETS OF MARS

We have not traveled as far as we think in space.

Eleven years after Sputnik, we are still groping for the moon. Yet in the same amount of time, Columbus had made four trips to the new world and John Cabot, inspired by his example, had reached Nova Scotia.

And even the moon trip will be but an infant's toddling step compared with future space voyages.

For example, what awaits us on Mars, the prime planetary target, eight months distant by rocket? That was described in a recent issue of National Geographic Magazine by Harvard astronomer Dr. Carl Sagan.

Dr. Sagan quickly dismisses legends of canals and little green men on this most earthlike of the other planets.

But he describes experiments in "Mars jars" which prove that earthly organisms can exist even in the dusty, oxygen-less, radiation-saturated atmosphere of Mars.

It is thus not too much to believe that Mars contains molds and even vegetation of its own. And analysis of native life forms on Mars would prove whether we earthlings evolved long ago from a universal ancestor, or whether there are myriad life forms not only on our sister planets but in other galaxies many trillions of miles away.

REFUGE FROM EARTH

But what good is this to us on earth? Could we adapt to the alien atmosphere of other planets? And why should we, even if we could?

Remember that New England looked hardly less hostile to the Pilgrims of 1620 than Mars appears to us today. "For summer being done," Gov. Bradford wrote, "all things stand upon them with a weather-beaten face; and the whole countrie, full of woods and thickets, represented a wild and savage hue."

If the Pilgrims could adapt, so can we.

And remember, too, that today we strive to make the deserts bloom and we even probe the oceans' depths in search of living room for our swollen population. We worry about an earth contaminated by air and water pollution—or, irrevocably, by radiation from nuclear explosions, purposeful or accidental.

We may some day need the escape hatch of space if we are to survive.

But again, the greatest benefit of space exploration may be its potential cure of our malaise of spirit, our cynicism and uneasiness in a world of clashing philosophies and

nations, of cheap materialism and shallow religion.

We forget our history.

Europe before Columbus was similarly corrupt, cynical and depressed. But then the daring sailors who triumphed over the vast and forbidding seas produced a mood well described by the late British historian, Sir Charles Oman:

"A new envisagement of the world has begun, and men are no longer sighing after the imaginary golden age that lay in the distant past, but speculating as to the golden age that might possibly lie in the oncoming future."

DON'T CUT SPENDING

And so it can be—must be—today. Wrote space scientist Dr. Sagan in the National Geographic:

"Space exploration is in the finest human tradition; many feel that it is a prerequisite for our continued survival as a species.

"The same technology that has conquered earth's surface now also permits the destruction of mankind. Our planet is in danger of becoming a vast closed society, with its tensions and enormous energies turned inward upon itself.

"The challenge of the great spaces between the worlds is a stupendous one, but if we fail to meet it, the story of our race will be drawing to its close. Humanity will have turned its back upon the still untrodden heights and will be descending again the long slope that stretches, across a thousand million years of time, down to the shores of the primeval sea."

Shall we spend \$4.6 billion—1/2 of 1 per cent of our gross national product—to explore space? The sum is little enough for the rewards it promises.

Print 68

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Print 68, the largest exposition of printing and paper converting machinery ever presented in the Western Hemisphere, will be held in Chicago at the International Amphitheater June 20 to 26, 1968.

More than 500 manufacturers, including 80 from Europe and Asia, and all the leading U.S. companies will participate in this trade show which is expected to attract between 75,000 and 100,000 visitors.

I am sure we all realize the historical importance of the printing industry, as well as the immense growth and changes which it must undergo in order to retain its vital place in modern life.

Hardly any other industry has been affected by the technological revolution as strongly as has the printing industry. Not only have there been technological developments which affect the industry directly, there have been equally innovative developments in the fields of electronics and communications which affect it indirectly. This state of affairs has been referred to as a "multirevolution"—new inventions, refined production techniques, and streamlined methods have been hitting the industry from all sides.

The printing industry has especial need for reliance on a program of continuing education and exposure to innovation. Although at one time a craftsman

learned his business "once and for all," he must now study—not read casually—but study regularly new products, new techniques, and new materials. Major changes underway include widespread use of faster presses, offset lithographic printing, gravure printing, and photographic typesetting. Continued refinements in automatic color separation will increase the trend toward more extensive use of color. Research and development expenditures are increasing, plant and equipment expenditures are rising steadily, and total employment in the entire industry will soon exceed the 1 million mark.

The immense importance of exhibitions such as Print 68 in keeping the members of an industry up to date on the innovations in equipment and technique in their field cannot be understated.

I want to extend my most sincere welcome to the printers who will be attending Print 68 in Chicago, and to salute them on their progressive response to the ever-increasing demands and challenges which they face.

I believe that the following statement of Thomas Roy Jones helps place this vital industry in its proper perspective:

So basic is printing as an agency promoting civilization that one cannot conjecture what mankind's lot would have been or would be without type and the printed page. From the 15th Century, or earlier, printing has pervaded every exercise of men's intellect, has recorded their history, their emotions, their triumphs, their disasters; has been the outstanding vehicle of their enlightenment, has told them of life and living; has explained to them their surroundings; has brought them to their knees, pointing the way towards inspiration . . . Printing is one of man's greatest weapons; for good or evil, for success or failure, for victory or defeat . . . the printed word shapes the world's human destinies.

Conventional War Puts Air Proving Ground Back in Business

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the privilege of submitting for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a very comprehensive article from the March 1968 issue of the Armed Forces Management magazine. It is entitled "Conventional War Puts Air Proving Ground Back in Business." In addition to explaining the functions of the Air Proving Ground Center, it is a glowing tribute to the leadership and capabilities of its very able commander, Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney.

The article follows:

CONVENTIONAL WAR PUTS AIR PROVING GROUND BACK IN BUSINESS

Kinney: "... this area of limited, non-nuclear war needs the greatest attention. We should have started years before."

(NOTE.—The renaissance of the need for non-nuclear, conventional warfare capability brought along with it an upsurge of activity at Air Force Systems Command's Air Proving Ground Center, on Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. With the increase of demands for more tech-

nological know-how to support U.S. forces in Southeast Asia, the Air Force has turned to its huge 45,000-sq.-ft. complex to come up with some fast answers.)

Long before an airline turned the shape of the State of Florida into an airplane, the Air Force had developed the northwest section into an exotic test range complex. Many pilots attacking key targets in North Vietnam are returning home to Southeast Asia airfields today because APGC (Air Proving Ground Center) was created and, more importantly, is still there.

Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney is the commander of this complex, but he could be called, not inappropriately, an assistant governor of the state. Next to Governor Claude R. Kirk Jr., he governs one of the largest slices of Florida real estate, and one of the nation's most valuable assets.

"APGC's capability is unique in the field of armaments and munitions testing. Coupled with the developmental capability of the Armament Laboratory which also is based here, we are the prime quick-reaction testing ground for equipment and techniques in direct support of this nation's Southeast Asia efforts," Kinney told AFM.

The complex he manages today is a far cry from what it was in the late 1950s. From World War II through 1958, primary emphasis was on operational testing of weapon systems and components, and development of tactics and techniques. Then followed a period of near dormancy in conventional munitions development and testing as the emphasis overwhelmingly favored nuclear warfare. But in 1962 the spotlight swung back to conventional warfare, specifically to meet the need for building counterinsurgency (COIN) and limited war capabilities, and the APGC was back in business.

Since then there has been steadily increasing effort in the development of conventional munitions and testing of delivery systems. But at the same time other efforts continued at Eglin, such as electronic system testing and participation with NASA in the space program. The increased work load in the last five years is shown by the mission statistics of the center: in 1962 there were 4434 test missions, in 1967 the number reached 15,722, with the end not in sight.

The Air Proving Ground Center, one of the Air Force Systems Command's five major test centers, is situated in the Florida panhandle. From its headquarters at Eglin Air Force Base it controls a land and water area of approximately 45,000 square miles. Its four-point basic mission is to conduct Air Force Weapons Effectiveness Testing, developmental testing, Technical Applications for Southeast Asia and support through tests and evaluation of special projects of other Air Force commands, DOD and the other services.

Because of the requirements of Southeast Asia, the center has intensified efforts in the past several years in the testing of conventional munitions, weapon systems, electronic systems, armament systems, chemical/biological weapons, electronic equipment testing and providing support for the development and test of special air warfare tactics, techniques and equipment.

With a total base population of more than 60,000 military, civilian and contractor personnel plus dependents, APGC has among its 51 tenant organizations at Eglin Main and Hurlburt Field (TAC) the Tactical Air Warfare Center, the Special Air Warfare Center, the Air Force Armament Laboratory, the 33rd Tactical Fighter Wing and the Army Rangers and lends two of its 11 airfields to the Navy for flight training. Not considering the land value, APGC is valued at more than a half billion dollars in real property, aircraft, supplies and equipment. Parked on Eglin's more than 800,000 square feet of apron and using its two 10,000-ft. long plus runways are a variety of aircraft ranging from World War

II vintage to the F-111, the most advanced fighter-bomber in the inventory.

Keyed to the immediacy of Southeast Asia, Gen. Kinney and his organization are geared to react when, for example, they receive a message from the MACV (Military Assistance Command-Vietnam) Deputy for Air, Gen. William W. Momyer. The request could be "I've got to know the following in 24 hours . . ." or "Could you possibly do this?" To meet such challenges, Kinney has bare-boned his organization for quick action.

This type of operation occasionally has stripped a gear or two in the traditional way of doing things, such as in establishment of priorities. Kinney has even received a priority rating on the scene from the Secretary of Defense, but normally projects arrive at the center with priority determination from the Air Force or Systems Command. Yet to be able to answer the requests from "on-the-spot" commanders such as Momyer, the traditional way of doing things has had to bend with the need.

"We sometimes have to make judgments on priority here," Kinney explained. "That's one reason for the interface between APGC and TAC at Eglin. We all must understand the problems of the operating forces—and most specifically the combat forces in action and the relative urgency of the operator's various requirements. I think this is one place in the Air Force where this interface between TAC and AFSC really exists to this degree."

Kinney is an admitted crusader for greater limited war capability and the necessity for continuing developments once the present conflict is ended. He sees the results of the close interface with TAC and is determined to maintain it as a permanent part of Air Force policy.

In its simplest terms how does APGC operate in performing its mission of testing and proving? What new management techniques have been required to mesh the load with the resources? Gen. Kinney sent AFM to the start of the chain of events—Plans and Requirements—which is directly responsible to the Commander and Vice Commander Col. Joseph Davis, Jr.

Col. Joseph J. Berkow, chief of the Plans and Requirements Office, said, "We like to think of ourselves as the nerve center of the entire operation."

His organization of some 90 specialists is the central receiving point for testing projects. "There are five questions we try to answer when a project lands on our desk," Berkow continued. "What is required, when is it required, and what facilities, what instrumentation and what targets are needed."

The P&R Office basically is a packaging organization. The product is detailed project directive that triggers the "doers," as Berkow described them, into action. In this case the "doers" are the Directorate of Test, Directorate of Technical Support, Directorate of Foreign Technology, Directorate of Civil Engineering and Directorate of Material.

"All these directorates contribute to our project directive and the result is a tightly laced package that tells everyone what to do and who will do it, including the building of targets and special instrumentation."

Under peace-time operations, the planning phase for a crash project would take 30 days. Today, APGC can, if necessary, do all the planning and programming within 24 hours. There have been occasions where a high-priority project was received and completed and the final report written before there was time to write the project directive.

"We have been able to cut down the time factor to meet the demands," Berkow stated. "That has meant doing away with management practices which fit perfectly well in a business-as-usual operation, but are archaic today. We've cut paperwork to a minimum minimum."

When a project is received it not only faces the five question survey, but also must be

achievable. Often there is a requirement for negotiation with the requestor before the specialists diagnose the project and the problem and squeeze the requirements to a realistic format.

"Five years ago there were about 250 projects assigned to the center. Today there are more than that number just in direct support of Southeast Asia. We now have more than 400 projects. This sometimes creates headaches in assigning priorities. Some of our facilities are heavily tasked, and work 24 hours a day, seven days a week."

Universally, the personnel at APGC are aware of the importance of their work, their mission and the unique organization.

"While we test armament, electronics and aircraft for their particular missions here, because of the location of the Armament Laboratory at APGC, Eglin is the unmanned Armament R&D Center of the Air Force. We work directly with the Armament Lab people on crash projects."

Urgency is evident in the atmosphere in Johnson Hall, the white headquarters building of APGC. And the largest government-owned base complex obviously has the potential for a manager's nightmare. But such is not the case, as Kinney explained:

"We have cut across all traditional lines. We talk with each other—we're not only associates, we're friends. And we help each other. The people at Eglin realize our interdependence, our common mission and the importance of the other agency's mission."

This becomes of paramount importance when a project reaches the Directorate of Test, headed by Col. R. F. Todd. Technical Director H. L. Dimmig breaks the mission of this directorate down into an admitted oversimplification, but one which makes sense to the layman. "The customer gives an objective, which is the information desired. We supply the information."

"We manage the test. We also design the test to suit the task. To design a test requires understanding of technical and statistical requirements."

Dimmig stressed the need for test design to obtain valid data and that these data must be interpreted properly. "Unless you do, it is a GIGO situation—garbage in, garbage out. Our job, mine specifically, is to make sure the test programs are conducted so that, when the tests are completed, the data are of such a high confidence level that they may be used for valid decisions."

In the directorate are five test divisions and one flight division. The five test divisions are Interdiction, Munitions, Aircraft/Missiles, Electronics and Air Force Weapons Effectiveness Test. Project responsibility is given to one of these divisions, which assigns a test project officer who is the overall project manager.

Since 1965 the work load of the Directorate of Test has increased 50 percent. During that time the total of assigned personnel has increased less than 10 percent. And it is a fact of life that the missions in 1968 are vastly more complicated than they were in 1965. Yet some major projects have been completed and the results back in the hands of the operators in Southeast Asia in four days.

The moment of truth in the APGC cycle is reached when project planning has been completed and the project manager lays out the specific tasks. With 400 plus projects on the "current" list, this is the supreme test in scheduling and coordination. Because APGC and the Air Force are concerned with aerial delivery of conventional munitions the final answer comes from testing with the aircraft.

There are 21 test pilots in the Test Operations Division, headed by Col. Edward H. Risher: 10 are graduates of the Air Force Aerospace Research and Test Pilot School conducted at Edwards AFB, Calif., and 11 are combat veterans from Southeast Asia. One of the returnees is an Edwards graduate.

In addition there are 16 pilots who mother the QB-47 and the QF-104 pilotless drones.

Risher's division does the final scheduling on the numerous Eglin ranges. Then the specific mission or missions are flown. "Our job," Risher said, "is to test the aircraft and the object: bomb, fuze or dispenser in the actual flight environment. If the concept doesn't work it means we are worthwhile."

The Test Operations Division is the agency where the increased workload has made its maximum impact. While the number of missions have increased 50 percent, the number of sorties Risher's pilots are flying have doubled without an increase in personnel.

"Under normal circumstances we scheduled each pilot for two sorties a day five days a week. Now we schedule three or four sorties a day six days a week and instead of seven-to-four workday we work from daylight to dark—then we fly the night missions."

There are 11 types of aircraft in the program. That is only part of the story, however, for there are 29 different models of the 11 types.

"These pilots usually are working on about eight projects at once with the various project managers. They know the problems of the pilots in Vietnam and they work until they get the job done. They don't worry about the time. Sure it takes a lot of shuffling of schedules to comply with Air Force crew requirements but we do it as a team."

More projects come down to the scheduling section each day than the total resources can meet so rescheduling is a way of life. Most of the projects relate to Vietnam, but this unique flying organization is also working actively on long-range futuristic projects, which Risher estimated account for some 25 percent of the workload.

The close relationship among APGC, the operators and the Armament Lab people has brought a clearer understanding of the often laborious task of testing a new munition. For example, on a munitions test the test pilot starts at slow speeds to test for functions and then builds up speed to cover the entire combat envelope. Here the proof-testing takes place for accuracy, release from aircraft, suitability against target and safety. The results obtained by the test pilot and the range are channeled to the project manager, who prepares the final report. However, long before this task is completed, particularly in Vietnam-related projects, the results have gone to the user by message.

Not all pilots at Eglin are military. Currently General Dynamics is testing the F-111A for Category I. At the end of January on a munitions test, a capricious iron bomb damaged the right flap and horizontal stabilizer during a high-speed release.

Risher's pilots fly chase for the F-111 test. "It is an expected progression," he said. "The F-111 is testing out a lot better than did some of the aircraft now flying combat in Vietnam. The problems the F-111 and the others encounter are nothing new in testing aircraft. We test to find these things, to prove or disprove the announced capability or to extend the announced capability. If everything tested out as expected we wouldn't be needed."

Actual testing takes place on more than 20 specialized areas, such as Test Area 70, which is more than 10 miles long and heavily instrumented with phototheodolites and ballistic cameras, which gather complete space-position-versus-time data on both the delivery aircraft and the munitions under test. Test Area 71 is a large bomblet range for testing dispenser weapons. There is a large carefully surveyed impact area on this range which is used to obtain dispenser pattern length, width and distribution.

The APGC Electromagnetic Test Environment consists of a large array of radars of various types which, with associated facilities, are used in ECM (Electronic Counter-Measures) testing. The Eglin Gulf Test

Range reaches southeastward from the base for a distance of 350 miles. Tracking, control and data-recording stations are located on Santa Rosa Island, Cape San Blas and at Tarpon Springs. This range is used for missile tests and advanced aircraft systems.

Other APGC test areas include bomb fragmentation arenas and a simulated Vietnam village complete with heated underground bunkers, rice paddies, sampans, huts and tents. The village is located in semi-tropical foliage with varying degrees of jungle canopies. Any type of terrain in Vietnam's War Zone "C" can be duplicated at Eglin.

But all tests do not require aerial flight. The Climatic Hangar, which last year marked its 20th anniversary, tests equipment for all the services. The Army's Pershing Missile was recently retested in the 200- by 250-ft. main chamber.

Another unusual test area is No. 74, which has a 2000-ft. dual rail, level sled track which is used to conduct hard impact tests of munitions. The sled accelerates the munition to aircraft speed and various ballistic and high-speed cameras record the result.

A \$12 million instrumentation system to augment the Air Force Weapons Evaluation Test Division range requirements is under way at Eglin. When the system is tied in with APGC's Mathematical Services Lab computers, the Air Force will be able to perform the most realistic testing of concepts and tactics ever attained.

While the Test Directorate is concerned primarily with today's ordnance, it also tests futuristic developments such as the dial-a-thrust *Sandpiper*.

T. H. Dalehite, APGC's chief scientist, in recalling the decline of non-nuclear weapon activities at Eglin, looks at the problem and the future for APGC both with the eye of a scientist viewing a laboratory complex and as a man keenly aware of the final product and its importance to the security of the nation.

"There are two important factors one must keep in mind. First are the physical assets—the laboratories, ranges, instrumentation and our electromagnetic testing capability. The second factor is people—our scientific and technical resources. I think we are going to have to maintain a strong level of conventional munitions effort in the foreseeable future, whether we are at peace or war. Eglin has the resources, but we can't afford to have a highly cyclic procedure."

Dalehite believes it would take five to six years under a crash program to develop a comparable set of resources. Looking at the future, he is confident that the complex will be able to cope with the higher speeds of follow-on aircraft. Although the land area of APGC is two-thirds that of the state of Rhode Island, it still could become cramped for space to do all the testing required. As the chief scientist he not only looks at the present and future systems, but he also is concerned about the facilities which must be able to do the testing for these systems.

"We must and are responding to the problems of Southeast Asia and we are giving these requirements the utmost priority, but we are not doing all we can, I think, in the way of future development. This is a difficult management problem because of an active conflict. However, we must recognize that if you overfavor support of operational forces for too long you dry up your technology bank. We must try to maintain a balance and it is difficult for management to make the judgment on balance."

Gen. Kinney is aware of this need for balance. "In the early 1960s," he stated, "we found ourselves at the point where we had ignored limited war and put our main emphasis on preparation for nuclear war. Our mistake was in not preparing adequately for the logical result of successful nuclear deterrence—that the communists would react with non-nuclear aggression."

In discussing non-nuclear warfare in to-

day's terms and looking at the future, Kinney stressed the need for quick response and the application of required force with surgical precision.

"Limited war is more complicated than nuclear war," he said. "If you're going to be ready for complicated wars, you must do the R&D before you get into them. We've got to come up with military capabilities so that we can react with speed and decisiveness to suppress aggression rapidly. Eglin is where the munitions and delivery techniques can be developed for this type of surgery."

To do the surgical job, Kinney spoke of an improved military capability, foresees a 10-ft. Circular Error Probability (CEP), which would reduce the number of sorties and the time needed to perform the survey. Confident that everything needed is well within the capability of American technology, he sees a clear and urgent requirement to provide this capability to meet more sophisticated contingencies.

"We can't see through a leaf yet," he said, "but we will. There are a lot of things on the horizon that are breadboard today, but they are attainable. This is to a great extent what the Air Proving Ground Center is involved in. I think the limited, non-nuclear war area needs the greatest attention. We should have started years ago. We are getting there now, but we must keep the effort up. We shouldn't mortgage the future by any reduction of our R&D effort."

Recently General Momyer informed General Kinney: "... our success over North Vietnam is due in no small part to the tactics and theory of employment work done by the people at APGC."

That's the kind of customer endorsement that makes it all worthwhile.

The Hard-Core Unemployed

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, two fine ladies in my congressional district, Mrs. Alice A. Halverson and Mrs. Yvonne Hess, of Annandale, Va., made a determined effort to contribute in their own way to the solution of the problem of the hard-core unemployed as we hear so much about, only to find that, in their words:

In all the agencies within the Government to which we appealed, there could be no help found.

They started a small business, called Maid-A-Day, Inc., to train unemployed women to become experts at light housekeeping, able to support themselves and their families, and to provide under contract light housekeeping service on a daily basis to large numbers of apartment occupants at moderate cost.

Two girls were trained to work as a team to provide customers with daily service which included cleaning kitchen and bathrooms each day, doing the dishes, hanging up clothes and picking up, making beds, and dusting, plus once a week linen change and twice weekly vacuuming.

Each employee worked an 8-hour day, and received a minimum salary of \$55 a week, with a bonus of \$5 when her crew was doing a maximum of \$200 in business weekly.

Through their own maids they found others, and once they had made their

services known to various apartment managers and began to obtain orders for volume service, they contacted the Small Business Development Center for assistance. Through the SBDC, they obtained a small business loan and virtual assurance from the SBDC and the National Committee on Household Employment, a Labor Department funded group, that the United Planning Organization, Washington's poverty agency would locate trainees for them.

From early 1967 until these ladies finally were forced to end their operations this January, in spite of many fruitless calls to the national committee, SBDC and UPO, only three prospective employees were ever sent to them. One never reported at all, one spoke no English and could not understand directions, and the third worked one day and left saying the "work was too hard."

Mr. Speaker, considering the large number of apartments in the Washington area where services of Maid-A-Day, Inc., would be welcomed, opportunities for employment with this organization would be unlimited. But where were the hard-core unemployed they so desperately needed? They could not be found.

Mr. Speaker, the United Planning Organization last year had a payroll in excess of \$1 million specifically designated to pay salaries of employees in its work coordinating employment project. Yet they were able only to provide three prospective employees to Maid-A-Day from the entire Washington area. I ask in all sincerity, what were these several hundred UPO employees, with such fancy titles as "employment progress development supervisor," "employment progress developer," "scheduling coordinator," "job coach supervisor," and "personnel job developer," doing during that year? They drew salaries ranging up to \$12,000 and were obviously supposed to be developing jobs for hard-core unemployed. I believe this Congress should demand an accounting of exactly what jobs, if any, they developed, and of how many hard-core unemployed they brought into the work force, and, more importantly, what they did with more than a million dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mrs. Halverson and Mrs. Hess no longer operate Maid-A-Day, Mr. Speaker. They have suffered severe financial loss trying to work with the so-called poverty agencies, and are unable to repay a part of the small business loan made to them.

They tell me that they have learned a number of things from their experience, though. They have learned that anyone can learn to push a vacuum, but that no one seems to be trying to teach unemployed such things as just to notify his office when he cannot make it to work, how to make arrangements for child care, how to pay rent, how to stay out of debt, what a checking account is, why you must pay taxes.

They have also learned, to their dismay, that the National Committee on Household Employment is not interested in these problems, preferring to concentrate on establishing some fancy new name for domestic workers.

They learned that "thousands of dollars in grants from the Department of Labor" could be made available to them if they would branch out into something

"new and different," but that what they were trying to do did not warrant help from anyone.

They learned, too, that in spite of the countless millions being spent on the so-called war on poverty, the only escape from poverty, through an opportunity to work, is neither promoted or encouraged by the agencies of Government with which they dealt.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe the United Planning Organization and its parent, the OEO; the National Committee on Household Employment and its parent, the Department of Labor, should explain to this Congress how they have spent millions of the taxpayers' dollars right here in Washington, D.C., on employing the unemployables and have been unable to produce as many as three prospective trainees for a program such as Maid-A-Day, Inc.

Hard-Core Unemployed Still Present Major Challenge

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders places heavy emphasis on the problem of jobs for those in the ghettos. The Commission found that—

Employment is a key problem. It not only controls the present for the Negro American but, in a profound way, it is creating the future as well.

In Detroit, the city's businessmen understand this.

Soon after the riots last summer, businessmen began intensive efforts to increase job opportunities. And they have found jobs for a significant number of workers.

Yet these same businessmen are among the first to admit that more—much more—needs to be done.

Recently the *Detroit*, the weekly publication of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, reported on the jobs program there, and concluded that while work has been found for about 56,000 persons, "the job really has only just begun."

John R. Steiner, manager of the board's research and information department, writes:

Within a broad context then, the scope of the job is evident—total unemployment must be brought down with major emphasis on the hard-core and the underemployed.

This article clearly explains the problems involved in finding jobs for the hard-core unemployed. The business community is dedicated to the task, as Mr. Steiner shows.

However, the facts indicate that the Federal Government must supplement the efforts of private enterprise. The job is just too great.

The President has proposed an extensive manpower program, with the Federal Government and private enterprise sharing the responsibility for putting a

half million hard-core unemployed to work by 1971.

The National Commission on Civil Disorders recommended the creation of 2 million jobs over the next 3 years—1 million in the public sector, another million in the private sector.

And I have introduced in the House of Representatives legislation, cosponsored by nearly 80 Members from both political parties, which would provide a million jobs in public service occupations during the first year of the program's operation.

These are the various proposals for reaching the hard-core unemployed. Mr. Steiner has described the problem well, and I recommend this article to my colleagues:

HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED STILL PRESENT MAJOR CHALLENGE

You have been impressed by figures published lately on the number of people hired by Detroit area firms since last August. A figure on the order of 56,000 has been used. This is indeed a major achievement.

But unfortunately, it has led some to believe that the biggest part of the task of finding jobs for the unemployed—particularly the so-called unemployables—has been accomplished.

The facts, however, present a much different picture. The job really has only just begun.

Meaningful statistics are extremely difficult to come by. The figure upon which most reliance must be placed is the one which measures total unemployment in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. In 1967, unemployment reached an annual average of 68,600—highest in three years. In January, '68 it was 61,000 or 3.7% of the work force.

But no continuing statistical measure is made of unemployment in the corporate City of Detroit—nor of its inner city. Here guess-timates rule, since sampling techniques for the metropolitan area do not distinguish between the City of Detroit and the rest of the area or between the city and its inner city.

Unanswered are the questions "How many are unemployed within the corporate limits of Detroit? How many are unemployed in its inner city?"

The distribution of income and population in the area justifies an assumption that of the total unemployed in the area—most reside in Detroit—and within the corporate limits of Detroit, most can be found in the inner city.

Perhaps the best statistical measure of unemployment in the inner city is expressed as a percentage. Unemployment in the Detroit area now stands at 3.7%. The rate of unemployment among minority groups, experience shows, is generally three times the average rate.

Another important figure, this one a projected estimate, is that 30,000 net, new jobs must be found each year for the expanding work force in the Detroit area. This is net, over and above the 39,000 jobs that open up each year due to people leaving the work force.

Complicating attempts to arrive at reasoned estimates is the fact that the poverty programs in major cities—particularly the employment efforts—have speeded up the migration of workers from rural sections to the big cities in a search for jobs.

Overlooked entirely by statistics are the underemployed, including low wage earners, part time and short time workers—many with families. In the judgment of some—their numbers are even greater and need as much attention as the hard-core unemployables.

Within a broad context then, the scope of the job is evident—total unemployment must be brought down with major empha-

sis on the hard-core and the underemployed.

Based upon the limited statistics available, the inner city probably has at least 10,000 hard-core unemployed people or 16% of the Detroit area's current total unemployment.

The National Alliance for Businessmen has already set a target figure for businessmen in the Detroit area, to be achieved by June, 1969—at least 4,000 jobs for the so-called unemployables. All Detroit area businessmen have a stake in the successful achievement of this goal.

"Mount Mitchell" Commissioning

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey ship, *Mount Mitchell*, was commissioned in a ceremony at Jacksonville, Fla. This ship is named after Mount Mitchell, the highest American mountain east of the Rockies, and located in the congressional district in western North Carolina which I am privileged to represent.

A very challenging address was delivered by North Carolina Congressman ALTON LENNON in which he emphasized the importance of scientific investigation and study of the resources of the ocean.

I recommend Congressman LENNON's address to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF HON. ALTON LENNON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY SHIP "MOUNT MITCHELL" COMMISSIONING, JACKSONVILLE, FLA., MARCH 23, 1968

Dr. Kincaid, Dr. White, officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Mayor Tanzer, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is pleasant to be in the land of sunshine, the home State of two of our great U.S. Senators, Spessard Holland and George Smathers, and especially to be in Jacksonville, represented by my colleague and esteemed friend, Charles Bennett.

To participate in an event as important as the commissioning of this modern hydrographic and oceanographic survey ship is indeed a high honor and personal privilege.

The sea, as most of us here realize, has a different meaning for different people. To the commercial fisherman, the sea is the productive environment from which he derives his livelihood. To the person seeking escape from the burdens of working life, the sea is a beach upon which to relax—a place to swim. A place for boats and surfboards, or a place simply to daydream while relaxing. To the geologist faced with shortages of strategic material on the land, the sea offers great potential. To the scientist, the sea is a complex challenge promising better understanding of the planet on which we live.

The sea engulfs almost three-quarters of the earth's surface—nearly 140 million square miles. Knowledge of the oceans must be enlarged to learn more about their resources. Our future depends upon how well we meet the challenge to unlock the secrets of the ocean depths.

Our present need is to examine and describe the oceans in detail, to study the accrued data so as to understand the total ocean environment, and, consequently, to utilize the resources of the oceans for the betterment of human life.

Oceanography is neither a new subject nor a new interest in the United States. The

hydrographic surveyor actually was the first oceanographer, his efforts being directed primarily to measuring ocean depths and charting dangerous shoals, rocks, and wrecks so that ships might travel our coastlines in safety. The work performed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in charting our territorial waters, since the nineteenth century, has provided a large volume of oceanographic data and a wealth of experience to support today's more sophisticated oceanographic research effort.

The year 1966 was a significant turning point for modern oceanography in our country because of the enactment of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act. This act calls on the President to develop a comprehensive, long-range and coordinated national program in marine science, with the assistance of a national council on marine resources and engineering development and a national commission on marine science, engineering and resources.

The objectives of this act call for the United States, through direct Government action and with the support and active participation of industry and other private endeavors, to maintain its place as a leader in marine science and marine resource development. The declaration emphasizes the importance of developing improved methods and equipment for undersea research, exploration, recovery resources, and transmission of energy.

President Johnson in his 1968 state of the Union message stated: "This year I propose that we launch, with other nations, an exploration of the ocean depths to tap their wealth, energy, and abundance." A few days ago he proposed an international decade of ocean exploration to expand cooperative efforts in probing the mysteries of the sea.

Our national goal then is to investigate the ocean, with the best coordinated science program we are capable of developing. The challenge is great for we are pioneering in a little known area. We must push back the frontiers of the unknown in the waters which surround us, just as our forefathers did in settling our western territories. We are, undoubtedly, on the threshold of a most exciting era which will greatly affect the future of our country and other nations in the years ahead.

Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels have been conducting hydrographic work along our Atlantic and gulf coast since the 1830's. But even after all the many decades, the oceans touching our shores are still inadequately charted and so poorly understood in all facets, that only very limited use can be made of our Continental Shelf resources. With one major exception, the petroleum industry, little has been accomplished in the great potential offered. Vast opportunity is now offered for exploitation, the need for food, the need for safe disposal of wastes, for improved weather forecasts, for better charts for offshore shipping, to find new sources for mineral wealth that is being depleted on land, and the need for military defense measures. Thus, we must have knowledge of our offshore domain if we are to utilize it and its resources. Our marine scientists and engineers have a compelling challenge to meet.

Continental slopes and margins should receive first priority for intensive exploration study. At present, less than 5 per cent of the ocean floor is adequately surveyed and charted. The mounting interest in that part of the sea nearest our coasts reflects expectations for the greatest economic return. The United States acquired outright about 850,000 square miles of undersea territory, when it became a signatory on June 10, 1964, to the Convention on the Continental Shelf, adopted in Geneva at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

This new ship—the *Mt. Mitchell*—which we commission today, will play a major role in investigating the ocean, in carrying out

the historic mission of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in charting the areas off our shores, and in supporting other activities of the Environmental Sciences Administration.

This 231-foot, 1627-ton, \$4.3 million vessel has a cruising range of 8,000 miles and accommodations for 79 officers, crew, and scientists. In the immediate future, she will conduct gravity surveys along the Continental Shelf of Georgia and South Carolina, followed by Gulf Stream studies off Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. This summer, she will participate in radio tracking radar tests off Wallops Island, Virginia, and will conduct hydrographic surveys in the vicinity of Martha's Vineyard.

This vessel is named for Mt. Mitchell, the highest mountain in the Eastern United States, the area in which she will operate. Located in the Blue Ridge chain in western North Carolina, the mountain was named for Dr. Elisha Mitchell, the noted professor and explorer who established its elevation in 1835.

The name of this vessel is symbolic of the strength, enduring and spiritual, that we associate with mountains. It is significant, I believe, that she will reach the "highest peak" of service for the welfare of mankind.

I would offer a prayer of godspeed for all, those in Government and in industry, who have had a part in the planning and construction of the *Mt. Mitchell*, for the officers and crew, for the ESSA scientists who will guide and program the activities of the ship.

May the *Mt. Mitchell* be dedicated to increasing knowledge of the sea and to furthering man's progress in the challenge of the seas.

Forty-nine Years Working for Good

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion celebrated its 49th birthday this month. For nearly half a century this organization of dedicated men who have served their country both in and out of our armed services has been working for the good of our Nation.

A recent issue of the *Stars and Stripes*—the National Tribune carried an editorial about the activities of this organization throughout the years of its existence. I would like to present that editorial at this time as a tribute to the American Legion and the fine, patriotic individuals that comprise its membership.

FORTY-NINE YEARS WORKING FOR GOOD

The 49th birthday of the American Legion will be celebrated this week—March 15-17. A lusty, healthy child it was, that was born in Paris a few months after the close of World War I. And it grew to a manhood of tremendous virility and a mighty influence for the good of the world.

The officers and men of Pershing's army who gathered in Paris to form an organization to carry on in peacetime did a greater job than they knew at the time.

The Grand Army of the Republic which came out of the Civil War at the time World War I started in 1914 was almost identical in age to the Legion today. The GAR, too, stood for the good of the nation as well as for protecting the interests of its members. Its influence by the time it was 49 years old had dwindled with the passing away of many of the men who had given it strength. Likewise, with the fine citizens who were numbered in the Confederate veterans' ranks.

World War II, Korea, and now Viet Nam

have caused the creation of vast new numbers of veterans, men in their prime, and, like the men who constituted the first mass of the American Legion, imbued with patriotism and dedicated to the good of the nation.

The Legion has had a profound influence in every state, and particularly in the halls of Congress. True, there have been those who probably used their affiliation to climb ladders in public office and otherwise gain for themselves.

But unselfish work for the good of their communities and nation on the part of the great bulk of membership far outweighs any elements of self-interest.

Probably in no field did the Legion perform greater service and influence for good than in the country communities. In these it became the heart of community activity and civic betterment. It created programs for youth, civic improvement and welfare that had never before existed. Post memberships in these country towns united in work for good. Their leadership in community affairs became accepted routine. Their service to their fellow citizens came at a time when it was urgently needed.

Today with paved highways, automobiles, radio, television, improved schools, and scores of other developments in the American way of life, the Legion's small-town post activities for their specific communities are probably not as vital as they were 30 to 40 years ago. In those days they were in reality, the heart of the community.

Instant communications of today make the small town in essence a fixed part in the state and nation as a whole. The small-town post today has become a part of the whole, but it is still a unit valuable to its own community and to the nation.

In summary, our happy birthday wishes to the Legion. By inheritance, it must always stand for good.

The People's President

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, although it is a bit early, I wish to announce my plans for this summer.

I plan to support the Democratic candidate for President.

And that Democratic candidate will be the President of the United States. Lyndon Johnson will be our party's candidate for President, and he will be our President for another 4 years.

I support President Johnson because I sincerely believe that the American people will respond to the greatness of the man who leads us in a most difficult time.

I think the people are fully capable of recognizing that they have a President for all seasons—a man they can depend upon when things go against us, as well as when things go well. I think they know that no one in our country is more determined to achieve and maintain a peaceful and just world.

I personally believe our President is a man for all ages. A good deal has been said, Mr. Speaker, about the so-called alienation of youth of this Nation. Well, I just want to point out that Lyndon Johnson has been the greatest educational President in the history of this country.

He has done more for the workingman than any other President.

And he will always be remembered as the President who helped create Medicare for the Nation's senior citizens.

President Johnson gets my support because he has earned it, through his efforts in behalf of the American people.

The welfare and security of the American people have been the focal point of every action, every program, every recommendation made by this administration.

We Democrats pride ourselves on being the party of the people.

In Lyndon Johnson we have a President who deserves to be known as the people's President.

He has served their cause truly and well.

I am proud and honored to support his reelection.

Role of Congress in the Decisionmaking Process

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in his March 1968 report to his constituents, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable TOM CURTIS, discusses an issue which is of major concern today, the role of Congress in the decisionmaking process. His presentation of the problem and the need for congressional reform merits the thoughtful consideration of all concerned with the question of congressional responsibility to the people of the United States. His report follows:

The lead question in *Parade Magazine* Sunday February 18th was:

"Whom should the average U.S. citizen believe on the war—the Government or the Press?"

The answer was: "The Press."

Both the question and the answer exhibit a shocking lack of understanding of the basic theory of representative government. Yet this question, "Whom shall we believe?" increasingly is being asked by more and more concerned American citizens not only about the war but about any subject of public concern.

How, indeed, do the people inform themselves on the issues of the day? How are intelligent decisions to be made? Is the world too complex for government by the people to function with efficiency? Do the people have to leave matters up to the President or Huntley-Brinkley or other wise persons operating behind closed doors to make the decisions in their behalf?

I think not, and yet what the press has referred to as the "credibility gap" in talking about "the government" is a real thing and becoming a credibility canyon. I do not want to get into a crossfire of deciding which is more reliable in informing the people, the press or the Johnson Administration because I think the situation of giving honest accurate information to the people has deteriorated so badly that there is enough blame to be shared by all involved. And this includes my profession, the politician, and the Congress.

I am concerned with what, if anything, we can do about it.

A LOT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THIS SITUATION

There is a lot that can be done about it and it is not too difficult. It simply requires

reviewing the basic theory of representative government as it has been developed and getting it back on the track.

Congress has defaulted in its primary function and responsibility to the people, namely to gather together what knowledge and wisdom exists within the society to apply it to the problems that face the society. It has allowed itself to become all too much an organization where "wheeling and dealing" instead of honest study and honest debate determine the decisions that it makes.

The Congress in ideal, if not in practice, is essentially a study and deliberative body. It is Congress which has been given the power to call before its Committees for open interrogation the Administrators of our government, be they Secretaries of State, of Defense, of the Treasury, or four star generals and admirals. It is through the process of public congressional hearings that the statements made by the government officials are subjected to cross examination and to rebuttal testimony and here that concerned and knowledgeable private citizens and groups who disagree with the facts and arguments presented by the governmental officials can come and testify . . . they too under cross examination and subject to rebuttal testimony.

In the process of conducting these public hearings the people have an opportunity to learn what the facts are and what the issues are and so contribute their knowledge and wisdom to the decision-making process. How, indeed, can the people participate in the process if they do not know what are alleged to be the facts and what the arguments are?

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND OBSTACLES TO IT

I was the ranking Republican on the now defunct select joint bi-partisan committee set up to propose reforms to improve the work of the Congress. For two years we held public hearings and early last year reported out unanimously a bill for this purpose. Senator Monroney introduced it in the Senate. I introduced it in the House. The Senate passed it early last year as the first order of its agenda. The House leadership has bottled the matter up ever since. I introduced a bill to continue the existence of the select committee until the bill was debated and passed the House and the Conference. The leadership of the House allowed the committee to expire and congressional reform is dead for the time being.

What killed Congressional Reform? The power structure of the House of Representatives centered as it is in the senior members of the 20 standing committees. Over a period of years these committees have increasingly become little centers of power in the areas of their assigned jurisdictions. Instead of fulfilling their function, namely to gather facts and arguments surrounding issues so the House itself could more intelligently reach a decision, they have usurped the prerogatives of the House and sought to make the decision themselves, each in their own little kingdoms.

This usurpation of the power to make decisions has corrupted the study and deliberative process from one of gathering as much information as possible and spreading it out on the record for the rest of Congress . . . and the people . . . to see, to one of squirreling away what information the senior members of the committee have acquired . . . to make of the committees the "experts" on the subject . . . so that the committee's decision, made behind closed doors, becomes the decision the full Congress adopts . . . without full debate or discussion.

The main thrust of the Congressional Reform bill was to break down the power of committee chairmen and senior members . . . to return to the committee members at least the power which by law is vested in them as a majority to control the agenda of the committee, the conduct of the hearings, the

witnesses to be called, the staff to be employed, to be retained and promoted.

It gave to the committees and to the minority party members of the committee more adequate professional staffs. No committee can conduct an intelligent public hearing without the help of competent professional staff.

The power structure of the congressional committees is such that the senior members of the committees have been able to make decisions in lieu of the other members of the committee and of the Congress itself. These members all too often do not want adequate professional staffs. They prefer very small . . . albeit thankfully in some instances, expert staffs which they can control. A larger staff, though it may be necessary to do the adequate studying required is not so easily controlled. Junior members on the committee and other Congressmen not on the committee find they can get access to the professional staff members and so have the same information the senior members of the committee have.

POWER STRUCTURES OUTSIDE THE CONGRESS HAVE ENCOURAGED THIS UNHEALTHY DEVELOPMENT

This narrowmindedness on the part of the Chairmen and senior members of the various 20 standing committees of the House of Representatives fits in aptly with the efforts of groups outside the Congress who wish to manipulate the decision-making process. These groups assist the senior members of the committee to maintain their vested interests in controlling the subject matter of their committee's jurisdiction and in their efforts to mutually protect each other's jurisdictions and the process itself. Herein lies the successful resistance to reform.

There are four general power structures outside the Congress which has encouraged the Congress to develop in this unhealthy fashion and who covertly resist all efforts to reform it . . . and to let the public know about how Congress is really run.

The first is the Executive branch of the federal government. There is little question that this is the most powerful "lobby" group in Washington using taxpayers' money to do the job. There are laws written by older Congresses which make these lobbying activities crimes. Yet the present Congresses . . . under the leadership that has grown up . . . work along with this criminal operation. Probably the most sinister of all the lobbying techniques and the most effective employed by the Executive branch of the government is the indirect lobbying through propagandizing the people on the issues before the Congress. Note, if the Congress through its committee hearings and debates did the proper studying and deliberation it could expose and combat this Executive propaganda with ease.

The second is the established private pressure groups who conduct their own lobbies. They too have vested interests in a system where decision-making is confined to a small group on a committee and done behind closed doors. They don't want the study and deliberative process to work so long as they have access to the inner councils of power. But note also that these groups have learned, as has the Executive, that the most effective lobbying is the indirect lobbying through propagandizing the people who are taught in turn to put pressure on their Congressmen. So adept are these groups at indirect lobbying and with the power they possess over the small group of Congressmen who have the power to make the decisions in the area of their concern that they, not the key Congressmen, make the real decisions. . . . Of course, the remedy here is the same simple remedy . . . perfect the congressional committees as study and deliberative bodies.

The third group is the intelligentsia or those in the group who adhere to the Machavellian theory of political science. This

school today dominates the political science departments of our colleges and universities. By and large the text books used by our young people today have been written by their members. There is no gainsaying the fact that men and governments throughout history have been motivated to do things through appeals to their baser instincts and developing the science of making men do things through these kinds of appeals has a semblance of reason about it and even justification for those whose stated objectives are for the long range benefit of society. But I would argue that the aims and means of any long range objective are of the same material . . . therefore if the means are corrupt . . . the ideal cannot escape that corruption. In some respects striving for the ideal is the ideal itself . . . and if the striving admits of corruption the ideal is lost. Essentially, however, this school of thought prides itself on being "pragmatic" and casts ideals into the discard. They say God is dead.

On this point I must express fundamental disagreement and point out to the pragmatists that throughout history there have been idealists and, I believe, there always will be idealists. What then do you, in your pragmatism, do with idealists? Ridicule them so they are ineffective? Shoot them if necessary? This has been tried and even seemed successful for short periods of time, decades and even centuries on occasion, but somehow or other, the truth . . . if that's what really was being buried . . . did not stay buried.

I wish the pragmatists would stop fighting the development of the rational process for reaching decisions and join in developing it. It really is much more pragmatic.

The fourth power structure is the news media. The news media, at least in Washington, D.C. has a vested interest in the present congressional power structure and the dramatic personae that has grown up in the Congress almost of their own creation. It really is quite a difficult art to report the study and deliberative process. Ideas must be the heroes and villains rather than personalities. The label itself must be the issue . . . is it properly descriptive of the package or person upon which it is placed? . . . and so the art of reporting which, perforce, relies on labels becomes even more difficult.

CONGRESS NEEDS HELP IN THIS AREA

In order to improve the Congress as a study and deliberative body so that the people can participate in the decision-making process we must improve its structure and its procedures. This is the proper subject for political scientists and we badly need political scientists to get back to their business and off the "dirty trick" binge they have been on. Men and politicians don't need any expert help in figuring up new dirty tricks. We need help in minimizing them. Indeed, that is the art of political science . . . to bring out the nobler things in human nature and to minimize the brutish.

BECAUSE HUMAN FREEDOM IS WRAPPED UP IN DEVELOPING BETTER PROCEDURES

Let me close this important dissertation with two observations, both about the Bill of Rights in our Constitution. The Bill of Rights is almost entirely concerned with procedures, not with substantive issues. If procedures are boring, then we need to relive (and we may have to) the days that brought about these radical reforms because there is nothing boring about being thrown in jail to languish without a speedy trial, or to be accused of crime without ever seeing the accuser.

Human freedom is wrapped up in developing better procedures . . . in developing government by law in contrast to government by men.

I am asked why I am a conservative when I seem to have such "liberal" views on civil rights. The answer is that the Bill of Rights . . . indeed the structure of government established in the U.S. Constitution is still, by today's standards, radical. We as a society

are still far from attaining these radical ideals. Almost as far as we are from attaining the still radical ideals set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. As a conservative I seek to conserve these radical thoughts as the basis for the ongoing of our society.

I wrote a lengthy and critical letter several years ago to a distinguished group of Republican intellectuals who were seeking to establish programs and a platform for the Republican Party because this group, it seemed to me, had lost sight of the fact that Congress in design and ideal was to be the study and deliberative body to develop programs and platforms. I tried to spell out my criticism with many specific examples and because I was somewhat in despair I concluded my letter with the following statement which I believe to be of fundamental importance in America today.

"I feel that a political party can and must be built around the fundamental and simple principles of proper representative government which I have sought to enunciate. I hope it will be the Republican Party but if our party fails to base its program on these principles then this must be done through a new political organization set up for this purpose. It can only be done through people who are willing to enter the political arena to be elected by the people. It cannot be done by people who sit on the sidelines and who fail to study the picture but who, nonetheless seek to enter on an intermittent basis to make opinion and render decisions, ignoring those who are waging what battle is being waged. This amateur approach lends aid and comfort to today's enemy of representative government, who, whatever else he is, is a seasoned professional political infighter."

A Long Way To Go

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is especially important that we not jump to advance conclusions on the developments in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other dictatorships in Eastern Europe. The State Department, of course, is happily but erroneously reporting that developments there justify its bridge-building concept whereas the opposite is true since the forces of change were not those in the good graces of our Department of State. The Wall Street Journal, in its March 26 edition, carried one of the most objective articles on these developments that I have seen. The article follows:

A LONG WAY TO GO

The ferment rippling through Eastern Europe again stirs the hope that communism will eventually evolve into something less threatening than it has been. The important thing for U.S., though, is to distinguish hope from dreams.

It is more than merely gloating to see good news in the recent troubles of Communist rulers. In Poland students take to the streets demanding greater intellectual and personal freedom. In Czechoslovakia old-line Communists are ousted from the government. Rumania thumbs its nose at Moscow by walking out of a Communist unity conference. And in the Soviet Union itself, trials of writers set off petitioning and protesting scarcely imaginable in former times.

These developments are encouraging because they show the Communist high priests have not succeeded in conditioning their youth. One of the most frightening aspects of Communist dictatorship has been the im-

age of succeeding generations nurtured from infancy on the idea they are merely servants of the state, and on the doctrine of perpetual hostility toward non-Communist nations. The human spirit has again proved too durable for that, and its resilience means that even in communism there remains a potential for evolution.

Upon achieving power, the Communists were unable to reconcile dogma with reality. Economic progress required material incentives, which have an inherent implication of the importance of individual desires. Scientific progress required a measure of intellectual freedom, always dangerous to dogma. Stalinism bred de-Stalinization, with its implicit admission that the state and Party are capable of evil.

For all these reasons, the notion has been loosed that Marxist writ as interpreted by the Party is not after all infallible. No future Communist leader will find it easy to put that genie back in the bottle.

These observations, however, do not necessarily end with the tag line that we shall all live happily ever after. The problem is that too many Americans leap to that dangerous conclusion every time they see the least portent of a less illiberal type of communism. In some circles, any mention of a Communist threat is met with an automatic rejoinder about the end of "monolithic world communism." As if Russia alone, or China alone, could not threaten our security.

Communist ideology undeniably does retain all that cant about world revolution, and about the use of force and the rest. Evolution may dull this appeal and alter the meaning of its words, but it is not likely to do so either quickly or completely.

When Communist nations like China or North Vietnam feel nationalistic urging toward expansion, the ideology will be there to feed the fire. The same ideology seems likely to stick as a residue in even a relatively civilized Communist state; Tito, for instance, has recently been calling for new militancy in the name of world communism.

Anyone who doubts that communism remains a real menace need only look at the world. Despite any differences, the Soviets and the Chinese apparently have in some ways armed the Vietcong better than we have armed the South Vietnamese. On their own, the Soviets apparently played a huge part in precipitating war in the Middle East and using its aftermath to further their penetration. They are rapidly building a larger strategic missile force; perhaps they will stop at "parity" as some optimistic strategists assume. But don't bet on it.

This record must be kept firmly in mind in evaluating whether Communist evolution or internal dissension means its menace has been reduced to the point where the U.S. can relax. If one looks realistically at the whole record, instead of dreamingly at parts of it, one conclusion is inescapable.

To wit, the Communist world has come a long way since Stalin, but it has a long way to go.

Johnson Backed

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the reading of my colleagues a forthright and candid letter which was written by one of my constituents, Rabbi Samuel Silver, and which appeared in today's New York Times editorial page. In his letter which follows, Rabbi Silver points to the very real facts which surround the bid for the Demo-

cratic presidential nomination, the power of the Presidency and the desire for peace borne by all Americans—and especially the President:

JOHNSON BACKED

To the Editor:

Whoa, everyone! That New Hampshire primary wasn't all that significant.

Remember, the Johnson forces hardly campaigned. Remember, to vote for Johnson it was necessary to write his name in.

Remember, people are anxious for peace.

Had President Johnson campaigned against Senator Eugene McCarthy, the results would have been different.

As for the voters' desire for a peace candidate, remember that Johnson, too, wants peace. And he may bring it off before the election.

Some of the New Hampshire voters opted for McCarthy because they thought of him as a liberal. Well, Johnson is more liberal than McCarthy, as anyone can discover by comparing the Senator's record in voting with Johnson's record in proposing legislation.

And let's bear in mind what one of your reporters said: Estes Kefauver once won all the primaries and couldn't even get close to the nomination.

Rabbi SAMUEL M. SILVER.

STAMFORD, CONN., March 15, 1968.

Baltimore's Innovation in Creating New Housing While Renewal Area Is Developed

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress created the Department of Housing and Urban Development it declared that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of our people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

As a Representative in Congress from the Greater Baltimore area, the largest city south of the Mason-Dixon line, I was very pleased to note that HUD has praised Baltimore's practical way of creating new housing while an urban renewal area is being developed. I have been a strong supporter of the Department's efforts to provide optimum assistance for housing and for the development of our country's cities and communities on behalf of the people who live and work in them.

Believing that Baltimore's innovation in this regard may be helpful to other communities, I insert the Department of Housing and Urban Development's remarks at this point in the Record:

PARK SPACE USED AS HOUSING SITES, THEN REPLACED WITH CLEARED RENEWAL LAND

BALTIMORE, Md.—The Nation's sixth largest city—has hit on an ideal but practical way of creating new housing while an urban renewal area is being developed.

The city is converting existing park land in the renewal area into housing sites for low- and moderate-income housing and then replacing the parkland with land cleared for redevelopment. This approach is being used when no other land is available.

The plan already has been incorporated in two Baltimore urban renewal projects financed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development—the Harlem Park I project, completed in June 1958, and the Gay Street I project, where planning is under way with a \$4,861,539 HUD grant.

In the 20-acre Harlem Park project area in West Baltimore, a school was built on half of a large city park. Later on, dilapidated buildings in the center of the area were demolished and space was provided for the city to build 29 "mini" parks to replace the park space used for the school.

NEW PARKS MORE CONVENIENT

The new parks include more acreage for park and recreation use than the former park, and they are more convenient for the residents. No two of the 29 new parks are alike. Some feature basketball courts and cycling facilities; some are for adult recreation; some for small children exclusively and some for older children.

In the 52-acre Gay Street I project area in East Baltimore—bounded by Monument, Eden and Biddle streets and Broadway—the city plans to use half of Madison Square for Federal Housing Administration insured moderate-income housing for displaced families.

The project will proceed in "checkerboard" fashion by demolishing structures elsewhere in the project area and building new housing and creating new park land. Then families will be moved into new housing in another section of the project area. Work then will proceed on the third and fourth phases of the checkerboard operation in a way which will provide orderly relocation with a minimum of hardship.

The Gay Street project will add nine acres to the present 25 acres of residential land and will more than double the existing 3½ acres of recreation land.

Baltimore, one of the first cities to make community organization an integral part of its urban renewal operations, is proud of the relationship between project area residents and redevelopment and planning officials. More than 40 meetings have taken place between the city's Planning Department and Gay Street I project area residents and merchants. The plan for using park space for housing and then replacing it is proudly referred to by the people of the area as "our plan".

State Marine, Soldier Die in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Michael D. Rolfe and Pfc. Vernie H. Powers, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

STATE MARINE, SOLDIER DIE IN VIETNAM

A 20-year-old Maryland marine has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday. And the name of a Maryland soldier, missing since December, has been added to the fatal casualty list.

Cpl. Michael D. Rolfe, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Rolfe, of Rising Sun, Md., died March 8, when his amphibious tank hit a mine in a river near the buffer zone.

Pfc. Vernie H. Powers, 20, of 346 Upperlanding road, Baltimore, was reported missing in action on December 24. His wife, Mrs. Ruth C. Powers, was notified yesterday that, since he had not been found within the

90-day period, his name was added to the list of fatalities.

Corporal Rolfe, a native of Radford, Va., grew up in Wilmington, Del., where he graduated from John Dickinson High School.

After he enlisted in the Marines in October, 1966, he received basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and amphibious tank training in Camp Pendleton, Cal.

He was stationed at Quantico, Va., before he was sent to Vietnam, where he worked as a chief mechanic for only seventeen days before his death.

He wrote home about the rocket and mortar attacks on his camp and about the Cambodian mountains which he could see in the distance, his mother, Mrs. Donald Rolfe, said.

Besides his parents, his survivors include a brother, Donald K. Rolfe, of Rising Sun, and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick K. Williams, of Dublin, Va., and Mrs. Grace C. Rolfe, of Elkton, Md.

Private Powers, a native of Pound, Va., came to Baltimore at the age of 3. He attended schools in Glen Burnie.

He joined the Army in July, 1966, and was stationed in Germany before he was sent to Vietnam in August. He was a member of Company C the 4th Infantry Division.

Besides his wife, his survivors include his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Powers; four brothers, Harold Powers, Nolan Powers, Jerry Powers and Owen Powers, and a sister, Miss Pamela Powers, all of Baltimore.

The Alewife Problem in Lake Michigan

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last fall a series of conferences were launched to meet the threat of pollution and related complications in Lake Michigan. Like so many situations involving Government, the advance fanfare is not being matched with practical programs. Therefore, I feel that an editorial on March 18, by radio station WBBM, Chicago, is especially timely, since it addresses itself to practical steps that must be taken to control the alewife problem in Lake Michigan. The editorial follows:

ALEWIVES

Just about a month ago, we mentioned that Lake Michigan faces another summer of trouble due to alewives. At that time, we called for the use of trawlers to help catch and dispose of alewives when they start to die-off by the millions.

There has been some talk of using the Coho salmon as a means of controlling the alewives population. It is a sound theory. But the trouble is that only the State of Michigan has taken part in this effort. And although the number of Coho salmon are increasing, it is still not enough to make a dent in the alewife population. And it may be two years—perhaps more—before the salmon do have a major effect.

Meantime, we've got that messy alewife situation to handle. A recent conference of officials from Indiana, Michigan, Illinois and Wisconsin approved a "crash program" to curb the problem of alewives this summer. It will involve the use of commercial trawlers. They'll skim off dead alewives before they reach the shores of Lake Michigan. Then tons of the dead fish will be dumped at land disposal sites and buried.

The Department of the Interior says it is willing to put up half of an estimated \$500,000 needed to pay for a six-week trawler program. The other half will have to come from

Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. This program—to be effective—must get underway next month. We think the four states involved should act swiftly to provide the necessary funds for the alewife program. We urge Illinois officials to act promptly.

Citizens' Criticism of Police in Arlington Called Unfair

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 44 years, has just announced that all crime has increased 16 percent over the past year, with the increase being 23 percent in the big cities. These are disturbing statistics and come at a time when much criticism is being aimed at many fine police departments throughout America. Often this criticism originates in studies by advisory committees and commissions, who mean well but who have limited knowledge and experience in the thankless, dangerous, and sometimes tragic duties of the police officer.

One of the fine police departments in the East is protecting the lives and property of the citizens in Arlington County. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Star of March 10, 1968:

CITIZENS' CRITICISM OF POLICE IN ARLINGTON CALLED UNFAIR (By Brian Kelly)

A largely critical citizens' report on Arlington's police department was criticized roundly in turn before the Arlington County Board yesterday.

Commonwealth's Atty. William J. Hassan and a spokesman for the county's Police Beneficiary Association charged the report was unduly critical, inaccurate or deficient in giving due credit in certain areas.

County Board Chairman Thomas W. Richards singled out one of the 73-page report's few laudatory statements as he thanked the 18-member citizens' panel that produced the report.

The section that Richards read aloud said the report's criticisms should not "obscure the fact that upon occasions the department has performed well indeed; that there are many excellent officers in the department, and that the county is indebted for the conscientious performance of duty and acts of valor by these officers."

TOOK NO ACTION

The governing body took no action on the panel's 30 proposed improvements, but instructed County Manager Bert W. Johnson to prepare a staff analysis of the recommendations.

Chiefly, the report criticized the police department's leadership. It also charged that officers were given almost no in-service training, and little direction and policy guidance from the top. The report also called for a new entrance requirement or the equivalent new entrance requirement of two years of college studies, or the equivalent for future recruits and similar educational levels for future promotions within the police force.

It recommended increasing the officer strength from 235 to 300 and construction

of a modern new police headquarters in five years.

CITIES "GROUP PROBLEM"

Theodore R. Groom, chairman of the citizens' panel, told the board that his group carefully avoided singling out Police Chief (Maj.) William G. Fawver for criticism, because it appeared that the department's alleged leadership deficiencies was a "group problem."

Groom suggested that "perhaps" manager Johnson and the county board itself have failed to pass sufficient direction down the chain of command to the police department. He said the goal of his group's proposals was to create an unexcelled, professional police force for the community.

Hassan charged the report was factually erroneous, because it failed to note that he had given police officers continuous lectures and training on new state laws and the effects of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions relating to police and court procedures.

The Arlington prosecutor also said the study group gave the department's leadership no credit for building "one of the best police departments on the East Coast" in the last 20 years.

MENTIONS DEDICATION

He declared Arlington police veterans who dedicated their lives and careers to the county force "ought not to be criticized or pointed out for a lack of education." He said many of them began their working careers in the depression or immediately after World War II, when economic conditions or military service blocked their educational hopes.

Officer William C. Jeunette, head of the beneficiary association, said, "We feel that certain sections of the report were harshly worded and placed undue criticism on certain sections and men of the police department." He also criticized press coverage of the report and its public release a week before yesterday's meeting.

However, Jeunette said his group also welcomed "constructive criticism" in the report and realized the "urgent need" for implementation of some of its recommendations.

In reply to Jeunette, Republican board member Ned R. Thomas commented, "This is a generation of beating policemen over the head."

Independent Jay E. Ricks said he disagreed with the proposal calling for added education as a basic requirement for future promotions, on top of the proposed college education for recruits.

In another development, the board approved a use permit for operation of a "halfway house" for newly released jail inmates seeking help in finding jobs and in reentering society. The halfway house will be operated at 1036 S. Highland St., by the Good News Mission, an Arlington-based group that offers religious guidance for jail inmates.

Meet Benjamin Banneker

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Banneker was introduced to the readers of Tom Wicker in the March 26, 1968, New York Times.

Students of history, especially those living in the Nation's Capital, may already have met Mr. Banneker. I feel, however, that most Americans will never have heard of him. He was one of the most distinguished men of his day and was one of three who determined the

original boundaries of the present city of Washington.

Mr. Banneker was a Negro, and tragically this is why very few have met him. His contribution to the Nation, no doubt because he was black, is usually omitted in the textbooks from which we learn of our past.

There are many like Mr. Banneker—Negro Americans who, unknown to the public, white and black, have helped to make our Nation what it is and have been banished from the pages of our "history."

What we do not know has hurt us. Mr. Wicker states it well in his article when he says:

This all-white education (a matter quite distinct from the question of pupil segregation) has been responsible for what James Baldwin called "A feeling of no past, no present and no future" in Negro children; it has made black soldiers in Vietnam unaware that they are part of a long and valorous tradition, and it has obviously been a large factor in the lack of self-esteem noticeable in many older Negroes.

It is equally obvious that the practical expunging of the Negro from the record of the past is bound to have had its subtle effect on white attitudes. If white men do not know that black men helped win American independence and pacify the continent it is a lot easier to talk glibly of "giving" the Negro his rights only when he has "earned" them.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a deep need in our Nation today to make the record of our past an honest one—to acknowledge and honor that which we have received from our Negro citizens in establishing this democracy.

I hope the Congress will give full consideration to the legislation introduced by myself and several Members of the House to establish a Commission on Negro History and Culture. I think this is a valuable step, but only the first one, in writing honest history.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the article by Tom Wicker:

IN THE NATION: MEET BENJAMIN BANNEKER
(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—"We hold these truths to be self-evident," wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1776, in the Declaration of American Independence, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

"But, sir," Benjamin Banneker protested, in a 1791 letter to Jefferson, "how pitiable is it to reflect, that although you were so fully convinced of the benevolence of the Father of Mankind, and of his equal and impartial distribution of these rights and privileges, which he hath conferred upon them, that you should at the same time counteract his mercies, in detaining by fraud and violence so numerous a part of my brethren, under groaning captivity, and cruel oppression..."

A DISTINGUISHED NEGRO

Banneker, these lines make plain, was a Negro, one of the most distinguished of his day; he is described as follows in "The Black Power Revolt," a collection of essays edited by Floyd B. Barbour: "One of a team of three who determined the boundaries of the present city of Washington, Banneker published annually after 1792 a widely used almanac devised by himself."

In fact, Banneker seized the opportunity to chide Jefferson in a covering letter for a copy of the almanac which he was sending to the great Virginian, who undoubtedly welcomed it with the interest he showed for any-

thing scientific. It is too bad that so few today, white or black, know anything about this remarkable early American.

That is true also of, say Dr. John S. Rock, a Boston physician who also became, before the Civil War, the first black man admitted to legal practice before the Supreme Court; nor do many Americans realize that a black man came over the Atlantic with Columbus, well before the Mayflower; another explored the West with Lewis and Clark, and another went to the North Pole with Peary.

Tom Johnson of this newspaper has just returned from several months in Vietnam, during which he made a close study of the attitudes of the black soldiers who make up more than 60 per cent of the Army there. One of his most curious findings was that many of them believed that, in Vietnam, Negroes were for the first time getting a chance to prove themselves as fighting men, and that this belief pushed many of them to excel as soldiers.

Few of them knew, Johnson found, that thousands of Negroes served under George Washington in the American Revolution and under Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812; that black troops acquitted themselves well on both sides in the Civil War, and that a large number of the storied cavaliers who cleared the Indians from the old West were black men.

This is just one more result of the all-white orientation of American society and culture—that most deep-seated and unquenchable form of racism which is neither malignant nor expressed, but unconscious. It is this orientation which has virtually eliminated from American education any study of the origins, the development, the cultural and social contributions and even the simplest history of more than 10 per cent of the population.

This all-white education (a matter quite distinct from the question of pupil segregation) has been responsible for what James Baldwin called "A feeling of no past, no present and no future" in Negro children; it has made black soldiers in Vietnam unaware that they are part of a long and valorous tradition, and it has obviously been a large factor in the lack of self-esteem noticeable in many older Negroes.

THE SUBTLE EFFECTS

It is equally obvious that the practical expunging of the Negro from the record of the past is bound to have had its subtle effect on white attitudes. If white men do not know that black men helped win American independence and pacify the continent, it is a lot easier to talk glibly of "giving" the Negro his rights only when he has "earned" them.

Representative James Scheuer of New York has been looking into all this with a view to establishing a commission on Negro history and culture. No doubt that would help; but the greater need is for school boards, teachers' associations and textbook publishers to take some direct, practical action against this kind of mindless racism.

Melvindale Resident Tells Story of Band

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Melvindale High School band, in my congressional district, recently observed the 40th anniversary of its organization. Present for this milestone event was Joseph Vandervest, the band's original director, who this month celebrated his 90th birthday.

Originally organized as a group of ninth graders, the Melvindale High School band today is one of the finest bands in the United States, and has won nationwide recognition under the leadership of its present director, Mr. Lincoln Naumoff.

A very excellent history of the band was published last week in the Mellus Newspapers, under the byline of Pearl Kastran. The information was compiled by Sylvia Dragos, a past president of the Melvindale High School Alumni Association.

In recognition of this outstanding musical group, Mr. Speaker, I include Mrs. Kastran's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NINETY-YEAR-OLD DIRECTOR CITED: MELVIN-DALE RESIDENT TELLS STORY OF BAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The information for the following article was compiled by Sylvia Dragos, a long-time resident of Melvindale and a past president of the Melvindale High School Alumni Association.)

(By Pearl Kastran)

In 1928, a group of ninth-graders in the newly opened Quandt High School, in northern Allen Park, which was a small village at that time, decided that they wanted to form a school band. The school site is in what is now the Melvindale-Northern Allen Park School District.

Sunday afternoon, during the high school band's fortieth year, all instrumental music groups in the district participated in a concert to honor Joseph Vandervest, the band's first director, who will mark his ninetieth birthday tomorrow. The program, "Bands in Review," also was in tribute to the ninth-graders who formed the first band.

SCHOLARSHIP

During the concert, held at the present Melvindale High School, establishment of the Joseph Vandervest Assistance Scholarship was announced by Lincoln Naumoff, director of music for the school district, and Robert C. Nunn, principal of the high school. The grant was set up by the 24 original band members and the director to give assistance to students who hope to pursue musical careers. Sylvia Dragos is serving as scholarship-fund chairman.

A record, "Musically Speaking," which was made by the present high school band under the direction of Naumoff will be sent to Vandervest, who lives in retirement with his wife, Edith, at Copenish, Michigan. The record was accepted at the concert on behalf of Vandervest by Edward A. Vitez, originator of the first band.

Vitez was one of the six students who, in 1928, approached Grace Uhl, a music teacher in the school system, about forming a band. She encouraged the students, who hoped to form not only a band but also an orchestra.

ORIGINAL BAND

In addition to Vitez, who played the violin, other original band members included Marcus Brant, drums; Verner Collins, violin; Almeda Meissner, tenor saxophone; Julia Vitez, violin and saxophone, and the late William Wolchak, clarinet (he was the first Melvindale man killed in action of the second world war).

Assisted by Miss Uhl, the small group of musicians met and played for the remainder of the 1928 school session. The members provided their own instruments.

There were fewer than 700 boys and girls enrolled in the entire school system in 1928, at Quandt and the Dasher and Kaier elementary schools. That number was almost matched Sunday by the total of music students participating in the combined concert.

The efforts of the first musical group were so impressive that the school board in 1929

hired the high school's first band director, Vandervest, a native of Ludington.

UNIFORMS CHOSEN

Vandervest organized the first formal high school band at that time. Soon the initial six musicians were joined by other students, and many still provided their own musical instruments. Also during the first year, the band decided to purchase uniforms, and this led to the selection of the school's colors—red and white.

The first formal picture of the Melvindale High School band was taken in 1929 and later appeared in the Aileron—1931, the first yearbook. The photograph showed the members in their new uniforms—mostly with bell-bottom, flannel trousers (only two of the girls elected to wear white skirts), long-sleeved white shirts, red broadcloth capes (lined in white) and overseas caps, emblazoned with the school letters.

The roster of the first official high school band included the names of many pioneer Downriver families.

OTHERS JOIN

In addition to the "original six," the first roll included Edward Arico, James Bernth, Mary Carver, Iva Cherry, Joseph Coffey, Marian French, James Kane, Bertha McKittrick, Marie Perras, William Radakovech, Carl Sauer, Melvin Schonfeld, Irene Stone, Elizabeth Theeck, Harold Tomlin, Margaret Trobaugh, Dorothy Weissenstine and Helen Winters.

Among the band's favorite selections during the late twenties and early thirties were "Poet and Peasant," "Chimes of Normandy," "Southern Cross" and "In a Persian Market."

Many of the boys in the band were members of the football squad. Between quarters, those with dual roles would rush to join the high-stepping musicians as they marched onto the field to the shrill, booming "oompa-pa-ing" of their instruments.

Letter From Vietnam

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Joyce Holder, who wrote to me while she was visiting her husband in Saigon during the Vietcong Tet offensive. Mrs. Holder's clearly stated, poignant commentary on the tragedy of our involvement in Southeast Asia has meaning for all of us in this Congress, and I, therefore, commend her letter to the particular attention of my colleagues, as follows:

SERVICES AND SUPPORTS SQUAD,

San Francisco, Calif.

Congressman ALPHONZO BELL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Pardon the informality, but people dispense with formalities at times like this.

My husband left his apt. this a.m. at 8:00 to go to his office at the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. At 8:30 p.m. the Embassy was bombed and now it's 10:45 p.m. I have cleaned the house, scrubbed the floors, washed the dishes, smoked cigarettes and drank coffee and kept tuned to the radio. At 10:00 we had the radio report that 19 V.C. were killed, and the embassy secured at 9:30. At 9:00 troops landed by helicopter on the Embassy roof-top. News is scarce—every 20 minutes or so there is an announcement that all civilians and government employees are to stay in their "billetts" 'til further notice—'til

given an "all clear" from the provost marshal. So, I wait, and I have prayed for my husband's safety, and now I want to write you, because someone is responsible for the terribly twisted thinking in the U.S. that has led to this attack on American installations (9 of them at latest report) in Saigon.

This started last night at 3:00 a.m. or thereabouts—I was awakened by a grenade nearby. There is a police station near our apt., so it is a target for attack. There were machine guns tattering away and recoilless rifles whining out. My husband and I listened in the darkness. He told me that our building is solidly built, and the walls wouldn't be penetrated by machine gun bullets. He also told me the bathroom is the safest place in case of a bombing. Once they drove down this street and fired 4 shots—by day light it had quieted.

The streets are not completely deserted. Little crowds of Vietnamese are standing in door ways, at the corner, and a few are walking or riding bicycles—only a few cars go by—this is the downtown area where traffic is usually at its peak. Our children are in Manila, Philippines. I was allowed to come here for the Tet holiday. Seven days, including traveling time. It costs \$168.00 round trip, and I shall come each time I am allowed to—because this city is a human cess pool and if my presence here can brighten and cheer my husband a little I'll make the trip. Did you know every Communist "dove", "pacifist" or plain "nut" can enter this country at any time with impunity? Wives are not allowed to visit without express permission from the U.S. Gov.!

I want you to know that I blame you and every lawmaker, every Senator, every Congressman, present and past Presidents for this ghastly situation here. You are directly responsible for these American lives being lost each day. You have the opportunity to speak out to tell the people, to let them know what is happening here. You must shake the American public out of this stupor that has caused and resulted in a terribly worsening conflict here. Thousands of infiltrators have and are pouring into this country and they have 400,000 troops fully trained ready, ready, ready. That's only the beginning if S. Vietnam falls Laos, Thailand, Cambodia will be gone *within days*. Why aren't you shouting this from the roof tops there in Washington? Our country is in peril—our boys and husbands are being killed and still you debate the right and wrong the "morality" of this war—whatever that means! We must win *now, now, now*. Two years ago it was past due.

I'm ashamed of the poor showing America is making for herself—whatever happened to the men that could stand up to aggression and be counted there in Washington? God! You've all lost your minds in an endless "dialogue" while these guns keep on whining, and our men keep on dying. Why don't you care? We put our faith in you and elected you to lead us wisely and all you do is talk about *morals*, when we need action.

Muster your courage, and stop procrastinating with talk. If you believe America deserves to endure, see that we *win, here, now!*

Yours truly,

JOYCE HOLDER.

You've Got a Right—Part 3

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the RECORD the first two scripts in the series, "You've Got a Right," presented by

Group W, the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., to acquaint citizens with their constitutional rights and civil liberties.

Today I would like to call to the attention of the Congress the third in this series, on self-incrimination and the fifth amendment. This program was broadcast in Baltimore over WJZ-TV on February 1:

[Group W—Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.]

YOU'VE GOT A RIGHT

(The Fifth Amendment (Self-Incrimination), Written and Produced by Robert Lewis Shayon; Directed by Henry Behar)

PART 3

Cast

Director: Staats Cotsworth.
Actor 1 (Campion): Clifford David.
Actor 2 (Mallory Brennan): John Harkins.
Actor 3 (LaBelle, Sir John Banks): Addison Powell.
Actor 4 (Ingils, Lord Keeper Coventry): David Hurst.
Actor 5 (Strauch): Paul Stevens.
Actor 6 (Lilburn): Dan Travanti.
Actor 7: Conrad Jameson.
Actor 8: Dick Kilbride.

Prologue

Music—C.U. of an ordinary stage work-light on a stand.

Camera pulls back, pans high and reveals Actor 1 sitting in a plain Elizabethan chair, in a pool of light. He wears a priest's robe of a 16th century English order.

ACTOR 1. I was kept a long time in prison. Twice I was put to the torture rack to confess that I was plotting against the Queen. In my trial I could not lift up my hand to take the oath. They had torn out my fingers in an effort...

(Camera has pulled back to show Director, script in hand, kneeling on a step a little below the Actor.)

DIRECTOR (Interrupts). You'll have to hold out your hand. When you do it, show it.

ACTOR 1 (raises his hands). They had torn out my fingers in an effort to extract... "the truth."

DIRECTOR (Stands up). Remember, Father Campion speaks to us across almost 400 years.

ACTOR 1. Right.

DIRECTOR (Projects). Music—hold down in the background.

VOICE (off camera). Okay.

DIRECTOR. Places for the next scene.

Lights go up, revealing a rehearsal. (The set is a grouping of steps and platforms in limbo. The first scene we witnessed was played at the very top level, center, where there are two period chairs. Actor 1 sat in one of the chairs. The level below had a long judges' bench, with nine judicial chairs, suggesting an imposing courtroom. On the next level, below, to the left—is a smaller and less imposing judges' bench, with one chair. On the level below that, to the right, is a still less imposing judges' bench, with one chair. At stage-level, center, there is a witness chair. To the left, stage-level, is an ordinary table and chair with a phone on it, legal books and papers, a judge's gavel. Actor 1—in the priest's robe—descends to the second highest level and sits in the last chair, left. 7 other actors take their places in the judges' chairs (we have 9 actors in all, including Director). The center chair is empty, for the Director. Actor 6 who sits in the last chair, right, wears a 17th century English Puritan costume, but no hat. All the other actors wear informal rehearsal clothes.)

DIRECTOR (To Camera). We're a repertory company, 9 actors rehearsing freedom—more specifically, the Bill of Rights—the first 10 Amendments to the Constitution. We're working on the 5th; which includes among other rights, this guarantee: "No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a

witness against himself." We all play many roles.

We wear costumes occasionally. We suggest our settings; and we're always arguing about the issues. The author of our play? We the people of the United States—in collaboration with a long line of ghosts. (He turns and walks up to the long bench to join the other actors.)

ANNOUNCER (Off camera). Group W, the Westinghouse Broadcasting Company, presents "You've Got A Right" a series of programs dedicated to the proposition that "a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to secure the blessings of liberty."

DIRECTOR. Time, 1964. Place, the United States Supreme Court. Case—Malloy vs. Hogan.

MALLOY (Actor 2). I'm William Malloy, the petitioner.

DIRECTOR (off camera). Malloy works as a bartender sometimes, he is an ex-serviceman, he fought in World War 2 and was wounded.

MALLOY (Actor 2). I live in Connecticut, where I've been held in contempt of a local court. Technically, I'm behind bars in Hartford County jail.

DIRECTOR. The question the Supreme Court is deciding is whether Malloy shall be released or compelled to return to this witness chair. Three years ago Malloy refused to answer certain questions on the grounds that he might incriminate himself. This man asked him those questions.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). John D. LaBelle, attorney for the State of Connecticut.

INGILS (Actor 4). I was the presiding judge in the action involving Malloy.

DIRECTOR. He held Malloy in contempt for refusing to answer the questions which the court considered proper.

INGILS (Actor 4). The Honorable Ernest A. Ingils, Connecticut judge, sitting as a state referee in a Grand Jury investigation into gambling.

DIRECTOR. These three men wait to hear the Supreme Court decision; as does Harold Strauch, attorney for Malloy.

And in the minds of the justices—where the past throws long shadows—two ghosts wait.

CAMPION (Actor 1). Father Edmund Campion—a Jesuit Priest of the 16th century. "Blessed Campion" they called me.

LILBURN (Actor 6). John Lilburn, born a Puritan, died a Quaker—almost a hundred years after Father Campion. "Freedom John" they called me. The pain of mortal uncertainty afflicts us no more: yet, from our ghostly vantage point, we anticipate with disembodied curiosity, and some degree of preference the decision of the great American Court.

CAMPION (Actor 1). We represent a long line of martyrs—a few were celebrated, the rest nameless—who had some encounter with what you call "The Fifth Amendment"—in other times, in other lands. We mean to take the pulse of your 20th century justice.

ANNOUNCER (off camera). In a moment "You've Got A Right" continues as Act I of the Fifth Amendment.

Act I

DIRECTOR. The court deliberates. Taking shape in its present mind is its future decision. But clear in the court's thoughts are the ancient chronicles of the law... the settled precedents... the contemporary issues... and The Facts.

Flashback. Scene 1. The beginning of Malloy vs. Hogan, in a grand jury investigation, Superior Court, Hartford, Connecticut, January 16, 1961. Malloy, take the witness chair, Strauch, you're not in this scene. LaBelle, you're present—State Attorney. Conrad, you're the fourth person in the room. Any questions?

ACTOR 8. You said this was a Grand Jury investigation. Where's the rest of the Grand Jury?

DIRECTOR. Under Connecticut law, an investigation into crime may be conducted by one man appointed by the court.

ACTOR 8. Right!
DIRECTOR (To Malloy). How does Malloy feel?

ACTOR 2. Scared.
LA BELLE (Actor 3). What is your name?
MALLOY. William Malloy.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). On September 11, 1959, were you arrested in Hartford... and later convicted on charges of pool-selling?

MALLOY (Actor 2). I refuse to answer any questions on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

ACTOR 8 (interrupts). What's pool-selling?
DIRECTOR. Bookie joint.

ACTOR 2 (Malloy) (reverting to his actor personality). I and two other guys took bets over the telephone and relayed them to bookies. Cops raided us, I was fined and served 90 days.

DIRECTOR. Go on.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). You understand, do you, that I am questioning about a matter on which you are already convicted and there can be no incrimination in that?

ACTOR 8 (interrupts). Wait a minute. What's this jazz about you can't incriminate yourself because you've already been convicted?

DIRECTOR (to LaBelle). Addison?

ACTOR 3. One of the other clauses of the Fifth Amendment—double jeopardy. Malloy couldn't be convicted again for the old offense no matter what he said.

DIRECTOR. Next question.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). When you were convicted—for whom were you working?

MALLOY (Actor 2). I refuse to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). Who paid your fine? Do you know Mike Radeski?

MALLOY (Actor 2). I refuse to answer that question on the ground it may incriminate me.

LA BELLE (Actor 3). (To Referee). It seems, your Honor, the matter has to be referred for contempt.

DIRECTOR. Okay. Your playing of Malloy is uncertain. How do you feel about him—hostile or sympathetic?

ACTOR 2 (Malloy). Can't make up my mind. He broke the law once before. Where does he get the idea to take the Fifth anyway?

ACTOR 3 (LaBelle). Everybody knows the 5th. Especially people in the underworld.

ACTOR 8. Only gangsters and communists take the 5th. People who are guilty. If a person's not guilty, he's got nothing to hide.

ACTOR 5. The law recognizes that taking the 5th doesn't necessarily mean you're guilty. All it means is that the district attorney has to do the work of proving guilt.

ACTOR 1 (Campion). That's the whole point of the 5th. A civilized society doesn't force a man to dig his own grave.

ACTOR 6 (Lilburn). There are times you know when even an innocent person should take the 5th.

DIRECTOR. There's your answer John, innocent or guilty, Malloy's got a right to take the 5th. Malloy has been warned that he will be cited for contempt. What happens next?

ACTOR 2 (Malloy). He leaves the Grand Jury room and bumps into a lawyer.

ACTOR 5. I'm the lawyer.

DIRECTOR. Harold Strauch... How well do you know Malloy?

ACTOR 5. I handled an accident case for him some time ago.

DIRECTOR. Begin after Malloy has told you what happened in the Grand Jury. "Do I have to...?"

MALLOY (Actor 2). Do I have to answer those questions, Mr. Strauch?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). You know I'm not a criminal lawyer, Bill. Offhand, I'd say no.

MALLOY (Actor 2). Why not?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Well, the 5th amendment gives you the privilege against self-incrimination, and "due process of law." The 14th gives you due process against the states.

MALLOY (Actor 2). Wait a minute . . . what is due process?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Stated simply: It is whatever the law of the land is—what is reasonable, fair and right. Then the 14th also gives you "privileges and immunities."

MALLOY (Actor 2). I'll take your word. What's the penalty if I don't testify?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). You can be put in jail at your own expense, and kept there until you answer.

MALLOY (Actor 2). Indefinitely?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Yes; but you can get out on bond . . . or the court can change its order.

MALLOY (Actor 2). What would you advise me to do?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). I'd say the possibilities of your incriminating yourself are very real. Stick to the 5th. You've got a right.

ACTOR 8 (Interrupts). I don't get it. Look at the questions Malloy refused to answer. Who paid your fine? Do you know a man named Mike Radeski? They seem to be harmless. Why does the lawyer say he can get hurt answering them?

DIRECTOR. Mike Radeski is the superintendent of the apartment house Malloy was arrested in.

ACTOR 5. Don't you see? The State wants Malloy to supply evidence that will lead them to the big guys in the gambling racket.

ACTOR 2 (Malloy). Then why doesn't the State call Radeski? Why pick on me?

ACTOR 5. That's just it. The state is trying to trap Radeski by using Malloy.

ACTOR 3. Malloy must have known the superintendent. As a citizen, he's got to tell what he knows—especially if he's in the clear.

ACTOR 5. But maybe he committed other crimes. There were two other persons arrested with him. Nobody can be sure he's still not mixed up with law violators.

ACTOR 2. Once he opens that door a little bit—he can't shut it again. He's forced to answer all the questions. (To Director). That's right— isn't it? (Director nods).

ACTOR 8. We're so sensitive to the rights of criminals. What about the police? They're trying to do their jobs.

ACTOR 6. By taking short cuts—breaking the law? Let them do it the hard way—legally.

ACTOR 8. But this Malloy is a convicted gambler?

ACTOR 1. So what? It's better a dozen like him beat their raps, than to violate somebody's rights in order to convict them.

DIRECTOR. That's it . . . that's the issue . . . that's what you have to decide. Strauch—It's five days after you met Malloy in the courthouse. You're in your office . . . at your desk. Bill Malloy is on the phone.

MALLOY (Actor 2). About that Grand Jury investigation . . . I took your advice. I stuck to the 5th.

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Good.

MALLOY (Actor 2). But the Judge didn't buy it. He said I had to answer and held me in contempt. Will you handle my case?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Come over to my office and we'll talk about it.

MALLOY (Actor 2). I can't. I'm calling from jail.

DIRECTOR. All right. What have we got? A Connecticut Grand Jury subpoenas William Malloy . . . who refuses to answer questions . . . and now he's behind bars.

ACTOR 2 (Malloy). At my own expense.

DIRECTOR. The State wants him back in this witness chair.

ACTOR 8. Let him rot in jail. The power of the Community to keep law and order is at stake.

ACTOR 5. At stake is the fundamental

human right of a man to be let alone unless the community can proceed against him in a just manner.

ACTOR 2 (Malloy). Law and order is fine—and so are fundamental human rights—but what's at stake is me . . . Bill Malloy. I want to get out of jail.

DIRECTOR. Nuances too subtle to express are at stake—mysterious imponderables of duty and justice . . . elusive values—the marrow of men who live in a democracy. Add them all up—and you begin to understand the fascination of Malloy vs. Hogan—of the Bill of Rights—of the 5th Amendment: and why nine honorable but fallible men in Washington, sitting on the highest tribunal of our land, wrestled with the problem and disagreed on what the verdict should be.

ACTOR 7. This is the case of Malloy vs. Hogan. When does Hogan come in?

DIRECTOR. Never. He's the man who's technically holding Malloy in jail. Patrick J. Hogan is the Sheriff of Hartford County.

ANNOUNCER (Off Camera). In a moment, we will return to "You've Got A Right" and the rehearsal of the 5th Amendment.

Act 2

CAMPION (Actor 1). What do you think, John Lilburn . . . of that fellow who would have Malloy rot in jail?

LILBURN (Actor 6). He plays a familiar melody. We heard it in our day from kings and prelates—stiff-necked men in power.

CAMPION (Actor 1). God's wisdom makes strange paradox. This is a man of the people.

LILBURN (Actor 6). How odd that his voice should now be raised in the accents of tyranny.

CAMPION (Actor 1). This same tongue lashed at us—from the lips of Lords and Bishops.

LILBURN (Actor 6). Liberty and order, Father Campion, are twin passions. They know neither distinction nor rank. Nevertheless—Malloy is not without his defenders. We, too, had friends.

CAMPION (Actor 1). We were early players in a rising action. Human rights ascend slowly. Here is a far, far better stage than ours. Mr. Malloy has a defense counsel, a court; he has a jury, a constitution.

LILBURN (Actor 6). We had a sovereign alone—judge, jury, prosecutor. Rummaging around in men's minds . . . with foul inquisitions. High Commissions, Star-Chambers and oaths. Making God-fearing men accuse themselves out of their own mouths—with whips, pillories and torture-racks.

CAMPION (Actor 1). Do you think the great American court will free Mr. Malloy?

LILBURN (Actor 6). There's a heap o' law between us—and him.

DIRECTOR. Let's follow that law. Take the Habeas Corpus scene. (Indicating Actor 7, who was the Stenotypist), Connie, you're Judge Covello, Hartford Superior Court. (Indicating Actor 5), Malloy's lawyer is in this scene, too. (Actor 7 puts on a black robe and takes his place behind the Superior Court Bench, right, a level above the stage floor. The arrangement of levels suggests the march of Malloy vs. Hogan to the highest court. This is a step on the way. Actor 5 faces the Superior Court). (To Actor 5), It's January 25, 1961—the day after Harold Strauch agreed to take Malloy's case. What's your first move?

ACTOR 5. Produce the body—writ of habeas corpus—an old English custom—won at great cost of blood and suffering from English kings. The state must justify jailing Malloy.

DIRECTOR. And in the writ—you charge?

ACTOR 5. My client's imprisonment is unlawful.

DIRECTOR. You argue that before Judge Covello, February 7. The State presents its arguments. With whom does the judge agree?

ACTOR 7. With Connecticut. (Reads as Judge). The 5th Amendment is restrictive of national action only—and does not secure the petitioner exemption from self-incrimination in the state court. The petitioner . . .

DIRECTOR (Interrupts). (To Actor 7). Hold it. Why doesn't the 5th apply?

ACTOR 7 (as himself). Barron vs. Baltimore—a famous case which goes back to 1833. It set the precedent for constitutional questions involving the Bill of Rights and the states.

DIRECTOR. Correct. After that the Bill of Rights did not protect a person in a criminal action from the power of the states. Now—let's have the rest of the Superior Court decision in Malloy vs. Hogan.

ACTOR 7. The petitioner is secured the privilege under the Connecticut Constitution only if he is justified in refusing to answer the questions of the State Referee. The questions asked of Malloy do not show real danger. His imprisonment is legal. Writ of habeas corpus dismissed.

ACTOR 5. This court is in error. It's not human to force a witness to accuse himself, commit perjury, or place himself in contempt. Connecticut's Supreme Court will reverse this ruling. I'm sure of it. There is a principle involved.

(Lights suddenly go up in Jail Cell. Rest of stage is blacked out.) (Music) (Actor 1, Father Campion, is discovered in the cell).

CAMPION (Actor 1). There is always a principle involved. Are you surprised to find Father Campion in the cell of Malloy? It is highly fitting. It is a symbol. Malloy, in the eyes of many, is a low sort of fellow—a convicted gambler. I remind you that there was nothing lower than a seminary priest in the England of Queen Elizabeth, in the 16th Century. The Queen's officers persecuted all believers, Protestant or Catholic, who would not accept the teachings of her Anglican Church. I was captured as a spy in 1581, and taken to a cell in the Tower of London.

I stood silent—invoking my right not to give evidence against myself. The right of a man not to accuse himself was accepted in the ancient Jewish Talmud. It is a principle in the Canon Law of the Catholic Church. It is intangible—but so is liberty, and so is man's immortal soul. I was adjudged a traitor and suffered the barbarous penalty of being drawn and quartered. But they did not convict me out of my own mouth. "Mea Culpa", the fault is mine—it is a plea that cannot be extracted from free men by human authority. It belongs to a man and his God.

(The lights change. Campion is blacked out. The judges' bench—left—center—just below the U.S. Supreme Court lights up.)

DIRECTOR. Make a long leap in time—almost 4 centuries. 1962. Place. Connecticut's Supreme Court.

(Actor 8 in a black robe is on the court bench). (Actor 5 below him, awaits the decision.)

ACTOR 8. The only question is whether or not, under state law, Malloy was justified in refusing to answer. Under the existing standards, he was not justified because the questions were harmless. The State Referee had the right to determine that—not the witness.

Judgment of the lower court—affirmed.

(The court dims out. Actor 5 speaks fervently to the cast.)

ACTOR 5. Since 1925—there has been a steady trend in the decisions of the United States Supreme Court—bringing more and more of the Bill of Rights under the umbrella of the 14th Amendment. The Supreme Court must change its mind about the 5th Amendment—and apply it specifically to the states.

ACTOR 8. Can the Supreme Court change its mind?

ACTOR 5. Of course, it has done so often. "The Constitution," said Mr. Justice Holmes once, "is what the Court says it is."

(The witness chair, on stage level, is suddenly revealed in a pool of light. Actor 6, John Lilburn, is in the chair. The rest of the set is blacked out.)

LILBURN (Actor 6). The minds of men can change. John Lilburn will testify to that; but

it takes a bit of agitation, contentiousness, and the courage that only God can give.

"They called me a 'violent-spoken fellow' in the 17th century in England."

They said: "If the world were emptied of all but John Lilburn—Lilburn would quarrel with John, and John with Lilburn."

I was violent, 'tis true—for religious liberty. Oh, I was a busy, young lad at 23, smuggling in forbidden Puritan books and pamphlets from Holland.

In 1637, they arrested me on a London Street, and took me to Charles the First's hated "Star-Chamber."

(He rises, puts the witness chair aside . . . and now the lights go up on the judge's table, left, where the State Referee sat. Actor 4—the same one who played the Referee—is in the chair. He now wears a high official robe of the period. Actor 3—the same who played La Belle—stands near to confront Lilburn. He also has put on the suggestion of a period costume.)

(The other actors dress the scene—in the role of King's men. A few pikes are in evidence and touches of costume.)

LILBURN (Actor 6). Here it is, the Star-Chamber. No jury, no lawyer—merely the King's men, hot with their own will.

(He indicates Actor 4 at the table.)

There sits the Lord Keeper Coventry . . . and this . . . (indicating Actor 3) . . . is Sir John Banks, the Attorney General. And here am I . . . Freeborn John . . . a bit of a law clerk . . . an apprentice clothier.

(The scene begins.)

BANKS (Actor 3) (Referring to books and pamphlets before him). John Lilburn—you are charged with sending "facetious and scandalous books out of Holland into England."

LILBURN (Actor 6). The thing for which I am imprisoned—with is for sending over books—I am clear.

BANKS (Actor 3). Did you meet one named Hargust in Holland?

LILBURN (Actor 6). That is beside the matter of my imprisonment. I pray come to the thing for which I am accused.

BANKS (Actor 3). What speeches had you with Chillington since you came to town?

LILBURN (Actor 6). I am not willing to answer you any more of these questions, because I see you go about by this examination to ensnare me; If you will not ask me about the thing laid to my charge, I shall answer you with silence.

BANKS (Actor 3) (threatening). There will be a course taken with you to make you answer.

LILBURN (Actor 6). I am unwilling to answer any impertinent questions, for fear that with my answer I may do myself hurt.

BANKS (Actor 3). That is not the way to get liberty.

LILBURN (Actor 6). I have answered punctually to the thing for which I am imprisoned, and more I am not bound to answer; and for my liberty I must wait God's time.

LORD KEEPER COVENTRY (Actor 4) (rising angrily). You are a mad fellow! And you are here censured 500 pounds. You shall be whipped through the streets, from fleet Prison in the city of London, to the pillory which stands between this Star-Chamber and the gate at Westminster Hall.

(The lights dim out. Lilburn is left alone, center.)

LILBURN (Actor 6). I was condemned because I would not accuse myself. And so I put my neck into the hole, which being a great deal too low for me, it was very painful to me, my back being also very sore, and the sun shining so exceeding hot for two hours.

(This can be accented by a very hot key light on the pillory.)

Yet through the strength of God I underwent it with courage.

(The pillory dims out. Lilburn sits in the witness chair, center.)

I survived in prison for thirty months, and

when in 1641 the Long Parliament met, it set me at liberty—and awarded me three thousand pounds. Three months later, Parliament wiped out the Star-Chamber forever.

(The lights go up at the Supreme Court level. Actor 2, wearing a judge's robe, ascends the steps and take a chair, sitting between Actors 7 and 8, who are already on the bench in black robes.)

DIRECTOR (Stands a little below the bench). John Lilburn died a Quaker in 1657 . . . but 30 years later, the doctrine that no man is bound to incriminate himself was accepted by the courts.

Englishmen brought that right with them across the ocean to the American colonies.

Did we mean it to apply only to the federal government? Or would the ghosts of Father Campion and John Lilburn have approved of the decision of the United States Supreme Court, in *Malloy vs. Hogan*, delivered June 15, 1964, by Mr. Justice Brennan?

BRENNAN (Actor 2) (reads). "We hold that the 14th Amendment guaranteed the petitioner the protection of the 5th Amendment. The Connecticut Supreme Court erred in holding that the privilege was not properly evoked."

DIRECTOR. And from the setting in which Malloy was questioned, it was evident, the court ruled, that by answering he might incriminate himself. The witness chair remains empty. Malloy is free of contempt. Harold Strauch, how do you feel?

STRAUCH (Actor 5). Elated! This is a vindication of a fundamental human right. Now, any person can hold up his head and say: "I am an American; I took the 5th." The powers of government grow ever more formidable in the 20th century—and they must progressively be balanced by insistence on procedural safeguards which are the protection of the individual.

(The topmost level lights up. Campion and Lilburn rise in excitement.)

CAMPION (Actor 1) (Claps his hands in satisfaction). Would you argue with that conclusion, Freeborn John?

LILBURN (Actor 6) (A wry smile). I refuse to answer . . .

(Campion joins him as they both say: . . . on the grounds that . . . (They laugh).)

ANNOUNCER (Off camera). In a moment—Epilogue for "You've Got A Right!"

Epilogue

The cast at stage level, in their assorted costumes, arguing near the work-light.

ACTOR 2. So now the issue is settled once and for all. No more arguments about it.

ACTOR 8. But the opinion of the Supreme Court was 5-4. One vote and it would have gone the other way.

ACTOR 2. The majority rules.

ACTOR 3. Listen to the minority. What did Justice White say? . . . and Steward agreed. (He reads) "I prefer the rule permitting the judge rather than the witness to determine when an answer sought is incriminating."

ACTOR 4. And Harlan said: "If the power of the states to deal with local crime is unduly restricted . . . the responsibility in this area will shift to the Federal government . . ."

ACTOR 1. I'm not afraid of the federal government.

ACTOR 8. It shouldn't have too much power. Otherwise we're actually changing the Constitution.

ACTOR 5. We should change it—to expand our freedoms—to make this a more truly civilized society.

ACTOR 7. But that's not the Court's job—it's the legislature's. We can't let 9 old men make our laws.

ACTOR 5. Their interpretations won't stick—unless we the people give our consent.

(The cast walks away, arguing.)

DIRECTOR (To Camera). And so it goes. A repertory company, nine actors rehearsing freedom. "Liberty," said a famous judge, "lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no law can save it."

(He rejoins the cast. They continue mov-

ing about the set, rehearsing. Camera moves back to a long shot. The set is lit by pools of light.)

ANNOUNCER. Group W, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., in cooperation with the New York University School of Law has presented "The 5th Amendment," a program in the series, "You've Got A Right"—dramatizing historic Supreme Court decisions which have affirmed and broadened the first 10 Amendments to the Constitution—the Bill of Rights.

State Department Answers to Critics of Nonproliferation Treaty Unconvincing

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to the March 11, 1968, issue of Foreign Policy Briefs published by the Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of Media Services. From time to time in my reading of this fortnightly report I have found it informative and helpful. Therefore, I was disappointed at answers given to "misconceptions" about the proposed nonproliferation treaty. Three "misconceptions" were described. In comparing the language of the "misconceptions" with my testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee on the proposed treaty draft I find a striking similarity. This leads me to believe that the Department's answer may have been a rebuttal to my own arguments. I am pleased that the Department has taken the opportunity to continue public dialog on the significance of the treaty. At this point I would insert in the RECORD the full story on the treaty which appeared in the briefs:

DISARMAMENT: NONPROLIFERATION TREATY MISCONCEPTIONS

The Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC), meeting in Geneva, has only a few days left to report to the U.N. General Assembly on its efforts to reach agreement on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The General Assembly requested a report by March 15. The ENDC has held more than 120 meetings on the subject since its inception in 1962.

In January the United States and the Soviet Union finally reached agreement on a complete treaty draft (i.e., including the article on international safeguards), which they placed before the Committee; and since then the other delegations have made comments on the draft and offered certain additional suggestions.

In view of the fact that there have been a number of misconceptions about the proposed treaty, a few questions and answers about it may be helpful:

Question. Some of the treaty's critics say it may weaken the Atlantic alliance. How about that?

Answer. Almost every country in the world, including all the NATO countries, have on various occasions expressed themselves in favor of the principle of a nonproliferation treaty. Resolutions in this sense have always been voted unanimously or by massive majorities in the U.N. General Assembly. Also, during the negotiating process the United States has consulted very closely and extensively with its allies. Finally, the treaty contains nothing which could weaken alliance defense arrangements.

Question. What's the use of the nonproliferation treaty if France and Communist

China don't sign it? They could give nuclear weapons to other countries unimpeded.

Answer. Apart from the fact that it is very doubtful they would feel it in their interests to do so, dissemination of weapons involves not only a giver but a receiver. The adherence to the NPT of potential recipients will thus obstruct this kind of dissemination with or without the adherence of Communist China and France.

Question. Wouldn't the NPT hamper the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, especially in underdeveloped countries which have great need of it?

Answer. On the contrary, through the confidence created by its international safeguards system, the treaty should do a great deal to stimulate international exchanges in the peaceful nuclear field. The treaty also stipulates that "all Parties to this Treaty are entitled to participate in the fullest possible exchange of scientific information for, and to contribute alone or in cooperation with other States, to the further development of the applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the answers to the "misconceptions" go unchallenged because they are misleading and beg the question.

For instance, in answering the first misconception the entire issue is skirted. I asserted that the treaty draft weakens the Atlantic Alliance. To answer this charge the Department asserted: First, almost every country in the world supports the principle of a non-proliferation treaty; second, U.N. resolutions on this subject generally have little opposition; third, the United States has consulted its allies on the treaty; and, fourth, the treaty contains nothing which would weaken present defense arrangements.

In responding to these answers, let me make these points: First, few persons object to the principle of nonproliferation. It is the precise language of the proposed draft which will weaken the Atlantic Alliance because it forbids any NATO option.

Second, U.N. resolutions to which the Department refers have generally been broad in their wording so as to offend as few parties as possible. Indeed they seldom represent anything more than a statement of principles.

Third, the question of just how closely the United States has consulted with its allies is open to serious challenge. It might be more appropriate to state that we have informed our allies. If we have consulted with them it is clear that many of their fundamental objections have been brushed aside.

Fourth, the treaty certainly weakens present defense arrangements by foreclosing any NATO option which three administrations have worked toward. Furthermore, this statement assumes that present defense arrangements, including the NATO command structure, are satisfactory. There is a respectable body of opinion to the effect that they are not satisfactory at all.

In answer to the "misconception" that the treaty would increase China's and French prestige because they would not sign it, the Department asserts this is not a problem because the givers cannot give what receivers will not receive. This is true, certainly. But it mistakes appearance for reality. In the first place a country could sign this treaty and then a

coup d'etat, civil war, or internal revolution overthrow the existing government and the successor government renounce the treaty. Furthermore, a country could ostensibly agree to the treaty but secretly make a deal with France or China to receive nuclear weapons. Since the safeguards and inspection provisions have not been spelled out we simply do not know whether the inspection system will adequately guard against this event.

In answering the charge that the proposed treaty would hamper peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Department cleverly sidesteps the scientific evidence regarding the desirability of peaceful explosions of nuclear material. Instead the Department asserts:

Through the confidence created by its international safeguards system, the treaty should do a great deal to stimulate international exchanges in the peaceful nuclear field.

This is absurd. How can one have confidence in an inspection system which has not even been formulated. Ambassador Foster and Mr. Fisher clearly admitted before the committee that the inspection features in the treaty are nothing but an agreement to agree. How anyone can have confidence in that arrangement is beyond me. It is entirely inspection arrangement could be devised. But that is by no means assured at this point. In fact the facts argue against it. If the 18 members of the Geneva conference could not agree among themselves on an inspection program, then it is highly unlikely that the some 120 countries of the world can agree among themselves on such a system. The fact that the treaty draft provides for the "fullest possible exchange of scientific information" does not mean that the results gained from this exchange could be used for peaceful purposes if some authority decides that the utilization of the information would amount to a violation, albeit technical, of the treaty.

The Department's answers in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, are still unconvincing.

Ombudsman or What?

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a new article—"Ombudsman or What?" by Dr. Randy H. Hamilton, executive director of the Institute for Local Self Government—an urgent plea is made for local governments to do more in meeting the grievances of U.S. citizens.

While a good deal has been said in the past 2 or 3 years about the institution of the ombudsman, Dr. Hamilton's article cuts through the jargon of ombudsmania, as he calls it, and offers a concise, realistic discussion of the problems and inadequacies of present grievance procedures.

The article, published in the March 1968 National Civic Review, genuinely merits widespread public attention. For the attention of Members of Congress, I

insert Dr. Hamilton's article in the RECORD:

OMBUDSMAN OR WHAT?

(By Randy H. Hamilton)

(NOTE.—Dr. Hamilton is executive director of the Institute for Local Self Government, Berkeley. A former city manager, he recently served as urban studies project director of the Institute of Public Administration in New York City. This is his address, November 14, 1967, at the National Municipal League's 73rd National Conference on Government.)

The outstanding feature of local public administration in this century has been the extension of government responsibility for the provision of new services and engagement in new functions. The growth of new services and responsibilities has added new and larger dimensions of local administration which directly affects the lives and property of the individual in a manner and on a scale not previously prevalent. More discretionary decisions are being made (or are not being made) by local government affecting the rights and interests of citizens. Government's decisions and government agencies now affect the lives of people in ways not envisaged when the structure and administrative procedures of local government were being developed in the United States.

The unending conflict between liberty and authority has intensified. The area of rights without remedies is broadening. This being so, procedures for the redress of citizen grievances become of looming and extraordinary importance.

The problem is not one of civil rights. Properly understood, it is one of most urban administrations not being sufficiently aware of, much less structured and organized to provide simple, orderly, inexpensive, widely-known processes for the redress of citizen grievances in keeping with justice and equity.

The problem is to counterbalance the despair of the individual in his confrontation with the unyielding monolithic public agency which may be following perfectly legal procedures and still treat citizens unfairly because its monopolistic position enables it to ignore individual complaints.

Under today's urban conditions, much of our population cannot obtain redress for many of its grievances (real or imagined). Most administrative decisions necessarily do not carry a formal right of appeal. The three "great writs" of American jurisprudence are complicated time and money consuming procedures. The complaint window in some city halls is not well suited to handling today's complaints. And, while courts, internal administrative appeals, news media "hotlines," formal and informal voluntary agencies, and elected officials may amplify the voice of the citizen in the halls of government, the decibel rating is frequently not high enough to reach the bureaucracy. Unhearing, it can be unthinking and unfeeling.

We may be so blinded by the virtues of our system of common law that we have not perceived the appearance of novel forms of injustice for which existing mechanisms and procedures of adjudication are inadequate. Urban governments operate complex governmental programs based on legal machinery more appropriate to the simple agrarian society of old England from which we inherited our common law base.

William A. Robson has characterized the frequent faults of the bureaucracy which give rise to most citizen grievances:

"Excessive sense of self-importance on the part of individuals or an undue idea of the importance of their offices; an indifference toward the feelings or the convenience of individual citizens; an obsession with the binding and inflexible authority of departmental decisions, precedence or arrangement of forms, irrespective of how badly or with what injustice or hardship they may work in

individual cases; a mania for regulations and formal procedure; a preoccupation with particular units of administration and an inability to consider the government as a whole; a failure to recognize the relations between the governors and the governed as an essential part of the democratic process."

It seems apparent that imperfections exist in the operations of present institutions dealing with the redress of citizen grievances. In our rightful concern for the relationships between the governors and the governed, there is a need to improve democratic processes for adjudicating accusations of non-criminal maladministration.

The social tensions and disturbances which beset our urban areas will not be alleviated simply by improving mechanisms for the redress of citizen grievances. Many of the ills of our time, of which the alienation of the citizen from the governments that serve him is but a symptom, call for solutions which are essentially political. Neither improved grievance procedures nor legal and information services can be expected to cope with basic social disorders. Profound social and economic dislocations call for political solutions. While those who deal with citizens' perplexities and grievances may be able at times to identify underlying causes of discontent, they will not erase the main imperfections in contemporary America. Both the political solutions and the improvement of complaint machinery must proceed simultaneously. Both are episodes in the great and long struggle of mankind to convert the polls of the Greek city-state into Cosmopolis—the city neither of the Athenians or the Romans but of the human race; the city in which men at last may resolve the riddle of liberty under law.

The interlocking maze of visible and invisible government at all levels has led many to call for some third party approach which could help citizens find their way through the bureaucracy or locate a less visible agency. This could be institutionalized through improved information-referral services.

Many call for a third party critic to make certain that a complainant receives a fair hearing for his grievance and, if justified, a proper remedy. The most popularly current model of the third party for this purpose, the Ombudsman, can be characterized briefly as a high level officer, with adequate salary and staff, free and independent of both the agencies he may criticize and the power that appoints him, with long tenure of office sufficient to immunize him from the natural pressures concurrent with seeking reappointment, with power to investigate administrative practices on his own motion. He is a unique officer whose sole job is to receive and act on complaints without charge to the citizen. He should have the power to subpoena records. He operates informally and expeditiously without formal hearing procedures. His principal corrective weapons are publicity, criticism, persuasion and reporting. He does not have the power either to punish maladministrators or reverse administrative decisions.

The Ombudsman is seen by many as an antidote or supplement to current redress procedures which, if they exist at all, tend to be episodic, partial and selective, and which leave an aggrieved citizen confused and frustrated as a result of his dealings with administrative agencies that have been delegated quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial as well as executive powers. Academicians and public administrators are now engaged in serious discussions of the Ombudsman notion and the literature has grown from nil to hundreds of articles in four years. In fact, in keeping with one of the patterns of reform movements in this country, Volume I Number 1 of the *Ombudsman's Journal and Gazette* has appeared, despite the fact that we have no true Ombudsman in America as yet. And, of course, both the American Bar Association

and the Federal Bar Association have committees on the Ombudsman.

Any discussion of the Ombudsman, particularly at the local level, should be accompanied by the caution sounded by Walter Gellhorn who, while its most popular proponent in America, is also a sober critic of those who think that the transplantation would create a transformation. While an Ombudsman would, as he says, "substantially adorn the American governmental scene, it would not remake the scenery."

The Ombudsman is not a substitute for civic reform. If a city is content with its corruption, an Ombudsman is of no help. Kicking the rascals out in such cities will be of infinitely greater value than bringing the Ombudsman in. An Ombudsman can isolate aberrations, he can suggest better ways of reaching agreed ends, he can point out new applications of previously accepted concepts. "What he cannot do is force resistant officials to embrace a philosophy newly created by him."

A second note of caution should be sounded as it develops from the work of Gellhorn, Rowat, Moore and others: An Ombudsman will not be able to deal with many of the things that most deeply aggrieve some elements of the citizenry. He is, in short, not quite a combination of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Moses and Will Rogers. The Ombudsman is an overseer of administrative decision-making. He is neither a pathfinder for citizens through bureaucratic mazes nor an umpire tallying policy decisions.

Many of our citizens' complaints clearly pertain to policy choices which must be made by legislators and bureaucrats. Should a city's view of the waterfront be cut off by a freeway in the interests of an interstate highway network? Should a job corps center be established in a quiet Missouri town of 15,000 people? Should a treatment center for a growing number of narcotics addicts be built at all; if so, where? Should tuition charges be imposed for the first time at a great university? Should restaurants be subjected to more rigid controls in the interest of public health? While these are, of course, important questions about which citizens can and should make their opinions known—vocally and otherwise—they are essentially policy decisions about which the Ombudsman will be little concerned.

Nowhere is the Ombudsman a creator or critic of public policy. He is not a reviewer of the policy decisions made primarily in political arenas. While he may criticize a department for reaching a decision not in accordance with facts or required administrative procedures, the policy decisions at any level of American government are those in which the Ombudsman will not participate and which, when one is finally appointed, we would hope he would not seek to supplant. To some in our society the word "politician" is dirty enough for enshrinement on public toilet walls. No matter how much these people would want to expunge it from the community vocabulary, they are mistaken if they think it can or will be replaced by the word "Ombudsman." "No matter how able an Ombudsman may be, no matter how venerated he may be by the public, he cannot supplant the political processes that in the end control the administration of public affairs," Gellhorn warns.

There is a definite correlation between a considerable number of Americans who are heirs to the short-ballot movement and the advocacy of council-manager government and those who favor installation of Ombudsmen at many points of the American governmental compass. A word of caution to them is in order. Do not consider the Ombudsman as a super-administrator. He is not one anywhere he is now operating, and it is a useless dream to think that we can create such a wizard. For the bulk of the complaints familiar to operating officials, the Ombudsman can or will do nothing. He is

not a general supervisor of public services, nor an overseer of those who are.

Alleged deficiencies or failures in service or unimaginative exercise of the police power cannot be overcome by Ombudsmanic wand waving. Angus and Kaplan have noted that very few of the 5,000 complaints received in the Buffalo mayor's office have anything to do with an Ombudsman's purview: the maintenance of insanitary and hazardous conditions on vacant premises, illegal parking, violations of building ordinances and housing laws, leaks in the city water lines, the inevitable chuck-holes in the street, out-of-order street and traffic lights. Let it come through loud and clear that anyone who thinks that the Ombudsman at the municipal level particularly will keep the streets in repair, remove the trash from a public park or stop fire truck sirens from screaming in the middle of the night is bound to be quickly disillusioned.

For those who suffer from Ombudsmania, Charles Ascher and others prescribe a strong dose of realism. Enthusiasm for the Ombudsman rivals PBS in its widespread agitation, but as yet limited adoption. As Professor Ascher has said, "Today the warning may rather be that the Ombudsman will be looked upon as a cure-all, an officer who will do things for a puzzled, baffled or disgruntled citizen that are already being done or can better be done by others—including the administrator himself." In other words, the Ombudsman may, in fact, be most effective where he is needed least.

Deciding the proper order of priorities and the setting of public policies will continue to be the job of the department officials and legislators. An Ombudsman will bring no comfort to those who wish that another order of priorities had been chosen. His notation that the staff of the Street Maintenance Department is too small to give proper service is far, far different from making the policy decision to increase the staff, or from deciding that the potholes on Boardwalk and Park Place will be filled before those on Baltic Avenue.

Nevertheless, there remains the need for serious consideration of new methods for the redress of citizen grievances or the improvement of existing ones. Some of the broadest categories of need are:

Complaints against discretionary decisions wherein the citizen disagrees with the manner in which an official has exercised his discretion but has no formal means of challenging it, or, at least no inexpensive means. The complaint in these cases is generally not that the official is abusing his power, but that the decision reached is not, in all circumstances, appropriate. There may be no allegation of bias, negligence or incompetence but merely the charge that the decision is misguided. In essence, this type of complaint is one that has no right of appeal to an independent body which can substitute its discretionary decision for that of the official who made the original one.

Grievances against acts of maladministration, in essence, are not a question of appeal from but of making an accusation against an authority.

In new and previously unperformed functions, there is an absence of settled case law and only vaguely applicable common law. Few people, most of all the underprivileged, know what their rights or obligations are. In the absence of progressive state legislation or good case law, there often exist inadequate or inappropriate mechanisms for appeal against real or alleged grievances. There is, thus, not only an institutional lag but also what can be called a grievance gap as applied to the newer functions of urban government particularly.

For example: There are few, if any, administrative agencies, cities, states or counties which keep adequate records of complaints and grievances in order to discern patterns. Central complaint and grievance

files are, for the most part, non-existent. A student of the problem might well ask, if such patterns are not clearly delineated by orderly processes of administrative performance measurement, if bureaucrats do not use complaints and grievances known to them as a tool for measuring performance and making reforms, are they, in fact, keeping up with the demands of their jobs in today's urban life—an era which demands not only technical competence but social awareness and leadership?

Cities can do a much better job of keeping tuned to the stirrings within their communities. Improved complaint and grievance machinery can be of prime assistance in this regard because it can lead to sustained policy considerations and administrative innovations. However, even great improvements in existing mechanisms cannot provide all the help a citizen may need when confused by or in conflict with the officials who administer public affairs. As a recent American Assembly concluded: "At times the citizen must have recourse to an active advocate who can press a demand on his behalf or plan a defense against governmental action. A grievance bureau concerned with mistaken or imperfect action can sometimes be a valuable resource; the sometimes basic need is, however, for adequate legal services."

Civil rights activists have many governments "running scared." This causes them to improvise to meet crisis situations in redressing citizen grievances. But, because the panic button has been pushed, very little lasting, reasoned, orderly public administration results. Governments have tended to develop impromptu responses to pressures rather than structured, operational, institutionalized methods for redressing citizen grievances. It would be better to have planned, phased administrative or structural reform that could make our governments better able to handle grievances as part of our experiment with democratic self-government.

Some who seek the establishment of an Americanized Ombudsman often sound like idealists arguing for a perfect institution in an imperfect world. Those who assume this posture of militant advocacy, particularly in legislative debate, should realize that it is difficult to deal with complexities. The Ombudsman is not snake oil. Selling it as a panacea for society at large does the concept an injustice. The office should not be looked upon as a replacement for genuine reform in the structure of government, most particularly a complete overhaul of the methods for providing people-oriented services. While we have tinkered with different approaches to top-level administration and community-level contact points, such as in California's multi-service centers, we have not begun to deal with the basic problem. The Ombudsman, at best, is a supplemental remedy for the redress of citizen grievances. Where major administrative surgery is required he would be but a band-aid.

Even if the perfect city existed, its citizens would find some cause for complaint. It is essential that the perfect city and the not-so-perfect one, hear and respond to its citizens by finer tuning of the complaint and grievance handling machinery. A city council or board of county supervisors serving in a quasi-judicial, executive and legislative capacity makes it easy for a citizen to approach that level of government and eventually get to the right place. At the same time, however, where there is a blurring of the functions, eliminating the traditional checks and balances, a third party critic may be of particular help to the citizen confronted with a council which is not receptive to his complaint.

A city manager operates as an Ombudsman in the sense that he tries to keep his government operating efficiently and economically, but the machinery may be so operated, yet completely ignore the human element. Further, problems with minori-

ties not well represented in existing power structures and the bewilderment of individuals caught up in complex government are not necessarily provided for by capable chief administrative officers. An additional caution: Although a manager can serve in some of the capacities of an Ombudsman, he would not necessarily be altruistic enough to criticize his own administration.

Communication between the citizen and his government is at the heart of any grievance procedure. Residents must be aware of where government is and what it is doing; government must be able to hear what citizens want and need.

The best solution for any citizen with a complaint is to have well-trained government personnel working in the community to receive, process and handle grievances—quickly, cheaply and fairly. A social planning department, for example, can make a special effort to hear the complaints from low income groups that are not brought to city hall. A smoothly functioning government that listens and is willing to learn has less need for elaborate grievance mechanisms than one that is not.

The obvious first step is not a lemming-like surge toward a new and glamorized potential Lorelei but a simple desire to hear citizen complaints. Every operating official can do it.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops— Resolutions on Peace

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops represents our Nation's largest religious body with over 46 million members. In their last two meetings they issued resolutions which point to the fact that the moral sensitivity of the American people has increased and intensified in the face of the Vietnam war. These statements define citizens' responsibilities arising from present developments in the tragic war in Southeast Asia with these words:

Everyone—government leaders and citizens alike—must be prepared to change our course whenever a change in circumstances warrants it.

I believe that these two resolutions deserve our sincere attention, especially since they were issued by the leaders of such a large portion of the citizens we represent. Therefore I include in the Record at this point the "Resolution on Peace" and the "Statement on Peace":

RESOLUTION ON PEACE

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops meeting in Washington last year said in their statement on Peace issued on November 18, 1966, "There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may in time diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils." The intervening time and the reactions of responsible segments of our society have proved that the moral sensitivity of the American people has not diminished but in fact increased and intensified. We interpret this as a witness of the ever-deepening yearning of the American people for peace and an increasing horror of the evils of war.

This longing for peace has been expressed in extreme reactions for and against our presence in Vietnam. This has resulted in

considerable division among our people. Our deep concern for our people on the battlefield as well as on the home front forces us to plead for more rational debate and greater solicitude for mutual understanding. In the longing for peace we ought not to forget our moral and civic responsibilities. We embrace with great compassion the peoples of the lands who suffer the hardships of prolonged war.

We acknowledge gratefully the repeated efforts of our government to negotiate a termination of conflict. Despite the rebuffs to these efforts, our government is urged to continue with even greater determination and action in the cause of negotiation. We extend this plea to the governments of the world and urge them to join earnestly in the search for a just and lasting peace.

We wish it understood that we are not pleading for peace at any price—we are pleading and praying for that peace recently described by Pope Paul as "never to be separated from justice for nations nor from freedom for citizens and peoples."

STATEMENT ON PEACE OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS

Our common humanity demands that all people live in peace and harmony with one another. This peace will exist only if the right order established by God is observed, an order which is based on the requirements of human dignity. Everyone, therefore, must be vitally and personally concerned about correcting the grave disorders which today threaten peace. As Catholics we are members of the Church which Pope Paul has called a "messenger of peace."

We, the Catholic Bishops of the United States, consider it our duty to help magnify the moral voice of our nation. This voice, fortunately, is becoming louder and clearer because it is the voice of all faiths. To the strong words of the National Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America, and other religious bodies, we add our own plea for peace. Our approaches may at times differ, but our starting point (justice) and our goal (peace) do not.

While we cannot resolve all the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict, it is clearly our duty to insist that they be kept under constant moral scrutiny. No one is free to evade his personal responsibility by leaving it entirely to others to make moral judgments. In this connection, the Vatican Council warns that "men should take heed not to entrust themselves only to the efforts of others, while remaining careless about their own attitudes. For government officials, who must simultaneously guarantee the good of their own people and promote the universal good, depend on public opinion and feeling to the greatest possible extent."

PEACE AND MODERN WARFARE

While it is not possible in this brief statement to give a detailed analysis of the Church's total teaching on war and peace, it seems necessary to review certain basic principles if the present crisis is to be put in its proper moral perspectives.

We reaffirm at the Council the legitimate role of patriotism for the well-being of a nation, but a clear distinction was made between true and false patriotism: "Citizens should develop a generous and loyal devotion to their country, but without any narrowing of mind. In other words, they must always look simultaneously to the welfare of the whole human family, which is tied together by the manifold bonds linking races, peoples and nations."

But these limits on patriotism do not rule out a country's right to legitimate self-de-

¹ Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1 (*The Documents of Vatican II*, Guild Press, New York, p. 296)

² Ibid, Part II, Chapter IV, p. 286

fense. While making it clear that all means short of force must first be used, the Council restated the traditional teaching regarding the right of self-defense: "As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, government cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense."³ And what a nation can do to defend itself, it may do to help another in its struggle against aggression.

In the conduct of any war, there must be moral limits: "Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits univocal and unhesitating condemnation."⁴ Moreover, as the Council also reminded us, the fact that a war of self-defense has unhappily begun does not mean that any and all means may be employed by the warring parties.

While the stockpiling of scientific weapons serves, for the present, as a deterrent to aggression, the Council has warned us that "the arms race in which so many countries are engaged is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace."⁵ Indeed, it is a "treacherous trap for humanity." Far from promoting a sure and authentic peace, it actually fosters war by diverting resources which could be better used to alleviate the human misery which causes war. In their urgent plea for disarmament, however, the Council Fathers understood that it will be effective only if it is universal and if there are adequate means of enforcing it.

The Council commended those citizens who defend their nation against aggression. They are "instruments of security and freedom on behalf of their people. As long as they fulfill this role properly they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace."⁶ At the same time, however, it pointed out that some provision should be made for those who conscientiously object to bearing arms: "It seems right that laws make humane provisions for the care of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms; provided, however, that they accept some other form of service to the human community."⁷

PRINCIPLES PUT TO WORK

In the light of these principles, how are we as Americans to judge the involvement of the United States in Vietnam? What can we do to promote peace?

Americans can have confidence in the sincerity of their leaders as long as they work for a just peace in Vietnam. Their efforts to find a solution to the present impasse are well known. We realize that citizens of all faiths and of differing political loyalties honestly differ among themselves over the moral issues involved in this tragic conflict. While we do not claim to be able to resolve these issues authoritatively, in the light of the facts as they are known to us, it is reasonable to argue that our presence in Vietnam is justified. We share the anguish of our government officials in their awesome responsibility of making life-and-death decisions about our national policy in Vietnam. We commend the valor of our men in the armed forces, and we express to them our debt of gratitude. In our time, thousands of men have given their lives in war. To those who loved them, we express our sorrow at their loss and promise our constant prayers.

But we cannot stop here. While we can conscientiously support the position of our country in the present circumstances, it is the duty of everyone to search for other alternatives. And everyone—government lead-

ers and citizens alike—must be prepared to change our course whenever a change in circumstances warrants it.

This can be done effectively only if we know the facts and issues involved. Within the limits imposed by our national security, therefore, we must always insist that these facts and issues be made known to the public so that they can be considered in their moral context.

On the basis of our knowledge and understanding of the current situation, we are also bound always to make sure that our government does, in fact, pursue every possibility which offers even the slightest hope of a peaceful settlement. And we must clearly protest whenever there is a danger that the conflict will be escalated beyond morally acceptable limits.

On a broader level, we must support our government in its efforts to negotiate a workable formula for disarmament. What we seek is not unilateral disarmament, but one proceeding, in the words of the Council, "at an equal pace according to agreement, and backed up by authentic and workable safeguards."⁸ We commend the officials of our country and others for their contribution to the proposed Treaty against Nuclear Proliferation which, hopefully, will soon become a reality.

Moreover, we must use every resource available, as a nation, to help alleviate the basic causes of war. If the God-given human dignity of the people of poorer nations is not to become an illusion, these nations must be able to provide for the spiritual and material needs of their citizens. We must help them do this. The economically developed nations of the world, as Pope John insisted in his great encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, must come to the aid of those which are in the process of developing so that every man, woman and child in the world may be able "to live in conditions more in keeping with their human dignity."⁹

THE SECOND MILE

There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may, in time, diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils. Every means at our disposal, therefore, must be used to create a climate of peace. In this climate, prayer, personal example, study, discussion and lectures can strengthen the will for peace. We must advocate what we believe are the best methods of promoting peace: mutual agreements, safeguards and inspection; the creation of an international public authority to negotiate toward peace. Above all, in its peace-making efforts, we must support the work of the United Nations which, in the words of Pope Paul, marks "a stage in the development of mankind, from which retreat must never be admitted, but from which it is necessary that advance be made."¹⁰

We ask every person of good will to support with prayer the Holy Father's plea for a Christmas cease-fire. May it open the way to lasting peace. In the spirit of Christ, the Christian must be the persistent seeker in the Gospel, the man willing to walk the second mile. (cf. Matt. 5:42.) He walks prudently, but he walks generously and he asks that all men do the same.

As Catholics we walk in good company. Pope Paul, in his recent encyclical on peace, cried out, in God's name, to stop war. We pray God that the sacrifices of us all, our prayers as well as our faltering efforts toward peace, will hasten the day when the whole world will echo Pope Paul's historic words: "No more war, war never again!"¹¹

⁸ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 296
⁹ *Pacem in Terris* (NCWC, Washington, D.C., pp. 28, 29)

¹⁰ *Address to the United Nations Assembly*, October 4, 1965 (Pope Paul VI in New York, NCWC, Washington, D.C. p. 7)

¹¹ Ibid, p. 9

International "Paper Gold" Money

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the internationalist economic experts, to advance their "paper gold," are now swarming to protect their investments. Having successfully promoted the power to drain the United States of gold, they now seek to influence foreign governments to reduce protective tariffs and thus encourage U.S. exports—foreign aid on easy U.S. credit, of course.

Some economists persist in a solution of confusing the cause rather than solving the problem.

Why, for example, should our citizens be taxed to travel in a foreign land when tax-exempt foundations, such as Ford Foundation, give U.S. dollars outright to foreign politicians. Foundation grants in cash are redeemable in gold. Cash from foundations also contributes to the balance-of-payments deficit—much, much more than private citizens' spending.

So why should Congress beg the diamond-studded, gold-plated foundations for donations.

Let us tax them and control their international activities.

I include the Associated Press release from Brussels, Belgium, and the Associated Press release on foundations, accompanied by the text of House Resolution 1066:

[From the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La., Mar. 26, 1968]

TAX-EXEMPT UNITS ASKED TO DONATE MONEY TO UNITED STATES: PATMAN PROPOSES MOVE DURING VIET WAR

(By Edmund LeBreton)

WASHINGTON.—The chairman of a congressional investigating committee proposed Monday that tax-exempt foundations donate their receipts to the government during the Vietnam crisis.

Chairman Wright Patman, D-Tex., contended also that Winthrop Rockefeller, now governor of Arkansas, got a bargain in antique automobiles from a fund he organized.

Patman's report to a House he heads said the tax exemption granted charitable foundations was not intended to help "rich men . . . indulge in their whims and fancies."

The report said 596 foundations studied by the subcommittee had receipts of \$2.7 billion in 1965-66, including \$990 million capital gains, \$39.8 million profits on business operations as well as \$506.6 million contributions.

HIKE NOTED

Patman suggested the foundations draw on capital to continue their domestic philanthropies. Assets of the 596 foundations, he said, increased from \$10.2 billion to \$15.1 billion from 1960 to the end of 1966.

In his argument for foundations to turn over their receipts to the government, Patman said: "Grants to governments by U.S. foundations are not without precedent. The Ford Foundation, for example, made direct grants (in U.S. dollars) to at least 25 foreign governments during the period Jan. 1, 1965-Sept. 30, 1967."

Payments abroad by 25 foundations, the report said, amounted to \$176.6 million between Jan. 1, 1965 and Nov. 20, 1967, contributing to balance of payments problems. The total included grants, purchases of for-

³ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

⁴ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 294

⁵ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 295

⁶ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

⁷ Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

eign securities and remittances to foreign branch offices.

"Since Americans, at all levels, are being asked to contribute more and more taxes to the support of the Vietnam war, the tax-exempt foundations can certainly do no less," Patman wrote.

Discussing gain in assets over the years of foundations, the report said ten Ford-controlled foundations increased from \$2.7 billion at the close of 1960 to \$3.1 billion at the close of 1966; 13 Rockefeller-controlled foundations from \$1 billion to \$1.4 billion; six Mellon-controlled foundations from \$241.7 million to \$502.9 million; five Carnegie foundations from \$413.9 million to \$500 million, and 10 Du Pont-controlled foundations from \$179.3 million to \$304.8 million.

The report said Rockefeller acquired a number of antique automobiles at a bargain through transactions involving the Rockwin Fund, organized by Rockefeller in 1956. The same fund, Patman said, purchased 50,000 copies of a biography of the governor's mother and sold them to Rockefeller a year later. The report gave this account:

The Rockwin fund bought an antique automobile collection called "Aurorama" from singer James Melton in 1960 for \$200,000, borrowing \$150,000 of the price from the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Subsequently the fund spent an additional \$25,124 to satisfy a government tax lien and clear title, then bought and restored another antique car at a cost of \$10,252.

"Additional expenses totaling \$52,215 were incurred by the fund in 1961 before it transferred its interest in 'Aurorama' to Winthrop Rockefeller in satisfaction of loans to the fund totaling \$211,208. The Rockwin Fund incurred a loss of \$24,710 on this transaction," the report said.

FRENCH PRICE TO AID UNITED STATES: WORLD MONETARY OVERHAUL BUT WILL CONSIDER SPEEDUP OF AMERICAN EXPORTS

(By Nel Sliis)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—France asked Monday for a complete overhauling of the world monetary and commercial system as its price for helping the United States out of financial troubles.

But the French agreed to consider speeding up, for the benefit of the United States, the operation of tariff reductions decided by the Kennedy Round of trade talks. The speedup would encourage the sale of U.S. goods abroad by dismantling foreign tariff walls faster than the American wall would be lowered.

The six nations of the European Common Market undertook to get started with the United States before Easter—April 14—on talks about such reductions. In return, the Common Market countries hope to prevent the United States from putting a border tax or a surcharge on imports.

The six are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

WILLING TO HELP

France, said Finance Minister Michel Debre, is willing to cooperate.

"As usual," he added in a statement here, France "is ready to take its share in the effort required by this cooperation—but on condition that beyond provisional and inequitable expedients, a global solution is sought that will give a lasting solution to the basic problem, following agreement by the countries concerned."

U.S. officials believe this means that France will try to get a general discussion this week-end at a meeting in Stockholm of finance ministers from 10 of the world's most important financial countries. U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, will attend.

The main purpose of the Stockholm meeting is to complete work on a new kind of international money to be used by central banks in settling their accounts with one another. This "paper gold" is expected to go into use next year.

Meanwhile, other nations want to work out ways of helping the United States export more goods and stop the outflow of American dollars and gold that has badly disturbed the development of world trade and investment.

CABINET MINISTERS

Debre came to Brussels Monday to sit as chairman at a meeting of cabinet ministers from the Common Market countries: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg.

The main purpose of the meeting was to consider plans for speeding up reductions in customs duties by other countries in order to encourage U.S. exports and to discourage pressure in Washington to enact broader taxes and other restrictions on U.S. imports.

Economists generally think it better to help the United States balance its international payments by stimulating trade rather than restricting it.

H. RES. 1066

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of organizations which have been granted exemptions from Federal income taxes under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, for the purpose of determining whether such organizations comply with the provisions of such section, and whether modification of such provisions would be in the public interest by restoring to taxable revenue the incomes presently declared tax free.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

According to Law

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, much of the world has been outraged by the recent executions of convicted murderers in Rhodesia. This outrage is curious in that it seems to be prompted not by opposition to capital punishment but rather by the feeling that the ruling Government of Rhodesia had no right to enforce its laws.

I believe that some perspective is in

order with regard to these events. The convicted individuals were tried and sentenced in accordance with the law. The great outcry in Britain should more properly be ascribed to the opposition of the Labor government to Rhodesian independence. To view these events as a "racist atrocity" would seem to be out of place in Great Britain, inasmuch as the Parliament of that nation so recently enacted further restrictions on immigration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the State and Record newspaper, Columbia, S.C., of March 15, 1968, entitled "According to Law," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ACCORDING TO LAW

All the world was "aghast" when the government of Rhodesia, in defiance of a politically contrived reprieve signed by the Queen of England, hanged three murderers in accordance with the law. It was still aghast this week when the government hanged two more.

The world aghasts easily where Rhodesia is concerned. Thus it came as no surprise when Washington, the United Nations, and Pope Paul VI joined the British Labor party in condemning the "atrocity" as a vile, racist act. Was it really?

The record suggests that it wasn't. Nor is it proven that the rebellious regime of Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith is any more racist than many of its critics in London and elsewhere. It is fashionable in world capitals to condemn instantly any action by that regime, whatever the merits of the case, for no other reason than the ethnic character of its leaders.

Very little mention is made of the crimes for which the five Rhodesian blacks were tried, convicted, sentenced to death (all in accordance with due process, a fact no one denies) and hanged. Murder was the charge, not murder of white Rhodesians, but murder of other blacks. Arguments over capital punishment to one side, why should the sentences not have been carried out? Because of the queen's intercession?

That was a farce. The Labor government in London was determined to press the issue of Rhodesian independence by requiring the Smith regime to choose between its own concept of independence and the queen's command. Thus pressed, the Rhodesians chose independence. As a result, the split with Great Britain, which might have been bridged in time by a less fanatic Whitehall, seems permanent.

And, one marvels to note, a curious event took place in non-racist London the week before the first of the five Rhodesian convicts dropped through the gallows: Parliament, in a spasm of hypocrisy, shouted through a bill to restrict the further immigration of blacks.

Jeffersonville Youth Named Guidepost Writing Contest Winner

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent article by Tommy J. Boisseau, a senior at Jeffersonville High School, Jeffersonville, Ind.

Tommy, son of Ferne Boisseau, has been awarded a \$2,000 scholarship by the magazine for his essay, entitled, "Five Minutes to Manhood."

As the magazine's preamble to the article states:

It is the moving story of a broken home and a boy's struggle to understand.

It is an expression of young life worthy of inclusion in the RECORD:

FIVE MINUTES TO MANHOOD

(By Tommy J. Boisseau)

I never did like rain. Dark clouds, wet feet and steamed up windows always sent me into fits of self-pity and built up resentment against life in general. I remember how my younger brother, Bill, and I used to come in from school soaking wet, knowing that it would be at least another two hours before Mother would be in from work.

We were only in grade school but even then I knew that if she and Dad would have lived together we could have known what it was like to come home to a brightly lit house filled with the odor of something good cooking in the kitchen, and maybe somebody laughing once in a while. Somehow I resented her for my father's not being there. The more I thought of it, the more I was convinced she should have overlooked what faults he may have had. After all, he made good money. He taught us to hunt and fish and he could really barbecue!

By the time I reached the age of 13, I truly believed that the earth was formed by the junction of two planets crashing into each other accidentally and that, for the most part, people on earth hated one another. I believed this in spite of the fact that I attended church regularly—though not with much faith, I admit. I guess I was on the way to becoming an agnostic.

Fall came early in 1963. It was September 29th and a cold rain had fallen all day. I was in my usual bleak mood. The house felt cool and, as always, Bill and I were involved in TV, waiting as patiently as possible for Mother to get home and fix supper. After three years we were used to being alone.

Suddenly the telephone rang. As soon as Bill answered it, I knew something terrible had happened. It was a hospital across the river in Louisville, Kentucky, calling to tell us that our father was in critical condition. He had just been admitted after the car he was riding in had crashed into a tree. Four persons in the car were dead on arrival and he and another were not expected to live.

I knew that when Mother came in she would say, "Why should I care what's happened to him now?"

The car door slammed shut, and Mom came in. Her hair was wet. Her hands shook when I told her about the accident. To my complete astonishment she just said, "Get your coats on, we're going over to the hospital."

Once there, she calmly made arrangements, at her own expense, to have Dad moved to another hospital where she felt he would receive better care. She stayed there three days until he was out of danger.

Soon he began to show improvement and each day he grew stronger. Whenever Bill and I went to see him we couldn't help noticing that he had new pajamas, shaving equipment, magazines and plenty of cigarettes. One day our TV set was gone. I knew without asking where it was. Sure enough, when Bill and I went over to the hospital, there it was. I was selfish enough to wish that he didn't have it, but knew better than to say so. Every day I wondered, "Why is Mother doing this?" Bill and I secretly decided that she must have really been to blame for all the trouble in the first place. Otherwise, why this?

We knew Dad would have no place to go

for recovery after hospitalization. Finally, after six weeks he was discharged.

When I came in from school Friday, I heard the TV playing and there was Dad, all propped up in my bed, wanting to know what time supper would be ready. For another six long weeks he was waited on. Not once did Mom mention the past or question him about his present way of life, but when the doctor discharged him, she quietly packed his bag and told him that was all she could do.

He left and I don't remember hearing a word of thanks. I stood there watching him go down the road and I grew up in five minutes. I realized why Mother had taken care of him. I realized that everyone who expects to live a Christian life must do certain things, even things that are difficult, and that faith in God will give us the strength that is needed for them. I knew at that moment that I could face the world and its people with a different attitude and without the mixed-up hate and resentment that had always burned within me. It was a strange feeling and a strange way to appreciate the faith which I had always had without knowing it existed within me.

Bill and I are in high school now and pretty well grown-up. We have our share of battles and are both far from being angels, but ever since the days following that crash which snuffed out five lives, I can look at the rain and think of the rainbow. I'm sorry for the people who died, and for my father, but through them I was given a special day to learn what faith really means.

Wheat Certificate Program Under Attack

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the February 3, 1968, issue of the *Kansas Farmer*, one of the oldest farmer-oriented publications in the country published an unusually perceptive article on the wheat certificate program by J. A. Shellenberger, a distinguished agricultural economist at the Kansas State University. Professor Shellenberger has served equally both agriculture and industry for many years and is well known in the milling and baking industries. Since the President has sent to the Congress his farm program I believe Members will find Mr. Shellenberger's comments on a portion of this program—the wheat certificate plan—very timely.

The article follows:

THE CERTIFICATE CONTROVERSY

(By J. A. Shellenberger)

The wheat certificate program has been an important consideration of the major farm organizations and particularly of the wheat farmers. Although the present government processing assessment applies only to wheat, other crops such as cotton, soybeans, or tobacco could also be subject to a processing levy should Congress decide to use this means for providing funds to support agricultural prices. Thus the total implication and impact of this type of revenue measure needs to be wisely appraised by farmer, processor and the public.

The flour milling and baking industries were generally opposed to the government's policy of levying an assessment on the processing of wheat. Most wheat grower organizations and wheat farmers resented the stand

taken by the flour milling and baking industries. There has arisen, therefore, a need for an impartial discussion of this delicate subject without creating accusations of being for or against.

The following is a discussion of the wheat certificate payment plan whereby the processor is assessed 75 cents per bushel for all wheat milled for domestic human consumption. What it is hoped will be accomplished is a more sympathetic understanding of the problems created by this processing assessment. Wheat certificate payments have caused, in many instances, substantial misunderstandings between wheat farmers and wheat processors. The fact that the wheat certificate payment policy was opposed by a majority of the flour milling industry and some segments of the baking industry has erroneously been interpreted by many wheat growers in many instances as a conspiracy to hold down farm prices or disinterest on the part of processors in wheat producers acquiring an adequate income. It seems essential to correct, if possible, this misunderstanding among wheat producers and wheat processors and consumers.

Without exception, everyone with any knowledge or interest in the wheat farmer realizes that market prices are low in relation to what the farmer must pay for the goods and services he buys. Certainly the milling and baking industries would have no logical reason for wishing to deprive the wheat farmer of a fair return for his investment and labor. Whatever the price of wheat may be, all processors pay that price; therefore, the competition for the sale of flour or bread made from wheat is based on the same price structure regardless of the price farmers receive. However, the price of wheat in the U.S. relative to the world price is, of course, of concern to the processor who contemplates export sales. For that reason, there are legitimate reasons for objecting to wheat price increases by segments of the milling industry.

However, it has always been the position of the milling industry that the wheat producer is entitled to a fair return for his product in the marketplace. Recent discussions on rising food prices have, in some instances, indicated that the farmer is to blame for these increases. To be sure, the price of bread has increased because of the various economic factors contributing to rising cost but neither the wheat grower nor the miller or baker is responsible. The basis of the increased cost of bread, as detailed fully by last year's Congressional investigation of the subject, were higher costs for labor, transportation, social security and other taxes, interest and other operating expenses in addition to the increased cost of flour resulting from the certificate program. The miller must pay 75 cents to the Commodity Credit Corporation for each bushel of wheat purchased, in addition to whatever the current market price may be.

That wheat prices are too low is the vigorous complaint of the grower, but growers should realize that there is no organized opposition to their contention that prices received for wheat are too low. The milling industry certainly has not contested the growers' demand for a higher price. On the other hand, farmers, and often housewives, contend that the milling and baking industries have increased the price of bread without good reason and thus have derived considerable profit. The following factual account should dispel this notion.

The Economic Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture publishes in each issue of the *Wheat Situation* the marketing margin of the flour mills. Also, the National Commission of Food Marketing reports that the national average of flour mill profits before taxes based on percent of sales was only 0.22 of 1 percent.

About 85 percent of the total value of products produced by a flour mill is represented by the cost of the raw material, namely, wheat. Wheat costs consist of the price paid at the marketplace plus the 75 cents per bushel which must be paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 as amended. Normally, about 2.28 bushels of wheat are required to produce 100 pounds of flour. Historically, there is a close association between wheat costs and flour prices; therefore, the lower the price of wheat, the lower the price of flour and vice versa. Actually, over the past 16 years the price of flour has declined slightly more than the price of wheat not withstanding increased cost of wages, salaries, interest, equipment, and maintenance, etc.

Considering what increasing the price of wheat means in terms of the added cost of flour which the baker must purchase, the effect of the certificate payment is appreciable. The price of wheat, basis Kansas City, is about \$1.70 a bushel at the time this article is written. It requires 2.28 bushels to produce 100 pounds of flour and there are approximately 220 million hundred-weights of flour consumed in the U.S. per year. Thus, the payment of the processing certificate has created an added cost to the miller above the market price of wheat of over \$376 million a year. This is only the sum which the milling industry must pay for the wheat that is ground into flour and does not represent certificate payments involving other products such as breakfast cereals which make the payment to the government amount to between \$400 and \$450 million a year under the wheat certificate program. This is a sizable sum for consumers of wheat foods to pay.

The milling industry strongly protests the singling out of wheat for such a processing tax. In contrast, direct federal payments totaling \$1 to \$1½ billion are being made annually to feed grain producers. Payments in the neighborhood of \$750 million are being made this year under the cotton program. These and other commodity payments are being financed directly or indirectly by the general revenues of the government. There is no commodity program other than wheat that is financed by a direct and mandatory levy on the processors and consumers of that commodity—so there seems to be no sound economic justification for this special financing arrangement on wheat. Wheat will continue to be in a less competitive position than other grains so long as this inequitable treatment continues.

One example is the increase in rye flour production in 1966-67 compared to the same period for the preceding year. The milling of rye does not involve a processing certificate and the 75 cents extra cost. Hence it is economically advantageous to substitute rye for

wheat whenever possible in the baking industry. Baked goods that are dark in color such as some cookies and cakes can be made using some rye to replace wheat.

The present certificate payment program has caused the processor of wheat to pay 75 cents per bushel more than would be the case without the payment and thus the additional raw material cost amounts to \$1.71 per hundred pounds of flour produced. In competition with other grains, such as rye, rice, barley, oats, or corn, wheat and wheat products are seriously penalized.

The millers did protest rather vigorously when their first certificate payment of 70 cents per bushel was introduced because this policy caused, for some time, serious disruption of normal milling operations. However, most millers and bakers too, did object strongly to the proposal that the certificate payment be increased to \$1.25 per bushel. This resulted in the "bread tax controversy" and Congress decided that this was going too far and voted to continue the 75 cents per bushel assessments. Congress approved the increase in the federal payment, but to be taken from general treasury funds.

The irony of the situation is that with the Food for Peace programs as a part of our national policy and wheat being the principal food grain, the certificate payment plan places wheat at a price disadvantage compared with other grains. It has been difficult to formulate a "complete" food for developing countries based on wheat because of the more favorable prices of other grains and products. Rolled wheat and bulgur, which have had historical export markets, are also more difficult to market because of the certificate payment plan. In other words, at a time when the farmer needs a better price for his wheat, the method used to supplement its basic price reduces sales of his commodity.

The right and necessity of the wheat farmers to make a living is not questioned by the milling industry. Millers merely questioned why, as wheat processors, they should be victimized by the payment scheme.

The government's imposition of a processing levy on the milling of wheat and the industry's objection to this form of taxation are in no way new. Both Canada and the U.S. have had in the past processing taxes on all wheat processed for domestic consumption. Through 1940-41, Canada, for example, collected a tax of 15 cents a bushel on all wheat processed and used domestically. Similar legislation has been tried from time to time in Argentina, Australia and many of the European countries. At no time, however, have processing tax laws remained in effect for long because they have not proved to be a satisfactory long-term solution to inadequate price support for farmers' wheat at the marketplace.

The burden of the processing tax on wheat is a case for the general theory of incidence or shifting. In the operation of the processing payment imposed on the millers of wheat for domestic consumption, the burden of this levy is shifted to the purchaser of flour, namely, the baker who, in turn, shifts the cost to the consumer. Obviously the persons who finally bear the burden of the tax are the consumers, who need to be considered, as well as do the beneficiaries of the tax, namely, the wheat producer.

The processing levy on wheat falls on the public and is reflected in a higher price for bread and baked products. Experience has proved repeatedly that this is a questionable manner to remedy the price situation for the farmer. Certainly the miller and baker are justified in objecting to the processing certificate and their objections should not be regarded as organized opposition to a higher price to the farmer for his wheat.

There has been considerable agitation by some segments of wheat growers' organizations for an added certificate payment on wheat exports. The higher minimum world price of wheat just negotiated in the Kennedy Round at Geneva by the International Cereals Agreement, when they become effective later this year may not necessarily be reflected in domestic markets and could result in a decrease of foreign outlets for wheat. Higher prices usually create production expansion. A certificate payment on wheat exports to provide the funds necessary to pay the farmer higher prices could, therefore, result in a loss of markets and thus in net loss in the eventual total funds available to growers. The desire and hope of the negotiators has been a higher price for wheat for the farmer and an expanded export market.

It is hoped that this impartial review of the processing tax on wheat will contribute to a more sympathetic understanding among wheat producers and wheat processors. At least it should help wheat farmers comprehend that their best customers, namely, the flour millers and bakers are not against them. It is definitely not true that the millers and bakers are unsympathetic to the farmers' wheat price problems.

Those who advocate taxes on wheat processing should realize that this means of providing revenue to bring a higher selling price for wheat is an old and often tried method of providing help to farmers. As a revenue means the processing tax never lasts long because it disrupts the processing industry, results in an increase of bread prices and reduces the volume of wheat processed.

Both farmers and the flour milling industry share in the present cost-price squeeze and therefore they need more than ever to work together and to appreciate the problems which each shares.