"It is important that, through personal observations, students see that nonprofessional service positions in their schools are not for members of one race and that harmonious working relationships can exist between members of both races. The Superintendent and Board of Education should therefore take all necessary steps to assure that all staffs are bi-racial."

"Participation in extracurricular activities by students of both races should be actively encouraged by administrators and teachers as a means for developing school spirit and a feeling of belonging."

"School organizations—student government, cheerleaders, musical organizations, athletic teams—must be operated on a nondiscriminatory basis and should include students of both races.

"Guidance counselors should be oriented and urged to plan a leading role in successful implementation of the desegregation plan."

"The curriculum should be reviewed and, as necessary, revised to provide recognition of Negro history, culture and contributions to our society. Library books which deal with such subjects should be added to school book collections."

"The Superintendent should direct each principal to establish a student-faculty human relations committee representing both races to aid in the successful implementation of desegregation.

"All school staff and members of the student body should exert extra effort to assure the full participation of all students of both races in extra-curricular programs, including when appropriate the provision of a "late bus" for those staying after school to participate in such programs."

These H.E.W. guidelines not only violate the law but H.E.W. misused its appropriation to prepare them. Sec. 409 of the Appropriation Act under which the H.E.W. employees are paid reads as follows:

"No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance."

And Sec. 410:

"SEC. 410. *No part of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school or the attendance of students at a particular school* in order to overcome racial imbalance *as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal Funds* otherwise available to any State, school district, or school: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall assign as many persons to the investigation and compliance activities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 related to elementary and secondary education in the other States as are assigned to the seventeen Southern and border States to assure that this law is administered and enforced on a national basis, and the Secretary is directed to enforce compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by like methods and with equal emphasis in all States of the Union and to report to the Congress by March 1, 1969, on the actions he has taken and the results achieved in establishing this compliance program on a national basis: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds or commodities for school lunch programs or medical services may not be recommended for withholding by any official employed under appropriations contained herein in order to overcome racial imbalance: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys received from national forests to be expended for the benefit of the public schools or public roads of the county or counties in which the national forest is situated, may not be recommended for withholding by any official employed under appropriations contained herein."

Not only has the Supreme Court condoned violation of the law by HEW but it has authorized the Fifth Circuit to enforce as law the illegal HEW guidelines.

Thursday, we voted on the Selective Service Act. We have seen the Armed Forces of the United States used against our neighbors in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama to enforce lawless court orders. I did not support these amendments. I told the House:

"So long as the lawless HEW guidelines remain in effect, and are not publicly repudiated by the President, I cannot in good conscience as a representative of my people, cast their vote to give the President the power he seeks to draft young men into the Armed Services and even chance their exploitation by being required to enforce this illegal social injustice against my people."

Together we have overcome many hardships.

For the sake of our children, let us all unite together and work to overcome this latest oppressive wrong.

BLACK UNITED FRONT ASKS REPARATIONS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine who is a member of Washington's B'nai Israel Synagogue, recently called my attention to how ridiculous the Black United Front's demands for so-called reparations are becoming.

A representative of the front apparently felt it necessary to demand from the members of the synagogue payments on the basis of their "Christian vision." Without further comment, I should like to include the text of a brief article concerning their encounter with the synagogue janitor who received their demands:

MISLABLED, MISFIRED AND MISTAKEN

WASHINGTON.—The Black United Front, a militant Negro organization which is demanding reparation in cash from the religious community, sent representatives to read a policy statement on the steps of Washington's B'nai Israel Synagogue on Yom Kipper Eve calling on "Jewish church to shake off the shackles of white racism and capitalist exploitation that have strangled its Christian vision."

A BUF field chairman, Tony Cox, read a statement calling for a $10 million contribution to the Black Economic Development Corporation from synagogues. Mr. Cox and 16 other Black activists arrived at the synagogue at 8:05 p.m. when the worshippers had gone home to break their fast after Yom Kippur. The statement was read to the janitor of the synagogue.

In the statement, the BUF urged "the Jewish church on this, your Day of high Atonement, to not only stop sanctioning racism but to make amends for its active role in the capitalistic exploitation and economic gerrymandering of the Black community."

If the synagogues refuse, the BUF warned, it could lead to "another Middle East crisis in the District of Columbia or another Vietnam in Washington."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, October 31, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord; that He may teach us His ways and that we may walk in His paths.—Isaiah 2:3.

Eternal God, who art our refuge and strength, our present help in every hour of need, we would begin this day with Thee, we would continue it with Thee, and we would end it with Thee. May this be a day when we truly adventure with Thy spirit and in so doing increase in faith, advance in hope, and extend good will in our Nation and in our world.

We pray for our country that our people may learn to be one in spirit, one in purpose, and one in a desire to live together harmoniously. As a result may we endeavor to bring peace to our world, understanding between nations, and a new sense of responsibility for the welfare of all mankind.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on October 29, 1969, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11039. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; and

H.R. 12781. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak."; and

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired).

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 474), entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Government Pro-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

curement," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. RIBICOFF, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2062. An act to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH SPRANKLE, CHIEF CLERK AND STAFF DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce to the House the retirement of Mr. Kenneth Sprankle, the chief clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations.

He is retiring effective today, after more than 40 years of Federal service, all of which has been in the service of the House of Representatives except for 3 years in the Navy during World War II.

Mr. Sprankle has been on the staff of the committee for nearly 23 years, serving in his present capacity for some 14 years.

His first House service goes back to December 1925, when the late and beloved former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, John Taber, brought him here as a page in the 69th Congress. In 1930, he became secretary to Mr. Taber, and served there until he began his service in the Navy in 1943.

The distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), is the only Member of the present House who was here when Ken came to the House as a page.

Mr. Sprankle is only the sixth person to serve as the chief clerk of the Committee on Appropriations during its 104-year history, having been preceded by Robert Stevens, James Courts, Marcellus Sheild, John Pugh, and most recently, George Harvey.

It has been the consistent policy of the Committee on Appropriations through the years, irrespective of the political control of Congress, of maintaining a permanent career staff of dedicated, able and loyal employees—men of integrity; men of experience and judgment; men expert in both the endless detail and the broad features of Federal fiscal affairs; men who are familiar with legislative procedures and practices; men who are willing and able to be of service to all Members of the committee and of the House.

The public little knows of the tremendous power for good which is exerted by staff members of committees of the House. They are the sine qua non of effective legislation. They provide continuity and strength.

The staff policy of the Committee on Appropriations is not only a wise policy, it has in my judgment been a successful policy. The committee has a top-flight career staff. Ken Sprankle has been an integral and important part of it. He has a wide circle of friends and acquaintances among Members and Hill employees, among executive branch people, and others who come in contact with the committee.

The committee will miss Mr. Sprankle's valuable and ripe experience. While he is officially retiring today, he will remain temporarily on special assignment to assist the committee to complete its appropriation business for the session.

On behalf of the committee I extend congratulations to Ken Sprankle on a job well done and thanks for his long and distinguished service.

Effective tomorrow, I am appointing Mr. Paul M. Wilson to succeed Ken as clerk and staff director of the committee. Mr. Wilson is no newcomer to the Government and to congressional service. He has been in the Federal service for 36 years, nearly 23 years of which has been with the Committee on Appropriations. He has been the assistant clerk and staff director for the past 14 years.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with our distinguished chairman in tribute to Ken Sprankle. I approve of everything the gentleman has said.

May I say that we in the minority will miss Mr. Sprankle. His cooperation with us has always been magnificent.

I came to the committee 20 years ago. Ken Sprankle was able to give me a great deal of advice and scholarly information. It is a complex committee to serve on. I know of nobody in the Congress, Member or otherwise, who knows more about the budget, the procedures of the Appropriations Committee, than does Ken Sprankle. We shall miss him.

He is responsible, I think, Mr. Chairman, for the nonpartisanship that we have on the committee, where we all try to work together for what we believe is right and best for the country.

I will miss Ken Sprankle and his sage advice. I wish him well in his retirement. I am delighted he is going to be with us until we finish the present bills.

I compliment the gentleman from Texas for his tribute to Ken Sprankle today.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have served on the Appropriations Committee for a number of years in paying tribute to the tireless and effective service of Kenneth Sprankle. It has been my privilege to work with Ken during his days when he was with our late friend and distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member and also at one time chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Honorable John Taber, of New York State; during his years with the budget office of the Navy Department, and on the Appropriations Committee during many years under the longtime chairman from Missouri, the Honorable Clarence Cannon, and now under the chairmanship of the Honorable GEORGE MAHON.

I have frequently said that the position of staff member of the Appropriations Committee is probably the most exacting job of which I know. Not only is it essential that the myriad of detail that flows through the Appropriations Committee from every department and agency be checked as to accuracy, but it must be correlated and every subcommittee advised so there will be no duplication of efforts.

Ken Sprankle has filled this job, one it is next to impossible for anyone to fill to his own satisfaction; but never has he shirked the job that was his, which was tremendous in itself. And in addition he has always found time for extra effort in behalf of members of the committee and other members of the staff.

The many, many interests throughout the Government which must be dealt with requires not only a man of real ability but one of infinite patience; not only one who is tireless but one who has the mental capacity and ability to work with the enormous dollar figures involved, and who at the same time must be able to get along with his associates on the staff of the committee, with the investigating staff of the committee, and with the Appropriations Committee members, themselves, and particularly with the chairman, to whom he has final responsibility.

As Ken Sprankle announces his retirement, as of November 1, I can say that he has not only all these attributes so essential to a staff member but even more, because, in keeping with his high standards and outstanding conduct he has risen to be chief of staff, in which position he has served for many years; and notwithstanding his retirement—in line with his sense of obligation and appreciation—he is working on through the months of November and December to conclude the work of this session of the Congress.

As he retires, we wish him many more years of happiness and trust he will transfer his energies into that field of activity in which he finds pleasure not only for himself but for his fine family. We shall miss Ken and just hope that from time to time he will be back with us.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yielding to me, because I wish to join with him and the others who have spoken on behalf of the fine record of Ken Sprankle as a member of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. I served on the Committee on Appropriations for 14 years. I can vividly recall my first experience on that committee. The then chairman was the late Clarence Cannon of the State of Missouri. Subsequently Mr. John Taber of New York was chairman of that great committee. Subsequently the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) became chairman. Let me say anybody who could

satisfy Clarence Cannon, John Taber, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), ranking Republican on the committee, must be an outstanding public servant. Someone just commented that he is a miracle worker. I think the fact that he was able to serve all of the outstanding legislators mentioned above, and satisfy their many whims and satisfy the demands put upon the Committee on Appropriations in a technical way certainly indicates that he deserves commendation from every Member of this body.

I always had the feeling that if you asked Ken Sprankle a question, he gave you a straight answer. He was always willing to cooperate. I am grateful for his many kindnesses to me personally. I wish him the very best in his future years.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me.

Of course, I have never had the honor to serve on the great Committee on Appropriations, but I have known Ken Sprankle ever since I became a Member of the Congress. He has been a fine public servant. He is courteous, modest, and helpful. He is also able and thorough in his work. He has been a professional staff director and not a political partisan. I would like to say in this connection that I think the Committee on Appropriations in retaining Ken Sprankle and others on the committee, regardless of their political allegiance or regardless of whether they came to the Congress with Republican or Democratic Members, is in the spirit of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which intended for us to have professional staffs and not to divide our staffs between the two parties. There has been a lot of activity in the other direction in recent years, but I think that the soundness of the 1946 act has been proved in Ken's work on this great committee, which in many ways is the most powerful committee in the House. I say this because I know that Ken has served every Member of the House as well as the members of the gentleman's committee, regardless of political affiliation, with skill, with judgment, and always in the most accommodating manner. Personally I want to thank Ken for the many kindnesses which he has extended to me over the years and to wish him a long and happy retirement.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in paying tribute to Kenneth Sprankle, chief clerk and staff director of the House Appropriations Committee, who is retiring today after serving his country long and well. In addition to serving in the U.S. Navy during World War II, Ken Sprankle has a most impressive record of 40 years of Federal service—all but 3 of which were spent on Capitol Hill. Having begun his duties in the 1920's as a page, there are few, if any, on Capitol Hill today who are more knowledgeable of the legislative process than is Ken Sprankle.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee since 1945. Ken Sprankle joined the committee staff soon afterward, and it has been my pleasure to work closely with him since that time. Under Ken Sprankle's able direction, the staff has maintained its professional and bipartisan standards through the years. Few men have held the position of chief clerk and staff director since the Appropriations Committee was created in 1865, and I venture to say that Ken Sprankle has been the most outstanding staff director in the history of the committee.

While we regret very much to lose the valuable services of Ken Sprankle, I am sure everyone will agree that he has more than earned his retirement. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to him and to wish for him many happy years of retirement.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for me to join with my colleagues today in commendatory remarks for a loyal and faithful employee of the House of Representatives who is retiring at the close of business today.

Mr. Kenneth Sprankle, clerk and staff director of the House Appropriations Committee is ending a long and successful career in the House of Representatives of which he can be most proud. The position he has held on the staff committee is an arduous one, requiring infinite patience, great ability backed up by extensive knowledge of the budgetary process, courtesy, loyalty, much hard work and a commanding sense of priorities. In my estimation, Ken Sprankle, in his daily work, has fulfilled all of these requirements—he has done an excellent job.

In my 7 years on the Appropriations Committee. I have found him to be the soul of integrity, capable in all respects, never indicating any inclinations toward regionalism, and very much aware of his responsibilities and duties as a staff member, which, of course, are complementary to the duties and responsibilities of committee members.

It has been my observation that Ken Sprankle generously gave his assistance to all members of the Appropriations Committee regardless of their political affiliation. In my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, I have found him to be most helpful, always giving wise counsel, in guiding the Interior bill through the intricate legislative procedures of the Congress.

I extend my very best wishes for a long, happy, and healthy retirement to Ken Sprankle—he has earned it for a job well done.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on this occasion of the retirement of Kenneth Sprankle as the committee's chief clerk and staff director. I have known Ken for many years and have found him to be an able and dedicated man. He has served the Committee on Appropriations well and treated all Members, regardless of party, courteously and forthrightly.

Mr. Speaker, Ken has given the committee and the House many years of faithful service for which I am sure Members are most grateful. We will feel a personal loss without his presence on the committee staff. Ken Sprankle typifies the excellence the committee requires in its staff. He has demonstrated this excellence through his many years of service to the committee and its members. To him we owe a sincere debt of gratitude and the biggest "thank you" that one can offer for a job well done. He deserves the best in life and I wish him all the success and happiness that the Good Lord can bestow.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the comments that have already been made concerning Ken Sprankle. I thought the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, were especially appropriate and wish to endorse and concur in all that he had to say about Ken.

Ken Sprankle's work as chief clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations has been characterized by quiet dignity, complete dedication, and a standard of service that will be difficult if not impossible to match anywhere in Government. The importance of his service to the Committee on Appropriations can be measured by the fact that it was rendered under three committee chairmen: The late Representative Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, the late Representative John Taber, of New York, and the present chairman who is Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas. As the distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD, of Michigan, said, anyone who was able to please these three gentleman and be retained by them as staff director of the committee must indeed have had to have a great deal on the ball.

The Committee on Appropriations is fortunate to have a very able and dedicated staff and indeed it would be impossible for the members of that committee to do their work effectively if it were not for this able staff. While most of us on the committee devote a majority of our time to committee work, we also represent individual constituencies and we have our share of district problems to worry over, our share of visitors, and our share of mail to handle. We rely for much of the detailed committee work on the staff members and I am happy to take advantage of this opportunity to express my personal thanks and appreciation to them for their valuable services and to say a special word of thanks and appreciation to Ken Sprankle for his uniform courtesy, for his willingness to help with any problem I had to present to him, to share with me his vast knowledge of budget and appropriation processes and procedures.

We are going to miss him on the committee but I was pleased to hear the chairman state that he will be succeeded by Paul Wilson, another able, dedicated, and long-time member of the staff. While we will miss the guidance and counsel

of Ken Sprankle, we all look forward to working with Paul, who will have some big shoes to fill but can fill them if anyone can.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that Mr. Ken Sprankle, chief clerk of the House Appropriations Committee, has decided to enter retirement.

During my service on the Appropriations Committee I have had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Sprankle in regard to matters concerning the full committee and also the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. Sprankle's services have been of great value. His management and organizational capabilities have been a guideline to be followed by other staff members on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Sprankle should be applauded for his contributions not only to the members of the Appropriations Committee, but to the entire Congress.

I join with the many other Members of Congress who wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as Kenneth Sprankle, clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations, is retiring today after 40 years of dedicated and distinguished service on Capitol Hill, I want to join with others in commending him and wishing Ken Sprankle every good luck and continued success.

Kenneth Sprankle came to the Hill as a page—and he leaves through retirement recognized and appreciated as one of the ablest and most effective staff members in the Congress.

For the past 14 years he has been clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations where his work has been outstanding. He has rendered a distinct public service to the Nation.

I want to join his many other friends in Washington in wishing him the very best of good luck and success as he begins his richly deserved retirement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I genuinely regret to know that Ken Sprankle is retiring as staff director of the House Appropriations Committee.

Through the years, and on numerous occasions on Saturday, while reviewing the bills to come before the House during the week to come, I have called the Appropriations Committee for information. Invariably I have found Ken on the job. For him there was no such thing as a 5-day week.

Ken Sprankle has been a loyal, dedicated employee of both the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives. In mitigation of his leaving, Chairman MAHON has made two announcements. First, that Ken will remain with the committee until the first of next year; and second, that Paul Wilson will take over the post of staff director.

In his retirement I wish for Ken all the good things of life.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF FLOOR ASSISTANT TO THE MINORITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I herewith submit my resignation as floor assistant to the minority, U.S. House of Representatives, effective at the close of business, October 31, 1969.

Respectfully,

HARRY L. BROOKSHIRE.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY BROOKSHIRE, FLOOR ASSISTANT TO THE MINORITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, today, Harry Brookshire retires from Government service. Personally, I am sorry to hear this news for many reasons.

First of all, Harry has been a respected, trusted, and dedicated public servant for over 30 years. Men of his experience and ability are desperately needed in Government service today.

Particularly, Harry has been minority clerk of the House of Representatives since February 3, 1958. During that time he has earned the respect not only of the Republicans but I am sure all the Members of the House. His capability and broad knowledge of every phase of the legislative process has made him extremely valuable and helpful in the performance of his duties.

In addition to his natural ability, Harry has an impressive background of experience. A native of Marion, Ohio, he served 12 years as administrative assistant to Dr. Frederick C. Smith, my immediate predecessor, as Representative from the Eighth District of Ohio. Dr. Smith was a very popular political figure in Ohio and a respected Member of Congress. As his assistant, Harry made it his business to learn in detail the operation of the vast system of our Federal Government which later was to prove helpful not only to him but all the minority Members. Subsequent to Dr. Smith's retirement, he became executive assistant to Postmaster General Summerfield which position also furnished an abundance of experience.

In February of 1958, I had the privilege of presenting Harry's name to the House Republican Conference for the position of minority clerk to which he was elected and has served continuously ever since.

During that time I have observed that Harry has always been on the job, available, and completely competent in the performance of his duties. Also, during that time I have never hear a word of criticism about his work. His extensive friendship among the Members is certainly a recognition of that fact.

In addition to all these references to his background and ability, I am more impressed at this time with our longtime mutual friendship. It is not only to a former constituent and Government employee—but also to a loyal friend that I pay my respects to Harry today. He and his wife, Ruth, will soon be leaving Washington for the quiet rolling hills of Ohio and I want him to know that my best wishes go with them.

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

Mr. BETTS. I am happy to yield to the distingunished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has yielded to me at this time because I wish to join him in paying a high compliment to Harry Brookshire.

A little over 4 years and 9 months ago I was given the honor of representing the Republicans on the floor of the House as minority leader. At that time Harry Brookshire held the position that he now holds and from which he is now resigning.

Mr. Speaker, it was very difficult in those early days in 1965. We had our problems on this side of the aisle and I had to rely to a very great extent upon the counsel, the assistance, and the cooperation of Harry Brookshire. I have expressed my gratitude to him for his support during this period.

But I now wish to make it a matter of public record that whatever I have been able to do in the last 4 years and 9 months here, to a very great degree has been the result of the support of Harry Brookshire and his associates who work with us on our side of the aisle.

Harry has had a great record not only in the Congress as a member of the minority staff, but a fine record in public life as well over a long period of time. I simply want to say that I am grateful to Harry, and I wish him and his very lovely wife the very best in the months and years ahead.

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

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my remarks with those of our minority leader in what he has said about Harry Brookshire and his outstanding service to this House as minority clerk.

I have had the pleasure of serving with Harry on this House floor since he first took over this important office. I have favorably known other Republican House clerks we have had but let me say to the Members that no one has done a finer job or attempted harder to be of real service to the Members and to do those things which are vitally necessary and helpful on this House floor than did Harry Brookshire.

He has been a standout as a public servant on this House floor.

I would like to wish for him, since he has decided now to retire, the very best of everything and many, many years of

enjoyment in doing whatever he cares to do.

I would also like to say that from now on it will often happen here on the House floor when we Republicans will turn around and say "Where is Harry?" He was always on the job. We will miss him.

He may not be here in person, but he will be here with us in spirit. Good luck Harry and all good wishes to you and your wonderful wife.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today one of the very valuable members of the House staff, minority clerk Harry L. Brookshire, ends a career of more than 30 years with this body and a public career of even longer tenure to retire and return to his home in Ohio.

Harry first came to Washington in 1939 as an administrative assistant to the late Congressman Frederick C. Smith from Marion, Ohio, during Dr. Smith's first term in the House. Doc Smith had been mayor of Marion, and Harry served with him in city government there before they came to Washington together. My late father Clarence J. Brown, also came to Washington that year, and he and Harry were friends during the 27 years of dad's service.

Since becoming a Member of this body in 1965, I have become well acquainted with Harry and have greatly appreciated his valuable assistance. During redistricting in the State of Ohio last year, Marion County was placed in the Seventh Ohio District, and it honors me now to be able to have Harry and his lovely wife, Ruth, as constituents, although I am saddened to know that when they leave Washington it will be to retire to a home they have built in rural Morrow County, in Congressman DEVINE'S district.

Harry Brookshire did not arrive easily to the post he leaves today. Born in Forest, Ohio, about 30 miles northwest of Marion, as the son of a blacksmith, he was forced to quit school and help support his family during his early teenage years when his father died. He persisted in his goals to attain a better life, however, and returned to high school from which he was graduated at the age of 21. He then went to Oxford, Ohio, to attend Miami University and worked as a helper, and then as a machinist for a railroad.

The late Dr. Smith gave Harry his first opportunity to work in politics during his campaign for mayor of Marion. Harry then served as Mayor Smith's executive assistant until coming to Washington in 1939. He worked for Dr. Smith for 12 years on the Hill, and then for a time as administrative assistant for former Congressman Howard Buffet of Nebraska.

During the Eisenhower presidential campaign in 1952 Harry was a key advance man, in charge of the arrangements for the Eisenhower campaign train through Iowa, Nebraska, Michigan, Oregon, Tennessee, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania, and a 3-day motorcade in New York City. After President Eisenhower's victory he went back to Republican National Headquarters and assisted in the inaugural activities.

Harry's next job was as executive assistant to former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield.

He was appointed minority clerk of the House February 3, 1958, and his devotion to duty and helpfulness to Members in that post has earned the respect and friendship of those of us on this side of the aisle during a successful 11-year career in this post. We will all miss this help and friendship very greatly. I wish him the best of luck and continued success during his retirement.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues who pay tribute to our good friend Harry Brookshire on the occasion of his retirement.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to have known Harry for nearly 30 years, during which time there has developed a warm and lasting friendship. He has made a very fine and constructive contribution to official life here on Capitol Hill and will obviously carry with him to retirement, not only a great appreciation for his able services to the real affection of his associates.

It is my hope and wish that Harry and his charming wife, Ruth, will find complete satisfaction in their retired life in Ohio. It is my further wish that good health and happiness be theirs always.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Brookshire upon his retirement as clerk to the minority in the House of Representatives. Since being appointed to his position on February 3, 1958, he has made an outstanding contribution to the Government of the United States. Since 1939 he has continually served his country in strategic places of responsibility. From 1939 to 1952 he served as administrative assistant to Representatives Frederick C. Smith, of Ohio, and Howard Buffett, of Nebraska. From 1953 until his appointment as minority clerk he served as executive assistant to Postmaster General Arthur M. Summerfield.

It has been my privilege to know Harry Brookshire not only in his professional capacity but as a neighbor. For almost 5 years it was my good fortune to live next door to him and his wife, who for more than 30 years served ably on the staff of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. They are fine people and good neighbors.

In my association with Harry Brookshire, I have come to respect his keen political insight and his sound good judgment in any matter. We shall miss his efficient services here and wish him a very pleasant and rewarding retirement. He has served his party and his country well. His conscientiousness has not and shall not go unnoticed or unappreciated but shall always be remembered by those who have had the privilege to serve in this body during his tenure in office.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Harry Brookshire on the occasion of his retirement to private life.

We are all going to miss Harry but we all join in wishing for him a long life of joy and happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

While Harry's official service has been directed to Members on the minority side of the aisle, in a broad sense he has rendered service to the entire House of Representatives and he has enjoyed the respect and confidence of Members on both sides of the aisle.

Uniformally courteous and considerate, he has gained a host of friends during his service as clerk to the minority. Harry has always taken his responsibilities seriously and has always discharged them with ability and dedication.

Harry's shoes are going to be hard to fill by his successor because he set a standard in his service so high that it will be difficult to emulate. As he leaves his splendid service to the minority in the House of Representatives, he will take with him the thanks and appreciation of all of us for a job well done.

It is my hope that Harry Brookshire will enjoy long life, good health, and peace of mind in his well-deserved retirement.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, time after time, since my arrival here in the Congress, Harry Brookshire has been wonderfully helpful to me and to my staff. He has never failed to be completely responsive to whatever matter we were bringing to his attention.

Therefore, I speak not only for myself but also for my staff when I say we were always sure our request was in good and capable hands when we left it with Harry.

I want to associate myself—particularly with my colleagues from his home State, Ohio—but also with all the other Members of the House who are expressing today enthusiastic appreciation for Harry Brookshire's loyalty and competent assistance to all of us, on this occasion of his retirement from 30 years of Government service.

We will greatly miss Harry Brookshire, and will find it difficult to break the habit of calling upon him for assistance. However, we wish for him and his wife, Ruth—who retired recently after long and able service to our Merchant Marine Committee—good health and all that is best, knowing that they will enjoy to the fullest doing now many things they never before had time enough to do.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, Harry Brookshire has earned the right to his retirement. He has earned it through conscientious dedication to his work, his friends, and his country. I want to pay my tribute to Harry for what he has done. I wish him the very best in the years of his retirement. Good luck, Harry.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I appear here this afternoon to say goodbye to a very personal friend, the minority clerk, Harry L. Brookshire. Mr. Speaker, I say it is with mixed emotions because I realize that as a friend, one knows that Mr. Brookshire's retirement is the proper thing for him to do. He and his lovely

wife, Ruth, are more than entitled to enjoy the many years that lie ahead of them. He has earned this by conscientious hard work and dedication to his country and his fellow man. He has served with honor, distinction, pride, and with an ability that is given to very few men in life.

Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions because as much as we realize that Mr. Brookshire has more than earned this period of enjoyment, it is with deep regret that we also realize that we will be operating in this House of Representatives without him. All of us who have had the pleasure of knowing him, personally, have always felt that here was a true friend. His genial, likable personality is contagious. In the 5 years I have served in this House, I have never known him to refuse a single Member's request. He ran his office with the dedication and ability of the true professional that he is. He is a man well equipped to deal with the many problems and multiple personalities that he encountered in his day-to-day operation. The fact that he will not be with us in the House makes this a black Friday for me, personally.

I extend to Harry and Ruth Brookshire my personal best wishes for a long and happy retirement in the great and beautiful State of Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and pleasure to have known Harry Brookshire from the first day I came to Congress. His service as clerk of the minority has been valuable to me but nothing compared to his friendship and counsel. Harry Brookshire is a man among men, a man you can confide in, a man whose word is still his bond, a man you can trust.

We shall miss Harry Brookshire in these Halls, but I hope he comes back to visit us and that he does so often.

Harry Brookshire has rendered countless services to members of the minority. For this I say many, many thanks.

I wish Harry Brookshire and Mrs. Brookshire the best of everything in their retirement. May they enjoy it to the fullest as they both have earned it.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 30 years of Federal service, minority clerk Harry L. Brookshire, of Marion, Ohio, will retire on Friday, October 31, 1969. His service represents a lifetime of achievement.

I have become personally very fond of Harry and feel that his departure will mean the leaving of a true friend. This Friday will bring to a close a highly successful career of public service and contribution. We have all come to rely on Harry's ability, integrity, loyalty and experience and we will genuinely miss his presence.

I wish to congratulate this fine Ohio gentleman and welcome him back to his home State. I know that both Harry and his wife, Ruth, will have a very happy retirement.

My best wishes to both of them.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of regret that I see this week draw to an end, because I realize that Harry Brookshire, minority House clerk, will lend his many years of faithful service to the House of Representatives and go to richly deserved retirement.

When I came to the 89th Congress as a freshman Representative, Harry became not only mentor and guide, but my good friend. I found him generous with advice and counsel, and no matter how knotty a problem I encountered, "Brooky" never failed to let me have the benefit of his objective judgment, delivered in the pungent and salty manner that is his alone.

During the 90th and 91st Congresses, this friendship grew, and one of the first persons I would seek upon my return to Washington would be the minority House clerk. I could go on like this for thousands of words, but those of my colleagues who have served in the House far longer than I well know how we all have relied upon Harry Brookshire and they will want to pay him tribute also.

"Brooky" should have no regrets when he leaves. Those of us in the House—and I am sure I speak for colleagues on both sides of the aisle—will feel the loss. When his successor is selected, he will find a mighty big pair of shoes to fill.

I should like to pay tribute also to Harry's lovely wife, Ruth, who served the House of Representatives faithfully and well in her many years of committee assignments, and who has preceded her husband in retirement by a few months. To both Harry and Ruth go my best wishes for great happiness in the years ahead. I can only express the hope that occasionally they may find time to return to the House which served as their second home for so long and which owes them a debt of gratitude for dedicated and cheerful service.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 31, the House will lose one of its most valuable employees, Minority Clerk Harry L. Brookshire, of Marion, Ohio.

Harry is retiring after nearly 30 years of Federal service in a variety of responsible positions.

I have become personally very fond of Harry during my 9 years service in the House, and admire greatly the many fine qualities this Ohio gentleman possesses.

Harry and his wife, Ruth, also a former congressional employee, are retiring to their new home in Ohio, the State which Harry left more than 30 years ago.

Harry Brookshire's political career is a real American success story. Born in Forest, Ohio, the son of a blacksmith, Harry was forced to leave high school as a sophomore when his father died, but returned later to graduate at the age of 21.

He also attended Miami University, at Oxford, and worked as a helper and later a machinist for a railroad.

Harry's first taste of politics came when he campaigned for former Congressman Frederick C. Smith during Dr. Smith's race for mayor of Marion.

Serving as an executive assistant to Mayor Smith, Harry came to Washington as Dr. Smith's administrative assistant in 1939 and stayed on this job for 12 years.

Harry also was administrative assistant for former Congressman Howard Buffett, of Nebraska.

He was a key advance man for former President Eisenhower during the 1952 presidential campaign. He was in charge of arrangements for the Eisenhower campaign train through Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, Michigan, Oregon, Tennessee, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and a 3-day motorcade in New York City.

After Ike's election, Harry continued at Republican national headquarters where he was deeply involved in inaugural activities.

He then joined the Post Office Department and served as executive assistant to former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield.

Harry became minority clerk of the House on February 3, 1958, and this Friday closes out an illustrious and highly successful career in this important office.

This highly energetic and genuinely likeable congressional employee will be sorely missed by all of those Members of Congress who have come to rely and depend on Harry's ability, experience, and integrity.

And, for a great many of us, it will not only be the departure of a faithful and loyal employee, it will be the leaving of a fine and true friend.

So, I wish to congratulate my good friend, Harry Brookshire, upon the completion of a long career of public service and contribution, and to wish him and his wonderful wife, Ruth, a most pleasant and enjoyable retirement to their beloved Ohio.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, new Members of the House of Representatives need much help during their early days in Congress. Three years ago, I can say that as a new Member I needed lots of assistance. One of the first people to come to me with a helping hand and words of advice was Harry Brookshire, House minority clerk, who today has announced his retirement. The Republican Party, the House of Representatives, and the Nation will lose today a great and dedicated servant. As he returns to his hometown, Marion, Ohio, we shall miss his wisdom and his contributions. Today, I want to thank him for his contributions to the people of this country through his more than 30 years of faithful service. We wish him and his wife, Ruth, many years of happiness.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker. I would like to join in paying tribute to Harry Brookshire upon the occasion of his retirement after more than 30 years of Federal service. We on the minority side will miss Harry, one of the most valuable and dedicated employees of the House, but I want to wish him many happy years of retirement in Marion, Ohio.

Harry Brookshire is the epitome of the dedicated congressional employee. Not only is he a faithful employee of the House, but he is also a personal friend to many of us. During my 5 years' service in the Congress, I have come to depend heavily on Harry and his wisdom in a number of areas, and I deeply regret that we will no longer be able to call on his experience.

You will be missed, Harry, but I join my colleagues in wishing for you and

your wife a most enjoyable and rewarding retirement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my best friends and one of the most helpful persons on the Hill leaves us today. I will miss Harry Brookshire because I have always received friendly cooperation from this fine minority clerk.

Harry has been one on whom we could depend. He kept his promises and never forgot a request. I admire his hard work and appreciate the extra effort he has exerted to make my job easier.

Having been in politics for more than 30 years, Harry knows the responsibilities placed on public servants. He certainly has had variety in his career, working for a mayor, Congressman, a postmaster, and most recently for the Republican side of the House of Representatives.

Today, I join my colleagues in saying "thank you" to Harry for faithful assistance and "goodby" to a good, loyal friend. May the days of retirement be very enjoyable.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in this race of life for each of us when the baton of service is handed on to others who will take over where we leave off. When one has completed his stretch around the track, and has left the race he can reflect upon that which has taken place along the way. Harry Brookshire today releases his grip on the baton of service and will have the time, for many years we hope, to reflect upon those hundreds of men who, coming from all sections of this Nation, have been the recipients of his talents and gracious assistance. We on this side of the aisle will miss his presence not only as a staff member but as a friend.

May God richly bless him and keep him and cause His benevalent love to abide with him through the many glorious years ahead.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the final day for our highly respected minority clerk of the House, Harry L. Brookshire. His legion of friends in and out of the Congress sincerely regret seeing this dedicated public servant retire from his position, although he well deserves some happy years in retirement.

Over 50 years ago, Harry started as a machinist apprentice for the Erie Railroad in Miami, Ohio, and although required to work, completed high school in 1921. He also attended Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, and at the same time worked for a living. Harry Brookshire served as city clerk and clerk of council in Marion, Ohio, as well as executive assistant to Mayor Frederick C. Smith. He resigned, however, on January 3, 1939, to accept a position as administrative assistant to Congressman Frederick C. Smith of the Eighth Ohio District, and served as Congressman Smith's administrative assistant for 12 years. In 1951, Harry Brookshire was the administrative assistant to Howard Buffett, of the Second District of Nebraska, and thereafter became the executive assistant to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield.

On February 3, 1958, Harry Brookshire was appointed minority clerk of the House of Representatives and has served in this capacity until today.

During these years, Harry has rendered great service not only in his office capacity, but personally to Republican Members and has been helpful in many capacities. Harry Brookshire will be sorely missed by all Members of Congress, yet we all wish him many years of happiness as he returns to his home State of Ohio to enjoy his well deserved retirement.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say goodbye to old friends.

Harry Brookshire is leaving us after faithfully serving as minority clerk of the House of Representatives for nearly 12 years, rounding out a career in Government totaling 30 years. He is a credit to his Nation and to our party.

The House is like a home to Harry, who came here in 1939 as executive assistant to former Congressman Frederick Smith from Marion, Ohio, for whom he worked for a dozen years. Later he was administrative assistant to former Congressman Howard Buffett of Nebraska.

During the 1952 Eisenhower campaign, Harry was an advance man in charge of arrangements for Ike's campaign train through Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Tennessee, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and a memorable 3-day motorcade in New York City. He joined the Post Office Department as executive assistant to former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield after the 1953 Eisenhower inaugural.

In 1958 we elected him our minority clerk and his loyalty, friendship and unflagging dedication have made him a standby. Now he and his lovely wife, Ruth, are retiring to their home in Marion.

With reluctance we say, "Goodbye Harry and thank you," with one addendum—"We hope to see you and Ruth often in Washington."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the House today, a long and honorable career of service to the American Republic and its citizens, which has spanned over 30 years, will come to a close. Harry L. Brookshire, minority clerk of the House of Representatives, will retire from the post in which he has served with distinction and great ability for the past 12 years.

My own acquaintance with Harry, both personal and professional, began when he was rendering such superb yeoman service as executive assistant to former Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield. Harry is one of that unsung, unknown, handful of House employees who contribute so much to making the House of Representatives that great "forge of Democracy" which it has become.

The last bells, the last crack of the gavel, will sound for Harry Brookshire today. But, knowing Harry as I do, I like to think that his sentiments, on retiring, are like the following, attributed to Dr. Sam Johnson:

> Exert your talents and distinguish yourself, and don't think of retiring from the world until the world will be sorry that you retire.

He has exerted his talents, he has distinguished himself, and now he is retiring, and we are sorry to see him go. But, Harry. you will not be forgotten, and from me and from all of us who have been proud to call you friend, hail, and farewell.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was difficult to believe a few days ago when Harry Brookshire told me that he would retire, effective as of today.

It was in the nature of another pillar of the House of Representatives being removed for I have known Harry for many years and through those years he has been most helpful at all times.

Harry's retirement is almost as though a Member of the House had suddenly resigned. I will greatly miss him as a friend and for his good works as an employee of the House of Representatives.

To Harry and his wife I wish all the good things of life as they embark upon their retirement.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many expressions of good will and bon voyage to our longtime minority clerk, Harry L. Brookshire, who is retiring today. We will all miss his valued assistance on the House Republican side. His 11 years of experience will not be easy to replace. His energetic and efficient service will serve as an example to those who follow in his footsteps.

Harry certainly has my best wishes for a pleasant and enjoyable retirement in Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker. Today marks the end of a long and productive career of a valuable House employee. I am speaking of the retirement of the minority clerk, Mr. Harry L. Brookshire.

For the past 11 years, Harry has served us well in this capacity, and we will indeed miss this dedicated and capable worker among our ranks.

As a fellow native of the Buckeye State, I heartily congratulate Harry on his fine record as minority clerk and applaud his achievements in a successful political career which extends over a magnitude of 30 years. I have come to appreciate this fine and experienced gentleman and I am sorry to see him leave.

I wish him the continued success and happiness which he so rightly deserves when he returns to his home in Marion, Ohio. Although I join my colleagues in Congress who deeply regret his leaving, I have no doubts, however, that the State of Ohio will gladly welcome the return of an outstanding citizen, Mr. Harry L. Brookshire.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of Harry Brookshire.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 608) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 608

Resolved, That Henry P. Smith III of New York be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF PETER LEKTRICH

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all the Members will join with me in singing the praises of Mr. Peter Lektrich and thanking him for the excellent job he has done as chief of records and registrations since 1964. Pete will be retiring today after serving some 19 years in different capacities in the Office of the Clerk of the House. He first came to Washington in 1938 and worked for various agencies in the executive branch until 1949. Pete served as administrative assistant to former Congressman Anthony Cavalcante during the 81st Congress. In 1950 he joined the staff of the Clerk of the House as assistant property custodian and later as assistant bill clerk until be became chief of records and registrations in 1965. His present duties also include the administration of the Corrupt Practices Act and Lobbying Act of 1946. I for one will miss Pete's smiling face and helping hand. I would urge my colleagues to join me in wishing Pete well as he begins his richly deserved life of retirement.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing deep gratitude and appreciation for the fine services rendered us by Mr. Peter Lektrich, who is retiring from his work with Congress, after serving some 19 years.

I have known Pete for a number of years and consider him to be one of the most conscientious and outstanding employees of the Congress it has been my privilege to know.

He first came to Washington in 1938 and worked for various agencies in the executive branch until 1949. He served as administrative assistant to former Congressman Anthony Cavalcante during the 81st Congress, and in 1950 joined the staff of the Clerk of the House as assistant property custodian. He later was assistant bill clerk until he became chief of records and registrations in 1965.

His wide experience in Government work over the years well qualified Pete for his position as chief of records and registrations in the House of Representatives, and he is to be commended for the excellent job he has done in this capacity.

Pete has always been extremely cooperative and helpful and will be greatly missed by those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him. I wish him many years of happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks with reference to the services of Peter Lektrich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SERGEANT ALFRED GONZALEZ

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the Rio Grande Valley of Texas counted a new hero today when Mrs. Dolia Gonzalez accepted the Congressional Medal of Honor for her only child, Sgt. Alfred Gonzalez of Edinburg, killed in action at Hue, Republic of South Vietnam, on February 4, 1969.

Sergeant Gonzalez is the first valley man to receive the Nation's highest award in the Vietnam war, joining other border men whose heroism was recognized in past wars. He is Texas' 51st serviceman so dignified.

Vice President AGNEW presented the medal to Mrs. Gonzalez at a ceremony in the Executive Office Building. Three men who have known Sergeant Gonzalez from school days, who had played on the football team with him, who served as pallbearers at his funeral, were also present, Lt. Michael B. Reilly, Sgt. J. J. Avila, and Raul Garcia, the latter now out of the Marines. I was also present, witnessing a ceremony that moves the soul and makes the heart rejoice as the saga of another brave man is unfolded.

The bravery that won Sergeant Gonzalez this award is a panorama of 4 days of highest courage, fighting while wounded but never giving up until life was gone.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to describe Sergeant Gonzalez' actions is to use the Marine Corps citation, which reads:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as Platoon Commander, Third Platoon, Company A, First Battalion, First Marines, First Marine Division, in the Republic of Vietnam. On 31 January 1968, during the initial phase of Operation HUE CITY Sergeant Gonzalez's unit was formed as a reaction force and deployed to Hue to relieve the pressure on the beleaguered city. While moving by truck convoy along Route #1, near the village of Lang Van Lrong, the marines received a heavy volume of enemy fire. Sergeant Gonzalez aggressively maneuvered the marines in his platoon, and directed their fire until the area was cleared of snipers. Immediately after crossing a river south of Hue, the column was again hit by intense enemy fire. One of the marines on top of a tank was wounded and fell to the ground in an exposed position. With complete disregard for his own safety, Sergeant Gonzalez ran through the fire-swept area to the assistance of his injured comrade. He lifted him up and though receiving fragmentation wounds during the rescue, he carried the wounded marine to a covered position for treatment. Due to the increased volume and accuracy of enemy fire from a fortified machine gun bunker on the side of the road, the company was temporarily halted. Realizing the gravity of the situation, Sergeant Gonzalez exposed himself to the enemy fire and moved his platoon along the east side of a bordering rice paddy to a dike directly across from the bunker. Though fully aware of the danger involved, he moved to the fire-swept road and destroyed the hostile position with hand grenades. Although seriously wounded again on 3 February, he steadfastly refused medical treatment and continued to supervise his men and lead the attack. On 4 February, the enemy had again pinned the company down, inflicting heavy casualties with automatic weapons and rocket fire. Sergeant Gonzalez, utilizing a number of light antitank assault weapons, fearlessly moved from position to position firing numerous rounds at the heavily fortified enemy emplacements. He successfully knocked out a rocket position and suppressed much of the enemy fire before falling mortally wounded. The heroism, courage, and dynamic leadership displayed by Sergeant Gonzalez reflected great credit upon himself and the Marine Corps and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life for his country.

PRAYERS FOR THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have had the personal practice of saying each morning a silent prayer for the good health and long life of the President of the United States.

For the past 9 months I have been listening to the comments and views of the Vice President, and particularly to his statements of recent days. I have now decided to expand that personal practice and to say a silent prayer for the good health and long life of the President each evening as well as each morning.

MR. AGNEW'S HALLOWEEN WITCH HUNTING

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is quite appropriate that I follow the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that Mr. AGNEW's latest bit of witch hunting is reported on Halloween. It is eerie to realize that our Vice President views free speech as a goblin. That he would make democracy a ghost is certainly terrifying. He is no treat; it must be a massive trick.

A TIME TO SUPPORT OUR PRESIDENT AND TO HEAP SCORN ON THOSE WHO SEEK DEFEAT

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Red-led demonstration scheduled for Novem-

ber 15 is being billed by its publicity conscious organizers as a death march. I would like to remind those advocating an immediate and complete withdrawal of our troops that during the Tet massacre in February of 1968 more than 3,000 South Vietnamese civilians—women and children included—were brutually killed by the Vietcong, whose flag these moratorium leaders carry so proudly. These victims were chained together, many of them brained with mattocks, beaten to death with rifle butts, or simply shot. That was a real death march.

This is the kind of blood bath the Communists are working for when they send messages of encouragement to their agents in this country who are organizing the march on Washington. This is what the American public will be supporting if we cater to their plans. Communists always have depended on using unknowingly and altruistic people by piggybacking their plots onto a common and popular cause.

Everyone wants to end the war. Our President wants more than anything to get it over with. Mass demonstrations harm our peace efforts for they give the enemy false hope that America has turned world coward.

The best thing we can all do at this time is back our President, back our boys who are still in Vietnam, and heap the scorn that rightfully belongs on those who want this country to go down to defeat.

REPUGNANT CIGARETTE COMMERCIAL

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal, and properly so, about the encouragement of violence that appears on our television programs.

A TV commercial has been called to my attention which I think is deplorable—a commercial advertisement for Chesterfield cigarettes. It pictures a black-gloved hand reaching out and breaking through a glass window in order to reach the cigarettes.

The clear implication of this commercial, which I regard as quite repugnant and questionable, is that some products are so irresistible that they are justifiable motivations for crime.

I am calling this commercial to the attention of the president of the Liggett & Meyers Co., manufacturers of Chesterfields, in the hope that he will withdraw this rather tasteless commercial from further airing.

I am also calling this advertisement to the attention of the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

In my view, this particular advertisement is not typical of television advertising in general. Television advertising has contributed greatly to racial integration and other socially desirable developments in this country. It is therefore particularly shocking to see a supposedly reputable company tempting people, especially the young, not only to smoke, but to rob and burgle as well. Young people have enough problems without being encouraged through the media to behave in the manner suggested by this advertisement. The kind of vision we need to bring the people of this country together in harmony is light years away from the lack of judgment and taste evident in this commercial.

I hope soon to see all TV advertising of cigarettes stopped. In the meantime, I trust that when the president of Liggett & Meyers has an opportunity to reflect on this advertisement, or to see it if he has not already, he will not approve it for further use.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PLAN TO SHARE FEDERAL REVENUES WITH THE STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in August, President Nixon proposed a sensible plan to share with the States and the District of Columbia a portion of Federal revenues.

The President's proposal is a constructive, practical program of action designed to renew the ability of local and State governments to cope with local and State problems.

The American people have lost faith in the Federal Government's ability to solve problems of local and State nature. In all too many instances these problems have increased in complexity and intensity even as greater and greater amounts of Federal funds have been spent toward their solutions.

We have constructed a Federal grant-in-aid system of staggering complexity and diversity that has impeded rather than aided the effectiveness of local government. It is a system that is characterized, as the President has stated, by overlapping programs at the State and local level; distortion of State and local budgets; increased administrative costs; program delay and uncertainty; a decline in the authority and responsibility of chief executives, as grants have become tied to functional bureaucracies; and, creation of new and frequently competitive State and local governmental institutions.

President Nixon's revenue sharing program will halt these trends, and will make it possible once again for State and local governments to meet their own responsibilities and obligations.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR HICKEL SHOULD ANSWER HIS MAIL

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickle apparently has succumbed to the way of Washington bureaucrats.

On September 26 I wrote the Secretary a letter directing some very timely questions to him concerning water pollution control and his administration of the Water Quality Act.

Some 5 weeks later I still have not received a reply.

Although Mr. Hickel has the time to fly around the country to make speeches, issue dramatic press releases and seek headlines, he seems to be completely unconcerned with congressional interest in proper water pollution control.

Before Mr. Hickel embarks on a nationwide drive to tell the various States how they should handle their own affairs, I think it not misplaced to suggest to the Secretary that he get his own house in order and devote more time to managing affairs of his department here in Washington such as answering his mail.

TRIAL OF THE "CHICAGO 8"

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks a good deal of dust has been kicked up during the trial of the so-called "Chicago 8" who are answering charges of conspiracy to incite a riot. Both in and out of the courtroom, pro and con arguments can be heard over the application of a gag and restraining straps to one of the defendents, Black Panther leader Bobby Seale.

The judge, Julius J. Hoffman, has a great obligation to carry out the duties of his office. If this country is to maintain its sound legal basis, the very instrument of the administration of the law must remain intact and operable. The actions of Seale in cursing the judge, his frequent disruptive outbursts and other conduct unbecoming a civilized person, are in themselves a clear indication of his disrespect for the law and unwillingness to live within the constraints of an orderly social system.

Seale and others like him seek to live in America only on their own terms. He will not be happy in our society until he has been enthroned as the No. 1 citizen above all others—the king fish in a pond of minnows.

As a result of true freedom—freedom with responsibility—an honest, hard-working judge must bear the brunt of insults and vile diatribes against his person and his office. Yet in spite of all this, he continues the trial which is guaranteed to the curser and vilifier in his court. May God give him strength to discharge his duties and bear up under the wrongful accusations against him from within and without the courtroom.

IN DEFENSE OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR HICKEL

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Ohio has expressed an understandable frustration over the slowness of the executive branch of the Government in answering important requests from the Congress. I think it ought to be said, however, that Walter Hickel is one of the strongest and finest

men in the Government, a dedicated public servant, who, like all of the other members of the Nixon Cabinet, inherited a vast bureaucracy comprised primarily of civil service personnel. I think it is not entirely fair to hold that one man at the top and his thin line of people that he can bring in with him responsible for all of the evils of a vast bureaucracy. I feel certain that is not the case.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Does the gentleman think 5 weeks to answer a congressional inquiry is unreasonable?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it is completely unreasonable, and I expect the bureaucracy is fully responsible. I am certain that the Secretary will correct the situation as soon as it comes to his attention.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR HICKEL SHOULD ANSWER HIS MAIL

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Ohio lamenting the fact that our Secretary of the Interior Hickel had not responded to a letter that he had sent down there 5 weeks ago. He was very disturbed about it and thought that is not the way for a Cabinet official to act in response to letters from Members of Congress, but I would tell the gentleman from Ohio that I wrote a letter to Secretary Hickel on March 18. I wrote two letters to Secretary Hickel with questions last January. I have not yet received a reply nor even the courtesy of an acknowledgement of the receipt of any of the three letters. So, as far as I am concerned, I am not even sure that there is a Wally Hickel.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–189)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby submit the Second Annual Report of the Department of Transportation, covering Fiscal Year 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 31, 1969.*

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14252) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14252, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1 ending on line 4, page 1, of the bill.

If there are no further amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that drug abuse diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation; that such abuse of dangerous drugs is increasing in urban and suburban areas; that there is a lack of authoritative information and creative projects designed to educate students and others about drugs and their abuse; and that prevention and control of such drug abuse require intensive and coordinated efforts on the part of both governmental and private groups.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to encourage the development of new and improved curricula on the problems of drug abuse; to demonstrate the use of such curricula in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to disseminate curricular materials and significant information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders; and to offer community education programs for parents and others, on drug abuse problems.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill but I have serious misgivings about it. In the first place, I think it is probably overly funded for a trial run. I do not like the advisory board, the creation of a brandnew advisory board, in the Government. I again display this compilation of 218 pages of committees, commissions, and advisory boards, this being compiled by the Library of Congress. You name them and you will find this Government has got them.

And here in this bill we create another one with 21 members at $100 a day per diem when they meet, plus their expenses and so on and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I want to do all I can, as does every other Member of the House, realizing the gravity of the narcotics and drug addiction problem, to put an end to it. But I do not think it is going to be done through the process of education. Helpful though it may be, it will not be done that way.

I would rather take some of this money and build a stockade out in the desert and then insist upon mandatory and drastic penalties for the peddlers and pushers of narcotics and drugs. For example, let us start with about 20 years for a peddler, the scum of the earth. I would start with about a 20-year sentence for the first offense for peddling dope to youngsters in this country—starting them on a life of addiction. This is how and when you will get results.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, let us build a big stockade out in the desert where it is not too cold, and not too warm; where they are not fed too much but not too little to starve, give them long-term sentences and then watch the population of criminals, the peddlers of this dope, decrease. It is time to stop coddling the crime syndicates and their peddlers and pushers.

The Navy has an excellent film on the use of drugs and I had the opportunity of circulating that film last year to the schools in the Third Congressional District of Iowa. It is a tremendous film. That educational program is already going on. I do not see how you could do a better job of educating the youngsters of this country, those of high school age and younger, to the dangers of dope than with visual aids of this kind.

I will go along with this bill for what it can do in the next 3 years, but unless it shows real results, as one Member of this body I will have no hesitancy in cutting down the appropriation or abolishing the program altogether.

I am sick and tired of building up a bureaucracy that fails to produce results. I am convinced that the answer to this question is strict and drastic law enforcement for those who peddle narcotics and drugs, but the situation is such that I will join in this attempt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we do have a great problem of drug addiction throughout our country.

LSD perhaps has become more familiar as a dreadful drug than any other in the past year or two. We have not known much about LSD until recently, but our Navy and other branches of the armed services have issued educational films which have been used throughout our country. Education as to what LSD causes has resulted in a lesser use of this drug.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that one of the things we must do is to educate the people of our country as to what drugs actually do to the person. For instance, we know that LSD does affect future generations, and that it does affect the genes, the genes of young people, so that when they marry their offspring are liable to be crippled or disabled. The knowledge of the fact that LSD does this has resulted in a lessened use of the drug throughout the country.

I feel that education as to the effect of other drugs will be extremely helpful.

As for marihuana, there are some people who are taking perhaps a more liberal attitude on that particular drug. It too is a dangerous drug, but we should know more about it.

If we read the history of this drug, we find that it is what is called cannabis Indica; that in ancient times it was known as hashish, which is another name for "assassin," and that actually as far as we can go back in history people would smoke hashish, and then they would go out and assassinate people.

I am saying that this is a dangerous drug. It is called by some "pot," "muggles," and by various other names, and as I say it, too, is a dangerous drug.

Many years ago I had a young friend who meant to go to medical school with me. He was a user of this drug, and before he entered school he became depressed and committed suicide.

It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that better education of the young people throughout our country will result in a lessened use of the dangerous drugs when they know how the drugs will affect them and their progeny.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill, and I urge the enactment of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $7,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972 for the purpose of carrying out this Act. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary", shall assist in educating the public on the problems of drug abuse by—

(1) making grants to or entering into contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for—

(A) projects for the development of curricula on the use and abuse of drugs, including the preparation of new and improved curricular materials for use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(B) pilot projects designed to demonstrate, and test the effectiveness of curricula described in clause (A) (whether developed with assistance under this Act or otherwise);

(C) in the case of applicants who have conducted pilot projects under clause (B), projects for the dissemination of curricular materials and other significant information regarding the use and abuse of drugs to public and private elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(2) undertaking, directly or through contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education or other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, evaluations of the effectiveness of curricula tested in use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs involved in pilot projects described in paragraph (1) (B);

(3) making grants to institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to provide preservice and inservice training programs on drug abuse (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, workshops, and conferences) for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders;

(4) making grants to local educational agencies and other public and private nonprofit organizations for community education programs on drug abuse (including seminars, workshops, and conferences) especially for parents and others in the community.

(b) In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), the Secretary may make available not to exceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act for each fiscal year for payment of the reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies in assisting local educational agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug abuse education programs.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Financial assistance for a project under this Act may be made only upon application at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary deems necessary, and only if such application—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provides for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under section 4 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such projects or programs;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in section 4, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(5) provides for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications from local educational agencies for financial assistance under this Act may be approved by the Secretary only if the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Interagency Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education which shall consist of the Secretary (or his designee) as Chairman, the Attorney General (or his designee), the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and with the consent of such other Departments or agencies as the Secretary may from time to time designate as having a substantial interest in the field of drug abuse education, representatives of such Departments and agencies.

(b) The Council shall advise in the coordination of the respective activities of the Federal Departments and agencies concerned in drug abuse education.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall promulgate regulations establishing the procedures for consultation with other agencies and with other appropriate public and private agencies.

(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may not approve an application for assistance under this Act unless he has given the Interagency Coordinating Council an opportunity to review the application and make recommendations thereon within a period not to exceed sixty days.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education, which shall—

(1) advise the Secretary concerning the administration of, preparation of general regulations for, and operation of, programs supported with assistance under this Act;

(2) make recommendations regarding the allocation of the funds under this Act among the various purposes set forth in section 4 and the criteria for establishing priorities in deciding which applications to approve, including criteria designed to achieve an appropriate geographical distribution of approved projects throughout all regions of the Nation;

(3) review applications and make recommendations thereon;

(4) review the administration and operation of projects and programs under this Act, including the effectiveness of such projects and programs in meeting the purposes for which they are established and operated, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for improvements in this Act) to the Secretary for transmittal to the Congress; and

(5) evaluate programs and projects carried out under this Act and disseminate the results of such evaluations.

(b) The Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twenty-one members. The Secretary shall appoint one member as Chairman. The Committee shall consist of persons familiar with education, mental health, and legal problems associated with drug abuse, young persons, ex-users, parents and others familiar with drug use and abuse. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or of the Secretary.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General shall, when requested, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs of drug abuse education. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies or institutions information regarding effective methods of coping with problems of drug abuse, and making available to such agencies or institutions personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice, or other persons qualified to advise and assist in coping with such problems or carrying out a drug abuse education program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize

the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, but frankly I am not optimistic about the ultimate benefit of the program. We tend to put too much faith in book learning. Too frequently, finding ourselves without solutions to problems, we actually hide behind education as a panacea.

I am perfectly willing to give the proposition a chance. Perhaps what I am really saying is, I hope we will not consider that this bill is the answer to the entire problem.

In this day the school itself has a great amount of competition from other factors in the business of education. We had some startling figures a week or 2 ago showing that the average youngster probably spends more time watching television than he spends in the classrooms. It is suggested, according to current figures, that by the time a teenager is ready to attend college, he has spent more time watching television commercials than he will spend in the classroom in college obtaining his baccalaureate degree.

This is one example of outside school education, audiovisual education. And remember, audiovisual education has great impact in or out of school, but the in-school proposition bothers me even more, because education in schools is certainly more than book learning. In every learning situation there are concommitants—development of habits, attitudes and motivations. Employing oversimplification, I think it might be said that book learning develops the intellectual being and the concomitants develop the human being.

It is one thing for a student to learn the answer to such questions as, What are drugs? What are the effects of drugs? That is the easiest part of this business of drug education. Much more difficult is the development of character and the values of things, the nature of which are so inherently a part of the drug problem.

The matter of drug abuse, of course, is a single thread of this whole fabric of today's living and I do not think it can be successfully isolated and treated.

Let me be specific. One detail which will inevitably be a subject of discussion is the potential hazard of marihuana. When we debate the penalties for the use of this product today, we argue quite generally that the present penalties are too severe. Automatically, this suggestion connotes that the use of marihuana is not as hazardous as we have said in the past—and this is not true at all.

What we are really arguing is that if the penalties for the violation of any law are too severe, they will not be imposed consistently.

Marihuana is probably nonaddictive, yet we know that many present narcotic addicts started on marihuana and many still use grass. Others got their first shot of heroin while under the influence of a nonaddictive drug.

One of the toughest questions I get when I talk to students is the one that comes from the youngster who says, "Why is marihuana worse than alcohol?" This is a hard and embarrassing question. We excuse alcohol in our society even though in terms of dollar costs and social costs it is absolutely the most expensive bad habit that we have.

If marihuana is one-half as costly as alcohol, in those same terms—who needs it?

There is another difference. There are very few individuals who imbibe for the purpose of getting drunk. But every single individual who lights a joint does so with the prospect of getting drunk from the use of marihuana.

So often the use of drugs is symptomatic of deep psychological and sociological problems. That is a valid statement. It suggests that what we really need in this business of education is more effective guidance and counseling effort in the schools and that this kind of attention to psychology might be a better route to follow.

As I said, this drug abuse is just a little part of the total illness of our society. In fact, it is a symptom as well as a problem in itself.

We have an instability in the land, a frustration, an uncertainty. As a Nation, we are close to paranoia. The reasons for the general condition are inherent in the reasons for the drug problem itself.

We have spent a lot of time and effort of late trying to figure out what we do not believe and in discarding standards felt irrelevant to today's living. What we really need now is an attempt to find out what we do believe, and until those beliefs and standards are established and accepted, we will have no stability or harmony. Until then, and in spite of all the book learning that bears on the subject matter of education, we are going to have drug problems and all the other problems which we have in this society.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I raised the question as to how the Committee on Education and Labor determined its authorization figures for this bill, as it appeared as though the $7, $10, and $12 million figures authorized here were merely pulled out of the air. Today I am still concerned that authorizing committees prepare their cost analysis on a more rational basis so that when appropriating committees have to make their final determinations they have a reliable basis of information.

I want to point out, that I am not raising these questions because I oppose this bill or mean to downgrade the subject of drug abuse education. In fact, the contrary is true. I have a long and deep interest in this area. I have made the point many times as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that funding for drug abuse education is necessary and that, when Government money is spent, we get the most for our dollar.

Funding for an important area of national concern such as drug abuse education is not really an issue here today. My concern is how the expenditure of these funds will be made. I think that it is important that Members understand how this money will be utilized and what educational techniques will be employed, because I feel that it is impossible for us to project budgeting for programs in education which may or may not be possible to implement, particularly when we have few prototypes from which to evaluate.

My principal concern in this matter is that, while we all know that education in the problem of drug abuse is essential and that this specter menaces every household in this country, we must have practical, workable, and well-designed programs in education to counter this grave threat to the fabric of our society.

While I am sure that this bill before us today will expand Federal efforts in drug abuse education, I wish to point out that there are and have been significant efforts made within HEW to attack this problem.

I have been aware of one such project conducted through the National Institutes of Mental Health for several years and have followed its preliminary planning, development, and progress with interest. Admittedly there are numerous techniques for informing and educating young people, parents, and officials about the problem. There are many methods and devices which can be employed.

On Saturday evening, October 25, in Washington, D.C., the Academy of Television Arts and Science presented two awards for documentary excellence to "The Distant Drummer." This series of special telecasts on drug abuse was produced by the George Washington University Medical Center, Department of Medical and Public Affairs, for the National Institute of Mental Health. These programs were conceived by Dr. Stanley Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, and his staff to counter the countrywide problem of drug abuse. Murdock Head, M.D., professor and chairman of the Department of Medical and Public Affairs, was the executive producer of this excellent series.

This is the fourth such award received by this educator for outstanding documentary achievement. Previous awards have been received for programs on heart attacks and air pollution. The tril-

ogy on drugs has also earned an award from the International Film Festival in Atlanta and is, I understand, presently entered into the Venice Film Festival competition.

"The Distant Drummer" series is only a beginning in what should be a major effort in education on the drug problem. Special films should be developed for every elementary and high school in the country. Educational films should be available to medical schools, physicians, educators, parent groups, teachers, and police officials.

The programs, produced by the George Washington University, have been translated into Spanish, Italian, and Japanese. These specials have consistently appeared in prime time in cooperation with county medical societies throughout the United States. These programs on the drug problem have presently been programed to over 175 cities and are scheduled to appear in over 200.

This timely series not only appears on prime time television once, but is rebroadcast on an average of three times in each city in educational time or as repeat programing. These films have been shown to professional meetings, civic groups, universities, public schools and to industry. It was estimated that the earlier program on heart attacks was shown over 700 times before counting was discontinued. Dr. Head holds degrees in dentistry, medicine, and law and has, in the past 10 years, developed a rapport with university centers, professional associations and broadcasters throughout the country. The American Academy of General Practice, the American Medical Association, the Student American Medical Association, the American Society of Medical Executives, and other professional organizations have cooperated in the distribution of these television specials.

One of the major problems confronting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over the past decade has been criticism of the Department to demonstrate to the professions and to the public the results of many important research efforts. For this reason there has been criticism of the Department stemming from the academic community, from professional organizations and from the Congress.

This effective communications technique in drug abuses has evolved from a decade of effort and has been followed by not only myself but by Melvin Laird, formerly of this committee, and by the late John Fogarty—all of whom had been interested in the development of a method for improving communications from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the American citizen.

The George Washington University communications research project began modestly but has resulted in one of the most productive efforts in the field of science information. In my judgment, this remarkable record of production and distribution on the part of this university department should be commended. I hope that, based upon the important contribution to education of this project, it will be possible to encourage other members of the medical profession to devote full time to biomedical communications. While pure "bench" research in the classic sense is vital, if the appropriate information is not made available to, and accepted by, the professional—who is to utilize the results, or to the public, who is the ultimate consumer—effectiveness of such research is greatly reduced.

Many of the problems arising in our environment—such as population, pollution of our cities, mental health, and others—involve controversial areas which preclude the utilization of the existing information resources of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This purpose can best be accomplished by such a scientist who is also a professional communicator. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cannot buy the television time required for these programs. They can best be distributed by this association with local professional organizations and civic groups to achieve maximum visibility and acceptance.

Is is my understanding that a grant has been approved for the continuation of this fine effort in other important areas of mental health, including suicide and alcohol, as well as environmental problems. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I look forward to following the development of these new programs and expect they, too, will be of similar quality and afford the impact that the series on drug abuse has provided.

In conclusion, I wish to commend Dr. Stanley Yolles, the National Institute of Mental Health staff; Dr. Murdock Head; and the Department of Medical and Public Affairs of the George Washington University Medical Center for their outstanding contribution to the education of the American physician and the public on one of the most dangerous and troubling problems of our society.

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. MEEDS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Washington (Mr. MEEDS), in urging the adoption of H.R. 14252. Mr. MEEDS' service on the Education and Labor Committee has been outstanding, but his leadership as principal sponsor of the proposed Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 is singularly commendable.

No greater problem faces our Nation today than drug abuse. No solution is more reasonable than education. This Nation must shut off the human demands for drugs. This can only be accomplished through enlightenment. We must strike down the prevalent ignorance about drug abuse.

Through Federal grants and contracts to local educational agencies, the bill provides for programs to be devised and funded to train teachers, lawmen, and other officials who, in turn, will carry truth about drug misuse to children and their parents.

The moneys involved—$7 million next year, $10 million and $12 million the succeeding 2 years—is a modest price tag for this program. The scars, tragedies, and deaths from drug abuse which we see increasingly these days are greater payments.

Each of us has heard the demands for a fresh approach to combating drug abuse. This bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor, offers that new look through education. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 14252, for the need is great.

To point up the widespread human tragedies of the problem, I quote here a news story appearing in the October 24, 1969, edition of the Longview, Wash., Daily News:

ARTICLE BY GENE HANDSAKER

HOLLYWOOD.—A letter from Magnolia, Ill., said "On Memorial Day I buried my 20-year-old son. He, too, was murdered by LSD . . ."

From Honolulu: "May the youngsters of this world take heed of your brave and magnificent words . . ."

From Richmond, Calif.: "You have brought me and my family many hours of smiles and happiness. What can we do for you now?"

Such is the mail pouring in for television star Art Linkletter—25,000 letters in the last 10 days, he told President Nixon and congressional leaders Thursday—after his daughter Diane's death.

Twenty-year-old Diane, youngest of his five children, died Oct. 4 in a plunge from the kitchen window of her sixth-floor apartment.

From rich and poor, young and old, prominent citizens and obscure, the letters to Linkletter express sympathy, sorrow, concern—and admiration for his forthright blaming of LSD immediately after the tragedy.

"What a fine person you are, to make the story known to all of us who have young people in our homes," says a letter from Columbus, Ohio.

Some letters, telegrams and telephone calls request speaking engagements. Some letters say, "God bless you," or "tell me what I can do to help" with the drug problem.

Some say, "Please write to my son." These are from parents who know their children are involved with drugs but don't know what to do.

"Frankly, I can't tell them what to do because I don't know," Linkletter, 57, told the two-hour White House meeting on the President's proposals dealing with drug problem.

Linkletter said at the meeting that his daughter "leaped to her death in a depressed state from bad LSD trips six months before . . . She thought she was losing her mind."

He urged that an educational program be aimed at both parents and pupils beginning in the fourth, fifth and sixth grades.

In Hollywood, meanwhile, three secretaries continued opening and answering the letters. Some are from college officials, ministers, bankers, doctors, lawyers, judges. All the letters express sympathy.

Anxious parents included one in Chicago: "Please advise me what course to follow as I'm so worried and fearful of my daughter's future."

Neptune Beach, Fla.: "My daughter is 17 and on LSD. It is wrecking her life and health. If you can send me any advice of any kind, I will appreciate it greatly."

Georgia: "My 17-year-old son has been in jail for over a month awaiting trial for possession and selling of LSD. We are a low-income family. He got started on it from a small salary he made from working at a drive-in."

Another Georgian knows the Linkletters' grief first-hand: "I also lost a daughter who jumped from a 17-story building."

Van Nuys, Calif.: "My son, who would have been 18, took his life by hanging from taking LSD."

San Diego: "I have lost two children to dope, a son and a daughter. They are still alive in body, but I know they have no conscious life left."

San Antonio, Tex.: "My 27-year-old son is taking some kind of narcotics. It caused my husband to die of a heart attack."

Panorama City, Calif.: "My son's last downfall was an overdose of LSD . . . This boy is what they term a vegetable, totally disabled, only 25 years old and finished."

Other letters have a religious tone.

Charleston, S.C.: "Perhaps Diane's death is God's way of calling you to accept the great challenge of your life."

A fourth grader, Astoria, Long Island: "We in our class offered prayers for your family and especially Diane . . . You always loved children and made them happy."

Many letters express admiration for Linkletter.

Indianapolis: "With all my talking, all my pleading to warn my four children of the dangers—it surely has meant more coming from you."

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. MEEDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, last April the citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., held a series of three "town hall meetings" on the mounting drug abuse problem in their community. At first there was some skepticism—there were some who doubted Garden Grove had a problem.

However, an enterprising reporter for the Orange County Evening News dramatically demonstrated the depth of the community's problem when he purchased an assortment of dangerous drugs from a young pusher in front of the city's main high school. With this, all doubts were cast aside. Concerned parents literally jammed the high school auditorium the night of the first meeting. They were treated to quite a demonstration.

Teachers, law-enforcement officials, students, clergyman, and the enterprising Evening News reporter told a frightening story to the assembled parents.

Reporting on the easy availability and shocking assortment of dangerous pills; children in junior high school "freaking out" and overdosing, bad "trips," "bummers," and horror stories that could easily have come from the pen of Poe; the citizens of Garden Grove were brutally jolted from their former apathy.

In two subsequent meetings, panels of local experts, including some young addicts, possible solutions were discussed.

The overwhelming consensus of all those who participated in the community "awakening" was the urgent need for new and intensive education programs. Education about drugs, their use, their availability, rehabilitation, causes for addiction—everything connected with the problem was lacking, and if this community was going to be successful in meeting this challenge, a program had better be put together. This was Garden Grove's conclusion. And I am convinced that this is the conclusion of thousands of other communities like Garden Grove.

To answer this need, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 was conceived. When Garden Grove citizens started examining available resources for an intensive program—they found none. Local resources were already exhausted, little if anything was being done by the State—so they turned to Congress as are millions of other Americans on this issue.

The bill we are considering today will provide funds to communities like Garden Grove. With these funds, local educators and law enforcement officials will be able to provide creative, carefully prepared educational programs designed to get across the message of the dangers of drug abuse.

Three million dollars is authorized for the first year of operation, with increases, as the program expands, to $10 million. The scope of the problem requires immediate attention and massive funds. The modest approach in the bill will probably forestall an impressive immediate impact, but it is a good first step and deserves the full support of the House.

At this point I would like to include a statement by Daniel P. Casey, regional director, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The statement provides some insight to the extent of the problem in my home State of California:

STATEMENT OF DANIEL P. CASEY, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS, BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL AD HOC COMMITTEE, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., JULY 11, 1969

I would like to thank the members of this committee for their invitation to appear today to discuss the current narcotic and dangerous drug problem in California and the efforts of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to combat this problem.

It is difficult to assess analytically the magnitude of the drug problem in California because of the problems involved in adequately counting the number of drug addicts and drug abusers. Until January 1, 1968, the State of California maintained excellent statistics on the number of hardcore narcotic addicts, based on a one hundred percent sampling of drug arrests within the State. As of January 1, 1968, this figure was quoted as 23,676. Since that time, because of the increasing volume of drug arrests, the State had to revert to a thirty percent sampling in 1968 and, this year, to a twenty percent sampling. This addict figure has continued to climb, according to some experts, at a minimum of two hundred additional addicts per month.

To estimate the number of individuals who have used marihuana, cocaine, LSD, methamphetamine and other dangerous drugs, is even more difficult especially when one considers the grey area between the one time casual user and the habitual user. Without question, the abuse of these drugs constitutes an extremely serious problem in the State of California. For the benefit of the committee, I would like to discuss briefly the principal drugs of abuse in California with particular reference to their origin.

Most of the heroin consumed in California is illegally smuggled from Mexico. This heroin is usually of Mexican origin, however, some is transshipped via Mexico City from France and is of Middle East origin. I would like to point out to the committee that all current estimates indicate that the Far East is playing a more important role as a source for the heroin users of the United States.

Virtually all of the marihuana that appears in California is of Mexican origin. This statement holds true not only for California but for the balance of the United States. There has been a definite trend in the past year on the part of the habitual marihuana user to shift to a more potent derivative of the marihuana plant: namely, hashish. Hashish is the resin of the marihuana plant and is considered to be ten times more potent than marihuana. Large seizures of hashish have been made in California during the past year and the source has been identified primarily as Lebanon and secondarily, Morocco, Israel and India. To date we have no evidence that Mexico is a source of supply for hashish.

Lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) appears in large quantities on the illicit market in California, and usually is a product of clandestine laboratories in the United States and Europe. There is no direct evidence at the present time that Mexico is a significant source for this product.

One of the most dangerous and most frequently abused drugs in California is methamphetamine, better known as "speed." The illicit source of this product is clandestine laboratories in the United States and to a lesser degree, diversion or burglaries from legitimate stocks in the United States.

Cocaine is appearing in the illicit traffic in California in increasing quantities. This drug originates in South America and is frequently trans-shipped into the United States via Mexico.

According to recent statistics released by the State of California, there has been a marked increase in dangerous drug violations in California and two of the more important drugs of abuse in this category are the amphetamines and barbiturates.

Our investigations to date indicate that some significant seizures of amphetamines from illicit market in California are of United States manufacture, legally exported to Mexico, diverted and smuggled back into the United States. We have also encountered several instances of clandestine manufacture of the product in Mexico.

The illicit source for the barbiturates in California closely parallels that of the amphetamines in that in some instances the drug is of United States manufacture legally exported and smuggled back. There have been several reported instances where barbiturate powder, originating in the United States or Europe, finds its way into illicit channels in Mexico, is capsulated and smuggled into the United States.

There is a twofold reason for the existence of the problem relating to amphetamines and barbiturates. First, there is inadequate export control in the United States, and secondly, there are no laws in Mexico controlling the regulation, importation or distribution of those drugs.

It is the opinion of the Bureau or Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs that new legislation should be drafted to control the exportation of dangerous drugs from the United States. Hopefully, by controlling the flow of dangerous drugs out of the United States, the bureau will be able to stop the consequential illicit flow of such dangerous drugs back into the United States.

We have also been advised that legislation has been drafted in Mexico, to control the production and distribution of dangerous drugs in that country and is currently awaiting introduction before the legislature in Mexico.

The principal goal of the Bureau of Narcotics and dangerous drugs is to change the present escalation of the mis-use of dangerous substances, to deescalate this trend and minimize the social misery attendant with drug abuse. Hopefully, this minimization can be effected by:

1. Vigorous law enforcement directed against major drug sources both in the United States and in foreign countries identified as sources for the United States.

2. Education.

3. Research.

To achieve our enforcement mission in California, we have set as one of our primary objectives, the development of criminal cases in Mexico against sources of supply responsible for the introduction of narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs into the United States. Such cases are developed in cooperation with Mexican Federal Judicial Police in the Mexican border cities adjacent to this region. As a result of information reported to Mexican authorities by our bureau 56 defendants were arrested in Mexico in 1968 and the following drugs were seized: 5 tons of marihuana, 5½ kilograms of heroin, 10 kilograms of opium and ½ kilogram of cocaine. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous drugs has received excellent cooperation and intelligence from local, state and other Federal agencies toward the identification and apprehension of major sources of supply in Mexico.

One month ago today meetings were concluded in Mexico City between a United States delegation led by Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General of the United States and a Mexican delegation headed by Julio Sanchez Vargas, Attorney General of Mexico. Both governments agreed that an increased enforcement effort was necessary to deal with the border narcotic problem.

I would be remiss if I did not point out to the committee that our enforcement efforts in the United States and in Mexico are only a partial solution to California's problem. In the decade of the sixties, we have witnessed an unparalleled shift of drug abuse from the ghettos to the middle class and to our affluent citizenry.

Recently, John E. Ingersoll, the director of our Bureau succinctly stated the problem as follows:

"And for some reason that you and I do not understand, literally hoards of young people from all walks of life, shed their clean clothes, their beautiful homes, their sports cars, their money, their material things, their parents, and just walked out of society."

I submit to the members of this committee that these young people who walked out of society and into a drug sub-culture, made their decision despite California's proximity to the Mexican border and not because of it. In my judgment, education is our real hope to reach today's youngsters, so that they may be adequately informed as to the dangers and possible consequences of the uncontrolled and indiscriminate use of drugs. Despite the most vigorous enforcement efforts of the United States and Mexico, we will still not have touched the root causes of why our youth rebel against the establishment and express this rebellion, in part, by the misuse of drugs and all the other manifestations we find so disturbing as this decade closes.

AUSTIN GERIATRIC CENTER, INC.—NONPROFIT CORPORATION PROVIDING HOME FOR ELDERLY

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PICKLE was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, the wire services this morning carried comments about a proposed geriatric center for old folks in Austin, Tex. In my opinion, the inferences made by a prominent public official was a low blow against a very worthy and humanitarian project.

That project is in my hometown, and I would like to set the facts of the matter straight.

The project is a plan to build a home for the elderly poor folks. A public nonprofit organization intends to build and operate it. The home will also serve as a research center with the cooperation of the Texas educational system, particularly the University of Texas. The nonprofit organization is headed by Frank Erwin, chairman of the board of regents of the University of Texas. The other two directors are Roy Butler, president of the Austin School Board, and John Burns, a local civic leader and president of the City National Bank of Austin, and a member of the Austin Public Housing Authority.

The home will be built on land given free by the people of Austin to the Federal Government at the request of the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson, a number of years ago, for the construction of a fish hatchery. After 30 years of operation, the Department of the Interior recommended that the fish hatchery be abandoned and the land was returned to the people of Austin as the site of a model home for old people.

Actually, the site has another purpose as well—3½ acres has been used to develop model low-cost homes in the $5,000 to $8,000 range for poor families.

This demonstration housing project attracted national attention when it was dedicated last fall. It was the forerunner—a full year ahead—of Operation Breakthrough which we hear so much about these days. President Johnson was there to dedicate it, at my request. The local and national press covered it. I wonder why the news took so long to reach Delaware?

The central fact is that this is a nonprofit corporation involved here. The three public-minded citizens serving as directors serve without pay, as will other public-minded citizens who will be added once construction of the project is underway. In no way can they benefit financially from this project.

The nonprofit corporation was deliberately set up to prevent that.

The State of Texas understands that. The Texas Legislature, in recognition of the humanitarian nature of the project, specifically relieved this nonprofit corporation from payment of State and local taxes in this particular instance. The city of Austin granted a zoning permit. So the people of my district know its value to the community. Perhaps even the critics, who have suddenly appeared, know the truth, really. But they find it hard to pass up a chance at a headline.

It is difficult for me to understand how people who raise no objection to this land being used as a hatchery for fish object to its being used as a home for our senior citizens in the twilight of their lives. I say shame on those who cast aspersions by innuendo.

This is a very poor way to bring us together, and I hope we will not later find that the genesis of this Senator's speech came from highly placed political sources in the executive department.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Frank Erwin, the distinguished chairman of the board of regents of the University of Texas, made a statement in Austin yesterday that sets forth the full truth of this situation, and I insert it in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF FRANK C. ERWIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Last year, a group of Austin businessmen formed a Texas non-profit corporation to build and operate in Austin a home for the elderly poor—both sick and well.

One of the primary purposes of the home is to be a research facility for the use of The University of Texas System, with the research to be conducted through contracts between the non-profit corporation and The University of Texas in the fields of medicine, nursing, psychiatry, psychology, social work and other related areas.

This public non-profit corporation, The Austin Geriatric Center, Inc., applied for and received through Title II a tract of land in Austin that had been declared surplus by the federal government.

This land was held by the federal government as a fish hatchery site, having been given to the federal government by the people of Austin. The government in this action returned it to the local public non-profit corporation to be used for the benefit of local residents as a home for the elderly poor. That land is presently held by the public nonprofit corporation in exactly the same condition as it was when it was received.

The public non-profit corporation also applied for and received approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development a grant to assist in conducting the proposed research into the problems of the elderly poor. Since the grant was an operating grant and the center has not yet been constructed, no part of that grant has been given to the corporation by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The public non-profit corporation also applied to HUD for an FHA loan to cover the construction cost of the building. A commitment was received for the loan, but no construction contract has been executed. And no money has ever been advanced by the federal government under that loan commitment.

Indeed, the public non-profit corporation has never received a single dollar from any source and has never paid out a dollar to anyone for any purpose, because thus far all the services rendered in connection with this project have been donated without a cost to the corporation.

The public non-profit corporation was structured in such a manner that no one can benefit financially from this project. This humanitarian endeavor was recognized earlier this year when a Texas Legislature adopted legislation relieving this non-profit corporation from payment of state and local taxes.

Senator Williams has seen fit to suggest—at least by implication—that there is something improper or unethical about this worthy project. This is most unfortunate because the project was conceived with nothing but the highest motives and has thus far been carried on in a manner above reproach.

As a matter of fact, this entire project has been reviewed several times throughout 1969 by the federal departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education and Welfare. During these reviews this year no question has ever been raised concerning the propriety or legality of this worthwhile project.

We welcome any investigation by the Justice Department or any other appropriate agency of the federal government and urge that such an investigation be conducted promptly so that this humanitarian effort can become a reality without unnecessary delay.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas—from Austin—and to join him in this plain act of justice in resisting a shoddy, malicious

attempt to embroil a former President of the United States in what the local press here attempts to describe as a shoddy affair, an attempt to gain Federal property.

We are all grateful to the gentleman for presenting the true facts to the House.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14252.

Mr. Chairman, drug abuse in the United States is reaching alarming proportions. Millions of young people—young people living in our urban slums, in our affluent suburbs, in small towns—are experimenting with drugs ranging all the way from marihuana to morphine.

Medical evidence accumulated over the past decade shows that they are flirting with a host of psychological and physiological disorders—in some cases, even with death. Drug abuse takes many forms, cutting across all social and economic boundaries. It means a college student smoking marihuana in search of the elation he finds lacking in everyday life, a high school boy swallowing pep pills to keep alert during final exams, a slum girl shooting heroin to escape the bleakness of her existence.

Drug abuse, however, is not confined to the young and impoverished—not to the fraternity party or the back alleys of a ghetto.

Drug abuse is so commonplace today that it ranks as one of our major health problems—indeed, perhaps our single most pressing health problem.

The best way to combat this problem is through education—through a frank and straightforward presentation of the facts on drug abuse. No young people—nor people of any age, for that matter—will be moved by pious homilies or angry exhortations. The Surgeon General's report stopped more people from smoking than all the righteous platitudes of the past half century.

A striking example of the kind of educational program this country needs is the drug abuse conference scheduled for next week—November 4, 5, and 6—in my congressional district. Sponsored by the public school system of Springfield, Mass., and open to educators from Springfield and its surrounding communities, the conference will explore virtually every aspect of drug abuse ranging from narcotics addiction to experimentation with marihuana. I arranged for Dr. Joel Cantor, Assistant Director of the Center on Drug Abuse within the National Institute of Mental Health, to deliver the keynote address at the conference. I further arranged for the distribution of NIMH instructional materials on drug abuse at the conference and to school systems throughout my congressional district.

The bill now before us—the Drug Abuse Education Act—would help create many more conferences like the one I have just cited.

This legislation concentrates on the preventive approach to drug abuse, coordinating the efforts of public and private groups to put a stop to desires for experimentation with dangerous drugs. The bill goes further than just dealing with the potential drug user—the young person. It aims at educating his family, his community, and—most important—his teachers.

Today, drug abuse is most alarming because it strikes primarily at the younger generation. Statistics on a national scale are at best approximations. In 1967 the National Institute of Mental Health put college users of marihuana at 20 percent. A Gallup poll of college students conducted last month showed 22 percent saying they had tried marihuana. Some local studies show usage of dangerous drugs by college students over the 50 percent mark.

Of 539 persons arrested within a New York suburb for drug abuse offenses in 1967, over 60 percent were in the 16 to 20 age group, 85 percent were 16 through 24 and 95 percent were 16 through 29.

We do not have to look at statistics to know that drug experimentation and even regular use has become a fashionable and accepted phenomena in the world our young people inhabit. It is no longer confined to the antiestablishment hippie group but has reached through to young people of a more conventional outlook. It is not confined to particular socioeconomic backgrounds, but reaches the rich, the poor, the urban, suburban, and rural.

In an alarming study, "Drugs and Students," Richard Blum describes the trend thus far and projects future trends concerning drugs and our young people:

> What we see now is a rapidly increasing tempo. While it took approximately 10 years for experimentation and use to shift from older intellectual-artistic groups to graduate students, it took only an estimated 5 years to catch on among undergraduates, only 2 or 3 years to move to a significant number of high school students, and, then, within no more than 2 years, to move to upper elementary grades.

Blum points out the marihuana is by far the most widely used drug—and it is considered the least potent—but "as the base number of marihuana-experienced students expands, so does the proportion willing to risk LSD, DMT, STP, opium, heroin, methamphetamine, and the like."

Why the fascination with drugs on the part of our young people? There seems to be no clear reason—flouting parental authority, disenchantment with the "establishment," a feeling of being part of an "in" craze. It has ever been suggested that the publicity given to drug abuse by the mass media may lead to experimentation to see "what the story really is." The most important realization we must come to is that drug use is accepted by a large portion of the young generation with apparent disregard to its consequences. We must fight this acceptance through an extensive educational program alerting our young people to the facts about drugs and their dangers.

In 1963, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs concluded that "—a critical need exists for an extensive and enlightened educational effort on drug abuse," and commented on the distorted attitudes about the problem that cloud the thinking of not only the general public but even many professionals. The Commission also stressed that an effective education program should concentrate on the teenager who may see drug abuse as an escape from the world around him or as an entrance to his peer world. Finally it called for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics to be responsible for dissemination of educational materials concerning drugs.

Subsequent efforts in drug abuse education at the Federal level have obviously been unsuccessful or at least have not been commensurate with the magnitude of the problem. In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recognized that Federal activities in the area of drug education were not sufficient and recommended an intensive program administered chiefly by one agency.

Education should be our most immediate concern in grappling with the problem of drug abuse because it is the way we can most immediately help prevent its expansion. There seems to be a credibility gap between the younger generation and their elders as to the real dangers of drugs. Perhaps this is because past educational efforts have been pervaded by ignorance and fear of drugs, or by sermonizing on the part of people who simply argue that drug experimentation is bad because it is illegal. No wonder these programs have had such little impact when often the student knows more about the subject and even may have a more enlightened approach than the teacher.

Our primary concern should be to develop curriculums that is unclouded by uninformed prejudices against drugs and that intelligently presents the facts—why people take drugs; the dangers to the body and to the mind, from casual experimentation to regular usage; the effects of the different kinds of drugs and the varying degrees of danger they pose; and the laws against drug abuse and their penalties. Teachers must be well educated in the subject matter so that they will be able to carry on a dialog with the students, gaining insight into their reasons for turning to drugs.

This cannot be done with movies or with a single lecture. This is the general posture of drug education today, which we know is ineffective. Ongoing programs should be developed, suitable for the different age levels we are trying to reach. Experts in the various disciplines concerned, especially educators, should have the means and the encouragement to produce these kinds of intensive programs.

Recently, we heard the tragic account of the death of Art Linkletter's daughter resulting from an experience with the dangerous drug, LSD. Courageously, Mr. Linkletter has since led an active personal campaign against drug abuse. Only last week he met with the President and a number of our congressional leaders, strongly urging intensive educational programs on drug abuse from the fourth grade up throughout the country. He also admitted that he did not know what to

tell parents to prevent such tragedies in their own families.

Here we see the importance of education going beyond the schools into the homes and the communities. Parents should be just as aware of the dangers of drugs and the reasons behind their use as their children are. They should especially be aware that the problem is just as likely to strike their own child as it is their neighbor's. The problem may be averted if the communications barrier between parent and child is broken. The family and the community must be able to listen to their young and their problems, understand, and be able to offer advice and alternatives to drug usage. Only in this way can we attack the cause and avert the consequences.

The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 has provisions meeting all of our needs in the area of drug abuse education—curriculum development at all levels, training of educators, and family and community educational programs. Furthermore, it coordinates the resources and activities of the Federal Government in drug education throughout the Interagency Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education. I think this bill offers a real chance for effective preventive measures in combating drug abuse, especially among our teenagers. I urge its passage.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 22, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not to exceed"; on line 23, after "1970", insert the words "not to exceed", and on line 24, after the word "and" insert the words "not to exceed".

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to our distinguished friend from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that the amendment at the bottom of page 12 is self-explanatory, it merely makes clear that the figures for the fiscal years 1971, 1972 and 1973 are "not to exceed" the amount authorized by this section.

We accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would only say I offered the amendment because I did not feel that justification had been submitted for these individual figures of $7 million, $10 million and $12 million over the 3-year period. I want to leave the Appropriations Committee some elbow room, when they hold hearings, as I assume and hope they will, on the matter of appropriations to fund this bill. For instance, half the current fiscal year will have elapsed before this legislation is enacted and therefore there should be no requirement for all the $7 million.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee has said, the committee will consider this appropriation and seek justification through the process of establishing what programs and what procedures it will be necessary to finance.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I merely wish to state that our side has no objection whatsoever to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 14255, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs.

As a cosponsor of this bill there is no doubt that one of the most immediate concerns today for parents is the health hazard presented to their children in the illicit use of drugs by the youth of this country. Part of the reason for the widespread drug experimentation by the youth is the lack of factual information available as to the relative dangers of various drugs. From testimony presented to the committee, drug abuse is not limited to any age group. While it is primarily aimed at youth, its use by others in all age brackets is also growing at an alarming rate.

Congressional approval of this bill will not solve the problem overnight but it will be a step in the right direction in that educational programs will be initiated to tackle the drug abuse problem. Our schools, as well as our community organizations interested in these programs, are in need of trained teachers, materials, and research and evaluation on the effects of the use of these materials. Passage of this bill will make this possible.

Mr. Chairman, at my own cost and expense, I had a pamphlet prepared and distributed to the people in my district regarding drug abuse, entitled: "Death From Within." I had a very good response from my constituency, and I will be happy to provide my colleagues with a copy of my pamphlet.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14252, which seeks to help eliminate drug abuse by striking at the heart of the problem—the lack of knowledge on the part of the average citizen, young or old, on the dangers of improper drug use.

Accurate statistics on the percentages of college and high school students as well as older persons who have experimented with LSD, marihuana, hashish, and other drugs, are difficult to obtain, but it is undeniably clear that abuse is on the increase. The importance of preventive education as a control measure in this situation has been widely recognized and many agencies within and outside of Government have taken an active role in developing educational programs. But up to the present time these programs have consisted of scattered undertakings, mostly on a pilot level, divided among areas and related to each other only in a general way.

The purpose of the Drug Abuse Education Act is to establish a well coordinated and scientifically developed program of drug abuse education and information that will enable all sectors of American youth to receive information in the most effective and appropriate form. In my opinion, the provision in the bill to bring the education materials to local and State agencies through an assistance program specifically funded for this purpose is especially good since it is through such local agencies that much of the actual work of education must be carried out.

Following the tragic death of his daughter, Diane, who jumped out of her apartment window while in a depressed, suicidal frame of mind as a result of LSD experiments some 6 months before, Art Linkletter—the television master of ceremonies—has been speaking out in an effort to alert parents that their children may be tempted to take dangerous drugs and to shock the Nation into a realization that no family can consider itself immune from the growing problem of drug abuse. He said recently that "from the fifth grade up children should be grounded as thoroughly in the dangers of putting drugs in their systems as they are in walking across a super highway with their eyes shut." Mr. Linkletter is to be commended for speaking out in regard to the case of his own daughter to help prevent such tragedies from happening to other families.

We all know, of course, that the Drug Abuse Education Act won't make the problem disappear overnight. But our schools and communities cannot afford to stand by idly and allow young people to experiment blindly with their own self-destruction. Proper knowledge of the effects of drug abuse may serve to avoid many future tragedies. In my judgment, highest priority should be given to Federal programs to coordinate and disseminate such information as widely as possible and H.R. 14252 is an important step in this direction.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, before this day is out we will pass a bill which will make an effective contribution toward resolving one of the most difficult problems that afflicts our present day society.

It is just impossible for us not to be aware of the fact that this Nation has a serious drug abuse problem.

There is much concern in this country because young people use drugs. Many thoughts have been put forth on this subject, yet no one seems to have the answer. So many factors come into consideration as reasons why we have the extent of drug usage and abuse by our younger generation.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I feel that it represents a sound and constructive step in the proper direction. If we are to be successful in our attack on drug use, we must attack the problem in various ways: through law enforcement, rehabilitation, and education.

I am happy to associate myself to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) in this legislation which will help us to find some of the answers to drug use. This bill aims squarely at the problem and we hope that it will begin to establish a foundation on which we can stimulate more action and an effective State and local effort and build an

education program which can be truly responsive to a demonstrated need.

Progress in the education of our youth regarding the dangers in the use of drugs, through spot announcements sponsored by the mental health group, have been aimed to get the danger of drug abuse across to our youth.

The addiction and abuse of drugs is not confined to an isolated sector of our population. The problem which was once fairly limited to lower-income slum dwellers is now found in all levels of our society. The rich and the poor, the urban and suburban, the young and the middle aged of both sexes are involved. No segment of our population is immune from the intrusion of this means of moral decay and self-destruction.

The problem is also found in college campuses and in city and suburban elementary, junior and senior high schools.

The key to this entire problem is education which can unlock the door to root out the causes of drug abuse and narcotic addiction.

Mr. Chairman, the drug abuse and narcotic addiction problems strike at the very core of our society. These problems act like an unknown and underrated cancerous growth that is spreading over our Nation. It is impossible to live in this country today and not know about the drug abuse threat to our national health.

Education is the best hope that we have for combating drug abuse. Our children, the teenagers, the young adults deserve more in the way of protection from drug abuse than legal prohibitions. The bill pending before us offers them the tools to build their defense, knowledge and understanding.

Through education we can present new information and be in a good position to teach the population a respect for drugs. Drug respect is probably the only way to curb drug abuse.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which can be of great impact to our country, and I urge its speedy passage.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this body needs to be told how serious the drug abuse problem in our country has become. In his July 14 message to the Congress, President Nixon highlighted the severity of the problem with one particular comment:

> It is doubtful that an American parent can send a son or daughter to college today without exposing the young man or woman to drug abuse.

Perhaps the most frightening aspect of this statement is that, within the near future if not today, it can be applied to high schools as well as to colleges.

I strongly believe that enlightenment through sound and comprehensive education at every level will provide the best means of coping with our growing problem of drug abuse. To make this education available throughout the United States as soon as possible, I urge my colleagues to act favorably on the bill H.R. 14252 before us today, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

Current estimates show that more than 75 percent of those who have used marihuana are "experimenters" or first users. Since this statistic may well apply to users of narcotics and other hallucinatory drugs, we must face the question of why young people are apparently so willing to experiment with drugs. Cutting down on the illegal traffic of narcotics must be part of the battle against drug abuse; but we cannot win this battle without answering that question.

In my opinion, part of the explanation lies in the fact tht young people are simply not adequately educated on the potential dangers of using drugs even one time. Too often we have tried to assume that merely outlawing drugs would effectively minimize their use, but certainly the growing use of drugs in recent years has pointed up the fallacy of this assumption. Now we must face the issue squarely by trying to educate young people before they join the ranks of the "experimenters." As with so many of our Nation's problems, education can offer the best solution.

My colleagues, Mr. MEEDS, who originally introduced the bill, and Mr. BRADEMAS, who led the hearings on it in the Select Subcommittee on Education, are to be commended for their efforts in bringing the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 before us today. With numerous cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, H.R. 14252 is a bipartisan bill which deserves overwhelming bipartisan support from the House. The $7 million authorization for fiscal 1970 seems a relatively small price to pay for what this bill can provide. In my opinion, if we do not pay the price of prevention now, we will have to spend a great deal more for the tragedy of drug abuse in the future.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, in the last several decades, the American people have reaped the benefits of preventive medicine. We no longer wait for illness to strike; whenever possible, we have instituted programs of immunization. Such farsighted planning has done much to restrict the spread of unwanted disease.

Drug abuse is now reaching epidemic proportions in our society. In 1967, some 62,000 active narcotic addicts were recorded by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. As chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Penal Institutions in the New York State Legislature, I received testimony stating that the number of addicts in New York City alone had reached the 100,000 mark. This figure did not include individuals who had become addicts accidentally or because of medical reasons. Because reporting is incomplete, the dimensions of the problem are even greater than they first appear.

Drug addicts are sick people unable to cope with their environment. They often turn to drugs for relief from their pressures without full knowledge of the consequences of such action. Yet the philosophy of preventive medicine has not yet replaced hand wringing as a response to the problem. I believe a meaningful program of prevention is the best cure for drug abuse.

The Drug Abuse Act is a good first step toward the goal of prevention. Harsher penalties for drug abuse have been notably ineffective in halting the spread of drugs. The junkie—the brazen middleman in the drug trade—will not surrender his lucrative business as long as there remains a ready market for his product. We must then act to decrease the size of his following.

A systematic program of information about the evils of drugs—their debilitating effects on the physical and mental capacities of the individual, the costs to society—seems essential. The scope of past programs of drug education strike me as unduly narrow in scope. I am glad to see that parents, educators, counselors, and public and private institutions will be included in this educational program. It is through these channels that much information reaches our youth.

The concern and action of Congress should not stop here. Self-congratulatory handshakes are not warranted at this time. Education is important, yet it will not totally eliminate the problem. The causes of drug abuse are complex; programs for prevention must be sophisticated enough to meet the challenges posed. If the supply of drugs reaching our shores were to be curtailed, diminished drug abuse would be likely to follow; if the junkie were eliminated as a drug source, our crime statistics might drop soaring; if imaginative rehabilitation programs were forthcoming, addicts might release their parasitic hold on society.

A new and comprehensive approach to the problem of drug abuse is needed. I am presently working on such a program and plan to introduce drug legislation in the near future. No family, no individual is fully immune from the evils of drug abuse. The roots and causes lie deep in our society. Before the epidemic spreads still further, I say it is time to practice a little preventive medicine.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 14252 and commend the committee for bringing it to the floor.

There is an urgent need for reliable information and education on the serious drug abuse problems of the Nation, and this bill is a necessary first step to meet this need.

The able gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) has performed a significant public service by his leadership on this measure.

Let us hope the bill will be overwhelmingly approved by the Congress and effectively implemented by the administration.

The President has stated correctly that narcotics addiction is one of the Nation's most pressing problems, and has called for action to deal with it. I support his efforts all along the line to meet this growing danger, and urge the committees dealing with other proposals in this field to expedite their recommendations.

Everyone who has law-enforcement experience knows very well the longtime role of the narcotics trade and the narcotics addict in our crime problem.

This is a frontline in the war on crime in America, and we will not make real progress in the control of crime until we are making progress in control of illegal narcotics traffic and addiction.

Let us pass H.R. 14252 and get on with the job, all along the line.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge the House to overwhelmingly approve this measure now before

us, H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

The very title of the bill constitutes, in itself, a most convincing appeal for its speedy adoption.

Mr. Chairman, the unanimous authoritative evidence presented in support of this bill clearly and impressively convinces us that the most effective factor in controlling and correcting the abuse of drugs is complete and widespread knowledge and information about the terrible dangers of drugs to those who misuse them.

We are urged, by all these authorities, to project a Federal informational program and campaign, through the cooperation of teachers, doctors, nurses, the police, social workers, and every other level of contact, that will tell the American people, of all ages, plainly and sensibly that the misuse of drugs is as dangerous, in the dramatic words of Mr. Art Linkletter, "as walking across a superhighway with your eyes shut."

Mr. Chairman, the abuse of drugs is not, statistics show, confined to the young people, but it is, unfortunately widespread within this country and expert testimony advises us it is increasing at a rapid rate.

It is emphasized that the most effective way of stopping this abuse is to educate potential users about the ruinous and killing effects of drug misuse. That is the single purpose of this bill. By any standard of judgment, this measure represents a timely, prudent investment in the public interest and I hope it will be resoundingly approved without prolonged delay.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the bill before the House today to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes, I know you will be glad to learn of the concern of one of my young constituents on the subject of drugs.

Brian Blumenfeld, an eighth grade student at Herring Run Junior High School in Baltimore, Md., age 12, was so perturbed at the death of Art Linkletter's daughter as a result of her use of drugs, that he expressed his feelings in the following poem:

DRUGS

(By Brian Blumenfeld)

Maybe you think drugs do no harm,
Or maybe you think they work like a charm
Maybe you think, they make you slick,
Or maybe you take them "just for the kick".
You better think again.
Psychedelic posters on your wall,
Or maybe they aren't there after all,
Drugs can do many things
And once you try it, to it you will cling
Don't get hooked.
Maybe you think L.S.D. "makes you hip,"
But don't you think its all a big slip?
Don't you think it's a slip to the end of your life?
It's just as deadly as a gun or knife.
Don't get hooked.
Don't become an "acid head"
Or maybe one day, they'll find *you* dead.

It is most encouraging to know that some of our young people realize the great danger involved in their use and I hope they will be able to influence many others.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I support the drug abuse education act.

Like my colleagues, I recognize the rising amount of drug abuse in this country, both innocent abuse of ordinary medicines and the powerful abuse of drugs that have no known medicinal value. I am concerned not only by the increase in drug abuse, but also by the fact that the illicit drug traffic is changing in nature; there is a rapid rise in the use of so-called hard drugs ranging from heroin to the synthetic hallucinogens.

More is needed to combat this dangerous trend than simple law enforcement. Drug abuse must be stopped before it ever starts. It is far simpler to prevent drug abuse than it is to correct it.

Education is the best approach to the prevention of drug abuse. Education must be used to counter the ill-advised and misconceived preachings of such drug cultists as Timothy Leary, and to correct the widespread misbelief that drugs can be used without ill effects. This educational effort must be sufficient to reach every household in the land. It must be deep enough to impress upon every conscience the dangers of drug abuse. Above all, it must be honest in its approach; it would do little good to attempt to overcome with myths the myths of the drug cultists. Fiction will be recognized for what it is and discarded, but facts will be recognized for what they are. I believe that awareness of the dangers of drug abuse will go far toward reversing the present dangerous trends toward deliberate experimentation with dangerous, medically useless drugs, as well as abuse of valuable but nevertheless potent and dangerous drugs.

We have much to learn in this land about drugs. We need to start learning now.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to comment on a matter that came up yesterday during the debate on the Drug Abuse Education Act in a colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) and me.

The gentleman from Missouri misunderstood my observation in the debate to the effect that the evidence showed that very little instruction was given in great medical schools toward the training of our physicians as to the dangers of the abuse of dangerous drugs.

The gentleman from Missouri apparently thought that I had stated that the drug problem is not taught in our medical schools and that the medical profession has not done anything about it.

On the contrary, as I pointed out in debate, no witness was more effective in testifying before our subcommittee on the need for drug abuse education legislation than Dr. Henry Brill, chairman of the committee on alcoholism and drug dependence of the American Medical Association Council on Mental Health.

I would reiterate, however, my observation that more efforts need to be given in medical schools to provide medical students, our future physicians, more instruction with respect to drug abuse. In this connection, I believe that Members will read with interest the following letter to me from Peter G. Hammond, executive director of the National Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education and Information, Inc. This council is made up of civic, professional, and Federal agencies.

The text of Mr. Hammond's letter follows:

NATIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND INFORMATION, INC.

Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: To the best of our knowledge no extensive survey has been conducted to determine the types of institutions which offer drug abuse education programs. There is an obvious need for institutions of higher learning and specifically the professional schools to provide interdisciplinary courses on drug abuse education.

Dr. Alfred Freedman, Chairman of the New York Medical College, reports that most medical students get little more than one lecture on the problems of drug usage and this lecture is usually limited to the pharmacological effects of drugs. He says, "There is a great need to enhance and encourage medical schools to undertake extensive courses on all aspects of the drug problem. This is an area in which medical schools have been neglectful, and it is essential to encourage this kind of activity."

The research conducted for S. 1816, the Drug Abuse Prevention and Rehabilitation Act of 1969, substantiates this conclusion and schools of medicine, psychology, psychiatry, sociology, and social work are singled out for special attention.

I trust this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

PETER G. HAMMOND,
Executive Director.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969. By passage of this vitally important measure, the bill will provide a program of education most sorely needed in our country—a program which in the long run will prove to be the most effective weapon against drug abuse.

The first approach toward eliminating the problem of drug abuse is to strike at the heart of the problem, which is the lack of knowledge on the dangers of improper drug use. To carry out this purpose, the bill authorizes a program of grants and contracts for: First, the development of curriculums on drug use for our schools; second, the preparation of instructional materials; third, demonstration projects on drug abuse education; fourth, inservice and preservice training for teachers, counselors, local law enforcement officials, parents, and other persons in the community; and fifth, community drug education programs especially for parents.

This bill will assist in alleviating a critical problem which touches virtually every social, racial, and economic group in our country. Testimony presented to the committee overwhelmingly indicates that the most effective manner of curtailing and preventing the improper use of dangerous drugs is through an effective and greatly expanded educational program. At this time, drug abuse programs are nonexistent in most areas—few instructional materials are available and there are little, if any, opportunities for preservice or inservice training for

teachers, counselors, community leaders, and parents.

My personal experience with drug education is more than academic. In 1965 my village of Millbrook, N.Y., with a population of under 2,000 became very concerned over the activities of one of its residents, Dr. Timothy Leary—a leading exponent in the nonmedical use of mind-affecting drugs. I was privileged to serve with the clergy of the community, educators and physicians in a group that attempted to deal with this problem.

Our solution was drug education—the best weapon to forewarn both parent and child. Speakers, movies, comic books, clinical works—all were utilized in our efforts.

Fundamental to our approach—and I believe correct—was that youth will not accept threats or emotional appeals but will respond to cold accurate facts. It was also quite clear that lack of a full understanding of drugs and their affects left many parents playing far less effective roles than they should have played.

The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 is a comprehensive coordinated approach to the problem of drug education. It recognizes the need for development of a relevant, up-to-date curriculum, pilot projects, and evaluation of the effectiveness of curricula aimed at all ages. It recognizes the fact that teachers, counselors and law enforcement personnel also need training on drugs and drug abuse. More importantly, it recognizes the need for education of parents.

The community education programs on drug abuse will give parents the concrete facts needed when facing the most difficult problem of the use of drugs in one's family.

Education is always our greatest weapon. The use of drugs, particularly hallucinogenic drugs, will not decrease through law enforcement alone. It is important that youth be informed at the earliest possible age. We have a responsibility to see that our youth has the knowledge and ability to cope with the problem when they are confronted with it.

The Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 is the first and most important step toward development of our greatest weapon in the fight against drug abuse-education.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, although we are told that some 12 million Americans have experimented with drugs, I have some question in my mind that drugs are that popular.

However, I am concerned that those Americans using drugs do not fully comprehend the pitfalls—for the sake of a few hours free ride on a drugged trip, these people are risking permanent damage to themselves and possibly to their offspring.

I think it is the responsibility of Congress to help bring forth the truths—good and bad—about the use of drugs. We owe it to the people of this Nation to explode some of the romantic motions attached to the use of drugs.

Without question, the use of marihuana is dragging in more and more people. The question is—are our laws keeping step. For one thing, I think our laws should be directed more toward the seller than the user. We are strapping it on too many of our young people while we are letting the organized crime rings get off relatively easy. Punishment does not match the crime.

Accordingly, I support the Drug Abuse Education Act. Furthermore, I hope the research money in this bill can be used to determine several drug myths with some degree of finality:

Is usage over a long term harmful?

Is marihuana addictive?

What prompts someone to change from marihuana to heroin?

Which drugs actually affect and harm the reproductive process?

And most important of all, how can we best educate our people about this misuse of drugs? This bill can help answer many of these questions, and I therefore support the measure wholeheartedly.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the rapidly growing problem of hard drug abuse among young people was discussed in a special report I sent to the people of my congressional district in April of this year. Since then I have received letters from parents and other citizens in the district advising me of their discoveries of drug abuse among young people in their own communities. These letters serve to confirm the fact that narcotics use is no longer a problem in just the big cities. It has become a serious national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans everywhere.

I have also found, as have many of my colleagues, a lack of good drug education material available in sufficient quantities to parents, students, and other members of the public.

The legislation before us today should go a long way in correcting this situation, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill. I am sure that all of us recognize the urgent need for the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

President Nixon pointed out in his drug abuse message to the Congress that the lack of knowledge and the great amount of misinformation about drugs and drug abuse has compounded the situation and is contributing to the alarming growth of drug abuse among young people.

This bill is not the final nor the complete answer to drug abuse. The President has proposed a 10-point program that, when implemented, will attack this problem on a number of fronts. But I am confident that by approving the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, we will be dealing effectively with a very important phase of a multifaceted situation.

And I am just as confident that we will take up those additional measures that require legislative action to assure that we deal effectively and completely with this drug abuse problem that cries for a solution.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

One of the most difficult and dangerous problems threatening our Nation today is the increasing use and misuse of dangerous drugs and narcotics.

While I strongly endorse the increased efforts of various law enforcement agencies to crack down on illegal drug traffic, it must be recognized that these efforts alone will not provide a complete cure for the problem. We must not confine our efforts to halting the supply in drugs, but we must also try to slow down and obliterate the illegal and unwarranted demand for drugs.

The greatest cause for the increase in drug traffic is the lack of knowledge on the part of users of the inherent physical and mental damage involved in drug abuse. This bill, by vastly increasing available resources to educate the general population on the dangers of drug and narcotic abuse, attacks the heart of the problem. If people are taught the ugly consequences of drug abuse early enough, hopefully they will never get started on trying drugs.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to local educational agencies and other private, nonprofit organizations for community education programs on drug abuse. Under the bill, training programs will be set up for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials, parents, and other citizens of the community.

The educational programs provided for under the bill are critically needed. Earlier this year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that drug abuse has reached epidemic proportions. In a recent discussion with Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime, he pointed out that the 15-year-old age group is the one in which most crime is perpetrated in the country today, and that about half of the violent street crimes are committed by young people obviously for the purpose of getting money to pay for heroin to which they have become addicted. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that since 1960 arrests for drug violations have increased by 329 percent; for persons under 18 years of age the drug arrests have risen by the shocking figure of 1,860 percent. These figures alone demand that Congress and the Nation come to grips with the problem before it gets totally out of hand.

I particularly endorse the provisions of the bill which set up an Interagency Coordinating Council on Drug Abuse Education. Presently several Federal agencies have programs concerning the problem of drug abuse, and the coordination of their activities will allow their collective experience and expertise to deal more effectively with the problem.

The tools provided for in this bill are crucial for an effective fight against the drug abuse problem, and I urge immediate and favorable consideration of this measure.

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Chairman, drug abuse is a crisis problem that has appeared suddenly and viciously in communities across the Nation. It is a danger which most parents and many teachers do not fully understand since it is something they never faced in their own childhood.

Yet today the improper use of dangerous drugs has spread rapidly from the

street to college campuses, into high school corridors, and of late has even penetrated into elementary schools.

Those who guard and protect children in their growing years too often know nothing or very little about meeting this difficult situation head on. For this reason I have cosponsored H.R. 14252, known as the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969. This bill will authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes.

This bill seeks to help eliminate drug abuse by striking at the heart of the problem—the lack of knowledge on the part of the average citizen, young and old, on the dangers of improper drug use.

Those in responsible positions in the care of children have tried their best to inform young people of the serious consequences resulting from experimenting with drugs. But even some of the published material on the subject contains factual inaccuracies, distortions, and ineffective sermoning.

In addition, reliable drug education has been hampered by at least three factors: First, lack of effective teacher training; second, uncertainty about and unavailability of the right teaching materials, and third, community resistance to drug education—which is in reality a reflection of fear and controversy.

This bill is designed to overcome these obstacles to drug education. The bill contains many important features. In the first place, its administration is placed under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the second place, the act would create a 21-man advisory committee with seven of its members being appointed by the Attorney General. They will review the act's administration, recommend priorities, and evaluate programs and expenditures.

In the third place, the Commissioner of Education will approve funds only after review and comments by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and by the National Institute of Mental Health. In addition, the legislation calls for Federal-State cooperation.

Finally, the Federal Government will help in financing the program, to provide short-term courses for instructors, enable schools to sponsor seminars for parents, assist in developing teaching materials about drugs, and help evaluate existing educational projects.

The proposed new drug education program will not make the problem disappear overnight. But our schools and communities cannot afford to stand by idly and allow young people to experiment blindly with their own self-destruction.

While the lure of the unknown and the forbidden will always remain fascinating to young people, knowledge tempered by restraint can strip away the lure and serve to avoid many future tragedies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this body to vote for the measure to help us protect our children.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, I firmly believe the time has come when our educational institutions in this country must "wake the Nation and tell the people" that drug abuse has become a frightening social menace in America, and that only through knowledge and truth can we hope to save millions of young lives from the nightmare world of drug addiction.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the prime reason for my enthusiastic support of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969. Experience has demonstrated that present "after the fact," stop-gap measures for dealing with the problem of drug abuse are too little and too late. What we need is a hard-hitting educational program for teenagers and adults alike that tells it like it is—before it is too late.

Using the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 as a vehicle of coordination and cooperation, I can foresee all parties to the drug abuse problem joining forces—parents, teachers, students, law-enforcement officials, and community leaders. Only in this way can we achieve the understanding that is vitally necessary and absolutely essential to combat drug abuse in America.

Along with enactment of this legislation, we must, in my judgment, move forward on many other fronts. Among them are:

First. Law enforcement: Federal and State enforcement agencies must crack down even harder on the "pushers" who prey on the weaknesses of human beings.

Second. Community action: More communities must develop action programs such as the "awareness house" concept which utilizes rehabilitated addicts to "tell it like it is" and reveal the real dangers to young drug abusers.

Third. Coordination and cooperation: The critical necessity at every level of government and within every political subdivision to enlist the support of the news media, civic and social groups, and our educational and law enforcement institutions to work together to combat drug abuse through education, information, and a better understanding of the nature and scope of the problem.

Fourth. Drying up the source: A more concentrated effort to determine and eliminate the sources of narcotics and dangerous drugs that are entering this country and being made available to the general public.

Fifth. Education and training: The fundamental ingredient of any effective drug abuse program is factual and meaningful education and training. In this regard, Federal legislation, such as the Drug Abuse Education Act, must be supplemented and coordinated by local drug abuse education programs that are tailored to cope with special or local problems.

Sixth. Treatment and rehabilitation: Greater emphasis must be placed on treatment and rehabilitation rather than on disciplinary action in coping with addicts, and these programs must be expanded to provide "aftercare services" in the community. These services could be provided by private hospitals, "halfway hourses," religious groups, and privately endowed centers.

Finally, in a time of spiraling inflation and skyrocketing costs, the necessity for priority spending is most acute. However, in my judgment, the need for a high priority in domestic spending is nowhere more acute than in the area of drug abuse.

Quite frankly, I view the drug problem in America as part and parcel of the decay that is sweeping America. I see it as an integral part of a deliberate effort to alienate young people from family, church, and school. What better way to alienate young Americans than to "bend their minds and bodies" with easily acquired drugs and narcotics?

With the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, we can provide a positive, well-coordinated and integrated national program for realistic, effective, and vitally needed drug abuse education.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable and swift passage of this legislation in the belief that it is imperative that we in the Congress move on a positive and constructive way to put down this threat to American youth and the society in which we live.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of this legislation and consider its passage to be among the most important acts of this body in this session.

If drug users knew what they are doing to their bodies and their minds with the continued use of harmful drugs we would not have the problem we have today.

I consider this legislation to be a tremendous step toward halting unwitting and excessive use of harmful drugs by providing the funds and the programs to educate present drug users and perhaps more importantly, the potential users to the very real dangers of drug abuse.

As a member of the Select Committee on Crime, I have seen at first hand the enormous scale of the drug abuse problem throughout this Nation.

I have found, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the greatest deficiency existent in this problem is not in the area of law enforcement, but in the area of education.

Educators and law-enforcement officials are now hampered in providing the necessary drug abuse education programs because of the lack of effective training, programs and materials.

I think this legislation will go far in correcting these deficiencies.

While the Congress is to be commended for this positive action, I think it is indicative of our late recognition of this widespread social problem that we have waited this long before acting on drug abuse legislation.

I must admit that my own State of California is even more remiss in its responsibility. Governor Reagan recently vetoed $55,000 of an $85,000 drug abuse research program authorized by the State legislature.

The extent of the drug abuse problem is so great and so acutely dangerous that it will require complete dedication of all levels of government, local, State and Federal, before solutions can be found.

Any slackening of efforts by the State administration can only be measured in the extra young people who will be damaged irreparably by their continued exposure to this evil.

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse

Education Act of 1969 and it is with pleasure that I commend the strong bipartisan support which this measure has received.

This piece of legislation before us constitutes, I believe, an indication by all of us that we publicly recognize the critical need for Federal financial assistance to educate our young citizens on the subject of drug abuse.

No one, either here in the mainland United States or in Puerto Rico, can rest assured that the passage of this legislation will remove the cancerous scourge of drug abuse prevalent in the land. But it is a strong step forward in providing all possible means of support and assistance to our local institutions and personnel who must deal with this problem.

H.R. 14252 is our reaction to a problem from which we cannot hide.

There is a national clamor for more research that will define adequately the relative danger of marihuana smoking and many medical men, legal defenders, and politicians are beginning to assert their voices.

There are other measures, both in the House and the Senate, which concern the revamping of existing laws to deal with drug offenders and, because of this, I want to make it clear that this legislation is primarily an educational measure and not one primarily dealing with criminal aspects of drug abuse.

It strikes at the core of only one aspect of the problem of drug abuse but, in doing so, it will fill a gap that is critical: the need for our schools so educate their students more effectively in this area.

The legislation would, among other things, allow the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs.

Evaluation of any new curriculum is provided for in the legislation and training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders is authorized.

As Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, I represent nearly 2.7 million of your fellow citizens and I address myself to Members of Congress from both political parties when I say that this bill repersents a courageous step forward in dealing with a public problem that many choose to ignore.

The legislation provides for effective coordination of existing programs within Government through the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Drug Abuse Education and the provision allowing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to give technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations, and institutions of higher education in carrying out the purposes of this bill.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I join the hope of the many Members of Congress supporting this bill that it will be speedily implemented.

Because drug abuse in this country is increasing at an alarming rate, not to act on this problem is to retreat. This legislation offers hope to our school systems that, in the long run, they will be better equipped to cope with an urgent social problem.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I take this time to make sure that the record here is ample in support of the authorizations which we have asked. I should like at this time to point out that the American Medical Association before our committee in testimony said:

> The scope of our efforts in drug education is undoubtedly circumscribed by fiscal limitations. At present we know only of less than $1 million in Federal funds which are earmarked for the purpose of drug abuse education and information. And to the best of our knowledge, the total available from all sources does not far exceed this sum. This falls far short of what is required to control the problem. * * *

The Student American Medical Association before our committee in very similar testimony said:

> Although this bill merely authorizes funds and does not appropriate them, I would hope that a high priority would be given to the appropriation of these funds. Compared to the size of the legal and illegal drug market in the U.S., this amount is negligible. Furthermore, these funds would serve as a catalyst for many private organizations which are currently interested in drug abuse programs, but are inexperienced concerning methodology, and thus hesitant to begin such programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the committee that witness after witness came before our subcommittee and said that they felt what we were asking in this legislation was inadequate—inadequate—to deal correctly with this problem. I must confess that I think it is inadequate, also, but I do not think it is inadequate to get started and do what we can at the present. So I would hope that the record is clear that we are very serious about what we are asking in this bill and that we will be very serious when we go before the Committee on Appropriations and ask that it be fully funded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14252), to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 602, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question was ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 294, nays 0, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

YEAS—294

Adair	Fish	McMillan
Adams	Fisher	Macdonald, Mass.
Albert	Flood	MacGregor
Alexander	Flowers	Mahon
Anderson, Calif.	Flynt	Mailliard
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Mann
Anderson, Tenn.	Ford, Gerald R.	Marsh
Andrews, Ala.	Fountain	Mathias
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fraser	Matsunaga
Annunzio	Frelinghuysen	May
Arends	Frey	Mayne
Aspinall	Friedel	Meeds
Ayres	Fulton, Pa.	Melcher
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Tenn.	Meskill
Belcher	Galifianakis	Michel
Bennett	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Betts	Gaydos	Miller, Ohio
Bevill	Giaimo	Minish
Biester	Gilbert	Mink
Bingham	Goldwater	Minshall
Blanton	Gonzalez	Mize
Blatnik	Goodling	Mizell
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Mollohan
Boland	Gross	Montgomery
Bolling	Grover	Mosher
Bow	Gubser	Moss
Brademas	Gude	Murphy, Ill.
Brinkley	Hagan	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Haley	Myers
Broomfield	Halpern	Natcher
Brotzman	Hamilton	Nedzi
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-schmidt	Nelsen
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Obey
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski
Buchanan	Harsha	Olsen
Burke, Fla.	Hathaway	Ottinger
Burke, Mass.	Hechler, W. Va.	Passman
Burleson, Tex.	Heckler, Mass.	Patman
Burlison, Mo.	Helstoski	Patten
Burton, Utah	Hogan	Pelly
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Perkins
Carter	Horton	Pettis
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Philbin
Clark	Howard	Pickle
Clay	Hull	Pike
Cleveland	Hungate	Poage
Collier	Hunt	Podell
Conable	Hutchinson	Pollock
Conte	Ichord	Preyer, N.C.
Corman	Jacobs	Price, Ill.
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Pryor, Ark.
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Purcell
Daniel, Va.	Jonas	Quillen
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Railsback
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Randall
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Rarick
de la Garza	Kazen	Rees
Dellenback	Keith	Reid, Ill.
Dennis	King	Reid, N.Y.
Derwinski	Kleppe	Reifel
Dickinson	Kyl	Roberts
Diggs	Kyros	Robison
Dingell	Landgrebe	Rodino
Donohue	Landrum	Rogers, Colo.
Dorn	Langen	Rogers, Fla.
Dulski	Latta	Rooney, N.Y.
Duncan	Lennon	Rooney, Pa.
Dwyer	Lloyd	Rosenthal
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Roth
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Roudebush
Edwards, Ala.	Lowenstein	Roybal
Edwards, Calif.	Lukens	Ruth
Erlenborn	McCarthy	Ryan
Evans, Colo.	McCloskey	St. Onge
Evins, Tenn.	McClure	Satterfield
Fallon	McDade	Saylor
Farbstein	McDonald, Mich.	Schadeberg
Feighan	McEwen	Scherle
Findley	McFall	Scheuer
	McKneally	Schneebeli
		Schwengel

Scott	Teague, Calif.	White
Sebelius	Thompson, Ga.	Whitehurst
Shipley	Thompson, N.J.	Whitten
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	Widnall
Sisk	Tiernan	Williams
Skubitz	Tunney	Wilson, Charles H.
Slack	Udall	Wold
Smith, N.Y.	Ullman	Wolff
Springer	Van Deerlin	Wright
Stafford	Vander Jagt	Wyman
Stanton	Vanik	Yates
Steiger, Wis.	Vigorito	Yatron
Stratton	Waldie	Young
Stubblefield	Wampler	Zablocki
Stuckey	Watson	Zwach
Sullivan	Watts	
Symington	Weicker	
Talcott	Whalen	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—137

Abbitt	Dowdy	Morgan
Abernethy	Downing	Morse
Addabbo	Edwards, La.	Morton
Ashbrook	Eilberg	Nichols
Ashley	Esch	Nix
Baring	Eshleman	O'Neal, Ga.
Barrett	Fascell	O'Neill, Mass.
Bell, Calif.	Ford, William D.	Pepper
Berry	Foreman	Pirnie
Biaggi	Fuqua	Poff
Blackburn	Gallagher	Powell
Brasco	Gettys	Price, Tex.
Bray	Gibbons	Pucinski
Brock	Gray	Quie
Brown, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Griffin	Rhodes
Bush	Griffiths	Riegle
Button	Hall	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Hanley	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Harrington	Ruppe
Caffery	Harvey	St Germain
Cahill	Hastings	Sandman
Camp	Hawkins	Sikes
Carey	Hays	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Hébert	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	Henderson	Snyder
Celler	Hicks	Staggers
Chappell	Jarman	Steed
Chisholm	Jones, N.C.	Steiger, Ariz.
Clancy	Karth	Stephens
Clausen, Don H.	Kee	Stokes
Clawson, Del	Kirwan	Taft
Cohelan	Kluczynski	Taylor
Collins	Koch	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	Kuykendall	Utt
Conyers	Leggett	Waggonner
Corbett	Lipscomb	Watkins
Cowger	Lujan	Whalley
Cramer	McClory	Wiggins
Cunningham	McCulloch	Wilson, Bob
Daddario	Madden	Winn
Daniels, N.J.	Martin	Wyatt
Delaney	Mikva	Wydler
Denney	Mills	Wylie
Dent	Monagan	Zion
Devine	Moorhead	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Couger.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. McClory.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Harrington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

OCTOBER 30, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transferred to you by executive communication and referred to this Committee. The work plans involved are:

[Watershed, State, and Executive Communication]

Lower Pine Creek, California, No. 1049, 91st Congress.

Aowa Creek, Nebraska, No. 1229, 91st Congress.

North Concordia, Louisiana, No. 1229, 91st Congress.

Pond Run, West Virginia, No. 1229, 91st Congress.

South Florida Conservancy District, Florida, No. 1229, 91st Congress.

As you will note in the attached Resolution concerning Lower Pine Creek, California, only that portion of the project at or above the Arroyo del Cerro Dam is approved.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

CEILING ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 579

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Commitee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4244) to amend section 576 of title 5, United States Code, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, to remove the statutory ceiling on appropriations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4244 to increase the statutory ceiling on appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The purpose of H.R. 4244 is to increase the authorized annual appropriation for the Administrative Conference from the present ceiling of $250,000 per annum to a new ceiling of $450,000.

The $250,000 was imposed when the Conference was created in 1964. Since that time there has been a very substantial increase in general costs, which include a full-time staff, intermittent employment, printing and reproduction expenses, travel expenses, and supplies.

The cost of the legislation cannot exceed $200,000 per year, the difference between the present ceiling and the new ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 579 in order that H.R. 4244 may be considered.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not something of a misstatement to say the cost of this leg-

islation will only be the $200,000 increase, when it is proposed to lift the ceiling to $450,000, or am I misinformed?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. What I meant was that the additional cost, the cost of this revision in the legislation, could only amount to $200,000. The total would be, as the gentleman says, a maximum of $450,000.

Mr. GROSS. The title on the report, it seems to me, is a misnomer, "Ceiling on Appropriations for Administrative Conference." What it actually proposed is a lifting of the ceiling, and adding $200,000.

What does the gentleman think of the language in the report on page 5 which says the reason for this legislation is to carry out its important work. What is the important work of this conference? Does the gentleman have any idea? Perhaps I can get it from someone else, but there surely must have been some justification made to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. If I might, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) who is in a better position to answer that.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me.

I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, of course, I intended once the rule was granted to discuss the work of the Conference, but I can identify some of the subject areas that they have been concerned with as recently as the last 10 days in their annual plenary conference. These are areas like those dealing with enforcement of NLRB orders, elimination of duplicative hearings on FAA safety, recertification cases——

Mr. GROSS. What kind of safety?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. FAA safety. That is the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. GROSS. FAA safety. Let us just take that one. The last table of organization I saw for the Transportation Office showed there were five or six safety divisions in the Department of Transportation Office, which includes the FAA. What in the world would this outfit be doing in connection with safety in the FAA?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. As I indicated, it refers to the elimination of duplicative hearings. I think that the gentleman just made the point why this particular conference ought to look into it. It is because there were so many hearings of this sort.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have asked these questions because I think this rule ought to be defeated and we should dispense with this legislation without going further. On the basis of the report and the hearings on this bill, this $250,000 is a waste of money that could be spent in untold places throughout this Federal Government to far better advantage.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. May I refer back to the title of the bill and point out that the title on page 2 is amended to read, "A bill to raise the ceiling on appropriations of the Administrative Conference of the United States." So there is an amendment to the title.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Do I understand the report to indicate that the salary of the chairman would be increased from $20,500 a year to $42,500 a year?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin to answer that question.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me.

His salary has been, along with other agency heads to which he is equivalent in the Federal bureaucracy, raised to $42,500. This is not done by this bill, but it has been raised by the laws which we have already enacted in the Congress this year, just as our salaries have been raised.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, was his salary then, as a matter of fact, increased from $20,500 to $42,500 by previous action of the Congress?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, that refers to what in 1964 was his estimated salary which had gone to $30,000. As I recall, the last salary increase raised the departmental and congressional salaries to $42,500. He is authorized to receive a salary according to the law we passed in 1964 providing that the chairman shall receive compensation at the highest rate established by law for the chairman of an independent regulatory board or commission.

And, there is a reason for that. The reason is that he sits in conferences with his peers who are also agency heads. When this was originally established in 1964, and all the measures leading up to it, it was determined that he too shall serve as an equivalent of any Federal regulatory head and he is compensated accordingly.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one further observation, I would like to say that I become more satisfied with the fact that I voted against the establishment of the Salary Commission which did these wondrous things.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. If the gentleman from Tennessee will yield further, I would point out to the gentleman that there was not a vote on this in 1964. It was overwhelmingly supported both in the other body and this body, and there has not been to my knowledge a record vote cast against this conference that was created to date.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the colloquy between the various gentlemen which has been held has indicated that, perhaps, we need some further discussion of this matter within the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the statutory ceiling now fixed for appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States.

Created in 1964, the Conference has as its responsibility the development of recommendations for improvement in the procedures by which Federal departments and agencies fix the rights and obligations of private business and individuals through administrative adjudication, rulemaking and investigation. The Conference has no regulatory power; it reports to the President, the Congress, the judicial Conference, and the departments and agencies of the executive branch.

Statutory language now limits the appropriations each year for the operations of the Conference to $250,000. This figure is based upon 1964 estimates. Current cost estimates total $400,590. The Committee on the Judiciary believes that the appropriations ceiling should be increased to $450,000 per year to insure some leeway.

There are no minority views. The Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Justice support the bill as introduced which completely removed the appropriations ceiling. The committee believes a ceiling is helpful to it in discharging its oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and in order to get into the Committee of the Whole I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4244) to amend section 576 of title 5, United States Code, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, to remove the statutory ceiling on appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4244, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation concerns authorization to appropriate for the Administrative Conference of the United States.

As originally introduced, at the request of the Conference, the bill would simply have removed the present ceiling of $250,000 per annum. As amended by our committee, however, the bill would retain an appropriation ceiling and

would raise the existing annual ceiling from $250,000 to $450,000.

Mr. Chairman, the Administrative Conference of the United States was created in 1964 by Public Law 86–499 as a continuing agency of the Federal Government to study Federal administrative procedures and to recommend improvements.

In the creation of the Conference in 1964 the other body, acting first, imposed no limitation on appropriations. The present limitation was inserted by amendment in the House. It was insisted, as a matter of fact, in the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The Conference advises that the present limitation is too restrictive, having been based on estimates which did not include sufficient funds for the salaries of the Chairman or the full-time staff, and wholly failed to take into account the full salary increases and general costs that have taken place in the meantime.

Actually, the cost estimates in 1964 were taken from the preceding conference of 1961 and 1962. The total estimate of 1964 was $256,500. The present costs, according to testimony before the Committee, in terms of what their mission requires them to do, is $400,590. The Conference indicates that approximately $200,000 of its present appropriation of $250,000 will be required for fixed charges, with the result that only $50,000 will be available for the necessary employment of consultants, for travel, per diem, printing, for reproduction and for all the other expenses attendant to the Conference.

The committee is persuaded that the present $250,000 limitation is unduly restrictive. It does not follow, however, that the ceiling on appropriations should be entirely eliminated. The committee believes that, especially with regard to relatively new programs like that of the Administrative Conference of the United States there is an advantage in terms of legislative oversight to maintain some limitation on appropriations. The Conference has offered figures indicating a present annual cost of approximately $400,000. The Chairman of the Conference testified that this figure itself is insufficient to constitute an adequate future maximum. He conceded that he could not see the need in the near future for more than $500,000 a year.

In the circumstances, the committee is of the opinion that a ceiling of $450,000 per annum is a fair one, bearing in mind both the needs of the Conference for adequate financing, and the desirability of periodic legislative oversight .

Both the Johnson and the Nixon administrations supported and support H.R. 4244 as introduced. However, the Administrative Conference itself has now accepted the $450,000 ceiling proposed by the Committee on the Judiciary, and has so advised the other body.

The additional cost of the proposed legislation to the United States cannot exceed $200,000 per year. Actually, there can be no cost at all to the United States unless the Conference persuades the Committee on Appropriations that an increase is warranted, and the Committee on Appropriations in the final analysis is the one to appropriate the money which is authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend just a few moments on what the Administrative Conference of the United States is.

It is an independent agency of the Federal Government. It arose out of two 18-month conferences in 1953 and 1954 under Judge Prettyman in the Eisenhower administration, and in 1961 and 1962 under the Kennedy administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman just say in effect that the House should pass the buck to the Committee on Appropriations in the matter of what they appropriate for this and other authorization?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Not the authorization, but in terms of the ultimate justification for the actual money needed that they are going to have to justify that to the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. That is what we ought to have here today, a justification and I hope we will get it before there is a vote to jump this spending to $450,000. I am surprised to hear today the suggestion to pass the buck to the Committee on Appropriations. They are estimable gentlemen, but I think we ought to assume our responsibility here today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I appreciate the gentleman's views. But I think I must disagree with the gentleman when he says that I said we would pass the buck. I merely stated that we are increasing the authorization, but in the final analysis the justifiction will be gone over a second time by the Committee on Appropriations of this House.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Unless we do agree to the authorization, then the Appropriations Committee will have nothing to act on and we can stop this matter right now.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No. I disagree with the gentleman. The Committee on Appropriations will survey the request of this committee or this conference whether or not we pass this bill.

Mr. SCOTT. If the measure now before us is defeated, it can still be considered by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Well, the Committee on Appropriations is not authorized to appropriate more than $250,000 for this conference.

Mr. SCOTT. If this measure is defeated, then the Committee on Appropriations cannot appropriate more than $250,000.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said that the Committee on Appropriations will have an opportunity to look this over, and that is true. But there has been a tendency recently to talk about full funding so that even if the Committee on Appropriations makes a careful study and comes in with something lower than the authorization, then we have a great deal of talk about full funding and the Committee on Appropriations recommendations are usually boosted up. So I would be in favor of keeping this $250,000 and not put the Committee on Appropriations in the position of not recommending or appropriating the full funding and then have somebody get up on the floor and say, "We authorized $450,000 and they should have given it to you."

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I do not know that that necessarily follows. I hope the gentleman's recommendation in this regard will not be followed because the House has indicated in the past and, indeed, the other body has as well, a strong disposition to support the Conference and its mission.

I do not think there is any doubt among other things that the commission or the conference saves money. After all, we have one of the largest bureaucracies in the world. We spend between $100 and $200 billion a year. If we cannot somehow add another instrument to enable us to operate more efficiently and more economically and serve the public interest in terms of the bureaucracy and in terms of the red tape that regulatory agencies and departmental constituencies produce within our Government within the Federal establishment, I think indeed we will have failed to serve the country well.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. The gentleman says we have built up a tremendous bureacracy, and that is true. But the Congress has done most of it since we had this Conference. What have they done to hold down bureaucracy? What would be the bureaucracy without them? Would this not be one place where we could establish priorities and hold this funding at this time at the lower level?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I think the question should better be directed to the Congress. What has Congress done about the bureaucracy? The Administrative Conference is not directed to attack the bureaucracy. It really is directed to making it operate a little better, making the bureaucracy which the Congress has created operate a little more efficiently. We cannot blame the Administrative Conference for failings in the federal system as far as efficiency, economy, or fairness to litigants, to your constituents and mine, to those who come before the Federal agencies in terms of the expeditious handling of various matters.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Can the gentleman tell the House when the Administrative Conference actually got underway? When did the Congress first authorize it, and when did it actually get underway pursuant to the legislation now in effect?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I will say to the gentleman that I was starting to give

the background of the Conference when I yielded to questions of our other colleagues. The Conference itself was created by legislation pursuant to the recommendations, as the gentleman well knows, of many in August 1964. It was not actually underway until after January 1968, when the Johnson administration found the man, according to the testimony, they were looking for to be Chairman of the Conference, Hon. Jerre Williams. He then acquired staff and got underway as the gentleman knows, in the year 1968.

A conference was held late in 1968, a plenary conference. As the gentleman knows, this involves some 82 members. There are 10 council members, the Chairman, 10 council members—82 members of the Conference. They came up with a recommendation in this matter. Another plenary conference was held last week, October 22 and 23.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. How often does the Conference convene?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It is required to hold at least one plenary session each year, but the Conference has convened twice preceding 1964 and since 1968 twice, that is, late 1968 and last week.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. What is the accomplishment of the Conference to date?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I think my colleague also knows from the hearings that many of the accomplishments of the Conference are not addressed in terms of concrete, black and white, and the reason for this is that we did not empower the Administrative Conference to issue regulations. It does not have any rulemaking power. We expect the agencies to conform, insofar as possible, with the recommendations made by the Conference. This sort of compliance is effected by means other than orders or matters emanating from the Conference itself. As I said earlier in response to the gentleman from Iowa, in last week's Conference they recommended simplification in hearings on FAA safety. I have been advised that the implementation of this recommendation alone will save $500,000 per annum, a sum in excess of the ceiling which the amended bill would establish.

The Conference will also have, in due course, if not already, recommendations for the Congress to act in terms of legislation. We, ourselves, can judge to what extent this brings efficiency and economy in the executive branch. I assume we ourselves are going to be responsible for that. These are some of the matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are we not now spending a substantial sum of money on a reorganization group in Congress, to tell us what we should do in that area?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. Then why do we need this outfit to tell us in Congress what to do? This is duplication, waste, and extravagance. I do not understand the purpose of this outfit. I wish the gentleman would explain.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. As the gentleman from Iowa recalls from the debate he participated in in 1964, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of the ranking members of the Government Operations Committee, and many others testified of the need for this Conference.

Furthermore, the suggestion was—and I think it still pertains—that we are not in a position to administer the nuts and bolts of these agencies in terms of rulemaking and the like. We are in no position to exercise that sort of oversight.

In the final analysis, this is an aggregation of Federal administrators in conference, 82 of them, including people from the outside, practitioners who appear before the agencies, and these people through plenary session and through committees try to follow the mandate Congress has put down for them to effectuate streamlined procedures and economies in terms of administrative procedure. This is its mandate. As far as I am concerned, it has been following this.

May I say we have had no complaints from the agencies of this Conference in the 2 years it has been in operation or even of the ad hoc conferences that preceded it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman to say that two plenary conferences have been held to date?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. One each year, one in 1968, and one in 1969?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Would the gentleman tell the House what the Chairman and the staff of the Conference do between sessions?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. There are the working committees. There are 10 committees formed under the Conference. If the Chairman of the Conference had the money, it is his job among other things to acquire the expertise on a per diem basis in various areas of administrative reform, so they work and proceed to the next full plenary conference.

Presently I gather he does not have this sort of money and he cannot commence the sort of work we would expect him to do.

I think there is no question this hampers the output but once we have funded them and authorized at any rate what they require to continue the mandate, I think we will see more than mere recommendations.

The recommendations I suggest to the gentleman—and the Conference has put out recommendations both last year and this year, or will shortly this year—are followed among the Federal commissions and governmental agencies. That is largely the purpose of it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain the length of term of the Chairman and how the membership of the Conference is comprised? Who appoints the members of the Conference? I understand there are approximately 82 members of it.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The Chairman is appointed by the President on what terms?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. The Chairman is appointed by the President and the Senate confirms the Chairman for a term of 5 years. Of course, the question the last time was an interesting one raised now by the gentleman from Michigan, but it was raised by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) the last time, and it was suggested the Chairman's term ought to be something else other than 5 years. But, as I think the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Harris, who is not now a Member of this body but who at that time was chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, suggested it would be better to have a term of 7 years rather than 5 years, because the Chairman is the one person identified with the Conference as a continuing body. Therefore, his term might well be longer. It should be at least 5 years. Some people suggest 7.

The Council members, and there are 10, are recommended by the President, but not confirmed by the Senate. That is for 3 years. The remainder of them, the 71 members of the Conference serve for a term of 2 years. I think they are selected first of all so that agencies are represented, and each independent regulatory agency is represented, but others are selected by the Conference.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. One last question, if the gentleman will yield for it.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Can the gentleman tell the House in what appropriation bill is the work of the Conference funded?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I confess I am not certain whether it is independent offices or the judiciary and other related agencies. I will have to verify that for my colleague.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Those two bills have already been passed by the House this year, have they not, for fiscal year 1970?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. My colleague probably knows better than I that they have.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. As a matter of clarification, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the Chairman is appointed for 5 years by the President with the consent of the Senate?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Then there are 10 Council members also selected by the Senate but not requiring Senate confirmation. The other members, 82 in number, are appointed by the Conference itself?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That is my recollection. If I am not correct, I stand to be corrected. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut for an answer.

Mr. ST. ONGE. The balance of the membership is appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Council.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. How did we get them in the first place? Who appointed them in the first place to appoint themselves later? This seems to be a self-perpetuating Conference here. How were they appointed in the first place, in 1964?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. First, of course, they start out with the Chairman and the Council.

Mr. HUNT. Right.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. As I understand it, the Council appoints others for a term of 2 years. These are in and out of Government. I believe the report and the proceedings indicate standards we expect to be applied.

Often these are outstanding students in law or the administrative process, or they are practitioners before the administrative bodies, and others outside the Federal Government. Those within the Federal Government are fairly well identified with the ICC, the FTC, FCC, FAA, and all the various boards and independent regulatory agencies represented, as well as the departments.

I might say that at least one former Member of this body serves. The present Secretary of State, the Honorable William Rogers, was until recently a member of the Conference.

Mr. HUNT. So originally in 1964 the 10 members of the Council made the selection of those persons in the community who were highly qualified, in their estimation?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. From that time on, of course, they then appoint themselves.

Did I correctly understand the gentleman likewise to say that it took 3½ years to find a man to fill this position as Chairman? Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say they could not find this man from 1964 until sometime later on?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. The committee interrogated witnesses on that point. The explanation was given. As I indicated earlier, this Conference was created congressionally in August 1964. The Chairman presumably was found some 3 years later, and appointed and confirmed in January 1968.

We were told that the President had a great deal of difficulty in finding a person who was not committed to certain points of view with respect to administrative law. He found a person who was recommended to him and who seemed to suit the bill, as far as the testimony suggested. I believe he was a professor of law at the University of Texas, Mr. Jerre Williams.

So far as the committee can determine, he serves his position well. We have seen no adverse comment whatsoever regarding Mr. Williams.

Mr. HUNT. Is that Dr. Williams?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Was his salary at the time when he was appointed $20,500?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I believe his salary at that time, January 1968, would have been $30,000. It would have been at the highest rate for a regulatory agency in January 1968. I assume that was $30,000.

Mr. HUNT. Then, it is now $42,500?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. As yours and mine are.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make these comments. The Chairman of this Conference is Dr. Williams. He served as professor of constitutional law at the University of Texas for several years and is considered one of the outstanding legal minds in the country. I know, having attended several of these conferences myself, that it renders a great service. It is the one place where the regulatory agencies have a commission or a conference that they can go to in order to try to iron out differences and make their various rules and regulations uniform. It is also one of the only places through which individuals can come to their Government to learn to abide by certain rules and regulations that they prescribe.

A lot of outstanding men belong to this Conference. I have been there myself and sat in on sessions. I know one of our former colleagues, Joe Kilgore, who served here in the House for some 10 years, told me just 2 weeks ago that he considered this one of the most important conferences or commissions in the Government. It is just that vital to the economy of the Government as well as to the preservation of the rights of individuals and agencies. It can save us a lot money. Over and above that, it gives the opportunity to people in the Government to operate under the same rules and regulations as other agencies. It is highly important, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I hope it passes.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

I believe those who vote against this bill need not wait for a flow of letters from any particular interest group objecting to your having done so. I do not think it will occasion any great stir in your offices for having voted down this legislation. Yet I think voting it down would be a great mistake. We are talking about an increase here of $200,000. We are talking about the one unit, that functions within this whole bureaucracy whose precise responsibility is to make the impact of regulatory agencies more equitable, more fair, and more efficient as they touch all of our constituents. We all spend a great deal of time railing against the bureaucracy and pointing out those times and occasions when we consider it to be took big, too cumbersome, to inefficient, and too inequitable and unfair. Here is a unit of the Government whose prime and only responsibility is to make that system work and work better.

When you talk about the allocation of resources in a society, we are talking about a unit that will help in the spending of billions so that it will be done in a better way, perhaps, and we are only spending $200,000 extra on it. There is not a large corporation in this country which either does not hire efficiency experts to review its programs or retain within its staff a body whose function is to do precisely that. Yet if we vote down this bill, we will be leaving our Government without the aid of this Conference, because if we leave the figure at $250,000 with the already mandated salary increases with the already mandated cost increases, then we will not permit this operation to continue at anything like an efficient pace. So it is very easy for us to rail against the bureaucracy, but it may be more difficult for us to do so if we are only content to do so with table pounding and not with analysis.

Now, analysis means you have somebody who goes in and takes a good hard look at these procedures. We can have a Hoover Commission—we can have a second Hoover Commission—and we can periodically go in and take a look at the way in which our bureaucracy works. But, unless you have a continuous and sustained program of dedicated people with which to do this, of course you will not have the consistency that you will have under the provisions of this bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would the gentleman tell me how often this Conference meets in plenary session?

Mr. BIESTER. It is my understanding that it has met twice this year in plenary session. Now, we are dealing——

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. What is the usual length of such sessions?

Mr. BIESTER. Sometimes 2 days or 3 days.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I notice in the report that there is an amount listed of $127 for air fare, $13 for buses and so much per diem. It further states that the average trip would be $164 which would indicate that that would be just a 1 day conference; is that not correct?

Mr. BIESTER. I think that those travel arrangements are not only for the conferences themselves, but also for council meetings and other meetings which may be for staff consultation or which may be for a research man to come into Washington and report upon what he has been doing before a committee.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. My conclusion is that very busy people are appointed as members and as in so many study groups, because the name lends prestige. The work is really done by staff people; is that correct?

Mr. BIESTER. I suspect it is both, because what we are dealing with here is two kinds of work. We are dealing with staff work which is the digging kind of research into a problem and the nonstaff work of coming to a judgment thereon. It has been our experience that those who are the busiest people are usually more capable of exercising the best kind of judgment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The reason I have asked this question is because I have been asked to serve on various conferences and usually in areas in which I am at least supposed to have some knowledge. I find when we go into these conferences that the work and recommendations are made by unknown staff people. But I sit there for a few hours, and there is really no possibility to exercise judgment because many of the

things that the staff recommends as desirable or not desirable are things with which time truly does not allow us to become familiar and when they come up for a vote, the work of the people of the conference is one of just simply satisfying the staff recommendations with insufficient time or knowledge to make value judgments.

This is true for congressionally authorized "reading" panels or committees who come to Washington.

Such committees have available only the materials that the agency staff has not previously screened out—on the recommendations that the staff has decided are worthwhile. If the gentleman will yield further? Of the 82 members, how many are agency heads?

Mr. BIESTER. I am sorry, but I did not hear the gentlewoman's question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. How many of the 82 are agency heads?

Mr. BIESTER. There is the chairman of every independent regulatory agency or his delegate.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. How many of the 82 are agency people?

Mr. BIESTER. I would have to enumerate that later. I am sorry that I do not have that figure at my fingertips.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would it be a dozen?

Mr. BIESTER. Possibly.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. My recollection is that 52 are presently agency people. The law requires that not less than one-third or more than two-fifths of the total Conference be other than Federal Government people and that ratio will vary from time to time out of the 82. At the present time it is approximately 52 or 53.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, there are two additional questions which I would like to ask.

Mr. BIESTER. I would like to respond with an example to one question which the distinguished gentlewoman asked before, because I think it deserves a clearer response than I gave earlier.

If the gentlewoman will refer to page 18 of the hearings she will find a series of recommendations by the conferees with regard to one of their last plenary sessions. There she will find a series of disagreements on the part of the conferees, distinguished people who take a personal position in disagreeing with or explaining the limitation of their position with respect to a number of positions. I think they represent an aggressive interest on their part and not simply just rubberstamping what has been recommended.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It is my understanding that a part of the work is contracted out to various universities, or individual professors?

Mr. BIESTER. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. How much of the budget is spent on this kind of contract?

Mr. BIESTER. About $100,000.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. About $100,000? For specific studies?

Mr. BIESTER. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would express my concern about the way we are moving in governmental contracting. Every agency in Government is doing it with no knowledge of what other offices are doing. The other day on the floor on the Health, Education, and Welfare continuing resolution I said there were 9,000 consultants on the active files of the Office of Education alone in addition to the large number of consultants hired through contracts or subcontractors by the Office of Education. It is my judgment that we have thousands and thousands of reports that are on library shelves and in closets and every place else that no one has read and no one has ever done anything with. They only gather dust. No one knows what the other is doing. I am convinced, that in the Office of Education and OEO alone, we are literally spending many hundreds of thousands of dollars on contracts for research and study that end right there at the time the study is filed. I even suggest this contracting business with private agencies and the use of consultants has reached epidemic proportions and may result in one of the most serious institutional health problems.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased the gentlewoman from Oregon made that point, because it offers me the opportunity to also point out that one of the recommendations of this Conference appearing on page 16 of the committee hearings is the recommendation No. 4, the creation of a consumer bulletin, and this recommendation would lift from the Federal Register those items of particular interest to consumers that are buried in there, and not ordinarily found there, and permit those to be especially promulgated to the consumers, and proposes the expansion of that concept into a general consumers' bulletin.

I am very pleased that our administration has, I believe yesterday, endorsed that kind of concept and urged the creation of just that kind of program so that it is not a sterile or wasted effort on the part of this Conference.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the most important aspect of this is the concept, and if the concept is to be served rationally I would say the fixing of $200,000 is in my opinion an appropriate figure.

I might say this in the history of this subject, that the Conference requested originally an open-end appropriation, or open-end authorization for their work. Such an open-end authorization was approved by the Department of the Budget on March 4, 1969, and such an open-end authorization was approved by Mr. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, on May 5, 1969.

The committee rejected that concept. We rejected the concept of an open-end authorization, and we proposed the authorization figure limitation of $450,000, believing that to be a rational figure, and believing that to be consistent with the wishes of the House.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, the statement was made here earlier that one recommendation made by the Conference just ended about 2 weeks ago, if followed, would save the Government an estimated $500,000. Is this true?

Mr. BIESTER. I believe that is correct, and it deals with the FAA Safety requirements.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. So that if that saving is effectuated by following this one recommendation, it will more than make up for what the bill authorizes. Is that not correct?

Mr. BIESTER. That is absolutely correct, and although we cannot cite the specific instances in the future, I believe it is likely to occur over and over again.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what sort of a recommendation was this? I am curious to know.

Mr. BIESTER. For the precision of that I would refer to the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

Mr. KASTENMEIER. If the gentleman will yield, it is relating to the elimination of duplicated hearings in the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will give you a recommendation, and it will not cost you a nickle, that probably we can save $2 billion if you vote against the foreign aid—the foreign giveaway—bill when it comes up.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been listening to the remarks of the Members who are here, and I have some feeling that this bill may be running into difficulty.

I rise to indicate my support for enabling the Administrative Conference to be continued and strengthened.

I say that because one of the things about which I have always had concern as a legislator is the inability of those of us who serve in public office to really keep track of what is happening in the bureaucracy.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon has pointed to example after example, and she does her homework better than most. I am one of those who have tried to keep the Administrative Conference busy by sending cases to that group for their analysis and for their comment.

I must say I have been surprised at the willingness of the Conference chairman and his staff to take specific examples of alleged abuses of the rules and regulations that exist in the independent agencies and attempt through this vehicle to make corrections.

I cannot do this as an individual legislator—I cannot get any kind of pattern out of what happens to my constituents

in Wisconsin as contrasted to those constitutents who are in New Jersey or Pennsylvania, Oregon or Washington. But the Administrative Conference is the one vehicle that is available to us which can begin to determine whether abuses of the rules and regulations do take place within the bureaucracy.

That is what this Administrative Conference is all about. I think it would be shortsighted for the Congress of the United States not to give this concept, and this vehicle, at least a fighting chance. I have sent cases down there relating to the FCC, for example.

I have asked the Administrative Conference to give me their reaction to complaints and their recommendations as to whether or not the law was being followed accurately and whether or not there has developed a pattern of abuses.

I think we would be very, very remiss if we were not to try to take advantage of this concept and of this opportunity because I do not know how any of us as Members of the Congress can begin to get a handle on our massive Federal bureaucracy. The Administrative Conference is perhaps an imperfect vehicle. But if the Members of the House will refer to the inserts that I have made in the past 2 years in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I have attempted to portray this group and its Chairman, Jerre S. Williams, as the only kind of ombudsman that exists at the Federal level today. We do need someone, somewhere who can work to correct agency wrongs and imperfections, for this reason I hope that the bill can be supported and approved by the House. We can take advantage of this group's availability to help us do a better job for our constituents. That, I think, is a goal worth striving for.

Therefore, I intend to support the bill.

Mr. BIESTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

With respect to the gentleman's comments, I think it is important to remember that this Administrative Conference deals in very large part with the regulatory agencies and these are agencies which touch on the affairs of all of our constituents and they touch Americans individually and the inefficiency or the inequity of these regulatory agencies has an adverse impact on our people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Since this Conference is designed, according to some people, to save the Government a lot of money, I am going to be interested in that great day that will dawn upon the House when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) joins with some of us to cut some of these bills—since he is going to have so much help with this Conference.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have on a number of occasions joined with him in voting against bills which I thought were not appropriate, and I hope to continue to do so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. We have a committee of the House in addition to the Comptroller General's office, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Operations Committee charged with the responsibility of doing this very same kind of work.

Can the gentleman tell the Committee how many staff members the Committee on Government Operations has employed now?

Mr. BIESTER. I can only tell the gentleman that the minority has three. I cannot tell him how many the majority has.

Mr. JONAS. I mean the whole committee?

Mr. BIESTER. I can only tell you that the minority has three, but I do not know what the full committee has.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to have somebody inform the Committee of the extent of the activities of this Committee on Government Operations in this very field.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think I can contribute something to the question of staff allowance for the Government Operations Committee. The Government Operations Committee is probably one of the most thoroughly staffed committees in the Congress. I think the number now runs something like 60 in all.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say six or 60?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Sixty. I think we have a budget that is about $900,000 a year on that committee, the Oversight Committee. Unfortunately, we also have some subcommittees that are not too active.

I think the gentleman might well ask how many study commissions we have in the Federal Government that are studying ways of providing efficiency and economy in the operations of the Government, and perhaps ask how much these cost. Maybe we would get a little more efficiency and economy in the Government if we would stop forming new commissions and similar groups. To bring about increased efficiency and economy in the Government, that might be one place to start.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIESTER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. If this bill were not passed, the Administrative Conference would still continue with an authorization of a quarter of a million dollars a year.

This Conference actually did not get under way until 1968. At least to my satisfaction there has not been a sufficient justification based upon its work to date to justify so large a percentage of increase in authorization over just a 2-year period. Perhaps a justification can be made, but I do not feel that it was made before the Judiciary Subcommittee of which I am a member. I will concede that it is not expected generally that the same kind of justification would be made before a legislative subcommittee as would be made before the Appropriations Subcommittee. However, if I understand the statement of my subcommittee chairman today it is to the effect that the appropriation for this agency is provided for either in the judiciary bill or in the independent offices bill. My recollection is that both of those appropriation bills have passed this House this year.

Mr. CONTE. Post Office and Treasury.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I understand it is in the Post Office and Treasury bill. All right. That bill has also passed the House, presumably at the $250,000 level. In other words, this authorization bill comes too late this year to affect 1970, and under the circumstances I think the bill should be recommitted to the committee. I propose to offer a straight motion to recommit.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my distinguished friend from Michigan, who serves so well on the subcommittee that I chair. However, I do think the facts and figures suggest a different story. Presently the staff is small. I think it consists of nine members. The chairman's salary and his staff today cost $200,120 of the $250,000 appropriation that it was suggested they have lived with for 2 years, but was established in 1964 out of a 1961–62 Conference level. So we are not dealing with a current increase. This is an increase literally for an 8-year period, during which the estimates for their salaries have risen from $121,000-plus to $200,000. It leaves less than $50,000 for equipment supplies, furniture, travel, printing, reproduction, and particularly, per diem employment.

While they would like to operate on the $100,000 level, perhaps they cannot do so and are not able to do so presently. The Bureau of the Budget has allowed them every dollar they have got coming, because the Bureau of the Budget knows the difficulty they are in under this particular administration and the past administration. It is their intention, if authorized, to seek a supplemental appropriation if there is an increase in authorization. I cannot speak as to the success of that application. That is up to the Congress, and whether it is effective in fiscal 1970 or otherwise, but I do know they feel very definitely that the limitation imposed on them many years ago is today a limiting factor.

At this time, I want to express my appreciation for the underlining of the major purpose of the agency and how it serves, as so eloquently attested by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER). I think we would be acting penny wise and pound foolish to deny this small Conference, in terms of size and cost, the facilities and resources to cope with a $100 billion bureaucracy that we and not they created.

I would also say, in terms of our own

constituents and people from our areas who appear before Government agencies, the Members ought, indeed, to seek every possible means to make sure these agencies are responsive to our people. We can do this by helping at least one agency of the Government dedicated to this.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about the figures he quoted a few minutes ago about the staff. Are we talking about the chairman's salary and full-time staff?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. The present costs, in the figures I have to show the chairman receives $42,500 and the full-time staff receives $157,620.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I see. So that leaves approximately $200,000 for printing and reproduction and travel and other expenses?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. If they were authorized the additional amounts, this is what they would propose to use the money for.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. My question primarily is, if the amount of money in this bill, approximately $200,000 was not approved what service that the Conference is now offering could not be offered?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Principally they would not be able to contract, in my estimation—although this would be up to the chairman, and he has to distinguish between things he can and cannot do—but I would assume his ability to seek part-time per diem employment would be limited to the point where he could virtually not use it at all, because he would have to have the balance, and he would have to use his money for just housekeeping expenses. He has only $50,000 for expenses. He has to be able to authorize the travel money at the present per diem rate, whatever it is, $16 or $20, to those non-Federal participants who come to the parliamentary conference. He probably cannot print or reproduce many materials, and I assume that would be part of it, in addition to cutting down on the per diem employment.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. The material that is printed and reproduced—where does it go? Do we have it? Does the gentleman receive it in his office?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. To my knowledge I do not. Of course, there is a report made to the Congress and to the President. I assume we all get that report. The printing and reproduction does not principally go to that, but for other matters, for internal circulation among the 82 participants within the Conference. There is a rather large community served by the executive agency.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. The reason I ask, the statement was made that we in Congress were advised by the Conference. That is why I was wondering about the printing, how we were advised if we do not have it sent to our offices. That information would be helpful.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Insofar as I know, the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on Post Office and Treasury, headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) has thought well of this Conference, and the committee approved the budget estimate this year of $250,000, as I recall.

I know among some of the members of the committee there is a feeling that if the Conference is going to do the job it has set out to do some additional funds may be required. While I cannot speak authoritatively as to precisely how much might be required for this purpose, I myself favor giving the administration more flexibility in making requests for the program for next year and I therefore feel that the pending authorization should be approved. If the full amount is not required, and I trust it will not be, the Appropriations Committee after full hearing can present the required figure in the appropriation bill next year.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. We are assuming that there is additional work to do, and additional workload each year, to require the additional funds and staff people, plus the increased salaries per year.

Apparently the Conference is riding herd on many independent agencies, and apparently what we are doing on the floor today is riding herd on the Conference. To my knowledge I have not received quite enough information to know that the Conference is doing what it is supposed to do. I believe we need additional information yet as to the additional workload they have for the $200,000 which is requested.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Of course, most of what the Conference does, does not serve Congress directly. It does have printed material, and I assume this generates a report to the Congress which would come to the office of each Member in January, very probably. The bulk of the work is in terms of the agencies themselves within the executive branch. As such, I believe it is not likely to be as visible to us as we might want.

I believe this is largely a matter of the Member's own discretion. If he cares to use the facilities of the Administrative Conference they are at his disposal for the purposes mentioned before.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it would appear from the report there is going to be an increase of over $80,000 here in payments to the chairman and full-time staff, so that there will be over $200,000 being paid just for these full-time employees. With that kind of outlay and in these times of fiscal stringency it would seem very questionable to me that in addition $115,000 a year should be paid to law professors at the tune of $100 a day for what is labeled "research" in this report. That does not count the travel expenses they will get, which will be additional and which will probably bring the amount paid to law professors for travel to Washington to do research under this bill an additional $150,000.

This item alone makes this bill extremely vulnerable, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 576 of title 5, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 576. Appropriations

"There are authorized to be appropriated sums necessary, not in excess of $450,000 per annum, to carry out the purposes of this subchapter."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 576 of title 5, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 576. Appropriations

" 'There are authorized to be appropriated sums necessary, not in excess of $450,000 per annum, to carry out the purposes of this subchapter.' "

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand this situation, this Conference was statutorily created in 1964 but no chairman was appointed until 1968 or 1969. Is that correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Yes. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan, we discussed that, and that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the reason no chairman was created, I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) said earlier in his remarks, was that they could not find a chairman who was equipped for the job. Is that correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. That was the thrust of the answer given by the Executive Director of the Conference.

Mr. GROSS. And they were looking for an individual who was trained in administrative law. Is that correct?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No. Just the opposite. The feeling was that those who were schooled exclusively or primarily in administrative law would have a point of view with respect to the Conference that would make them not desirable.

They wanted someone close to this area of law but not so thoroughly immersed in it that he was partisan for the purpose. That was the testimony that was given to us, at least. Finally the testimony was that they found Mr. Williams, who, as the gentleman from Texas suggested, had been a constitutional law professor and done some work in the field and in other respects.

Mr. GROSS. But did not the present chairman testify before your committee that he taught administrative law?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. He said he had taught it formerly at one time.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. He taught administrative law. He so testified before your committee. Now, lest there be any misconception about how this money will be

spent, the hearings plainly state that the additional money—and this is the chairman testifying—"is money we need to pay travel expenses to our members," and also "to pay the per diem costs of our experts, young law professors hired in many instances at our maximum per diem of $100 per day." That is what this shooting is all about. It is for more travel for conference members and their hirelings and to pay young law professors to tell the Congress, among other things, how to run Congress?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can comment on his own time. I cannot think of a worse boondoggle that has come down the pike in a long, long time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4244) to amend section 576 of title 5, United States Code, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, to remove the statutory ceiling on appropriations, pursuant to House Resolution 579, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HUTCHINSON

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUTCHINSON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4244 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 134, not voting 167, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—130

Adair
Alexander
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Beall, Md.
Betts
Bevill
Bow
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Chamberlain
Chappell
Collier
Conte
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dickinson
Dorn
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gaydos
Giaimo
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Haley
Halpern
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Heckler, Mass.
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McKneally
McMillan
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Mathias
May
Mayne
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Montgomery
Morton
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pettis
Pollock
Quillen
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Springer
Stuckey
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wold
Wyman
Yatron
Zwach

NAYS—134

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Bennett
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Clark
Clay
Conable
Corman
Coughlin
Culver
Dawson
de la Garza
Dennis
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Foley
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gonzalez
Gray
Gude
Hamilton
Hanna
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kyros
Lennon
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McCloskey
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Randall
Rees
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Scheuer
Shipley
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
Whalen
White
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—167

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Biaggi
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collins
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dowdy
Downing
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan
Hall
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kee
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lujan
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
Madden
Martin
Michel
Mikva
Mills
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Nichols
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Ullman
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Zion

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Poff for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Brasco against.

Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Rhodes for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Lipscomb for, with Mr. Biaggi against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Goldwater for, with Mr. Daniels of New Jersey against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Michel for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Eilberg against.

Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Landgrebe for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. St Germain against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Pucinski against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Gilbert against.
Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Daddario against.
Mr. Wydler for, with Mr. Cohelan against.
Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Boland against.
Mr. Bray for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.
Mr. Zion for, with Mr. Ashley against.
Mr. Foreman for, with Mr. Burton of California against.
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.
Mr. Dowdy for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.
Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Hanley against.
Mr. Hagan for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Harrington against.
Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.
Mr. Frey for, with Mr. Sisk against.
Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Smith of Iowa against.
Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Cleveland for, with Mr. Ullman against.
Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Karth against.
Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Kee against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Price of Texas for, with Mr. Koch against.
Mr. Steiger of Arizona for, with Mr. Mikva against.
Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Morgan against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Pepper against.
Mr. Winn for, with Mr. Ryan against.
Mr. Wylie for, with Mr. Nix against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Eshleman for, with Mr. Steed against.
Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Fascell against.
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Moorhead against.
Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Button.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Wyatt with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Whalley with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Sandman with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. POLLOCK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. WRIGHT, TEAGUE of Texas, WATTS, and BLANTON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 127, not voting 171, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—133

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Bennett
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Clark
Corman
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dennis
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Feighan
Fish
Fisher
Foley
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gonzalez
Gray
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kyros
Lennon
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
McCarthy
McCloskey
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Melcher
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Scheuer
Shipley
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waldie
Watts
White
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—127

Adair
Alexander
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Beall, Md.
Betts
Bevill
Bow
Brinkley
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Chamberlain
Chappell
Collier
Conable
Conte
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dickinson
Dorn
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gaydos
Giaimo
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hammer-schmidt
Hansen, Idaho
Hastings
Heckler, Mass.
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kleppe
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
Lukens
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McKneally
McMillan
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Mathias
May
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mizell
Montgomery
Morton
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pollock
Quillen
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roth
Roudebush
Ruth
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Skubitz
Springer
Stuckey
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Wampler
Watson
Weicker
Whalen
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wold
Wyman
Zwach

NOT VOTING—171

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Biaggi
Blackburn
Boland
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collins
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dowdy
Downing
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Eshleman
Fallon
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goldwater
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gude
Hall
Hanley
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hicks
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kee
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Landgrebe
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lujan
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
Madden
Martin
Michel
Mikva
Mills
Mize
Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Nichols
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Ullman
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Zion

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Poff against.
Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.
Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Caffery against.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Rhodes against.
Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Williams against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Goldwater against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Pirnie against.
Mr. Eilberg for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Martin against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Lujan against.
Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.
Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Cederberg against.
Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Corbett against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Smith of California against.
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Cowger against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Snyder against.
Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Wydler against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Foreman against.
Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Cunningham against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.
Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Zion against.
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
Mr. Hanley for, with Mr. Griffin against.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.
Mr. Harrington for, with Mr. Henderson against.
Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Gettys against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Frey against.
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Denney against.
Mr. Smith of Iowa for, with Mr. Abbitt against.
Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Cleveland against.
Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Camp against.
Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Belcher against.
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.
Mr. Koch for, with Mr. Steiger of Arizona against.
Mr. Mikva for, with Mr. Bush against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Winn against.
Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Wylie against.
Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Nichols against.
Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Eshleman against.
Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Flynt against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Mize against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Quie against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Button.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Wyatt with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Whalley with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Sandman with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Broomfield with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. ADAIR changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to raise the ceiling on appropriations of the Administrative Conference of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the calendar, if any, for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the business for the week and will ask to go over until Monday upon the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

On Tuesday we will begin consideration of H.R. 6778, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act, under an open rule with 5 hours of debate.

On Wednesday there are two suspensions scheduled, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 934, to increase the authorization for the food stamp program; and

H.R. 13949, to provide certain equipment for use in the offices of Members.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week we will continue consideration of H.R. 6778, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act, and also we will consider H.R. 14465, to provide for the improvement of the Nation's airport system and for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, subject to a rule being granted. A hearing on this bill has, I understand, been scheduled by the Committee on Rules for next Tuesday.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority leader agree with this observation: looking at the two rather major bills, H.R. 6778 and H.R. 14465, in all likelihood, if not certainly, there will be a session next Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. It certainly is a distinct possibility, and I believe Members should govern themselves accordingly.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if there is anything that can be said with respect to Veterans Day?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. That, of course, is the week after next. I do not want to be bound by this at this stage of the game, because the gentleman knows that there are certain matters pending, but we had not planned—I think I am free to say this after discussing it with the Speaker and the minority leader—to have a session on Veterans Day, but we will have to cross that bridge when we announce the program next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NOVEMBER 3, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office on a matter of extreme urgency when the vote was taken on the matter of H.R. 4244 concerning the Administrative Conference. Had I been present, I should have voted "yea."

SUPPORT FOR $1 BILLION MORE FOR EDUCATION

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the House for voting this week to reaffirm our action of last July to provide $1 billion more for education in the United States than was provided by President Nixon's budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1970.

The House action added nearly $7,200,000 for education programs in Hawaii for the current fiscal year, over what President Nixon sought, bringing the State total of Federal funding for education to $20,795,650 under the House bill which I supported.

Despite the rapidly increasing student population in Hawaii and other States, President Nixon asked Congress to appropriate only $3.1 billion this year for the U.S. Office of Education—a substantial reduction from the $3.6 billion provided in the previous year, and obviously far short of our current requirements.

I was proud to help lead the emergency effort last July in which the House increased the Office of Education budget by more than $1.1 billion over the President's request for education programs in Hawaii and other States. The Senate, however, has yet to act on this bill, so the Office of Education and other

Federal agencies have been continuing their programs at the low Nixon administration funding level under a continuing resolution passed by Congress. This delay has caused our schools and colleges to be denied the benefit of the higher funding for this year contained in the House-passed bill.

This week the House considered an extension of this continuing resolution, but voted to repudiate the Nixon education budget by allowing the Office of Education to fund programs at the higher level approved by the House pending final congressional action on its 1970 budget.

All of this still means nothing for our schools unless the other body agrees. It is hoped that they will give the Office of Education budget top priority and pass this bill immediately. We are already 4 months into the current fiscal year, 1970, and further delay would hamper the cause of education which we sought to benefit last July.

Approval of these increases will be of tremendous benefit to Hawaii across the whole education spectrum. They will raise funding of the title I program for educationally deprived children in Hawaii by more than $428,000 over the President's request. Other elementary and secondary school increases would total $679,000.

A $5 million increase for Hawaii over the President's request would be provided for our schools under the federally impacted area program. We would also get more than $550,000 over what the President sought for vocational education in Hawaii.

Under this proposal the budget for higher education in Hawaii would be increased by more than $200,000 over what President Nixon asked. Library and community service funds in Hawaii would go up by more than $150,000.

All of these increases are vitally important to Hawaii if we are to keep pace with the increased student enrollments in our schools and colleges.

Following is a table showing the increased funds for education in Hawaii which would be provided under the House action, which I supported:

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate 1970	House passed appropriation bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Assistance for educationally deprived children (ESEA I):					$3,211,221
Basic grants	$2,430,762	$2,215,107	$2,633,771	$2,633,771	
State administrative expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Grants to States for school library materials (ESEA II)	386,217	193,833	162,821	0	192,394
Supplementary educational centers and services (ESEA III)	841,079	874,776	903,778	716,722	895,686
Strengthening State departments of education (ESEA V):					
Grants to States	213,704	281,390	283,268	283,268	283,268
Grants for special projects				0	0
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III):					
Grants to States	298,618	301,047		0	325,337
Loans to nonprofit private schools	31,063	9,946		0	0
State administration	10,000	13,333		0	13,333
Guidance, counseling, and testing (NDEA V)	94,918	66,059	50,000	0	68,974
Subtotal, elementary and secondary education	4,456,361	4,105,491	4,183,638	3,783,761	4,990,213
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Maintenance and operations (Public Law 81-874)	8,756,000	9,117,000	5,172,000	5,741,000	10,735,000
Construction (Public Law 81-815)		1,785,000		0	0
Subtotal, SAFA	8,756,000	10,902,000	5,172,000	5,741,000	10,735,000
Education professions development: Preschool, elementary, and secondary:					
Grants to States (EPDA B-2)		137,551	156,823	156,823	156,823
Training programs (EPDA, pts. C and D)	569,568			0	0
Subtotal, education professions development	569,568	137,551	156,823	156,823	156,823
Teachers Corps	161,025	211,201		0	0
Higher education:					
Program assistance:					
Strengthening developing institutions (HEA III)	139,266			0	0
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts (Bankhead-Jones)	165,040	162,092	165,047	165,047	156,047
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources (HEA VI-A)	51,362	58,366		0	0
Construction:					
Public community, colleges and technical institutes (HEFA I, sec. 103)	276,813	327,314	169,240	169,240	169,240
Other undergraduate facilities (HEFA I, sec. 104)	857,813	547,034	357,621	0	127,380
Graduate facilities (HEFA II)	841,520			0	0
State administration and planning (HEFA I, sec. 105)	20,269	51,522	51,522	51,522	51,522
Educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A)	196,000	55,099	265,182	265,182	195,295
Direct loans (NDEA II)	272,454	328,050	545,627	545,627	781,953
Insured loans:					
Advances for reserve funds	17,365	56,820		0	0
Interest payments	(1)			0	0
Work-study programs (HEA IV-C)	542,283	481,321	504,241	504,345	504,345
Special programs for disadvantaged students: Talent search	71,837			0	0
Personnel development:					
College teacher fellowships (NDEA IV)	485,800			0	0
Training programs (EPDA, pt. E)				0	0
Subtotal, higher education	3,937,722	2,067,618	2,058,480	1,700,963	1,985,782
Vocational education:					
Basic grants	1,009,303	1,000,869	943,321	943,321	1,449,742
Innovation			210,047	210,047	210,047
Work-study	43,311			0	43,289
Cooperative education			214,090	214,090	214,090
Consumer and homemaking education			59,523	59,523	59,523
Subtotal, vocational education	1,052,614	1,000,869	1,426,981	1,426,981	1,976,691
Libraries and community services:					
Grants for public library services (LSCA I)	203,338	203,338	203,338	142,449	203,338
Construction of public libraries (LSCA II)	320,520	140,944	97,206	0	97,206
Interlibrary cooperation (LSCA III)	40,473	40,560	40,560	40,560	40,560
State institutional library services (LSCA IV-A)	38,000	39,509	39,509	39,509	39,509
Library services for physically handicapped (LSCA IV-B)	23,750	25,049	25,049	25,049	25,049
College library resources (HEA II-A)	55,822			0	0
Librarian training (HEA II-B)	141,163			0	0
University community service programs (HEA I)	117,338	115,728	115,728	115,728	115,728
Adult basic education (Adult Education Act):					
Grants to States	211,515	235,281	251,540	251,540	251,540
Special projects and teacher education				0	0
Educational broadcasting facilities				0	0
Subtotal, libraries and community centers	1,151,919	800,409	772,930	614,835	773,118

OBLIGATIONS IN THE STATE OF HAWAII—Continued

Program	Actual, 1968	Estimate, 1969	Estimate, 1970	Nixon estimate 1970	House passed appropriation bill
Education for the handicapped:					
Preschool and school programs for the handicapped (ESEA VI)	$100,000	$113,023	$113,023	$113,023	$113,023
Teacher education and recruitment	115,744			0	0
Research and innovation				0	0
Media services and captioned films for the deaf	3,225			0	0
Subtotal, education for the handicapped	218,969	113,023	113,023	113,023	113,023
Research and training:					
Research and development:					
Educational laboratories				0	0
Research and development centers				0	0
General education	237,965			0	0
Vocational education	41,872	25,334	15,000	15,000	15,000
Evaluations				0	0
National achievement study				0	0
Dissemination				0	0
Training				0	0
Statistical surveys				0	0
Construction				0	0
Subtotal, research and training	279,837	25,334	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	203,182			0	0
Civil rights education				0	0
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts (2d Morrill Act)	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Promotion of vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act)	31,661				
Student loan insurance fund	1,000			0	0
Higher education facilities loan fund				0	0
Total, Office of Education	20,869,858	19,413,496	13,948,875	13,602,386	20,795,650

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ADDRESSES THE GREATER YOUNGSTOWN COLUMBUS DAY BANQUET

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY of New York, before the Greater Youngstown Columbus Day Banquet on October 12, 1969.

It was fitting and proper for the 20 Italo-American organizations which participated in the celebration to invite as their principal speaker the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY. Congressman MURPHY was one of the cosponsors of the Monday holiday bill, which beginning in 1971 and thereafter, will make Columbus Day a national legal holiday to be celebrated on the second Monday in October.

I have the privilege of serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with Congressman MURPHY, and he represents with dedication and devotion the people of America on that committee.

He is also a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where he is making a tremendous contribution to the important legislation that comes before that committee.

Congressman MURPHY is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He has an honorary doctor of laws degree from Sung Kyun Kwan University of Seoul, Korea.

Mr. MURPHY has given outstanding service in the U.S. Army for which he has been awarded the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Bronze Star with V and Oak Leaf Cluster, a Commendation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Parachute Badge, the Korean Service Medal with six battle stars and the Chungmu Distinguished Service Medal. He was discharged as a captain in July 1956.

Congressman MURPHY is a member of many civic and fraternal organizations and is the father of three children. He was elected to the 88th Congress, and was reelected to the 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses.

I commend the Italo-American organizations for inviting this distinguished American to participate in their Columbus Day festivities.

Congressman MURPHY's speech follows:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE GREATER YOUNGSTOWN COLUMBUS DAY BANQUET, OCTOBER 12, 1969

It gives me great pleasure to be here in the City of Youngstown to meet with the Greater Youngstown Columbus Day Committee and the sponsoring organizations to honor the accomplishments and memory of Christopher Columbus.

I am also so greatly pleased to be in the district of my dear friend and colleague Congressman Michael Kirwan.

In my eight years in the Congress I have received so much good advice and guidance from Mike that my ability to represent my district, my State and nation has been greatly enhanced. Mike has a habit of looking out for some of the younger Members and we so appreciate the benefit of his superlative ideals and wisdom.

It's interesting to note that in the last two decades, Mike is the only Member of Congress to have over-ridden a Presidential veto in both the House and the Senate. He has a unique, persuasive ability and calm logic that makes it difficult to disagree with his position.

His concern for Youngstown and his congressional district is legendary in the Congress. Many of us came to feel that Youngstown is a part of our interest as well.

Mike has always told us to keep our think factories working and when he urges us to move in a certain direction we usually "get the point he makes." Rarely, if ever, a disciple of the "Mike Kirwan philosophy" "puts on the rabbit" when a difficult issue confronts the Congress.

He has often spoken to me of Bill Cafaro in his most endearing terms—"he's one of the best". Your outstanding Mayor Anthony Flask is another one of the best from this outstanding district. It is also a pleasure for me to be sharing this delicious dinner with Father Louis Latina who was my next-door neighbor at St. Charles Seminary where I had the privilege to attend his ordination.

The western world owes a debt of gratitude to Christopher Columbus for his legacy of courage, hope and perserverance—for his faith in a dream and a goal—and, indeed, in himself—when other men of less mettle gave way to despair or cynical mockery. And we must make sure that we ourselves do not forget, and that our sons and daughters learn and remember, how the inexhaustible energy of this one man brought together, in a contact never again to be broken, the two halves of the globe.

In addition to being the man who discovered the new world, Columbus became the first Italian-American, the first of a long line of Italians who contributed so much to the development of this Nation.

ROUTE OF COLUMBUS STOOD THE TEST OF TIME

In the nearly five centuries since Columbus, millions of Italian immigrants, and immigrants from every other nation in the world, have followed the trail he marked, and it has been to our advantage as a nation not only that they chose to settle on our shores, but that they shared the courage and determination which Columbus possessed to such a high degree.

While the Italian-Americans did not face the uncertainties of sailing on unknown seas, they often faced adversities which tested to the fullest their ability to survive and prosper. But a casual look through Who's Who will show that they passed that test with the higest marks. American history is replete with the names of Italian immigrants who played leading roles in every important field: Fermi, Volta, LaGuardia, Gianini, Toscanini and Procaccino, are just a few.

There have been others, both before and after Columbus, who shared with him certain qualities of greatness. The first man to reach the top of Mt. Everest, the first to reach the North Pole, the first to fly across the Atlantic, and the first men to set foot on the moon—all of these men shared the same driving impulse, the same inquisitive minds, the same vision and the same free spirit which lead Columbus to our shores nearly five centuries ago.

These were men who dreamed not of what is, but what ought to be; men who drove themselves not to the limits of their endurance, but a little bit further; men who looked not to the horizon, but beyond.

What drives men like this is difficult to say. Partly it is the spirit that drives men to climb that proverbial mountain for no other reason than "because it's there."

Partly it is the inexhaustable search for knowledge that has led mankind through the pages of history at ever-increasing speed.

What makes Columbus and others like him unique, however, is not just the fact of their discovery, but the fact that they were the first. The second man to cross the Atlantic and land in the new world faced most of the same difficulties as Columbus, but does anyone remember his name? Does anyone remember the name of the second man to climb Everest, or the second man to fly the Atlantic?

Someday we might have a proper celebration for the number two's of our history to give them the recognition they deserve. It seems to me that "Avis Day" would be a proper title for the celebration.

The real difference is between men who follow maps, and men who make their own maps as they go. Columbus and the men like him charted their own destinies. Where they went, the only footprints were those they left behind.

Probably the greatest discovery since Columbus is the recent moon landing by our own astronauts. Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins showed that regardless of whether man sails the Atlantic Ocean and sets foot in the new world or whether he sails the Sea of Tranquility and sets foot on the moon, his spirit of adventure is much the same.

There are differences, of course. The voyage by Columbus was supported by only a few people, while the majority were either uninformed, indifferent, or openly hostile to the adventure. Our spacemen were part of a national effort requiring the efforts of thousands of men and women and billions of dollars, with the enthusiastic support of the vast majority of Americans. It was months before anyone knew of Columbus' success; the first step on the moon was watched live by people around the world. Times have changed, and the space age has become a mirror for that change.

One thing common to both Columbus and the astronauts, however, is the response by a small group of people who would rather walk backwards through history. There were those after Columbus who must have said: "Well, we know the world is not flat now, so let's stop playing games and start solving our own problems here at home."

Sound familiar? It should. Today we hear similar voices of those who want to abandon the space program now that we have landed on the moon. Of course, the desire and the necessity to solve problems here at home cannot be challenged by responsible men. But we are working to solve our problems, and certainly the two can exist side by side. There is no reason to stop all other endeavors until we reach utopia here at home, whatever that might be. A nation that ceases to inquire into the unknown can never survive the rapid change of time.

I would point out as well that while most people believed the world was round after Columbus, it was not until recently that one group would accept this fact. You may have read about that lonesome little group of diehards who had organized to fight the notion that the world was, indeed, round.

The day after our astronauts sent back pictures from outer space of the earth which, lo and behold, was round, a news article appeared in our press stating that the majority of the members of that "earth is flat" club had decided that maybe it wasn't flat after all. We will never convince all of the people all of the time.

And so, almost 500 years after Columbus, the march of progress takes its final toll on yet another link with the past. Such is the price we pay for our spirit of adventure.

America, and the rest of the world, will always face adversity; such is the reality of a changing world. But one constant factor if we are to survive must be our incessant quest and determination to seek knowledge about our environment and to accept the challenge of solving our problems. We must never say never.

Western man has made mistakes; he faces the possibility of self-destruction. And yet, his accomplishments have been such as to offer a prospect for hope—for the redemption of past failures with future success undreamed of by men of Columbus' time; for a life of universal abundance and harmony and for a decent life in which all men may have the opportunity to attain the fullness of their potential.

So let us today, in paying tribute to the descendants of Italians, and to the man who made possible Italian-Americans, and the United States of America, always remember the questing spirit of Western man as typified by Christopher Columbus.

Arriverdeci Youngstown.

COMMITTEE AND SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

COMMITTEE

Atty. Joseph Schiavoni, Chairman.
Carmelo C. Foti, Treasurer.
Mary Nudo, Secretary.
Carmelo Foti, Michael Pope, John Trimboli, Co-Chairmen.
John Eorio, Frank Napoli, James Battafarano, Julian Altier, Carl LaRubbio, Don Marsco, Mary Ferguson, Anthony Senabaldi.
Edith Gambrel, Pasquale Leone, Fred Gioglio, Atty. Armond L. Rossi, Joseph Garea, Alex DiBlasio, Lucille Phillips, Elizabeth DeSerio.

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

Italian-American War Veterans Posts 3, 10 and 27.
Adua Lodge, Hubbard, Ohio.
Agnonese Club, Youngstown, Ohio.
Arco Club.
Amerital Club.
Bella Piemonte, Girard, Ohio.
Bella Vinezia, Youngstown, Ohio.
Calabrese Club.
Columbia Lodge.
Duca Degli Abruzzi Colombo Society.
Freedom Lodge.
Giardina d'Italia.
Giuseppe Verdi Lodge.
Gloria d'Italia, Lowellville, Ohio.
Italamer Club.
American Committee on Italian Migration.
Latin Culture Foundation.
Mt. Carmel Lodge.
Neapolitan Society.
Youngstown Lodge No. 858, Order Sons of Italy.
Alba Lodge.
Knights of Columbus.
Sons of Columbus.
Wolves Club Den VI.
Holy Name, St. Anthony Church.
Vestibule Club, Mt. Carmel Church.
Holy Name, Mt. Carmel Church.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH DELEGATES OF THE NORTH VIETNAMESE

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my concern, alarm and indignation over the callous acts of individual American citizens connected with the so-called peace forces, in making repeated contacts with representatives of the North Vietnamese, particularly in the area of negotiations concerning prisoners of war. When U.S. troops are fighting and dying in Vietnam, no American citizen should be permitted to undermine our Government's effort. This past August, Rennie Davis, one of the founders of the revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society who accompanied three American prisoners of war home from North Vietnam, endeavored to use some 50 letters from other imprisoned Americans as propaganda for the purpose of undermining this country's defense effort. Davis was thwarted in his attempt to obtain some propaganda value from the letters when Time magazine refused to publish them. This week, Attorney William M. Kunstler, said to be acting for his clients, David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, met with North Vietnamese delegates in Paris. Kunstler's subsequent public pronouncements indicated that through him the North Vietnamese gave concessions of a more regular flow of mail from the prisoners and data on the prisoners' health.

Kunstler indicated his action was purely humanitarian in nature. However, after delving into this matter, I submit that the facts do not substantiate his claim. I call attention to the fact that his client, David Dellinger, self-admitted non-Soviet-type Communist, at the request of the militant Black Panther Party has previously announced the possibility of releasing U.S. military prisoners in North Vietnam if and when the United States unconditionally released Black Panther Party leaders Bobby Seale and Huey Newton. Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver, who fled this country as a fugitive from justice, has been in consultation with the North Vietnamese in regard to this matter. The political import the Black Panther Party is placing on this matter is that Seale and Newton are not simply "political prisoners" but prisoners of war because "it is a military policy the U.S. Government utilizes against the Black Panther Party." Dellinger and Davis asked to be allowed to go to Paris to discuss the exchange of American prisoners of war for the freedom of Black Panther Party leaders Seale and Newton but, Judge Hoffman, who is presiding over their conspiracy trial in Chicago growing out of disturbances during the Democratic National Convention in August 1968, denied permission. Lawyer Kunstler went instead. I am confident that the exchange contemplated by Dellinger would never be permitted to materialize but in view of what previously happened I submit that Kunstler cannot validly claim that his motives are purely humanitarian.

Perhaps a speech made by Kunstler at the United Front Against Fascism Conference sponsored by the Black Panther Party which was held in Oakland, Calif., July 18 to 21, 1969, and printed in the July 26, 1969, issue of the Black Panther, official organ of the Black Panther Party, will give some insight concerning Mr. Kunstler. During his speech, Kunstler in speaking of the murder of white police officer John Gleason in Plainfield, N.J., during a racial uprising in that city, stated:

> The crowd, justifiably, without the necessity of a trial and in the most dramatic way possible, stomped him (Gleason) to death.

In view of Kunstler's close relationship with the Panthers, I do not think they

would publish something concerning him that was not true. I have no information that Kunstler has made any effort to repudiate the statement attributed to him and in addition, I have been advised by a highly reliable source who was present during Kunstler's speech that Kunstler did, in fact, make this statement.

It seems absolutely incredible and reprehensible in view of Mr. Kunstler's past activities that he should be able to obstruct the conduct of our foreign affairs during wartime. The U.S. Government is now in the servile and degrading position of having to rely on Kunstler and his associates for further prisoner-of-war information. Hanoi intends to send American prisoner-of-war mail to an office which the Communist-saturated New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—sponsor of the forthcoming November 15, 1969, "March Against Death"—is establishing to process the mail and forward it to relatives. This tactic is utilized by the enemy to lower the morale of the American people and to humiliate the Government and people of the United States.

While I can readily understand the desires of bereaved families of American prisoners of war to obtain whatever information is available concerning the prisoners, it is important that the American people know that the activity, such as engaged in by Kunstler, is nothing short of a callous propaganda act designed to improve the image of the defendants and other associates of the same ilk. In addition, such activity is designed to divide the American society. The treatment and release of our prisoners of war should be the concern of all Americans, but it is clearly not an area for barter to be engaged in by citizens of the United States to advance the interests of forces hostile to our Nation.

The Logan Act which appears to provide a base for prosecution of Kunstler for his action has not been utilized and, as a matter of fact, I do not recall any instance where this statute has been applied to penalize such conduct. The Logan Act provides that:

> Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without the authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measure or conduct of any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

The Logan Act may be inadequate to provide an enforceable base for prosecuting Kunstler. There have been numerous instances during the Korean and present war when individuals such as Kunstler have corresponded and met with representatives of foreign governments for purposes inimicable to the interests of the United States. Inasmuch as not one single prosecution has been initiated under the Logan Act, and for other reasons, I must conclude that responsible officials feel it is not a suitable vehicle for coping with such activities.

This conduct has shocked the conscience of the Nation, and raised grave misgivings in the minds of many citizens whose sons are being called upon to die, if necessary, in the performance of their duties in the Armed Forces of this country. Our laws must be up-dated and strengthened to cope with the problems with which we are currently faced. The situation does not promise to ameliorate, but to become increasingly aggravated in the future. Kunstler's action last week, I believe, is but a prologue of what may be anticipated. We cannot dismiss this act as "humanitarian" or purely an isolated incident. If we are not prepared to suppress this activity in its infancy, we shall be faced with greater problems. If we value our liberties, as we do, we shall not permit any impairment of our national security while powerful forces, avowedly hostile to our society, are preparing to make us their victim.

I have introduced today a bill designed to make punishable certain activities affecting captive personnel of the U.S. Armed Forces. Specifically, it prohibits correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government with which United States is engaged in armed conflict, respecting any matter in controversy affecting the disposition, captivity, or detention of military or naval personnel of the United States with intent to influence or aid such foreign government or to interfere with the operation of the military or naval forces of the United States and to promote the success of their enemies. This bill does not provide for a blanket prohibition. For example, it would not prohibit the families of prisoners of war or persons specifically authorized by the President or Secretary of State from making contact with a foreign government.

I call upon this House to take quick, positive action on my proposed legislation.

BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, attorneys are officers of the court. As such, it is their solemn duty under oath to uphold the judicial process.

On isolated occasions, perhaps carried away by emotion engendered by partisan attachment to a cause, they may be guilty of occasional impropriety which in the discretion of the court can be overlooked or dismissed with a reprimand. When attorneys become willfully and repetitively contemptuous of the judicial process, of the judge, the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association, of all of the things that the organized bar has provided in an effort to assure the public that the practice of law shall be conducted with propriety and restraint, it is time that they be disciplined.

There is no obligation on attorneys to represent clients who flatly refuse to abide by the rules of the court. In fact, the obligation is to decline and to tell such individuals that their cause will be presented under the rules or it will not be presented. After all, it is one of the signal strengths of this union that we are a government of law and not of men. No individual, and in particular, no attorney at law, has the right, either morally or legally, to declare that he in his cause is above or beyond the law.

The conduct and statements of Attorney William Kunstler in the so-called Chicago 8 conspiracy trial require disciplinary action by the bar. Mr. Kunstler should be suspended from practice forthwith. Unless he reforms and agrees to abide by the rules of practice that apply to all attorneys he should be permanently disbarred.

History records that occasionally movements to reform society have included calls to get rid of lawyers. Sober reflection impels the conclusion that as long as there are people there will be causes and that the need for advocacy continues whether the advocates are called lawyers, ombudsmen, or something else.

Unfortunately, the bar has its share of shysters, fakers, and ambulance chasers. The bar can deal with the former and in a certain measure with the latter. The public will measure the fakers, which takes time. However, it is the solemn obligation of the bar to protect itself against repeated willfully contemptuous conduct such as that of Attorney Kunstler, wherever and whenever it may occur in our judicial system.

His threats to the court, his participation in a calculated exercise to create a mockery of the judicial process, his inflammatory and provocative incitement to violence in and out of the courtroom, his public record of activity while a member of the bar is incompatible with his obligation as an officer of the court. The organized bar, and the American Bar Association in particular, owes it to the people and to its public image to act promptly and effectively to suspend attorneys who conduct themselves in this manner. If these attorneys fail to reform within a probationary period they should be permanently disbarred. I urge ABA President Bernard Segal of Philadelphia to take prompt and effective action to protect the bar and our people from this continuing abuse of process.

Anything less will result in the total erosion of public confidence in the law. Such confidence is already at a low ebb. The antics of counsel on public display, such as those in the Chicago trial, cannot be permitted to continue undisciplined or it is a fair conclusion on the part of John Q. Public that bar associations are more interested in protecting their own than in protecting the people of the United States. This is not the case but the hour is late for responsible action to bring to an end the disgraceful conduct of Kunstler and any other attorneys to follow.

By way of background I include at this point this morning's Washington Post report of the goings-on in Chicago:

> CURSES, ACCUSATIONS ROCK CHICAGO 8 TRIAL
>
> (By William Chapman)
>
> CHICAGO, October 30.—More courtroom disruptions, including the muffled shouts of a bound and gagged defendant, brought the Chicago Eight conspiracy trial close to pandemonium today.
>
> Gagged and strapped to his chair, Black Panther leader Bobby Seale mumbled curses at the judge while fellow defendants shouted

and lawyers accused each other of unethical conduct.

After one scuffle in which his gag came off Seale shouted an obscenity at U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman and called out: "You fascist dog—you rotten low-life son of a gun."

Marshals reached down to restrain him and to strap down an arm that had come loose as other defendants began shouting that Seale was being attacked.

"They're beating Bobby," yelled David Dellinger, veteran leader of the antiwar movement. Another defendant, Yippie leader Jerry Rubin, claimed Seale was elbowed in the mouth and struck in the groin. Rubin was shoved back several feet by a marshal.

Defense attorney William Kunstler moved to the lectern to tell Judge Hoffman, "I just feel so ashamed to be an American lawyer at this point." Judge Hoffman replied, "You should feel ashamed—of your conduct in this trial."

Seale was taken from the room and a new gag applied. When he was returned the judge told the jury to disregard the incidents and explained that he was trying "each day to discharge my obligations under the law . . . to assure a fair trial."

Seale began grunting loudly. "I ask you to refrain from making those noises," said the judge. More muffled grunts. "I order you to stop those noises," Hoffman insisted.

With his gag partially off again, Seale began shouting, "The judge is lying." A luncheon recess followed.

At a news conference during the noon recess, Rubin displayed a note that he said Seale had written. The note read: "Tell all the Brothers & Sisters I said cool it everywhere. Just spread the word about injustice on the part of Hoffman and the U.S. Court room."

The afternoon was relatively quiet after Judge Hoffman told Seale he would have to "deal appropriately" with further outbursts. Seale wrote a note in which he said he wanted to defend himself in court and argue motions "as any defendants or citizens of America may do".

But at the close of the day, Seale shouted again through his gag: "I want a chance to examine the witness. My constitutional rights have been violated."

Judge Hoffman warned him, "Time is running out. If you persist, the court will have to deal with it in an appropriate manner."

There was no indication what further measures the judge would—or could—take. He had ordered Seale shackled and gagged yesterday after the black leader repeatedly shouted demands to be allowed to conduct his own defense.

Seale has claimed he is not represented by the two defense lawyers, although one of them, Kunstler, formally filed a notice of appearing in his behalf before the trial started. The lawyer Seale prefers, Charles R. Garry of San Francisco, has been ill and unable to participate. Judge Hoffman has refused requests to delay the trial until Garry has recuperated from an operation.

The only alternative discipline available to the judge seemed to be an order excluding Seale from the courtroom. But the Seventh U.S. Court of Appeals here has ruled that exclusion of a defendant is unconstitutional, and told a trial judge he should have had an unruly defendant bound and gagged in court to preserve order.

There was some speculation that Judge Hoffman might order Seale kept in a cell anyway, having demonstrated that binding and gagging him did not prevent disruptions.

There is legal precedent for binding and gagging disruptive defendants. Two persons among 15 defendants in a narcotics trial seven years ago were ordered restrained in that manner by a U.S. District judge in New York.

A U.S. Court of Appeals upheld their conviction and the Supreme Court refused to review it. The appellate court decisions said: "There was no abuse of discretion in the trial judge's action, taken to preserve security of the courtroom, ordering two defendants gagged and shackled after one had climbed into the jury box and pushed jurors and another had thrown a chair at an assistant United States Attorney."

At one point yesterday, Kunstler, the chief defense attorney, asked Judge Hoffman to refer the behavior of the marshals and the binding and gagging of Seale to the U.S. Judicial Conference, the administrative arm of federal courts.

"If you don't, we will," Kunstler told Hoffman.

"Don't you threaten this court and a district judge who has practiced law and been on state and federal benches for many years," Hoffman shot back.

"When a judge with all that experience has to sit here and have a defendant call him 'pig' . . ." Hoffman continued, but Seale interrupted again with muffled protests.

"Listen to him now," Hoffman said. "You take that to the Judicial Conference or anywhere you choose."

At another point, the other defense lawyer, Leonard I. Weinglass, asked Judge Hoffman to poll the jurors on whether they felt they could continue "orderly deliberation" while one defendant sits before them bound and gagged.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Richard Schultz called Weinglass' request "one of the grossest attempts" to influence the jury, which was present when the request was made. Hoffman refused to poll the jury.

The 10 female and two male jurors were led in and out of the courtroom repeatedly as the judge sought to prevent them from hearing the outbursts and arguments this morning. But several incidents took place in the jury's presence.

Several jurors seemed visibly upset by the scene. They occasionally cast quick glances in Seale's direction, but for the most part appeared reluctant to look at him.

A MOVE TO VETO JUSTICE

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Chicago Sun Times reiterates the fact that justice should not be available only to those who can afford it. Justice should be guaranteed to all American citizens.

Unfortunately, the OEO legal services program, which has been extremely successful in providing legal assistance to the poor, has been endangered by a Senate amendment which would threaten the delivery of such assistance to the poor.

As a lawyer and as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have been impressed with the achievements of the neighborhood legal services programs conceived and funded by OEO. Such action should not be allowed to stand. We must do all we can to be sure that the poor continue to get the expert legal representation which OEO has been providing. Admittedly, there is some temporary discomfort in having legal services lawyers challenge existing institutions which have traditionally shortchanged the poor. But yielding to that irritation by putting shackles on the legal services efforts would, I am convinced, result in a longterm calamity for this Nation.

The Senate amendment removes from the Director of OEO his power to override a Governor's veto when he feels such action is in the best interest of poor clients. Such action should not be allowed to stand. We must do all we can to be sure that the poor continue to get the expert legal representation which OEO has been providing.

A Move To Veto Justice

Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.) has pushed through the Senate an amendment that would give governors the right to veto any legal service activity offered within their states by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The amendment is attached to a money authorization bill that must go to the House, and, legislatively, there will be a chance to erase the folly.

Nonetheless, the move definitely endangers the legal services program, which has become one of OEO's true successes. OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld will need all the allies he can muster.

The legal services program has brought to the poor and harassed something they have not historically experienced: expert legal representation and protection of the law in both minor and major matters. Naturally, the program—staffed by 1,800 eager and persistent attorneys—has made enemies. It has done so because the lawyers often step on establishment toes.

One of the luminaries sent limping on occasion is Murphy's friend and former screen colleague, Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Reagan has been sorely troubled by migrant workers demanding reform down on the farm. He has been at least as sorely troubled by the OEO legal assistance given these workers.

For example, as Tom Littlewood of The Sun-Times Washington Bureau pointed out Monday, these attorneys "resisted the importation of Mexican braceros to pick the tomato crop thwarted Reagan's cutback in medical care for the needy aged and blocked a school district from closing classes so the students could help with the grape harvest."

Reagan, of course, is not the only state official to feel the impact of the OEO efforts, and the lawyers themselves have rubbed a little salt in the sore spots. Rumsfeld appointee Terry F. Lenzner, head of the legal services program, said he plans to broaden the scope of legal assistance activities to community questions such as poor garbage pickup, bad street lighting or other "misallocation of resources."

And in August a group of poverty lawyers banded together to "oppose and resist political . . . or other interference in the effective representation of our clients who are indigent."

The poor need this tough-minded help, for justice should not belong only to those who can afford it. Let's hope a few voices are raised to that effect in Congress.

A CALL FOR SENATE ACTION ON THE BILL TO REVISE THE DRAFT SYSTEM

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

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday considered and passed legislation which affects the lives of all our young men who must still face the possibility of military service. There is little doubt that the draft concerns

more individuals in a personal way than virtually any other Federal program.

Through the years our draft system has become a hodge-podge of rules and regulations which have created some most unjust situations. Too often we have heard from the young man who has volunteered for military service only to be turned down for physical reasons, and then, later, drafted and told that he has met the standards. Frequently we have heard similar stories about men who were turned down because of failure to reach certain educational standards, only to be found acceptable under other standards when drafted.

I know we are all cognizant of the fact that one of our greatest responsibilities is to the young men of America. We owe these people the opportunity to plan their future with a degree of certainty. Our present draft laws deny this right to the majority of the young men of our country. President Nixon has recognized the need for substantive change in the draft law and has made proposals that we bring greater equity to the system. The House yesterday provided the legal instrument that will allow the President to implement his reform.

The bill which we have passed will remove the final roadblock in the way of the President's plan to revise the system. We can soon have a draft that will take the youngest first by a system of random selection that will reduce the period of uncertainty from 7 years to 1 year or less. We can soon have a complete study of the policies of deferment and exemption that have grown at the local level. This review of guidelines, standards, and procedures by the National Security Council and the Director of the Selective Service should be carried out swiftly with the least delay possible. It is one of the most important aspects of the President's plan for change.

Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to learn from this morning's news that the Senate leadership has apparently decided not to consider this or any other draft legislation during the current session of the Congress. I am extremely disappointed in this news because I feel that we owe more to the young men of America than mere lipservice to their problems. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the leadership of the Senate will move forward in consideration of the House bill. The strength of our form of government rests to great degree on the confidence that the people have in their legislators. I hope that we can merit the confidence of our draft age citizens by showing through legislative action that we are concerned for their future. Favorable consideration of the House passed bill is the least that can be done to show the young men of America that we do care.

AIR TRAVELERS DESERVE MORE U.S.-ORIENT SERVICE TO JAPAN

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the United States and Japan have reached agreement on an air route between Tokyo-Anchorage-New York, not including Seattle and Chicago.

This action came as a disappointment to Washington State interests since, geographically, Seattle is the nearest big-city gateway to Japan. And, while this has been overlooked, the oversight can be rectified next year.

The State Department has assured Seattle interests that it will consider Seattle's position in 1970 negotiations with the Japanese, and accordingly, I have, this day, sent a letter to the State Department strongly urging that they give such consideration to Seattle as a gateway to the Orient and that I be kept informed of any moves they make in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, air-route decisions can overlook geography just so long. With the advent of 747's and, in a few years, supersonic transports, passengers will want the shortest possible nonstop routes. The first step in improving Seattle's status should be taken through a regional agreement to seek flight rights through Seattle for Japan Air Lines and a U.S. airline.

Presently there is just one Seattle-Tokyo combination carrier. The main thrust of transpacific air travel now is by way of the island-hopping central Pacific, about 1,200 miles longer. Three-carrier competition through the Seattle gateway, coupled with a badly needed reduction in Pacific fares, and fares based on mileage, could place Seattle in its rightful role as the Nation's leading transpacific gateway.

But, the next move is up to our Government, and, again, I trust the State Department will be true to its word in keeping Seattle's geography and the world's air travelers in mind during the 1970 negotiations with the Japanese on air routes to the United States.

ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, I took the floor to comment briefly on what seemed to me an untenable attack on business by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. I was disturbed by statements of the Attorney General and his staff that they were going to move to block mergers of large companies on the basis of "economic concentration." It appeared to me to be an attack on "bigness," despite the absence of a legal basis for such a position.

It was my feeling then, as it is now, that if there are social or economic dangers inherent in concentration or in the current conglomerate trend, it is the duty and obligation of Congress to examine the situation, and after a review of the facts, pass such legislation as necessary. Certainly, in the absence of specific law, the Justice Department oversteps its bounds by pursuing the "bigness is bad" philosophy, which has been rebuffed time and time again in the courts.

I take the floor today to point out to my colleagues that last week a Federal court again made the point absolutely clear. On Tuesday, October 21, Chief Judge William H. Timbers, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, denied Government motions for a preliminary injunction to block the mergers of International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. with the Grinnell Corp., of Providence, and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford. The Justice Department has injected the issue of economic concentration in both of these cases.

My belief that the Justice Department's position, as espoused by its Antitrust Chief Richard McLaren, goes well beyond the scope of the existing law is substantiated by Judge Timbers' decision. He made plain his view that section 7 of the Clayton Act should not be wielded irresponsibly to cover efforts to block mergers on the basis of economic concentration.

To quote from a press release issued by the court:

> A key statement in Judge Timbers' decision rejects the government's argument regarding economic concentration. Pointing out that Section 7 of the Clayton Act "proscribes only those mergers the effect of which 'may be substantially to lessen competition', *not* those mergers the effect of which may be substantially to increase economic concentration," the Judge then concluded (Opinion, P. 71–72):
>
> "The alleged adverse effects of economic concentration brought about by merger activity, especially merger activity of large diversity corporations such as ITT, arguably may be such that, as a matter of social and economic policy, the standard by which the legality of a merger should be measured under the anti-trust laws is the degree to which it may increase economic concentration—not merely the degree to which it may lessen competition. If the standard is to be changed, however, in the opinion of this Court it is fundamental under our system of government that that determination be made by the Congress and not by the courts."

Judge Timbers' finding also adds validity to the warnings issued by President Nixon's Task Force on Productivity that the Justice Department should not take antitrust action against conglomerates on the basis of "nebulous fears about size and economic power."

Similarly, a panel of antitrust experts earlier had told President Johnson that antimerger attacks on large companies using the Clayton Act would have to be through "a contrived interpretation."

The Justice Department has been rebuffed twice in its attempt to extend the Clayton Act—in this case and earlier in the Northwest-Goodrich merger case.

In view of these court rulings and the expert advice of two study groups, I believe the time has come for the Justice Department to reconsider seriously its policies with regard to mergers.

If, as it claims, conglomerate mergers are causing economic and social harm, Congress is willing to hear the facts. As Judge Timbers said, it is a matter for Congress and not the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the press release issued by Judge Timbers in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES AGAINST ITT AND GRINNELL CORP., CIVIL NO. 13319, AND UNITED STATES AGAINST ITT AND THE HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO., CIVIL NO. 13320

(NOTE.—For the convenience of the press and other news media—in view of the length

of this opinion and the 6 p.m. release hour (after the closing of all stock exchanges in the United States, including those on the West coast)—here is a nutshell summary.)

NEW HAVEN, October 21.—Chief Judge William H. Timbers, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, today denied government motions for preliminary injunctions in two antitrust suits brought by the government to enjoin proposed acquisitions by ITT of the stock of Grinnell Corp of Providence and the stock of The Hartford Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford. Judge Timbers directed that "hold separate orders" be entered in both cases to preserve the status quo pending trial and decision on the merits.

The practical effect of this decision is that the companies will be free to consummate the mergers as soon as formal orders are entered one week from today; but pending the outcome of the trial on the merits, Grinnell and Hartford must be operated as separate companies and must make no changes in their operations which might hinder divestiture if ultimately ordered.

The ITT-Hartford and ITT-Grinnell mergers are said to constitute the largest combined merger in the history of the United States. With ITT's assets of $4,022,400,000, Hartford's assets of $1,891,700,000 and Grinnell's assets of $184,453,229, the resulting combine will have total assets in excess of $6 billion.

One result of the decision today to permit the mergers to be consummated is that the 18,661 stockholders of Hartford, will realize an aggregate gain of approximately $600,000,000; and Grinnell's 5,939 stockholders will realize an aggregate gain of about $75,000,000. If preliminary injunctions had been granted, ITT, as well as Hartford and Grinnell, had announced that the proposed mergers would have been terminated.

Judge Timbers' 77 page opinion filed late today, after a detailed analysis of the evidence introduced at the 5 day hearing in September, concludes—with respect to each of the government's claims that the proposed mergers would result in substantial lessening of competition—that the government has not sustained its burden of establishing a reasonable probability of success in proving its case on the merits at trial.

A key statement in Judge Timbers' decision rejects the government's argument regarding economic concentration. Pointing out that Section 7 of the Clayton Act "proscribes only those mergers the effect of which 'may be substantially to lessen competition', *not* those mergers the effect of which may be substantially to increase economic concentration," the Judge then concluded (Opinion, p. 71–72):

"The alleged adverse effects of economic concentration brought about by merger activity, especially merger activity of large diversified corporations such as ITT, arguably may be such that, as a matter of social and economic policy, the standard by which the legality of a merger should be measured under the antitrust laws is the degree to which it may increase economic concentration—not merely the degree to which it may lessen competition. If the standard is to be changed, however, in the opinion of this Court it is fundamental under our system of government that that determination be made by the Congress and not by the courts."

In deciding that "hold separate" orders should be entered, Judge Timbers stated (Opinion, p. 74):

"The Court has decided, however, in the exercise of its inherent equitable powers and pursuant to what it believes to be sound administration of federal justice, to condition the denial of preliminary injunctions upon the entry of appropriate hold separate orders to preserve the status quo pending hearing and decision of the case on their merits."

Judge Timbers' decision today denying the government's motions for preliminary injunctions cannot be appealed either to the U.S. Supreme Court or to the U.S. Court of Appeals. The government has stated that it will not seek to appeal the decision (Opinion, p. 74 n. 98). The only appeal in a government antitrust suit under Section 7 of the Clayton Act is from a final judgment *after trial*; and that appeal must be taken directly from the District Court to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Acknowledging the assistance of counsel for all parties, Judge Timbers stated, "The Court has been greatly assisted by the briefs, oral arguments and proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law from able counsel for all parties" (Opinion, p. 5). And he praised losing counsel for the government in these words (Opinion, p. 72):

"Government counsel on the instant preliminary injunction motions have demonstrated competence and diligence of the highest order in presenting the government's cases fully, fairly and at all times in keeping with the high professional standards of the Department of Justice."

WATSON COMMENDS PRINCETON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days, Princeton University students have been calling upon Members of Congress in an attempt to gain congressional support for an organization founded by them entitled, "Undergraduates for a Stable America," or USA.

I commend these very forthright and patriotic young Americans. Their program is designed to make the American people aware of the magnificent sacrifice being waged by our fighting men in Vietnam for the cause of freedom. Symbolically, they have chosen Veterans Day, November 11, as a time for Americans to demonstrate their support for these noble efforts by our men as well as the untiring devotion and dedication by President Nixon to find an honorable peace in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, these students certainly have my overwhelming support, and I believe that all Americans who truly want an honorable and just solution to the Vietnam war will also give them their support. I am proud that one of them, Ken Graham, is a resident of my congressional district. His parents, Dr. and Mrs. Bothwell Graham, are dear friends of mine, and they can be justly proud of their son.

These students are in marked contrast to the youthful radicals who organized and participated in the recent so-called Vietnam moratorium day. Instead of doing such despicable things as burning the U.S. flag, throwing garbage—real and verbal—at police officers, burning draft cards, and so forth, like some of their militant campus contemporaries, these students are doing something for their country and its efforts to keep Southeast Asia free from Communist tyranny.

While it is disturbing to see youthful militants degrade America, it is absolutely appalling when the old guard liberals join their ranks. A number of these, of course, are politicians who are seeking to capitalize politically on the antiwar sentiment. Their demagoguery is disgusting.

While I would always fight for the right of a person to dissent, it is most tragic when cynical public figures join hand in hand with the most notorious radical leftists, including Communists and anarchists, to undermine the morale of our troops in Vietnam. Whether intentional or not, they and others like them have aided the Communists, and I do not know of an American fighting man over there right now who would state differently. They have delivered a propaganda victory to Hanoi, and because of their tirades and opportunistic babbling, North Vietnam will continue to carry on this terrible war, operating under the illusion that most Americans subscribe to their unpatriotic handiwork.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting with a delegation from the Japanese Diet, here in the Capitol, with the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, chairman of our informal House Textile Committee, and the Honorable CHARLES JONAS, vice chairman of our group. Both Houses of the Japanese Diet were represented. The purpose of this meeting was to promote an understanding for the urgent need of a voluntary agreement limiting Japanese textile imports to the United States.

The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM), informed our Japanese friends that legislation providing for mandatory quotas would be initiated in the House; and he predicted it would pass unless Japan, with a favorable textile trade balance of $1.2 billion in 1968, manifests more interest in a voluntary agreement limiting her textile exports to the United States in all categories, including manmade fiber, woolen goods, and blends as well as cotton, to reasonable levels with a proviso that they and other exporting nations share the future growth of our market.

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking much of our Japanese friends. We are only seeking orderly trade in textiles covering all categories which would be to the mutual advantage of both the United States and Japan. As so many times in the past with representatives from Japan, the Japanese Diet delegation was under the erroneous impression that the American textile industry was not really hurting from Japanese imports.

Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary is true. The American textile industry is hurting badly. The condition grows progressively worse. We had been hoping that a voluntary agreement with Japan would have been reached long before now. The entire textile market is threatened. Only a moment ago I received the following release from the Abney Mills:

NEWS RELEASE

GREENWOOD, S.C., October 29, 1969.—Abney Mills announced today that it will discontinue the operation of approximately 2,000 narrow looms at its Brandon Plant.

It will continue to operate in this mill approximately five hundred 50" X-3 looms, along with the necessary supporting equipment.

The 300 people involved in the reduction will be offered employment in the other 14 Abney plants, including the new Sally Plant just coming into full production.

Management said this decision was reluctantly reached after much study. The overall depressed condition of the textile market, due to imports and adverse economic conditions, made the move necessary.

This release follows the closing of 1,911 looms and 80,496 spindles at another Abney plant in Anderson, S.C., located in my congressional district, only a few months ago. Also, Mr. Speaker, here is another letter that arrived in my office a moment ago from a good American and textile employee. Mr. Lenwood W. Melton works in the finishing plant of the Graniteville Co. It has been years since this particular plant has run less than 6 days a week.

The letter follows:

GRANITEVILLE, S.C.
October 24, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DORN: From recent articles I have read in magazines and newspapers, I find that you are working towards improving the textile imports in our country. I appreciate all efforts that you are making for me in Washington.

Recently Graniteville Company posted on the Bulletin Board an article which appeared in the *Textile Chemist and Colorist* published August 27, 1969, stating that imports for this year are 13% ahead of 1968 and that in the "blend program" are 32% ahead.

I work in the finishing plant of Graniteville Company in Graniteville, South Carolina. For a number of years we have been running six days. In recent months, however, we have been on short time due to the business situation. Since textile wages are among the lowest in the country, other industries may be able to survive on short time but we cannot. The loss of money in my weekly earnings, plus the inflation running wild in this country is putting me in a very bad financial position. What I am trying to say is that my fellow employees and I need to work six days to provide for our families.

Please continue your efforts in Washington on behalf of the textile industry in our country.

Very truly yours,
LENWOOD W. MELTON.

Mr. Speaker, Dan River Mills, one of our great textile firms, closed three mills in Alabama a few months ago and are now closing two mills in Clifton, S.C. They are seriously curtailing in several other plants. The following article is a cold hard fact of the depressed textile market in this country due principally to imports from Japan:

[From the Daily News Record, Oct. 28, 1969]

DAN RIVER SUFFERS $248,000 LOSS IN QUARTER

GREENVILLE, S.C.—A combination of low volume, unsatisfactory fabric prices and higher costs brought about a third-quarter net loss of $248,000 for Dan River Mills, Inc., the company said Monday.

This contrasted with a net profit of $1,656,000 or 28 cents a share for the like period of last year.

The loss dropped earnings for the 39 weeks ended Sept. 27 54.5 per cent to $2,661,000, or 43 cents a share, from $5,852,000, or $1 a share for the period of 1968.

Sales for the quarter increased 5 per cent but showed a 1.1 per cent decrease for the 39 weeks. The quarter net sales totaled $69,916,000, against $66,564,000, while the 39-week volume was $215,453,000 compared with $217,768,000 a year earlier.

The sales and earnings of Morganton Hosiery Mills, Inc., are included in the figures for this year, and results for 1968 have been restated to include Morganton's operations. Morganton was acquired on Oct. 8, 1969 on a pooling of interests basis.

During the first nine months of this year Morganton reported sales of $6,908,000 and net earnings of $309,000. For the three months, the hosiery manufacturer had sales of $2,196,000 and net earnings of $100,000.

R. S. Small, president, said staple fabrics, such as sheeting and twills, and several major apparel fabrics, such as shirtings and dress goods, were severely affected by imports. This curtailed volume and prevented price increases adequate to compensate for higher wage and other cost. He noted that production had been cut back in many of the company's plants, and that two mills of the Clifton division were now being closed down. Earlier this year, a third mill at Clifton was shut down because of unprofitable operations.

Small said there had been a general softening of the textile market, accompanied by inventory reduction programs by customers, reflecting concern about future business and the high cost of money. Many of the factors that have adversely affected operations are expected to continue through the fourth quarter, he added.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time this great company has lost money in any quarter since 1947, and it is attributed to excessive Japanese imports. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the situation is desperate in some localities where curtailment in the work week has gone from 6 to 5 and in some places to 4 or less days. I wish to restate our position that we much prefer to work out a voluntary agreement with Japan in all categories of manmade fiber, woolen goods, blends, apparel, as well as cotton. If nothing is done, I firmly believe this Congress will take positive action to limit imports by mandatory quotas.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to work out a voluntary agreement, I am pleased to say we have the support of a great Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Maurice Stans and the support of President Nixon. I strongly urge the President to bring these facts of injury to our great textile industry so essential to our national defense to the attention of Prime Minister Eisaku Sato when he meets with him in November.

POUR IT ON, SPIRO

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, for those critics of our Vice President who think that they alone have a license to speak their mind, let me say that they are wrong. The Vice President's message in New Orleans was certainly an expression of my sentiments. In fact, if a poll were taken, we would no doubt find that his remarks reflect the attitude of a majority of Americans. It is very enlightening when a Vice President will speak up for the silent Americans who would like to be heard but who have no forum for their remarks. Vice President AGNEW's statements were applicable and they were succinctly expressed.

A recent editorial in the Montgomery Advertiser expresses my feelings quite well. I now insert it in the RECORD:

POUR IT ON, SPIRO

The reaction of the "effete bunch of impudent snobs," as Vice President Agnew called the supporters of M-Day, proves Agnew's indictment.

They reacted exactly like an effete bunch of impudent snobs who, to add the rest of Spiro's statement, "characterize themselves as intellectuals."

Foul, they cried; they have a copyright on name-calling and who does the Vice President think he is to respond in kind?

For our part, we think Agnew's statement was far too gentle. He was talking about the same group which has marched around cursing and vilifying two presidents and the nation as a whole; essentially the same group which attacked not only candidates Nixon and Agnew as warmongers a year ago, but Hubert Humphrey as well.

The same group wrung their hands in despair because a mixed bag of hippies, yippies, anarchists, commies and America-haters were not allowed to exercise their democratic prerogative to tear up Chicago and the Democratic National Convention last year.

They're against everything except an America reshaped in their own image—effete, powerless, fawning and coddling its impudent snobs in their every demand.

As expected, the pundits are saying Agnew is serving as Nixon's hatchet man, that he's "tricky Dicky's" answer to George Wallace and the President's attempt to court more conservatives who doubt that he is one.

It doesn't matter what the ulterior motive was, if there was one. The apparent one is good enough. Agnew simply told off the effete corps in language they might understand.

You don't beat around the bush with mobocrats; you call them what they are. And you also call them servants of Hanoi, as Agnew had implied in an earlier statement, following North Vietnam's praise of its "comrades in arms" in America. Agnew could have gone much farther than that too.

They talk about dissent, these impudent snobs, but they mean it should be a one-way proposition. Agnew taught them something of what dissent means. We hope he will ignore the girlish screams and lay it on some more, harder.

They want "dialogue," they say. Spiro is giving it to them, and their outraged screams prove the falsity of their position. They don't want free discussion, dialogue, dissent; what they want is the unilateral right of vilification, confusion, mob scenes.

Our guess is that old Harry Truman, a master of pouring it on, is sitting there on his Missouri porch and smiling at Agnew's performance, but also wishing he could teach Spiro a few pointers about really getting rough.

Agnew has been type-cast by those he offended as a hack and an oaf. If so, he's proving that even an oaf can flush cowards.

FAIR PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 8 years since the Congress committed itself to the principle that Federal employees deserve salaries comparable with that earned by workers in

private industry. Last week the House finally passed H.R. 13000, a small step toward fair pay for postal employees, but I rise today to remind the House that that action was only a start, if we are to fulfill our obligation to pay those that handle the mail what they deserve on the basis of their needs, skills, and efforts.

For postal employees are among those Americans treated most unfairly in these times of uneven progress toward social justice. In part, this is because these devoted public servants have lived up to their celebrated motto so faithfully that they tend to be taken for granted in the public mind. On they toil, faithfully and unobtrusively, while all around them wheels squeak noisily and get greased.

But what neither snow nor rain nor sleet nor hail have been able to do over the centuries, national neglect is now threatening to accomplish. At last the dedicated and almost-forgotten men and women of the postal service are growing desperate.

We trust them to ferry much of the national commerce, to respect and deliver our personal secrets, to sort and transport tons of literature of all kinds. But we will not pay them nearly what they could be paid for doing less and easier work in other callings. We expect them to do forever what no one else is asked to do except in short periods of national emergency: to accept appeals for loyalty to the country they love in lieu of fair treatment by that country. It is wrong to ask this of any American. More than that, it is demeaning to all Americans when any of their fellow citizens are put in this kind of situation. And it is certainly not in the national interest to allow the wage scale of those who work for the Federal Government to become a national disgrace.

Salaries in private industry continue to rise, but pay increases are denied to postal employees in the name of combating inflation. The result is that postal employees suffer twice over—prices rise, but not their salaries. How long can we go on telling people who we underpaid to begin with, and who additionally are being crushed by inflation, that they cannot be paid fairly because if they were paid fairly it would contribute to inflation?

Even after 21 years of service, the best a postal employee can hope for is almost $2,000 a year less than what the Bureau of Labor Statistics has found to be the minimum level for a moderate standard of living. It is no mystery in these circumstances why postal employees abandon their jobs twice as frequently as do other Government workers. What is mysterious is how the public can expect to get better mail service by paying poverty-level wages to those who must provide the service.

Is it not high time we realized that one good way to begin to improve the postal service might be to improve the working conditions of those who do the serving? Many Members of this House have worked hard to ease the financial hardships of postal workers. Each time we get our own increased paychecks, we are reminded that their paychecks remain the same. One would think the President would be experiencing the same reminder.

Someone said earlier that those of us who have been pressing for the enactment of H.R. 13000 have made "nuisances" of ourselves. Let it be clear that if that is what we have been doing we will continue to make nuisances of ourselves until H.R. 13000 becomes law, and until other reforms are enacted that will bring justice to postal employees at last.

I include at this point in the RECORD the text of a poignant letter I have received from the staff of the Bellmore, N.Y., post office. It is important because it is representative of hundreds of letters that have come to Members of Congress from postal employees all over the country. I also include in the RECORD at this point the text of an open letter addressed to the Congress and to the American people on behalf of postal employees all over the country. I cannot see how anyone reading these two documents can doubt where justice lies in this matter or what those of us in elective office ought to do about this stiuation:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, BRANCH 2715,
Bellmore, N.Y., October 12, 1969.

Hon. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LOWENSTEIN: We as representatives of the supervisors, clerks, carriers, and custodians of the Bellmore, New York Post Office, are writing to you about two matters. We are deeply concerned about proposals we have seen regarding a new postal corporation. We are also impatient with the lack of progress of the Congress in the passage of H.R. 13000, a bill which provides desperately needed pay increases for most postal employees.

If improvements can be made in our postal service, we, as postal employees, would like to see them made. There are serious problems and uncertainties, however, in the Nixon-Blount proposals for a postal corporation. Such a postal corporation, instead of enhancing postal service, would be detrimental to it. We feel that the proposal is not in the interests of either the postal employees or the general public.

We are deeply concerned over the job uncertainties in the present proposal for a postal corporation. We are distressed over the threatened loss of our coveted Civil Service status and apprehensive over the absence of any meaningful guarantees of job security. Severance and transfer of employees to other locations will be subject to the whims of a private employer. The absence of meaningful grievance machinery, the no-strike clause, and the failure to provide for compulsory arbitration all serve to weaken the influence of postal employees. We are concerned as was former Postmaster General of the United States Gronouski when he said: "The (bargaining) procedure that would be established through a Disputes Panel clearly denies the postal worker and his union the right to demand binding arbitration as a matter of right. In short, the worker is denied an ultimate weapon in those cases when collective bargaining, mediation and fact-finding fail to provide an answer to dispute."

We are opposed to the seven positions of Director with seven-year tenure at salaries of $100,000 a year. These Directors are accountable only to the President, and there is no opportunity for postal workers to evaluate these Directors or help in their selection.

There are many advantages to the public in a postal system which is directly operated as a service by the federal government. The Post Office ought to be viewed as a service rendering organization rather than a profit-seeking organization. Presently the Postal Service delivers to hard-to-reach and sparsely populated places. Existing proposals for a postal corporation are unclear as to whether such service to isolated places might be reduced because delivery there is unprofitable. In addition, the Post Office presently provides such public services as delivering "undeliverables" to charitable institutions and cooperating with the Bureau of the Census. Pending proposals are unclear as to whether a private corporation would be willing to continue such worthwhile services at its own expense.

The Post Office, because it is part of the federal government, has the authority to operate the Post Office Inspection System, to protect the sanctity of the mailbox, and to help enforce federal laws. If the postal corporation is accepted, enforcement of federal laws such as mail fraud would be more difficult.

The Post Office has provided leadership in equal employment opportunity for the hiring of the many qualified minority group members. The importance of the leadership of the Post Office in this area should not be minimized. If the Post Office was sold to a private organization, however, the federal government would lose this opportunity for providing leadership in employment practices.

It is understandable that the pending postal corporation proposals have so many deficiencies since it was developed without consultation or participation of postal employee organizations. Those people most directly affected by this proposal were not able to take part in forming these recommended changes.

We are also concerned about the lack of action taken in Congress on H.R. 13000. While we are far from satisfied with the provisions of H.R. 13000, the unnecessary delays in its passage have created critical morale problems. We feel that this pay raise ought to include supervisors up to level 18. Despite this reservation, all of us agree that this bill must be acted upon immediately. Rapidly rising prices and wages for non-postal employees, including Congressmen, are leaving us far behind. It is becoming more difficult for us to hold back other postal employees from committing drastic action.

The uncertainties of the postal corporation bill, together with the lack of action taken on H.R. 13000, are prompting many employees to consider leaving the postal service. Morale is low, and there is a loss of productivity. In our Post Office there has been a 38% turnover since January 1, 1969. Loss of experienced employees is depriving the postal service of the competence and dedication of its best workers.

As representatives of the postal workers, we would like to see the United States Post Office be the best one possible. The Nixon-Blount proposal for a postal corporation is, however, a step backward. We urge that this proposal not be adopted, and instead, that H.R. 4 and H.R. 13000 be passed.

We ask you to bring this letter to the attention of House Speaker John McCormack, Chairman Dulski of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as well as to your other colleagues in the House of Representatives and that it be inserted in the Congressional Record.

We are sending a copy of this letter to Representative John W. Wydler, whose district also encompasses part of the Bellmore Postal District.

Sincerely yours,

OWEN MADDEN,
President.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE 200 MILLION CITIZENS THEY REPRESENT

President Nixon has invented a new political weapon: the veto-in-advance.

He used it this month for the first time by injecting it into House debate on H.R.

13000—the pay raise bill for Federal employes, sponsored by Rep. Udall (D-Ariz.).

It arrived on Capitol Hill in the form of a "Dear Jerry" letter to House Minority Leader Gerald Ford but the House recognized it anyhow. So it mustered a two-thirds majority to over-ride the pre-veto. The vote was 310 to 52 in favor of the pay bill.

Now we urge the Senate to pass H.R. 13000. We hope the Senate can marshal a big majority. Strict constructionists may argue that a two-thirds vote is not needed to over-ride a pre-veto. But clearly, it will be needed sooner or later.

Meanwhile, back at the "Dear Jerry" letter, we find ourselves in total disagreement with Mr. Nixon's view that the Udall bill is inflationary or gives disproportionate benefits to postal employees.

We sympathize with the President's concern over inflation. Better than most we know how much it hurts.

But we are also fed up to here with being chosen again as the sacrificial goats.

It is immoral for the Government of the United States to imprison us in a wage structure that has been so substandard for so long that some postal clerks are being forced onto public welfare to make ends meet!

Postal clerks are the victims of inflation, not the cause of inflation.

"Dear Jerry" letters trying to deny us catch-up pay come with poor grace from a President whose salary is double that of his predecessor.

It will hopefully not be given credence by a Congress which boosted its own wages 41% in a single leap.

Only a year ago, as the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Nixon told our postal clerk union in a personal message that he "wholeheartedly supports" the Republican platform provision for insuring comparability of Federal salaries with private enterprise pay.

Mr. Nixon thus joined a distinguished list of Presidents from Mr. Eisenhower, to Mr. Kennedy, to Mr. Johnson, who had made similar peldges before him. In more than 10 years none of these pledges has been fulfilled.

The Udall pay bill, H.R. 13000, brings us close to comparability at long last. But now Mr. Nixon opposes it.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A YEAR MAKES

Most people really don't know—and may find it hard to believe—just how bad wages and working conditions are in the postal service today.

The situation smacks of medieval times. We cannot strike. We have no binding arbitration. It takes up to 25 years to reach the top pay step. And 97% of all postal clerks finish their careers right where they started—in the same grade!

Our bargaining rights are a joke.

For decades we have urged Congress to give us at least some of the labor-management structure which employes in private industry have had as a matter of right for half a century.

A year ago the Republican candidate for President promised to sponsor legislation which would establish a statutory basis for collective bargaining and union organization in Government.

Where is it?

We can't even get a promised revision of the Kennedy presidential executive order which has long since outlived its usefulness as a temporary expedient for union recognition.

Postal management, meanwhile, has been cheating us out of millions of dollars in overtime!

After two years in the Federal courts of Washington, D.C., at our members' expense, we finally won a declaratory judgment from the U.S. Court of Appeals last February.

It put a stop to violations by the Post Office Department of Public Law 89-301 which was supposed to eliminate compensatory time off in favor of overtime pay.

Despite a unanimous decision by three judges that the Department's acts under the Democratic Administration were illegal the Republican Administration has now appealed to the Supreme Court. Obviously these ingenious but illegal procedures have a nonpartisan fascination for management.

As for wages: postal clerks' annual earnings are $824 smaller today, on the average, than were the wages 17 months ago of employes in private industry holding jobs of equivalent skill.

The Government's method of calculating comparability guarantees that postal clerk salaries at any given time will always be at least a year and a half behind the private sector.

Yet President Nixon says the Udall bill, H.R. 13000, gives disproportionate benefits to postal employes.

There are also people who choose to remind us that Congress has already enacted six Federal pay raises since 1960—so how long does it take to catch up?

They have short memories. They forget to count the five presidential pay vetoes by Mr. Eisenhower between 1952 and 1960 which put us so far behind the rest of the nation that we haven't caught up yet!

Disproportionate?

Joseph Young who writes the syndicated Federal Spotlight column in The Washington Star pointed out recently that most federal classified employes during their careers get a chance to advance to higher grades through promotion—but not postal employes. "Giving (postal employes) extra 'bonuses' on rare occasions such as that represented by the pending pay legislation," he added, "would not mean the end of the Republic nor the destruction of the merit system."

But it might—it just might—have a stabilizing effect on the postal service.

For some postal employes stability can only be found on the relief rolls. Public welfare, that is.

It may come as a shock but thousands of urban postal clerks and their families are literally eligible for supplemental welfare.

Most Federal employees are too proud to apply but in our larger cities there are postal clerks who have had no choice in order to feed their families.

Thousands of others moonlight—by working at a second job.

Why, then, do they stay? They don't. The latest official figures available to us show that the annual turn-over among more than 300,000 U.S. postal clerks exceeds 45%!

That's at least seven times the total considered tolerable by private industry.

These are the simple bread-and-butter facts—the hard core economics—that have created the most militant employe unrest in the long history of the Post Office Department.

This wave of discontent, with all its ominous implications, doesn't come from the hippies, the bippies or the dippies. It doesn't come from the Far Left, the Far Right or the Far Anything.

It comes from citizens—your neighbors—the men and women who have tried to fulfill their lives in honorable careers with the postal service.

They feel bewildered by the imbalance of their economic condition. They feel betrayed by the broken promises of politicians. They feel degraded by vicious and continuing attacks from the rich and powerful—who know little about the Post Office—and most of what they know is wrong.

Help us restore the morale of the postal service.

Help us restore dignity to the postal service.

Help us restore faith in the postal service.

Enact H.R. 13000 over the pre-veto—over any real veto—and in fulfillment of pledges long past due.

FRANCIS S. FILBEY,
President, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO.

NEEDED: CABINET STATUS FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it remains one of the greatest inconsistencies of our Government's organization that we continue to deny the Veterans' Administration full Cabinet rank. I think it is about time Congress acted to take the VA out of an agency status and give it top-level Government rank where it belongs.

Half of America's population is served by the Veterans' Administration in one way or another. Surely their voice should be heard on the highest level of Government. And this important agency should have Cabinet status to assure it of the dignity and authority it needs to translate the Nation's gratitude into action in behalf of veterans, their families, and survivors.

What better example can be shown than to compare the VA's structure to that of other agencies?

There are seven agencies in the Government of the United States with budgets in excess of $5 billion. Six of these seven are Cabinet-level departments—one is not, the VA.

There are four that have more than 100,000 full-time employees. Three of these four are Cabinet level—one is not, the VA.

There are three agencies in the Federal Government which spend in excess of $500 million for educational purposes. Two of these three are Cabinet-level departments—one is not, the VA.

There are two agencies spending more than a billion dollars for hospital and medical services. One is a Cabinet-level department—one is not, the VA.

There are two agencies spending over $5 billion annually for cash benefits for income security programs. One is a Cabinet-level department—one is not, the VA.

Since 1963, I have been introducing bills in each Congress calling for a Department of Veterans' Affairs. This year I introduced H.R. 10548 on April 24. We are all aware of the magnitude of veterans programs carried out and supervised by the Veterans' Administration. The statistics of the VA provide outstanding documentation to justify giving the VA equal standing in the executive branch with departments of smaller size and much more limited scope.

With its 175,000 employees, the VA as an employer is exceeded only by the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department.

The VA's current budget of $6.9 billion a year is larger than that of all but three of the full-fledged departments,

and it is by far the largest of the 35 independent Federal agencies.

The VA operates the largest single medical program in the world. In fiscal year 1968, it provided 36.4 days of hospital care to 762,000 veterans, at a cost of approximately $1 billion. If you add all types of care—like the outpatient and the in-the-house service provided by the VA—the annual cost totals about $1.3 billion.

The Administration's network of 166 hospitals is the largest in the world, and VA research staffs are engaged in about 6,000 research projects. One-half of all the men and women who win medical degrees in the entire country receive some part of their training at VA hospitals, and the same is true of about 10 percent of all student nurses.

The VA handles 5.6 million veterans' life insurance policies, with a face value of over $38 billion. The VA also supervises another $38 billion worth of insurance for some 3.8 million servicemen.

The agency pays disability and death compensation and pension to more than 4,600,000 veterans and dependents. It operates the Nation's largest guardianship program, involving close to 700,000 children and incompetents.

There have been 7½ million home, farm, and business loans, for a total of $76 billion under the VA loan guaranty program.

AMERICA AND VIETNAM: A PERSONAL OPINION

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am and have been in basic support of the Nixon administration's phased disengagement and "Vietnamization" policy. On October 6 I joined with more than 100 Congressmen of both parties in authoring the following House resolution (H. Res. 566):

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date.

In the last few months I have felt that we could accelerate the replacement of American soldiers and Marines by South Vietnamese forces. Without compromising our fundamental objectives in Vietnam, I believe that indigenous troops can fully take over from Americans all necessary ground combat and combat support roles before the end of 1970.

I cannot agree with those who demand "immediate withdrawal" regardless of the consequences. It is not physically possible for America to do so, and this cry for capitulation does not advance the cause of lasting peace.

The Nixon administration has applied considerable pressure on the Government of South Vietnam to effect reforms which would enhance its popular support and thus increase its capacity to deal with Communist attacks. The American people should be told more about these efforts. In addition, the Thieu-Ky government must step up its performance in curbing corruption and carrying out land reform.

Forcing Thieu and Ky out of power will not end the killing or achieve self-determination for the people of South Vietnam—except on Communist terms. In 1963, America helped to terminate the Diem government, and near chaos followed.

While the Paris peace talks have made no visible progress, I feel it is important to continue our efforts there. America should thoroughly explore at Paris the possibility of reaching agreement with the Communist side on a "standstill" cease-fire. This initiative offers the hope of ending the killing on a mutually observed basis.

The suggestion that we, acting unilaterally, "cease" in South Vietnam while the other side retains the right to "fire" has never been appealing to me. I do not urge it now.

If we could get mutual agreement on an end to the fighting while all sides temporarily held their places, we could then move rapidly to discussions on free elections under United Nations or other international supervision. As Presidents Nixon and Thieu have repeatedly stated, the National Liberation Front—or Provisional Revolutionary Government—can participate fully in all election processes.

Since there may be a continuing stalemate in Paris notwithstanding every concession we make and each initiative we put forward, progress must be pressed toward Vietnamization and American disengagement.

My views today are an extension of the recommendations I have made during the past 2 years. In late 1967 I urged the following Vietnam program:

First. Establish and implement a timetable for shifting the burden of ground fighting from the shoulders of American soldiers and Marines to the forces of South Vietnam and other free Asian countries.

Second. Shift from an emphasis on American ground troops to a more effective and less costly use of American sea and air forces to aid the South Vietnamese.

Third. Abandon "search and destroy" military tactics and substitute "clear and hold" operations.

Fourth. Transfer control of the pacification program from American military commanders to joint South Vietnamese-American and allied civilian hands.

Fifth. Increase the humanitarian and highly valuable nonmilitary American efforts to improve the lives of the people of South Vietnam.

I am pleased that Defense Secretary Laird has rejected "search and destroy" tactics and instituted the policy of "protective reaction." In recent months the level of violence has dropped and American casualties have been sharply reduced. Our Vietnam expenditures have been cut by 30 percent and will go down farther in the months ahead.

I agree with the views expressed by the New York Times in its lead editorial of October 15:

The answer now is not a panicky pull-out; the logical beginning is a standstill cease-fire, followed by substantially stepped-up withdrawal of troops. Such a course . . . offers the best hope of piercing Hanoi's intransigence and moving to productive negotiations in Paris.

A SHOCKING SITUATION

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a shocking situation has come to my attention in recent days with respect to attempts by the trucking industry to influence congressional action on the "big truck bill."

A truck driver from my district has advised me that the company for which he works threatened to withhold his paycheck if he refused to write to me endorsing the big truck bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is incredible, and certainly must not be tolerated. The driver explained that a notice was posted on the company bulletin board indicating that drivers and their wives would be expected to write to their Congressman expressing support for the bill. The notice also stated that the company wanted copies of the letters so they could forward them to the president of the company.

The driver with whom I discussed the matter was given the runaround when he sought his paycheck. He was forced to obtain it from the dispatcher rather than the regular office, and then received it only after a not-too-gentle reminder that he had not written the required letter.

This is just one more example of the high-handed, dictatorial methods employed by some of the truckowners to steamroller their legislation through the Congress. It is incredible that in a free country like America, we could have a situation where this sort of thing could happen.

I am asking Members of Congress to advise me of any correspondence they have received which would indicate a similar pattern of action by other truck companies.

I have asked that the Departments of Transportation, and Labor, together with the Interstate Commerce Commission fully investigate this shocking situation.

A copy of a story on this subject from the Davenport Times-Democrat of October 29, 1969, follows:

SAY TRUCKER "HARASSED"

(By Tom Kuncl)

A truck driver says he has been "harassed" by his employers because he refused to write a letter to his congressman in favor of two pending "big truck" bills, the Times-Democrat learned today.

The driver said the "harassment" consisted of a threat made by management officials of a trucking terminal to hold back his weekly paycheck until he wrote the letter.

Rep. Fred Schwengel (R-Iowa), to whom the complaint went, said he will ask for an investigation by the Department of Labor and the Interstate Commerce Commission into the allegations. Schwengel is a member of the roads subcommittee of the U.S. House Public Works Committee.

The driver said he and other employes of the trucking company were told by supervisory personnel they should write letters to their congressmen expressing favor of two bills awaiting congressional action that would increase the width and weight of trucks operating on the nation's highways.

The driver said a notice on a bulletin board initially told drivers that they and their wives would be expected to write such letters and that the company wanted copies for forwarding to the firm's president.

Later, the driver said, employes whom he knew personally were told that they would be required to write the requested letter before they could pick up their weekly paychecks.

The driver is asserted to have reported the substance of these conversations to Schwengel.

The driver's own experience involving alleged management "harassment" came later, he said.

The driver said that when he went to pick up his paycheck he was told that it was not in the regular stack of pay envelopes and that he would have to report to a dispatcher to secure his wages.

The driver said he was told by the dispatcher "You haven't written your letter yet."

The driver added that when he became angry and said he would not sign such a letter the dispatcher produced his paycheck and gave it to him.

Schwengel said he would take the report of the driver to the Department of Labor and the ICC "just as soon as I can get over there," and indicated he would attempt to still do so today.

Schwengel said he was "shocked" by the driver's allegations.

Schwengel said the charges advanced by the driver support his contention that "the men who have to drive these big trucks don't want anything to do with them. It is the trucking companies who are trying to push this thing through against the wishes of drivers and the public."

Schwengel has been a consistent foe of proposed legislation that would increase the width of trucks from 8 feet to 8.5 feet and would permit them to carry heavier loads.

A similar bill died for lack of action in the 1968 House session. Two new bills calling for basically the same provisions are awaiting consideration in the House now.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT SERETSE KHAMA

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant addresses delivered to the opening sessions of the United Nations General Assembly last month was that of Sir Seretse Khama, the President of the Republic of Botswana.

In its efforts to develop a stable and viable nonracial state in southern Africa, Botswana is confronting not only the problems of economic development common to so many emerging nations, but the unique political pressures of its geographical situation, surrounded by powerful states dominated by white-minority regimes based on fundamental political principles totally divergent from its own.

President Khama's remarks are therefore particularly significant, for his discussion of the role of the United Nations in economic development and the significance of U.N. membership to the emerging nations, but even more so, for his courageous and realistic statement on racialism in southern Africa.

The policies of the United States in southern Africa have been ambivalent and uncertain at best, and African observers are questioning now whether we have any policy toward that critical area of the world at all.

President Khama's speech at the United Nations offers useful inputs to our own policy considerations, and one might hope that we approach the problem with the same courage and sensitivity he has.

I commend it to my colleagues in the House and include it at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY SIR SERETSE KHAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA SEPTEMBER 1969

Madam President, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you on your election to this important office. I feel confident that with your long experience of the work of this organization, you will steer this session through to a successful close.

May I also express my sorrow at the untimely death of the president of the twenty-third session of this assembly, Mr. Emilio Arenales Catalan, whose short term of office will be long remembered for the courage he displayed.

I should like on the behalf of my people to pay tribute to the Secretary General's work for world peace and untiring devotion to the service of humanity.

Botswana is within a week of celebrating the third anniversary of its independence. My country is thus a comparative newcomer to the United Nations, and this is my first opportunity to address the General Assembly. Botswana is a small country in terms of population if not in area. As a small and poor country we set a particularly high value on our membership of the United Nations and those of its specialised agencies which our Budgetary restrictions have permitted us to join. I should like to emphasise the particular importance of the United Nations for states like Botswana which, because of development priorities, are obliged to restrict their conventional bilateral contacts and keep their overseas missions to a bare minimum. Here in New York we can make contacts which would otherwise be difficult to achieve. The United Nations offers many advantages to a state like ours. The United Nations enables us to keep in touch with international opinion, and to put our views before the world. The United Nations is also regarded by small states as an institution which protects their special interests. Together with its specialised agencies, it is of course also a major source of development, finance and technical assistance from which Botswana benefits greatly. I am conscious of Botswana's indebtedness to the United Nations, and I am honoured to have the privilege of putting some of Botswana's problems before the world through the members of this Assembly.

I am aware that there are many international problems which will come before this Assembly during this, its 24th session. Botswana shares the general alarm at the prolonged impasse in the Middle East and the dangerous military escalation which has marked the last months. We are looking, like most member states with anxious eyes towards Vietnam and praying that this tragic and long-drawn out conflict will soon be resolved at the conference table.

We are watching the civil conflict in Nigeria with even greater anxiety, since our own Continent is directly affected. Botswana sympathizes fully with those member states both inside and outside Africa who want to see the fighting and the human suffering it involves brought to an end, and the work of reconstruction and reconciliation begin. Yet we believe the foundation for the effective resolution of this dispute in the best interests of all the peoples of Nigeria remains the work of the Organization for African Unity. Our efforts of earlier this month at Addis Ababa may not have been crowned with immediate success. But there is no magic key which will unlock this complex problem in which so many conflicting interests including interests outside Africa are involved. If the United Nations has a contribution to make to the resolution of this conflict it lies in restraining the external powers involved from taking actions and adopting policies which could further delay a negotiated settlement. Botswana favours any initiative acceptable to both principal parties involved which will lead to a peaceful and lasting settlement and which will not threaten the stability and unity of other African states. Our basic approach to all international problems stresses the need to resolve conflict by peaceful means. The weak of the world can hardly in logic support the recourse to violence, which must inevitably favour the strong.

Because Botswana is part of a region which faces the threat of violent conflict, I want on behalf of my people to lay particular emphasis on the need to find peaceful solutions to our problems. Southern Africa lives with the dangers of violent racial conflict. I want this afternoon to discuss the threat of racialism as it affects Southern Africa, and in particular my own country. Botswana. And within Southern Africa I should like in particular to draw this Assembly's attention to a problem which I fear some powerful countries, would prefer to forget. I refer to the problem of Rhodesia, which the people of Botswana are in no position to forget.

May I remind you of our geographical position and our historical circumstances. Botswana is almost entirely encircled by minority-ruled territories. We have a long and indefensible border with Rhodesia, and a long border with Namibia and with South Africa itself. The only railway running between Rhodesia and South Africa passes through Botswana. Not only is this railway operated by Rhodesia Railways, but it is vital to both Rhodesian and South African interests. It is also vital to Botswana because it provides our only outlet to the sea and to export markets overseas. Through this route must come the capital goods necessary for our development. Unlike some other states in Southern and Central Africa we have no practical alternative outlet.

We are for historical reasons part of a customs area dominated by the industrial might of the Republic of South Africa. We share the monetary system of the Republic of South Africa. Our trade and transport systems are inextricably interlocked with those of South Africa. So meager are our own employment prospects that we have for many years been obliged to permit some of our young men to go and work in the mines of South Africa. In the immediately foreseeable future we can find no way of providing alternative employment for all these men, nor can we afford to dispense with their earnings.

Botswana thus faces unusual and onerous handicaps, but we also face an unusual and challenging opportunity. I should like to describe our position because I believe it will give member states a useful insight into the problem the world faces when considering the question of minority-rule in Southern Africa. I should like to explain how Botswana is responding, not only to the challenge of underdevelopment, but also to the challenge posed by our powerful neighbours whose way of life is not our way of life and whose values are in most respects, the reverse of our own.

When my government took office in 1965 we were faced with a problem of underdevelop-

ment of classic proportions. Such development programmes as were initiated under colonialism no more than scratched the surface of our problems. Most important of all, in contrast to other British colonies, there had been practically no attempt to train Botswana to run their own country. Not one single secondary school was completed by the colonial government during the whole seventy years of British rule. There was little provision for vocational training even at the lowest levels. The roads, water supplies, power supplies on which industrial development is based were totally inadequate. We were in the humiliating position of not knowing many of the basic facts about Botswana on which development plans could be based. We are still learning about the resources of our country.

But we are now tackling these problems, and if I appear to boast of the progress we have made, it is to praise the efforts of my people rather than to vaunt the achievements of my colleagues in government and myself. We have received generous budgetry assistance and development aid from the British, who have done much to make up for earlier neglect. We have received aid from other member states and from the agencies of the United Nations itself. What is more, all this aid has come without political strings. There has been no attempt to use aid to change our domestic or external policies. We will reject all donors who do not show the same forbearance.

Nevertheless we depend on foreign aid for more than half our revenue. On what then is based our claim to be an independent state? Can we aspire to help in developing the prosperity, unity and freedom of our continent and hence play a constructive role in world affairs? I believe we can. Because, although we are for the moment dependent on foreign aid, we are also self-reliant. Because my people are mobilising their own resources, both human, physical and financial, we can accept overseas assistance without loss of pride. Furthermore, we believe that we have succeeded in attracting the major part of this aid because we are making great efforts ourselves, and because it is recognised that we have something to offer towards a solution of one of the world's most pressing problems, the future of minority-ruled Southern Africa.

Botswana is now on the threshold of new and major development. Since independence it has been discovered that we are blessed with mineral resources, which if exploited, offer us a prospect of financial self-sufficiency during the 1970's and in the long run the hope of healthy balanced development in all sectors. My government is in the midst of negotiating international loan finance for these developments. It is a matter of the greatest concern for us that this money is raised from the right source on the right terms. For despite all the handicaps of geography, climate and the legacy of colonial neglect, the people of Botswana have now embarked on the struggle to reduce our dependence on neighbouring minority-ruled territories. Only in this way can the people of Botswana reap in full the benefits of independence. We feel that only in this way can the fruits of our labours be fully enjoyed. We did not win our independence from the British to lose it to a new form of colonialism from any source whatever.

Yet we accept that we are part of Southern Africa and that the harsh facts of history and geography cannot be obliterated overnight. We recognise that in our present circumstances we must continue to remain members of the Southern African customs union and the South African monetary area. We have noted South Africa's assurances of friendly intentions towards Botswana and other independent states. We have noted South Africa's offers to assist other African states in their development. Botswana, together with Lesotho and Swaziland are in the process of concluding lengthy negotiations with South Africa on a new customs agreement. In these negotiations we have not been seeking aid. Our objective has been to secure an equitable distribution of the revenues of the customs area, and the opportunity to protect our infant industries while retaining access to the South African market. We welcome private investment in Botswana from any source which seeks to build in partnership with our people and not to drain us of our resources with little or no return to the country. We are confident that we can co-exist with the Republic of South Africa without sacrificing our national interest or our fundamental principles.

For we have made no secret of our detestation of apartheid. Although for obvious reasons we are obliged to interpret strictly the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other sovereign states, we have not hidden our views. Our voice has been heard in this Assembly, and in other international forums, in favour of universal self-determination, in support of peaceful solutions to international conflicts throughout the world, and in pleas for a realistic appraisal of what can be achieved by this organisation.

Living, as we do, face to face with the realities of apartheid, we have little sympathy with token demonstrations and empty gestures. Yet we have unequivocally condemned the theory and practice of apartheid and we deplore its intensification and particularly the extension of the full apparatus of apartheid to the international trust territory of Namibia. Nevertheless, for obvious reasons, Botswana must maintain diplomatic contacts with South Africa. For equally obvious reasons we decline to consider an exchange of diplomatic representatives until South Africa can fully guarantee that Botswana's representatives will in all respects, at all times and in all places be treated in the same way as diplomats from other countries.

We have expressed our opposition to Portugal's unyielding refusal to permit any progress towards self-determination in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). We have declined to entertain diplomatic relations with the Portuguese in the absence of any commitment on the part of Portugal to allow the indigenous people of their so-called overseas provinces to proceed to independence. Our criticism of Portugal's policies is not based on an argument about the timing of a programme for progress towards self-determination, but on the point-blank refusal of the Portuguese government to concede that these territories can ever choose to move towards independence.

I would like to draw attention at this point to the firmly stated preference, endorsed by all independent African States in the Lusaka manifesto, for the achievement of self-determination through negotiation. It was thus that Botswana achieved majority rule, and eventually independence, and this has been the path which most African States have been fortunate enough to tread. It is the wish of the government and the people of Botswana that the indigenous populations of neighbouring territories should eventually share this experience.

One consequence of our geographical position is that Botswana has provided a refuge for many who have found themselves unable for one reason or another to continue to live in neighbouring minority-ruled territories. Botswana recognizes a responsibility to these victims of political circumstance, and we are trying to discharge this responsibility as well as our resources permit. Refugees come to Botswana from Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia, South West Africa and South Africa. At present there are more than 4,000 recognised refugees in Botswana. My Government acceded to the United Nations General Convention and to the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, in January this year.

Botswana grants asylum and assistance to genuine political refugees who seek our aid. The financial burden of doing so would have been heavy were it not for the generous assistance we have received from the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, the World Food Programme, the World Council of Churches, and other international bodies. For our part we have granted refugees recognition of their status. We have allowed them to settle in various parts of our country and find jobs or open their own businesses. And where possible we educate them as well as our limited educational and training facilities permit. Equally important, we issue United Nations Travel Documents with a return clause to those refugees who wish to travel to other countries, where suitable training establishments are able to accept them.

The majority of refugees in Botswana have come from Angola. These people have been settled on a hundred square mile farming scheme. Through training in agriculture and fishing, we hope that they, like many other refugees, will become integrated with the citizens of Botswana. We have welcomed them to our country. They can make their home with us until their own countries achieve a government acceptable to them.

I have already referred to certain constraints which Botswana faces when considering its position on Southern African issues. I have also mentioned certain principles which guide us. Our constant concern is to respect those constraints while not violating those principles.

The future of Rhodesia is of the utmost possible concern to Botswana. I have referred to our long and indefensible common frontier. My Government from the outset condemned the Unilateral Declaration of Independence. We are committed to supporting the principle of no independence before majority rule. For that reason we joined the majority of Commonwealth Countries in rejecting the "Fearless" proposals. We condemned in no uncertain terms the illegal regime's constitutional proposals which entrench discrimination and separate development, and which definitively block the possibility of a peaceful transition to majority rule for which the 1961 Constitution, at least in theory, provided. We recognize that these proposals endorsed by an unrepresentative electorate end the prospect of a peaceful transition to majority rule without some form of external intervention to secure this. These proposals are now being implemented by the Smith regime.

I warned the white minority in Rhodesia that by taking this course they were increasing the risk of violent conflict and endangering the stability of the region. Botswana is on record as favouring the re-assertion of British rule in Rhodesia. This course is the only one which offers a hope, however, faint, of peaceful transition to majority rule. I recognize that the white minority in Rhodesia, conscious of the injustice it has inflicted, and rearing the justifiable bitterness of the oppressed African population, will feel the need for some guarantee that the transition to democratic non-racial government should be gradual and peaceful.

One way in which Britain could restore its authority is by the use of force. But I think that we must now accept, whether we approve of this decision or not, that Britain is not under present circumstances prepared to resort to force. Botswana feels that it follows that alternatives to force must be considered. There comes a point when one policy, having been pushed to its limits, must be accepted as having failed, and must give way to another. It is essential that Britain be held to her legal and moral responsibility to the African majority in Rhodesia. There must be no absolution.

This I have to admit leaves us with a policy which, as many member states have argued in past debates, has been far from successful. I refer to mandatory sanctions. Yet for all the frustrations and disappointments which the tardy application of sanctions has given rise to, it remains essential that they are in fact maintained and intensified. We feel that these sanctions serve an important purpose, even if they are not extended to include South Africa. Just as it is clear that neither Britain nor any other country will use military force against the Smith regime, it is clear that an effective boycott of South Africa on this or any other issue cannot be achieved. The existing sanctions are thus at the present time all that stand between the rebel regime's success and failure. That being the case, rather than dismissing the sanctions weapon as totally ineffective, it is surely wiser to try and make them as effective as possible.

While it is important not to over-estimate the impact of sanctions it should not be too readily accepted that sanctions have had no effect at all on Rhodesia. From our vantage point we can see some of the effects of sanctions and I can assure this Assembly that they are not negligible.

To permit them to be eroded at this point would be unnecessarily to concede defeat. Certain consequences would follow. The way would be opened to diplomatic recognition by powers which are at the moment hanging back from this step. Rhodesia's links with Portugal and South Africa would be enormously strengthened and the whole minority position in Southern Africa would be consolidated. There are, I am convinced, elements both in South Africa and Portugal and in the world at large who have serious doubts about the viability of Rhodesia as a white-ruled state, given its rapidly expanding African population and its handicapped economy. Lifting sanctions would liberate the fettered Rhodesia economy and serve to restore the confidence of such observers in the viability of continued white supremacy.

For this reason Botswana appeals to all member states to make what contribution they can to rendering sanctions more effective. And here I should like to pay tribute to the work of the United Nations Supervisory Committee and of the Commonwealth Sanctions Committee. On their efforts and those of the member states of this organization are pinned the last hopes of preventing the illegal regime from imposing permanently its own version of apartheid on the people of Rhodesia, for whose welfare this organization has assumed a certain degree of responsibility. The present international isolation of the illegal regime and those who support it must be maintained. Our own difficulties in the matter of sanctions are obvious, but we are attempting to play our part within the limitations imposed by our frail economy and our landlocked position. We have prevented Rhodesia from using their railway to import arms and military supplies. Botswana's airline has ceased to fly into Rhodesia. We are preparing to do more. Botswana has committed itself to diverting longstanding trade with Rhodesia, despite the very considerable economic and administrative problems which such a course presents. Contingency planning is well advanced.

Our contribution to this struggle can only be a small one, for we are not a rich and powerful country. But we are hopeful that it will help to check the erosion of sanctions. There are other powers who live less closely with this problem than ourselves, but who can make greater contribution towards solving it.

May I conclude on a more general point, but one which also relates to Southern Africa. I have referred to Botswana's prospects of mineral development and to our hopes that this will permit us to dispense with budgetary aid and to develop a balanced and prosperous economy and a healthy non-racial democracy. We hope this for the sake of our people, but we also look forward to it with all the more eager anticipation because we recognize that it will permit us to make a greater contribution to solving the problem of our region. By this I do not mean that we will depart from our principle of non-interference in the affairs of neighboring sovereign states. But Botswana as a thriving majority-ruled state, on the borders of South Africa and Namibia, will present an effective and serious challenge to the credibility of South Africa's racial policies and in particular its policy of developing so-called Bantu homelands and its stated goal of eventual independence for these Bantustans. It could force them to abandon the policy or attempt to make it a more immediate reality and even face the prospect of surrendering sovereignty to genuinely independent states. Either reaction would have important political consequences. A prosperous non-racial democracy in Botswana, immediately adjacent to South Africa and Namibia, will add to the problems South Africa is already facing in reconciling its irrational racial policies with its desire for economic growth.

If Botswana is to sustain this role, which you will recognise is not an easy one, its independence must be preserved. This means that we must ensure that we are insulated from any instability which the policies of neighbouring white-ruled countries may provoke. It also means that Botswana needs the support and sympathy of friendly nations. We recognise that our independence ultimately depends on the durability of our political institutions and on our success in achieving economic development. But our independence is also buttressed by our external relations. We have friends in all continents. Our membership of the United Nations is in itself a source of strength. I should like to appeal to all member states in their deliberations on the question of Southern Africa to recall not only Botswana's particular problems, but also our potential contribution to achieving change by peaceful means.

REFLECTS ON THE SMOG TRIAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the level of public interest in the Justice Department's antitrust air pollution suit against the automobile industry was dramatically demonstrated by the strong and sustained opposition to the Department's agreement to a consent decree with the industry terminating the case. This opposition came from States, cities, counties, national organizations, and over 60 Members of Congress.

The suit charged the industry with collusion to delay the development and manufacture of air pollution control devices for automobiles, going back as far as 1953. If this is true, it means the automobile industry bears responsibility for a great share of the injury resulting from automobile pollution.

This concern brought New York City, Illinois, Connecticut, Maryland, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, New Mexico, the county of Los Angeles, labor unions, civic and social organizations, and myself and other Members of Congress into the case when the Department decided to come to the aid of the automobile industry by dropping the case.

Nicholas von Hoffman in today's Washington Post describes the scene at Tuesday's court hearing in Los Angeles as the States and local governments attempted to salvage the public interest jettisoned by the Federal Government.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1969]

SMOG TRIAL

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—Lawyers came from all over for the Smog Trial. They represented New York City, Connecticut, Maryland, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana and New Mexico. The Attorney General of Illinois showed up complaining that the air in Chicago is so foul the bears in the zoo are coming down with lung cancer.

Everywhere people are coughing, wheezing, gasping for air, straining their circulatory systems, grasping for something decent to breathe. This was going to be the trial that would begin curing our national case of black lung disease. This was going to be the case in which the automobile manufacturers would be tried for conspiring to prevent the development and installation of antipollution devices on their machines. Ralph Nader calls it "product fixing."

Some people would have preferred to see the tire manufacturers, the gas companies, and the freeway profiteers in court too, but this would be a beginning. The government might do something, and the country could sigh and breathe again.

No.

The first words the judge said when the hearing opened were, "It's apparent that the general public is aroused, and rightly so, but it may come as a shock that this isn't a hearing about smog. I wish there was some order I could make, some decree I could sign that woud put an end to smog. Smog simply isn't a legal problem. It's a government problem. It's simply not a problem the courts can deal with."

As he spoke the smallest expression of approbation sneaked on and off the face of Lloyd N. Cutler, counsel for the Automobile Manufacturers Association. Mr. Cutler, of Washington's Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering, looked quintessentially Eastern in his dark suit with a vest. There were many other lawyers for the car companies, and they may charge equally high fees but Mr. Cutler was the boss. It was he who had negotiated the defendants out of antitrust conspiracy indictment and into a harmless consent agreement.

It was this agreement that the visiting lawyers had come to object to on the ground that it would exculpate the manufacturers for what they may have done in the past while making it unlikely they would do better in the future. The question hanging before the court was whether the agreement would be acceptable to the judge or whether there would be a trial with evidence and witnesses and a jury to determine if Ford, Chrysler, General Motors and the others had conspired to dirty the air. The judge's words were the tip-off Mr. Cutler had won. Not that he relaxed when he heard them. He sat tightly upright in his chair, making vigorous little whispers to his co-counsel, Eastern man, club man, genteel man, but sharp and combative for all his good manners and politeness.

When he got up to speak he was stiff at the lectern. His words were smooth and hard and quiet, silvery gray words, expensively fitted, made-to-order custom words. He rested his arms on the sides of the reading stand, but his hands wouldn't stay quiet. They have a life of their own, the way they slipped and flashed and twitched. "This is the first case that has ever been brought against an industry for trying to solve a public health problem," he said, and the hands floated limp and then flicked out in the air as though their function was to use up the excess competitive energy in the man.

He talked about how these big rich states with skillful lawyers only wanted the government to convict the car companies to make it easier for them to move in later and sue the blood out of the automobile manufacturers. But General Motors alone is richer than any state. In the esoteric field of antitrust law it can outbid any governmental body for the most skillful and devious attorneys. Mr. Cutler finished by saying, "I want to return to the importance of getting on with the job of making progress in pollution, the job of scientists achieving a major breakthrough," as if the bad air were not made by men, but was an act of nature like polio or multiple sclerosis.

This picture of the industry devoting great numbers of technicians and sums of money to pushing back the frontiers of knowledge is contradicted by Dr. John Goldsmith of the California State Department of Health at Berkeley. An expert in the physiological effects of smog on man, Dr. Goldsmith says, "They keep talking about research, but no person identified with the motor vehicle industry has made a contribution to the field. They have very few researchers working for them." The truth of the matter was plainly stated by the representatives of the three biggest corporations in a 1967 Commerce Department report (Automobile Air Pollution: A Program for Progress); "There has been inadequate incentive for an individual automobile manufacturer to apply pollution control technology to the automobile in advance of its competitors."

But these considerations are froth; Mr. Cutler had the law with him. The lawyers for the smog shrouded cities and states tried to interest the Court in higher and broader consideration of public welfare, but privately they admitted the law was against them. Mr. Cutler had all the precedents; all the citations were over on his side because, for 70 years, all the money, all the most adept legal brains have gone into shaping and warping the law so the judge would say he was awfully sorry there was nothing the could do about the smog.

The bad air does not know about this. It kills without court orders. In the San Bernardino National Forest 46,000 acres of Ponderosa-Jeffry pine trees have already suffered heavy damage from the killing air. Their needles turn yellow and they die, or their resistance is weakened and they can't fight the pine bark beetle which finishes them off. Of the forest's 1,298,000 trees, 82 per cent are now moderately damaged, 15 per cent severely injured and 3 per cent are dead. The experiments at the air pollution center of the University of California at Riverside (where these figures come from) show that smog reduces an orange tree's yield by about a half; a grapevine growing in good air produces 17 pounds of fruit; in bad air, only seven.

Some of the worst smog is invisible. It comes in the form of ozone and is particularly prevalent in sunny, warm climes like Los Angeles, but it will be an increasingly dangerous compound in the air over cities such as Phoenix, Dallas, New Orleans, Atlanta and Miami.

Ozone is oxygen with an extra, unstable molecule. It is created when sunlight hits certain automobile exhaust pollutants. Ozone weakens the cell membranes of the lungs and blood. It increases the obstruction of air flow to emphysema patients and cuts down the performance of athletes. When the ozone content of the air reaches .35 parts per million, doctors advise that children be restrained from strenuous play so that they don't breath heavily, and therefore cut down on their ozone intake. Since July 3 of this year, Los Angeles has had to close its school playgrounds 39 times because the ozone content had gone over .35.

It's because air pollution is not a theoretical problem, but a real one that is killing and weakening people and animals and vegetation now that governmental bodies from everywhere tried to stop the Justice Department from settling this case out of court, but the law says they are wrong. The judge was even a little miffed that they had made the attempt. The politicians had endeavored, he said, to "divert the fire and heat of their constituents onto this court."

MANDATORY JAIL SENTENCE PROPOSED FOR THE CONVICTED CRIMINAL USING A FIREARM IN THE COMMISSION OF A FEDERAL CRIME

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress passed the State Firearms Control Assistance Act which has since become law. A controversial provision of the House-passed version was the section providing for a mandatory sentence to be imposed on those convicted criminals who had in their possession a firearm in the commission of a Federal crime. My remarks today are addressed to the so-called Poff amendment which provided for minimum mandatory jail sentences which could not be suspended nor be subject to probation. Of significance also in this amendment was the fact that judges were required to impose the sentences to run consecutively rather than concurrently with the penalty imposed for the base felony.

It is my conviction that this was a very fine amendment. Indeed, by a overwhelming vote of 412 to 11, we demonstrated our support for the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. In the Senate, however, an amendment pertinent to the penalty section was adopted providing for the imposition of a sentence of an indeterminate length upon any individual armed with a firearm while engaged in the commission of certain enumerated Federal felonies. It further provided that in the case of a subsequent conviction, the court could not suspend the sentence or grant probation. As one can easily determine, both Senate provisions were less certain and weaker in content than the Poff amendment. What amazed me was that in conference the Poff amendment was among those provisions compromised, despite the strong conviction of the House that it be retained. If there was one provision that should have been kept completely intact, and should not have been subject to compromise, the Poff amendment was it.

Today I am introducing legislation which would strengthen the penalty provision of the State Firearms Control Assistance Act. It is identical to H.R. 319, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) early this year. Jail sentences for first-term offenders could not be suspended and probation could not be granted. My bill further provides that such sentences could not be imposed to run concurrently with any sentence imposed for such Federal felony committed.

If the real purpose of firearms control legislation is to control crime, then there must be included in the law a strong criminal deterrent. In short, my bill provides a penalty that focuses on the severity of a Federal crime committed with a firearm. This is not the case with the present State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1968.

In the State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1968 the House version requiring minimum mandatory sentences for first-term offenders was eliminated as was the important provision on consecutive sentences. At the discretion of the judge, the sentence for the first offense can be suspended and probation granted. Moreover, although it authorizes a mandatory penalty for a second offense, the present law grants the trial judge absolute discretion to impose the sentence to run concurrently with the sentence imposed for the base felony. In this instance one sees an excellent example of the permissive character of some of our laws in that it allows the convicted criminal the chance of not going to jail. As we were made aware, criminologists expound on the fact that certainty of punishment rather than severity of punishment is the significant deterrent to crime. The Poff amendment was designed to meet this objective by convincing the potential criminal that a definite penalty awaited him should he use a firearm to commit a Federal crime.

Mr. Speaker, what we need in this country is the proper enforcement of our laws in a way that will be a deterrent to the criminal element. Relevant to this subject, I am reminded of President Nixon's cogent remarks which were made during the last campaign:

> We must re-establish again the principle that men are accountable for what they do, that criminals are responsible for their crimes—that while the boy's environment can help to explain the man's crime, it does not excuse that crime.

At the Federal level, we must concern ourselves with enacting legislation which will hold the criminal accountable for a Federal crime. At the same time we must be careful not to infringe on the police powers of the State and local governments. Though the majority of felonies are committed at these governmental levels, the Constitution explicitly reserves police powers to the several States. However, we may hope that in the enactment of a strong mandatory penalty provision at the Federal level, State and local governments will take notice of our effort and enact similar legislation.

REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. OVERSEAS INFORMATION POLICIES URGED

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Overseas Press Club of New York City was the scene of a 1-day conference sponsored jointly by the Overseas Press Club Foundation and the Emergency Committee for a Reappraisal of U.S. Overseas Policies and Programs.

The conference was devoted to an examination, by a number of outstanding experts in communications and related fields, of our Government's information activities and their impact upon what is generally referred to as "the U.S. Image Aboard."

The foundation for this conference was provided by a report entitled "The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy," issued last December by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member.

The former chairman of that subcommittee, our distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, addressed the conference. The New York Times of October 26, 1969, featured a lengthy article summarizing the different points of view presented by the participants.

Because I believe that the subject is of great current interest to all Members of the Congress, I wish to place in the RECORD Congressman FASCELL's remarks and the text of the New York Times' article of October 26, 1969:

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY—A FACT OF LIFE

(Address by Congressman DANTE B. FASCELL at the Overseas Press Club, New York, October 22, 1969)

I would like to begin by extending my congratulations to Dr. Edward L. Bernays, president of the emergency committee for reappraisal of United States overseas policies and programs, to the Overseas Press Club, Foundation and Mr. Burnet Hershey, for jointly sponsoring this conference.

It could not be more timely, or more important.

Dr. Bernays, in particular, deserves a large measure of credit for bringing all of us here today. From all the accounts that I received, he has been a real moving force behind this enterprise. I do not wonder at that for I know from our brief association during a set of hearings sponsored by my subcommittee, that he is a man of profound convictions, boundless energy and virtually unstoppable determination. He also feels very deeply about the subject of our discussion. And, therefore, he has exerted tremendous effort to bring this issue before the American public not for any selfish reason, but because of his deep concern for the best interests of our nation.

It is for this reason that I am proud and delighted to participate in this conference. And, needless to say, I fully support the objectives of the emergency committee which Dr. Bernays heads.

My own feelings on the issue before us can be summarized briefly:

I believe that the United States Government—to use a colloquial expression—has "dropped the ball" in the field of communications.

It has done so by failing to appreciate the crucial role which modern communications play in the relations between nations—and ought to play in the shaping and implementation of our major national policies on the world scene.

To date, we have done an amazingly poor job in articulating our nation's goals, in communicating our concern for peace and the improvement of the human condition to three billion people who live outside our shores, and in making our overseas undertakings relevant to the major concerns of mankind in this second half of the 20th century.

More often than not, our Government has made great plans, and embarked upon extensive international undertakings, without first considering the urgent, overriding necessity to make our efforts meaningful from the standpoint of the hopes and aspirations, fears and prejudices of other nations.

In short, we have failed to realize that relations between nations today move within a new, evolving context of public diplomacy which conditions our enterprises, shapes the character of our age, and ultimately may determine the key issues of peace and war.

As a consequence, our image abroad has deteriorated steadily and many of our efforts, some very worthwhile and constructive, have encountered increasing resistance, opposition and even met with failure.

Let me make it clear at this point that I do not place the blame for this state of affairs on any single Federal administration, any one branch of our Government, or even on any particular agency, such as the U.S.I.A.

The apparent inability to cope with the new realities of our age has been characteristic of our governments for at least three decades. It has been shared by the executive branch and the Congress. And it has been compounded, if I may use that word, by the prevailing attitudes, habits of thought and expression, on the part of that tremendously articulate and influential segment of our society which includes the press and other mass media of communication.

It is strange, indeed, that this should happen here, in the United States, where the twin great revolutions of the 20th century—in technology and in communications—have achieved the highest level of advancement.

We have set human footprints on the moon, harnessed atomic energy to peaceful purposes, and demonstrated that man can change his condition and become the master of his environment.

We perfected techniques of sending a message across hundreds of thousands of miles in an instant and made it simultaneously available to millions of our fellow citizens.

We even learned how to tailor that message so as to produce a desired, predictable response and applied that knowledge with tremendous success in our commercial, industrial and other domestic endeavors.

Our advertising and public relations industries provide a splendid testimonial of our inventiveness, our sensitivity to human needs and concerns, and our ability to capitalize commercially on our understanding of human attitudes and motivations.

Yet, at the same time, our government has failed to communicate effectively with large segments of our own population and with the world at large.

There is, I must admit, a historical predicate for that outcome. There is a strong liberal strain in our national consciousness which rebels against the attempt by any government to mold the opinions, or shape the attitudes, of the governed. We view propaganda with healthy disrespect. We insist on the right to be informed but never indoctrinated. And we apply those standards in our dealings with other peoples and other nations.

I see nothing wrong with that. But the point is that when I speak of our government's apparent inability to communicate effectively, I am not talking about government propaganda. I do not advocate, and I have never advocated, our government undertaking to ram "the American dream," or the United States position on a particular issue, down the throat of a given audience. I believe that such an attempt would be foolish, short-sighted, and very probably counter-productive.

What I am talking about is the very real fact that we live in the age of public diplomacy—and that today the success or failure of foreign policy undertakings is frequently affected more profoundly by what people think and say than by the workings of traditional diplomacy.

Modern mass communications—not our success in reaching the moon—have turned our earth into a relatively small and intimate society in which nations, in the manner of neighbors leaning over the fence, chat with each other, gossip, spread rumors, sometimes scold, cajole and threaten, and become increasingly aware of what goes on in their neighbor's back yard.

The people of those nations, in turn, exert pressures on their governments, forcing them at times to adopt one course, at times another.

This fact is recognized by most governments. Many of them engage in the practice of public diplomacy and communicate directly with the populations and opinion molders in other countries. Some ignore public opinion and suffer the consequences.

Surely nothing can underscore these realities better than the impact of the public reaction to the Vietnam war on the public postures, and policies, of many governments currently in power.

Just last week, all of us were exposed to a nationwide demonstration on behalf of a moratorium on the conflict in Vietnam. That demonstration was a fact, a reality. It touched the consiousness of millions of people, both at home and abroad. It served to reinforce some of their attitudes, perhaps to change others.

What is more important is that the United States Government's reaction to that demonstration was bound to have an even greater impact on the world-wide radio, TV and press audience. The world knows of our involvement in Vietnam and it seeks to know constantly—about our government's intentions and actions with respect to that conflict. Any statement on this subject by a high-ranking official of the present administration falls upon eager ears.

For that reason, it is legitimate to ask: Did the administration consider carefully and in advance, the impact on millions upon millions of people in virtually every corner of the world, of its public reaction to the moratorium demonstration?

I have another example. An article from Monday's New York Times entitled "Tokyo bracing for antiwar protest tomorrow: 25,000 policemen mobilized." Tuesday's story in the Times, with pictures, indicated that Tokyo had been severely upset and that there had been violence

That event and those stories also touched the minds of millions of people. It affected their thinking not only about the demonstrators and the actions of the Tokyo police but also about the United States and the role which our country plays in the world community.

The events which transpire around us are real. Our Government's reaction to them is real. Through the instrument of the communication media, both become a part and parcel of the new dimension of public diplomacy which shapes the course, and affects the success or the failure, of our foreign policy.

The United States Government should recognize that fact. We should realize that public diplomacy is here to stay regardless of what we think or do about it. And for this very reason the United States should stop reacting and take the initiative. Instead of being the passive object of public diplomacy, we should go affirmative. We should use public diplomacy to advance the objectives which are good for this country and for the world community.

I hope that today's conference hastens the arrival of that day—and that our discussions here will be followed by the appointment of a national commission, with a mandate from the President himself, to reexamine the basic premises, and the total structure, of our overseas information activities.

As most of you know, this recommendation emanates from my subcommittee's report on: "The Future of United States Public Diplomacy", filed in the Congress some nine months ago.

That report reflects the work and the convictions of the entire subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans—and of a number of outstanding experts in communication. None of us, I can assure you, claims individual credit for its content and quality. I hope,

therefore, that those of you who have not seen it obtain a copy here today and read it. I do so recommend and I think that you will find the experience worth your effort.

I would like to add that this was the sixth in a series of reports issued by our subcommitte, focusing on the twin aspects of our country's image and operations abroad.

We began our studies on this subject as early as 1963 and we have continued them without interruption until the publication of this last report. I may mention that the late Edward R. Murrow who was vitally interested in our hearings was our lead-off witness.

In our studies, we addressed ourselves to the ideological factors in foreign policy—to overseas programs and operations which are a component of our national image—to the techniques of modern communication—to the input of the behavioral sciences—and to other related subjects.

We have tried to be as thorough and as objective as possible. We have produced a record which should prove valuable to any student or participant in the shaping of our Government's information policy. And we reached our conclusions with a bipartisan unanimity seldom encountered in the Halls of Congress.

We also found substantial support for some of the ideas which we have advocated—both within the executive branch and outside of our Government.

An excellent example are the last two reports of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, headed by a distinguished scholar and communicator, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Both of those documents recommend a thorough reappraisal of our overseas information programs—as well as a redirection of the United States Information Agency.

That agency, I may add, has been the object of much criticism, some of it undoubtedly warranted. A case in point is a series of articles published recently by the Philadelphia Bulletin and authored by a distinguished speaker at this conference, Mr. Paul Grimes.

While I do not intend to discuss Mr. Grimes' articles, which speak very pointedly for themselves, USIA's operation, or the Agency's shortcomings, I believe that it would be appropriate to point out that the USIA, like any other Government agency, can only operate within the mandate set for it by the Congress and the Chief Executive.

Unfortunately, neither the Congress nor the Presidents have given the Agency the type of a role and the kind of support which would enable it to become an effective instrument of United States public diplomacy.

Three quick examples will suffice to underscore this point:

First, in relation to the job that needs to be done, the USIA has been perennially undernourished. This applies to program expenditures as well as to its housekeeping. For example, how can you run an efficient, coordinated operation when you have to work out of 11 widely-dispersed buildings in Washington alone. And if the agency is denied the kind of a facility which modern management considers indispensable, how can it be faulted when its level of performance begins to dip.

Second, the USIA does not have a clear mandate as that term is generally understood. This is largely because the President himself has to define the role that the USIA will play in the foreign policy mechanism of his administration. The Congress cannot dictate that. And, unfortunately, in relation to the multiplicity of operations involved in our overseas information posture, none of our recent Presidents has assigned to the USIA any clear and effective role. The last directive that I have seen on this subject was issued by President Kennedy during the early part of his administration—and that was not very comprehensive, and has been subject to widely divergent interpretations.

Finally, the USIA has been denied opportunity for a systematic input into the foreign policy decisionmaking at the highest level. This is all important. Unless and until the agency will be able to contribute its proper input to the formulation of policy and the preparation of its exterior, visible shell, our Government will not begin to practice public diplomacy with any significant level of proficiency.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen—allow me to finish on this note:

In the report to which I referred earlier, my subcommittee, with the assistance of experts in the field of communication and human behavior, made three key observations. They were:

First, that the United States should accept the fact that foreign policy begins with domestic conduct and that we will always be judged by what we are and what we do rather than by what we say.

Second, that in this age whose character is being shaped by communications, the United States must learn to listen. Communication is a two-way street, a dialog. We have to learn to accept that fact.

And, third, that the United States must learn to speak effectively to foreign audiences. To be able to do this, we will have to review and possibly revise, our whole approach to overseas information, as well as the machinery and the operations of our government agencies involved in this field.

If we accept these premises, and carry them out, I am confident that—in the words of one of our witnesses—international communication can become the basis of a rational discourse of mankind about life and the destiny of our world.

It certainly can—and I join with you in hoping that it will.

Thank you.

UNITED STATES IS CRITICIZED ON OVERSEAS NEWS: BOTH ABOLITION AND GROWTH OF AGENCY ASKED AT PARLEY

(By Arnold H. Lubasch)

Journalists, diplomats, professors and politicians appealed last week for an intensive reappraisal of the Government's overseas information policies and programs.

Their suggestions, advanced in a conference at the Overseas Press Club, ranged from vigorously expanding the United States Information Agency to simply abolishing it.

Although the 20 participants voiced diverse views in the conference, they agreed on the need for a thorough review of the purposes and practices of the overseas information system.

Prof. W. P. Davison of Columbia University told the conference that new technologies and political forces required a review and revision of the information agency.

Dr. Robert F. Delaney, director of the Edward R. Murrow Center of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, asserted that the communications revolution engendered by radio and television represented "nothing less than a new diplomacy, a new weapons system."

John W. Henderson, author of "The United States Information Service," suggested that a review could consider whether the agency should be turned into a public corporation, relinquishing its role as a policy adviser.

COMMISSION IS ASKED

The hope that President Nixon would appoint a national commission to "reexamine the basic premises and the total structure of our overseas information activities" was voiced by Representative Dante B. Fascell, Democrat of Florida.

Generating support for the commission proposal was the avowed purpose of the conference, which was sponsored by the Emergency Committee for a Reappraisal of United States Overseas Information Policies and Programs in conjunction with the Overseas Press Club Foundation.

The committee and the conference grew out of recommendations by a House foreign affairs subcommittee headed by Mr. Fascell.

Dr. Edward L. Bernays, chairman of the committee advocating the reappraisal, asserted that the information agency suffered from problems of structure, administration, leadership, training, financing, coordination and objectives.

Peter Grimes, special projects editor of The Philadelphia Bulletin, said the agency was seriously inhibited by fear of Congressional criticism that resulted in severely diluting the information programs.

REPORT FROM GALLUP

The conference heard a report by Dr. George Gallup Jr. that his polling organization had found that the American image abroad "reached a low point" in 1968 as a result of the Vietnam war, race relations, violence and assassinations.

This image improved "not dramatically but decisively" this year, Dr. Gallup said, because of troop withdrawals, reduced violence, the moon landing and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In India, he added, the United States is more popular than the Soviet Union for the first time in several years, although both are now surpassed in popularity by Japan.

James Sheldon, columnist and lecturer, cautioned that the effectiveness of the information agency should be measured by the success of American policies rather than by the increase of American popularity.

URGES BETTER TRAINING

Ivan H. Peterman, veteran war correspondent, urged better recruiting and training of personnel to foster the "aggressive selling of America."

Contending, to the contrary, that the U.S.I.A. talked too much and listened too little, Dean Gerhart W. Wiebe of Boston University said it should "stop acting like a perennial pitchman" and participate in civil discussions with other countries.

A former Ambassador to Pakistan, Benjamin H. Oehsert, who proposed in a panel discussion that the agency and its overseas service be abolished, said, "Today they serve no useful purpose commensurate with their costs."

This was disputed by Barry Zorthian, president of Time-Life Broadcast, Inc., who evoked laughter by reporting that he knew a former ambassador who thought "the State Department should be abolished."

Mr. Fascell, citing the "horrible specter" of abolishing the U.S.I.A. and the State Department, quipped that "both agencies want to abolish Congress."

TRIBUTE TO ROSEL H. HYDE

(Mr. HANSEN of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today Rosel H. Hyde is retiring as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. This marks the completion of 45 years of exceptional Federal service. Mr. Hyde's career is unique in the history of our Republic. There are few who can equal his record of distinguished service to the Nation either in length or in accomplishment.

Rosel Hyde's long and dedicated service to our country has brought honor and distinction to the State of Idaho. He is not only a valued personal friend, but I am proud of the fact that he is a native

of, and continues to be a legal resident of, the district I am privileged to represent in Congress. He was born on his father's homestead in Bannock County, Idaho, on April 12, 1900. He was one of a family of seven children that grew up in the community of Downey, Idaho.

Rosel Hyde came to the Nation's Capital in 1924. He enrolled in night classes at the George Washington University Law School and entered Government service as a member of the staff of the Civil Service Commission. He later joined the staff of the Office of Public Buildings and Parks where he served from 1925 to 1928.

In 1928 he commenced his long and productive career in the Federal regulation of electrical communications when he was appointed as an assistant attorney with the Federal Radio Commission. Since then he has served the Commission in many positions of responsibility. His career has spanned most of the life of the Nation's broadcast industry. He has helped to shape the broadcast industry during the period of its growth from its earliest days into the powerful and responsible servant of the public interest it has become.

Rosel Hyde began his service with the Federal Communications Commission, the successor agency to the Federal Radio Commission, as an associate attorney. In succession he served the Commission as attorney examiner, associate attorney, examiner, senior examiner, and principal attorney. In 1942, he was appointed assistant general counsel and was elevated in 1945 to the position of general counsel.

President Truman appointed Rosel Hyde as a member of the Federal Communications Commission on April 17, 1946. His service as a member of the Commission continued by reappointment under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. He served two terms as Chairman of the FCC and at the request of President Nixon, continued as Chairman until his retirement.

Rosel Hyde's contributions to the Federal Communications Commission and to the public through his service on the Commission are far too many to list in these brief remarks. It is appropriate, however, to mention some of the highlights and most notable achievements during his public service.

From his earliest days with the Federal Radio Commission, Rosel Hyde has worked to build for the Commission a strong professional staff. During the 1930's as a staff lawyer, he was instrumental in obtaining Commission approval of a proposal for the delegation to the staff of routine licensing functions. This has enabled the Commission to devote its time to more important policy matters.

In 1952, when the Commission lifted a 4-year freeze on television development, Chairman Hyde was instrumental in setting up special agency procedures to permit the effective handling of the great mass of new TV applications that were to result in the establishment of a truly nationwide television system. This successful effort avoided the delay in television development that would otherwise inevitably have resulted because of the very large volume of applications.

In 1954 Rosel Hyde's timely and effective support for established rules limiting broadcast station ownership was instrumental in preventing a much greater concentration of economic power in broadcasting.

Rosel Hyde has won an international reputation for the leading role he played in the U.S. negotiation of a North American regional broadcast agreement treaty in the mid-1950's which effectively safeguarded our country's international broadcast interests. Despite the heavy pressure of national networks and giant clear channel radio stations, he has continued to play an important role in the negotiation of international broadcasting agreements.

He was an early and effective supporter of the Commission's efforts to stimulate the development of educational television and the reservation of channels for this purpose. His support of educational television has continued. Under his chairmanship the Commission retained its educational television policies despite industry efforts to delete the reservations and to make these channels immediately available for commercial use.

Rosel Hyde was the principal negotiator of the $100,000,000 telephone rate reduction instituted by the Bell Telephone System which was approved by the Commission in 1964. This rate reduction package included Bell's establishment of its $1 coast-to-coast phone rate. For many years he has been head of the Commission's Telephone and Telegraph Panel and under the Commission's "continuing surveillance" of Bell has played an important part in many negotiations that have led to a series of interstate rate reductions.

During his earlier tenure as Chairman, Rosel Hyde achieved one of the finest records of any FCC Chairman in effectively handling the agency's heavy workload and eliminating the accumulated backlogs that have prevailed during many other times.

He has been a champion of broadcast free speech and of the right of the broadcaster to editorialize. He was a leading force as early as 1949 in the Commission decision rejecting its earlier restrictive "Mayflower" doctrine and first permitting broadcasters to editorialize. More recently, he was part of a Commission majority which has given free speech protections to unorthodox or unpopular broadcaster views.

Mr. Hyde's skill as an administrator has contributed greatly to the modernization and the increased efficiency of the administrative process. He was chairman of a major working committee on compliance and enforcement proceedings of the Administrative Conference of the United States during the period from 1961 to 1963. Under his chairmanship the committee's efforts were instrumental in the Conference's adoption of a number of important procedural innovations, such as the use of pretrial discovery in most administrative proceedings.

He has been a leader in the effort to provide parties before the Commission with full due process and to modernize and improve agency procedure. An example has been the Commission's pending proposal to permit pretrial discovery in its proceedings and its decision to follow the more modern courts in permitting pretrial disclosure of the Government's cases against broadcast licensees put on trial before it.

Rosel Hyde's career is unique in many respects.

He has served as Commissioner longer than any other Commissioner in the history of the FCC—23 years;

He was named Chairman by three Presidents—President Eisenhower in 1952, President Johnson in 1966, and President Nixon in 1969;

He has served as Chairman and Acting Chairman longer than any other Chairman in the history of the FCC;

He has served as Commissioner longer than anyone presently serving as Commissioner of a major regulatory agency—SEC, FTP, FPC, ICC, CAB, NLRB; and

He has served the Federal Government longer than any other employee presently on the rolls of the FCC.

The International Radio and Television Society honored Rosel Hyde with its Gold Medal Award for the year 1965. In 1967, the Volunteers of America presented him with the Ballington and Maud Booth Award. During the same year, the University of Utah conferred on him an honorary degree doctor of laws degree.

On September 3, 1924, he married the former Mary Henderson of Arimo, Idaho. They have four children—Rosel Henderson, George Richard, William Henderson and Mary Lynn Day. A brother, G. Osmund Hyde, recently retired as chief hearing examiner at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to attend and participate in a ceremony at the Federal Communications Commission honoring Chairman Hyde on his retirement. In attendance were many distinguished leaders in government and in the broadcast industry, including many present and past Commissioners. Messages congratulating and paying tribute to Rosel Hyde from throughout the Nation were read. All America is deeply indebted to him for leadership that has always been characterized by wisdom, courage and a steadfast devotion to the public interest. Americans for generations to come will continue to benefit from his exceptional service.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues will join me in extending to Rosel Hyde our sincere thanks for a job well done. And, to Rosel and Mrs. Hyde go our best wishes for continued success and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

I include as part of my remarks copies of letters from President Nixon and former President Johnson addressed to Rosel Hyde on the occasion of his retirement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 29, 1969.

Hon. ROSEL H. HYDE,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROSEL: As you retire from the Chairmanship of the Federal Communications

Commission, you leave behind a unique and truly enviable record of accomplishment. You end a Government tenure that has earned you the highest respect of your associates, and an affection and admiration that goes far beyond party lines. There are few men whose professional excellence I am so pleased to applaud.

Surely your loyalty to the Presidents you have served; your steadfast devotion to the public trust you have held and your integrity, impartiality and talent have all earned you a place of distinction in the annals of America's Federal service.

As the Commission and its staff gather to honor you and to wish you Godspeed in the years ahead, I wholeheartedly join them in conveying my own strong admiration and my very high regard. And just as any man would do who occupies the Presidency in this communications-oriented era, I can only express the hope that, in your successors, our nation will find the same qualities which you so generously gave it.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
October 30, 1969.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.:

It is a deep pleasure to know that Rosel H. Hyde is being honored today. I want to join his many friends in bidding him farewell, and to wish him every happiness in the years ahead.

Dedication, vision, commitment, honor are words repeatedly associated with Rosel Hyde. I know them to be accurate, though not nearly adequate. His high standards of public service were exemplary. His long and well-spent career have won him the admiration and respect of a grateful Nation.

As ever, he has my personal appreciation and my best regards.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

SDS REPRESENTATIVES RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM VIETCONG

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, just about anyone who is exposed to radio, television, or a daily newspaper is aware that college today is not only a seat of learning but also the seat of considerable strife.

While no one organization or issue can be held responsible for all of the campus disturbances we have been witnessing recently, quite a few people are familiar with the name—Students for a Democratic Society—because it has been linked with much of the disorder.

I do not think many Americans are aware, however, of the degree to which this so-called democratic organization of American college students is under the tutelage of foreign Communist agencies engaged in armed hostilities with our military forces abroad. Little publicity has been given to a sojourn to Cuba by certain SDS activists during last summer's recess in college studies and college violence. Yet what was the purpose of the trip? And what were its results?

Officers and organizers of the Students for a Democratic Society, upon their return to the United States, reported quite frankly in radical newspapers that they had spent 2 out of 5 weeks in Cuba meeting with the "Vietcong." The Vietnamese delegation they met with included official representatives of the Communist government in North Vietnam, the Communist parties of both North and South Vietnam, and an officer in the armed forces presently engaged in combat with the armed forces of the Republic of South Vietnam and their American allies.

And note this: The Vietnamese specified in advance the type of Americans they wanted to talk with in Cuba. They wanted hard core new left organizers—which, as it turned out, were mainly from the Students for a Democratic Society, according to accounts in the radical press.

For quite some time, of course, SDS members have made periodic pilgrimages to North Vietnam. The SDS national secretary acknowledged back in the summer of 1968 that such trips were being undertaken by SDS people. Among the reports delivered at a meeting of the SDS National Council in the fall of 1968 was a report on meetings with the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong.

With respect to the talks between SDS members and Vietnamese Communists in Cuba last summer, I was struck by the admission of the American contingent that it had been summoned to the meetings by the Vietnamese, and that the reason was Vietnamese Communist concern over the lull in anti-Vietnam war activity in the United States. The Vietnamese, intention—according to the Americans—was to prod American radicals into getting in motion against American involvement in the war.

Vietnamese Communist representatives told the Americans that the war was actually being waged on three fronts. The conflict extended beyond the shooting war in Vietnam to the peace talks in Paris and to the arenas of international public opinion—particularly public opinion in the United States.

I regret to report that the SDS delegation agreed under the Vietcong prodding to do everything it could to speed up what it described as the inevitable American defeat in Vietnam. The SDS announced plans for militant actions which it claimed would build another war front within the United States, and provide material aid to the Vietcong.

I think organizers for Students for a Democratic Society would find it much more difficult to enlist college students and other young people in disruptive demonstrations if these dealings with the Vietnamese Communists were more widely known.

ROGERS INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would authorize the creation of the position "Under Secretary of Health" within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This Under Secretary would report directly to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and would have line authority over and responsibility for coordinating all health and health-related activities of the Department.

I believe there is a pressing need for more coordination and unified authority for health activities within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The controversy earlier this year surrounding the appointment of Dr. John Knowles as Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs, the recent problems within the Food and Drug Administration concerning cyclamates and the GRAS list, and the skyrocketing costs of medicare and medicaid indicate to me that a focal point for the Nation's health needs and problems must be established within the Department of HEW.

Since 1961, a total of 36 major health measures have been enacted that provide for increased authority and responsibility in the field of health. There are two major agencies which operate exclusively in the health field: The Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service. In addition, there are large-scale health activities in the Social Security Administration—medicare and the disability insurance program—and in the Social and Rehabilitation Service—medicaid, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

The administration of these health programs would become the responsibility of the Under Secretary for Health and would permit more effective, overall coordination of health programs. And, I believe we would see better control of health costs by such a reorganization within the Department through more efficient administration.

The concept of an Under Secretary of Health is not new. Indeed, it is a subject which has received consideration previously, with the Congress and within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1965, and in 1966, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of a Special Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In its report to the Congress, the subcommittee recommended the creation of the position of Under Secretary for Health in order to better coordinate the health programs and activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

During the first session of the 90th Congress, in 1967, an amendment was added to the partnership for health legislation by the Senate to create the position of Under Secretary of Health, but the conference committee on the bill rejected the Senate approach on the grounds that hearings on this important subject should be held by both Houses of the Congress.

There is a sense of urgency in this matter, and I am hopeful that hearings on the establishment of this important and necessary position can begin soon

before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE'S REPORTS ON SST

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, recently completed its hearings on the Department of Transportation. Among the appropriations requests was one for the SST. It was at my request that there was included in the hearings the report of the SST ad hoc review committee which was stated to have been made available to President Nixon by the Department of Transportation before he announced his decision to continue with the SST program. That report was made public today.

The report of that committee is so unfavorable to the program that I am amazed that President Nixon approved the request for the SST. The committee, which consisted of many of the ablest people in this administration, recommended overwhelmingly in favor of suspending work on the project.

The report rejects basic arguments used to justify the SST. It disputes that the balance of payments would be favorable; it casts doubt on the economic viability of the plane; it questions whether Americans will ever accept the jarring sonic boom which is an inseparable part of supersonic flight, it raises disturbing questions about the damaging effects the SST would have on the environment, it criticizes the two-headed conflicting role played by the FAA in acting as the guardian of the safety of the Nation's airways and of the aircraft using the airways. While acting at the same time as the principal supporter and loving promoter of an aircraft having such dubious value as the SST.

Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy launched the SST program in 1963 he said:

> In no event will the Government investment be permitted to exceed $750 million.

With the appropriation proposed for this year expenditures on the project will very nearly reach the limit set by President Kennedy, and if the appropriations scheduled to be made over the next 5 years are added, this airplane will cost more than one-half billion dollars than the amount that Mr. Kennedy established. I believe this is the logical time to call a halt to the program and I shall try to strike the appropriation in my committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the public should have the information contained in the ad hoc committee report and I am therefore appending it to my remarks. I am also attaching the report of the airlines companies who were consulted on the SST by FAA. At the request of FAA, I have removed identification of the airlines making comments.

The material follows:

REPORT OF THE SST AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE

Within this report are the views of the members of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee to the Secretary of Transportation. All pertinent documentation of the Committee activities are included.

MEMBERS

Hon. Rocco Siciliano, Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. T. C. Muse, Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Hon. John Veneman, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Hon. Russell Train, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Hon. Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Hon. Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Hon. Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Dr. Henry Houthakker, Member, Council of Economic Advisers.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, National Science Adviser.

Mr. Charles W. Harper, Deputy Associate Administrator (Aeronautics), NASA.

James M. Beggs, Chairman, SST Ad Hoc Review Committee.

On February 19, 1969, the President appointed this Committee to investigate the national interest questions associated with the pending SST decisions (Attachment 1).

Four meetings were held for the accomplishment of the activities of this Committee. Four working Panels were established to examine specific areas as indicated below:

1. Economics.
2. Balance of Payments and International Relations.
3. Environmental and Sociological Impact.
4. Technological Fallout.

The membership is indicated on Attachment 2.

Various witnesses, both pro and con, were called to testify before the Committee. Attachment 3 provides a listing of the outside witnesses.

The individual Panel Reports follow as Attachment 4.

At the meeting of March 25 with the Secretary of Transportation, the members stated there was some misunderstanding concerning which draft document was under consideration. As a result, the Chairman solicited final members' comments on the Comprehensive March 25 Draft (Attachment 4), and those comments are included as Attachment 5.

A Draft Summary Report of March 19 circulated by the Chairman requesting members' comments follows as Attachment 6 and the letters commenting on this draft summary follow as Attachment 7.

A letter from the Chairman providing guidance and a modus operandi for the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee, dated February 28 is included as Attachment 8.

An observer from the Bureau of the Budget participated in the activities of the Committee.

The Boeing Company report, "The SST Program and Related National Benefits," February 17, 1969, was provided to members for review.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 19, 1969.

Memorandum for Mr. James Beggs.

I am establishing an ad hoc committee to review the Supersonic Transport program in line with the recommendations given to me by Secretary Volpe.

I hereby appoint you the Chairman of this Committee. The other members of the committee will be:

Mr. Rocco Siciliano, Under Secretary of Commerce.

Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. John Veneman, Under Secretary of HEW.

Mr. Russell Train, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Dr. Henry Houthakker, Member, Council of Economic Advisers.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, National Science Adviser.

Mr. Charles W. Harper, Deputy Associate Administrator of NASA.

The activities of this committee should be coordinated closely with the Bureau of the Budget.

RICHARD NIXON.

WORKING PANEL COMPOSITION

(1) Balance of Payments and International Relations Panel—Representatives from Treasury (Chairman), Commerce and State.

(2) Technological Fall-Out Panel—Representatives from the Office of Science and Technology (Chairman), Department of Defense, and NASA.

(3) Environmental and Sociological Impact Panel—Representatives from HEW (Chairman), Interior, and Office of Science and Technology.

(4) Economics Panel—Representatives from the Council of Economic Advisers (Chairman), Labor and Commerce.

WITNESSES WHO ADDRESSED THE COMMITTEE

Dr. Arnold Moore, Director, Naval Warfare Analysis Group, Center for Naval Analyses.

Mr. Gerald Kraft, President, Charles River Associates.

Mr. Najeeb Halaby, President, Pan American.

Mr. Robert Rummel, Vice President, TWA.

Mr. Harding Lawrence, President, Braniff.

Mr. Karl Harr, Jr., President, Aerospace Industries Association.

Prof. William A. Shurcliff, Director, Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom.

Lt. Gen. Elwood R. Quesada, Chairman of the Board and President, the L'Enfant Plaza Corps.

PANEL REPORTS TO THE COMMITTEE

Balance of payments and international relations

Potential Impact of an SST on the U.S. Balance of Payments

Introduction of a supersonic aircraft will affect several closely interrelated components of the U.S. balance of payments:

Aircraft exports and imports (supersonic and subsonic):

U.S. travel abroad and foreign travel to the U.S.;

The distribution of this travel between U.S. and foreign airlines;

U.S. port expenditures by foreign airlines and port expenditures abroad by U.S. airlines;

The amount of export credit extended or received by the U.S. in connection with aircraft financing; and

General U.S. imports and exports, and U.S. investments abroad, all of which will be facilitated by the greater ease of U.S. business travel abroad due to the SST.

There are two widely divergent views about which of the above items should be considered in appraising the balance-of-payments impact of an SST. The first view is that only the aircraft account (and possibly port expenditures) should be considered. The basis for this view is that the U.S. has a long-run interest in encouraging the development and operation of better means of international transportation in the interests of the entire world economy; and that if a U.S. SST increases our aircraft exports (or decreases our aircraft imports) there is no U.S. balance-of-payments reason for not pursuing this long-run interest by production of a U.S. SST. The Commerce Department supports this view.

The second point of view is that all the above items must be considered, insofar as feasible, in appraising the balance-of-payments impact of an SST. The logic of this position is especially clear with respect to two of the above items: U.S. aircraft exports and U.S. travel abroad.

The amount of export contribution (a *plus* item) which a U.S. SST makes to the U.S. balance of payments depends in considerable part on the additional U.S. travel abroad (a *minus* item in our balance of payments) induced by the time savings on an SST. Since the *plus* item depends substantially on the *minus* item, both (as well as other relevant items) must be considered in appraising U.S. balance-of-payments impact.

State and Treasury support this second view.

In line with the above divergence of views, Section A of the attachment comments on the estimated impact of an SST only on the aircraft account in our balance of payments. The conclusion in this respect is:

If only the aircraft account is considered, there is no *balance-of-payments* reason for delaying the SST project, regardless of whether or not a commercially viable foreign supersonic aircraft emerges.

Section B of the attachment comments on the effects on other balance-of-payments items, primarily the U.S. travel deficit. The conclusion is:

If the U.S. over-all balance of payments is considered, there is substantial reason for delay in proceeding to the next stage of the SST project—prototype production. The reason lies in the large adverse effect on the U.S. travel deficit of a U.S. SST in the absence of a commercially viable Concorde *plus* doubt about the Concorde's becoming a commercially viable plane.

Results of the Concorde prototype testing over the next 12 months will throw further light on its chances of becoming commercially viable. The U.S., in addition to continuing further research in aircraft and engine design, could profitably use this period to update and improve the surveys of the effect of supersonic transportation on both the aircraft and travel accounts. The assumptions currently being used for dividing traffic between supersonic and subsonic aircraft and for estimating additional speed-induced travel are critical to both the aircraft and travel accounts and are subject to a high margin of error.

(A) *SST Impact on Aircraft Account in the U.S. Balance of Payments:* If there is a commercially viable *foreign* supersonic aircraft in existence, a competitive U.S. SST would improve the *aircraft account* in the U.S. balance of payments by reducing U.S. imports of the foreign supersonic; resulting in U.S. supersonic exports of greater value than the subsonic exports which are displaced.

There is a wide range of benefit estimates based on different assumptions about fares, passenger evaluation of time savings, etc. Also, benefits vary depending on the assumed market situations.

On a current cash basis, the FAA analysis indicates a total improvement of about $17 billion over the period through 1990, from introducing a U.S. SST in 1978 into competition with a Concorde.

If there is no commercially viable Concorde, the improvement in the aircraft account through 1990 due to a U.S. SST (beginning operations in 1978) is estimated at $11 billion—that is, an increase from around $17 billion of subsonic exports in the absence of *any* supersonic plane to $28 billion of combined SST and subsonic exports.

(B) *SST Impact on Various Accounts in the U.S. Balance of Payments:* U.S. aircraft sales and U.S. travel expenditures abroad have divergent effects on the balance of payments.

While an increase in exports of SST's will benefit the aircraft account, it will produce an even larger increase in the travel deficit, as long as Americans make the majority of supersonic trips.

The current rate of air travel deficit—including aircraft port expenditures, travelers' fares and travelers' expenditures in foreign countries, is approximately $1.6 billion. *Even in the absence of any commercial supersonic aircraft,* it is expected to increase in absolute amount, although at a reduced rate of increase, over the next few decades, totaling around $70 billion for the period 1971 through 1990—the period used by the consultant firm which has made the only quantitative analysis of the potential impact of the supersonic transportation on several relevant items in the balance of payments.

That analysis (performed in 1966) produced an unrealistically high estimate of the adverse impact on the U.S. travel account of speed-induced supersonic travel in the 20-year period. It would make the $70 billion figure mentioned above over twice as large. Use of a longer base period for determining statistical relationships, a reexamination of some of the underlying assumptions, and use of more realistic in-service dates for supersonic aircraft are believed likely to reduce the 1966 estimate substantially.

Even a more conservative estimate from revised underly assumptions is likely to indicate an adverse impact of speed-induced supersonic travel on the U.S. travel account considerably greater than the estimated *beneficial* impact of supersonic aircraft sales on the U.S. aircraft account.

The latter judgment depends heavily on whether or not a *commercially viable* foreign supersonic aircraft is assumed to be in operation when a U.S. SST is put in service. If such a foreign aircraft is assumed not to be in operation, the entire adverse travel impact of speed-induced supersonic travel must be attributed to the U.S. SST.

At present the commercial viability of the Concorde is very much in doubt—particularly because of landing and take-off noise, range limitations and prospective high operating cost per seat mile. Cables from our embassies in London and Paris indicate that some French and British officials close to the program are skeptical of the Concorde's commercial viability.

Foreign Relations Impact of U.S. SST Decision

The Anglo-French Concorde program has been a sensitive domestic issue in those countries, particularly the U.K. U.S. actions on the SST question which seem to the U.K. and France as designed to scuttle the Concorde for competitive reasons will undoubtedly stimulate an adverse political reaction. On the other hand, a U.S. decision to proceed in an orderly fashion, to delay, or to abandon the U.S. program on sensible technical and economic grounds should not generate an adverse Anglo-French reaction.

A more difficult question is raised by the problem of airport noise generated by SST's. U.S. noise standards could conceivably bar the Concorde from access to the principal U.S. international airports which would undoubtedly doom the Concorde program. It is therefore imperative that we keep the British and French advised of U.S. noise developments to insure their full understanding, if not acceptance, of the U.S. position on noise. In this connection, it would be desirable for the United States to seek early international agreement on noise standards, including airport noise created by SST's.

Economics

The Economic Subcommittee is struck by the large amount of uncertainty connected with the SST program. Almost every economic aspects of the program reflects unverifiable matters of judgment with great variance in the opinion of experts. Probably the single most uncertain aspect of the whole program relates to the uncertainty as to whether an SST can be built in the given time that will meet the specifications of being efficient, safe, and economical.

The record to date is not completely reassuring. After extensive study, the previous design was accepted as a good design that would produce an SST with the desired characteristics, but failed. While we are assured that the current design will succeed, the previous committee was given similar assurance. Assuming the prototype design meets its objectives, major innovations will still have to be made to produce an economical SST. Past commercial plane developments have never involved such a large jump in technology. In the case of commercial transports, a new type of metal—titanium—must be fabricated; a new type of guidance and electric control system must be developed; more efficient and quieter engines must be produced.

No doubt, all of the technical problems are eventually solvable, but how soon and at what cost? The record for new aircraft being designed to make technological jumps of this magnitude is confined strictly to military production. The record in those cases is not good. Production costs have often been more than three times what they were predicted to be. The record of civilian production of new planes has undoubtedly been much better. Most civilian jet transports have met their design goals with respect to performance and price and their performance has been improved during the economic life of the plane. However, these aircraft were designed from well known technology. For example, the 707 was a commercial adaptation of an already developed and well tested Air Force plane. The developmental experience with the Concorde gives little cause for optimism; developmental costs have more than doubled.

These comments do not mean that we believe that the plane cannot be built to meet the specifications at the forecasted costs but simply that there is a large element of doubt. If the forecasts turn out to be incorrect, costs could escalate considerably.

Demand

Estimating future demand involves another area of considerable certainty. Each element in the IDA model for forecasting demand involves large uncertainties and considerable elements of judgment in which reasonable people may come to considerably different opinions. Total demand for the SST will depend on total revenue passenger miles in the future. The IDA model basically forecasts the growth rate at approximately 10 percent per year. Historical experience, especially the last few years, suggests that a higher rate would be more accurate. However, it should be noted that IDA forecast a higher rate in the near future and a lower rate in the more distant future.

Revenue passenger miles in 1968 were 30 percent above IDA's forecast. If we extend IDA's rate of growth from that base level, total revenue passenger miles in 1969 will be 30 percent higher than forecast with an increase of approximately 150 aircraft. However, airport congestion which has already reached serious proportions in international terminals such as Kennedy, may prevent this traffic growth from being achieved.

The market for supersonic transport will depend on the supersonic-subsonic split. This depends in turn on those markets which are open to supersonic flight, on the relative fare between supersonic and subsonic, and on how the public values time saved. The FAA has assumed that the public will pay one and a half times their hourly earnings to secure an hour's reduction in flight time. IDA, after having looked at some very sketchy evidence, concluded that the travel-

lers value their time at their hourly earning rate. A 1967 Ph. D. study done by Ruben Gronau at Columbia University under the direction of Gary Becker concluded on the basis of a very detailed statistical study of air travel time from New York City to other points that businessmen value their time in air travel at 0.4 times their average hourly family income and that pleasure travellers valued their time in aircraft travel at zero. On the other hand, earlier estimates by the airlines indicate value of time from 1.3 to 2.1 times earnings.

The effect of assuming different values of time is substantial. Under the base case for the FAA with consumers valuing their time at one and a half times their hourly earnings, 500 planes will be sold. If, on the other hand, IDA is correct and they value time at one times their hourly earnings, only 350 planes will be sold.

In summary, the great uncertainties relating to estimating the public's valuation of time leaves the projected market subject to wide error.

Whatever the value of time, the split between supersonic and subsonic would depend upon the relative fares. If supersonic fares equal subsonic, all or almost all will travel by supersonic. The FAA in their base case has assumed that supersonic will have a 25 percent premium over the subsonic. The airlines are hoping for something less. The FAA predicated their relative fare position on the basis that the American SST seat costs would be roughly equal to the subsonic fares existing in 1965. They assumed that subsonic fares between 1965 and 1978 would decline in real terms by about 25 percent, producing the 25 percent differential. However, between 1965 and 1968 subsonic fares have already declined 18 percent. If one assumes as did IDA and the FAA that fares decline by 1.8 percent per year in the future, by 1978 the relative difference in supersonic and subsonic fares will grow to 36 percent rather than 25 percent. Such an increase in the difference between fares will reduce plane sales by about 150. However, airlines may be willing to accept a lower rate of return in order to preserve a 25 percent fare differential, with the result that the same 500 planes will be sold.

These plane fares, however, are highly speculative. They, of course, depend on the price of the plane and its operating costs which as has been pointed out above are highly uncertain. Both IDA and the FAA feasibility study assumed that the Concorde would not compete in the same markets with SST. Since the Concorde will be introduced five years prior to the SST, it may secure a considerable market before the SST is introduced. While the SST is expected to have operating costs below those of the Concorde, it may not be able to secure lower fares.

International fares are set by unanimous agreement of IATA in which each airline has a vote. With many airlines having the Concorde and with two airlines being intimately connected with its production—BOAC and Air France—it seems unlikely that the SST will force supersonic fares below those that are economical for the Concorde and drive the Concorde out of the market—the FAA assumption. The Concorde will be sold for about half the price and will have the seating capacity of an SST. Thus, two Concordes can be secured for each SST giving airlines an additional flexibility in scheduling. If fares are kept high enough to protect the Concorde so that both types of supersonic planes operate in the same markets at the same price, then they may split the market which will reduce SST sales from 500 to 250.

Another imponderable in the market forecast involves restrictions that might be imposed because of noise. The supersonic planes are by general agreement very noisy. Whether the planes will be permitted to land at major airports is uncertain. How much noise will the public tolerate? Problems clearly exist for Miami International, Boston's Logan Airport, and Los Angeles Airport. However, the planned or proposed construction of new airports may alleviate the problem. It is not clear how much of the added costs of new airports would be attributable to supersonic transports.

It should be noted that by the terms of the FAA-Boeing contract, Boeing establishes the price of the plane. Given the demand model specified, Boeing . . . could make more money at a price of $40 million than at a price of $37 million. In fact, Boeing could maximize its profits if it charged about $48 million. Such a price would reduce sales of planes to something under 350. This would in turn reduce government royalties to the point that the government barely got its money back.

Financing

Will the operation of the proposed U.S. SST provide a sufficient rate of return to the airlines to insure purchase of 500 U.S. SST's?

Since the SST is more capital intensive than subsonic aircraft, it is more sensitive to lower earnings. The model assumes that the higher rate of return earned on long-haul operations in the past will continue during the SST period.

The predicted ROI for the airline depends on the airlines achieving a load factor of 58 percent. This is relatively high compared to the experience of U.S. international and territorial airlines during the last two years or even the average for the seven years.

If load factors were to continue at the 1968 level of 52.6 percent throughout the SST period, 1978–1990, the return of investment to the airlines would only be 22.2 percent of the aircraft sales price compared to a ROI of 28.3 for the base case.

Statistics for the past seven years indicate that a lower overall load factor than 58 percent should probably be used in evaluating the SST program since this rate was achieved only once (1969) in the past seven years. The 1962–68 average of 55 percent would yield an airline ROI of 25.2 percent before taxes.

Moreover, long haul rates of return have been declining and were about 10.5 percent in 1968. Whether lower rates of return are practical is clearly uncertain. The problem of financing such a huge investment on top of the large investment in jumbo-jets could reduce the SST market considerably.

Financing the manufacture and purchases of the SST could prove more difficult than anticipated. It is generally accepted that the engine manufacturer will have the capacity to generate the necessary financing required. However, the EFR expresses some doubts regarding the airframe manufacturer: "Pending receipt of the financial plan from the airframe manufacturer, a reasonable approach suggests that any program decisions consider the possibility that the Government may be required to act as a guarantor of or to provide any additional funds needed by the airframe manufacturer."

Requirements

[In millions]

Facilities	$278
Development costs	1,226
Leadtime production costs	1,295
Total	3,429

Source of funds

[In millions]

Government prototype participation	$726
Airline prepayments	1,348
Tax considerations	310
Manufacturers shortage	1,045
Total	3,429

"This situation is expected to continue through 1975 at which point a cumulative financing of $1,064 million will exist . . . well in excess of twice the Boeing Company's net worth as of December 31, 1965."

Recent comments in the trade press indicate that the financing problem is more acute today due to increased costs and Boeing's additional developmental expenditures. The 747, 767, and SST programs could strain Boeing's financial and managerial resources. If the SST program is approved, Boeing might have to cut back some of its subsonic 767, 747, 727, or 707 activities.

The EFR assumed that the U.S. airline industry could provide 86 percent of its total cash requirements for the large subsonic and Concorde equipment cycle (1967–74) from internal cash generation (net income, depreciation, and disposal of flight equipment) and provide about 80 percent of its requirements for the heavy SST start-up costs during 1975–77 from the same sources.

The recent decline in rates of return on investment (8.9% in 1966, 7.7% in 1967, and an estimated 6% for 1968) suggests that the airline industry may already be overcapitalized. Declining earnings ratios will make it more difficult to obtain the large sums required for SST's from internal sources and require more expensive commercial financing.

Employment

Under the FAA base case the SST program may generate total employment, both direct and indirect, in excess of 100,000 workers, an unknown proportion of which will result from relative declines in other parts of the aerospace industry. This employment will be highly concentrated in professional, managerial, skilled, and semi-skilled occupations which in a period of full employment, when these skills are in short supply, may prove inflationary. Very few unskilled workers will be required. However, such employment should not be considered as a justification for proceeding with the program but only as a dividend from it.

REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL PANEL OF THE AD HOC SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Introduction

Supersonic transport (SST) has the potential for intensifying hazards to the passengers and crew for causing significant further deterioration in the environment for people on the ground particularly in the vicinity of SST airports and along SST flight paths. In recognition of their respective responsibilities in this regard in 1968, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare established a "Committee on Health Effects of Supersonic Transport", and the Department of the Interior assembled a "Special Study Group on Noise and Sonic Boom in Relation to Man." The Committee on Environmental Quality of the Federal Council for Science and Technology in July 1967 established a Task Force to report on noise as an environmental problem.

The Panel has drawn freely on the findings of each of these committees and has also been guided by the SST reports and briefings provided by the Department of Transportation.

The object of this report is to identify significant potential environmental and sociological problems related to the health and well-being of people which must be considered in making decisions concerning the SST. Technological, economic and political factors both domestc and international traditionally considered in developing national policy with respect to such matters are insufficient with respect to the SST.

The Panel considers the principal environmental and sociological problem areas to be: (1) Sonic boom; (2) Airport noise; (3) Hazards to passengers and crew; and (4) Effects of water vapor in the stratosphere.

Sonic boom

All available information indicates that the effects of sonic boom are such as to be considered intolerable by a very high percentage of the people affected. The Panel is

cognizant of statements and reports to the effect that supersonic flight over U.S. continental land areas is not contemplated at this time and that SST design and development is proceeding on this assumption. However, the Panel is very concerned about the economic pressures that will be exerted if it is subsequently found that the economic success of the aircraft depends on overland flights at supersonic speeds. For this reason the Panel believes it is essential that the public be formally assured by appropriate authorities that commercial supersonic flights over land will not be permitted and that SST design, development, and economic considerations are and will remain restricted to over water routes.

Airport noise

The rapid growth of the air transportation system has resulted in a wave of public reaction to aircraft noise on and near major airports and many smaller ones around the world. The problem can be characterized as one of conflict between two groups—those who benefit from air transportation services and people who live and work in communities near airports. The conflict exists because social and economic costs resulting from aircraft noise are imposed upon certain land users in the vicinity of airports who receive no direct benefits.

"The development of methods to reduce engine noise is an essential element in the development of the SST as well as subsonic jet aircraft. Reduction of engine noise, however, is more difficult for the SST. Acceleration to supersonic speeds and efficient supersonic cruise require engines with high-temperature high-velocity jets. These engines are fundamentally noisier than the fan engines that are optimum for the subsonic jets." *

According to estimates provided by the FAA, the levels of noise over a community on takeoff directly under the flight path one mile beyond a 10,000 foot runway, with power reduced to hold a rate of climb of 500 feet per minute, are 111 PNdB (perceived noise in decibels) for the SST and 125 PNdB for the 707. On final approach one mile out from the runway the level for the SST is 109 PNdB and for the 707, 123 PNdB. For the SST the 100 PNdB contour extends laterally 6000 feet on either side of the runway when the plane is 200 feet in the air at the end of the runway on takeoff. The comparative 100 PNdB contour for the 707 is about 2000 feet on either side of the runway. At the three mile point on takeoff, the 100 PNdB contour extends about 2000 feet on either side of the flight line for both the SST and the 707. By way of comparison, a trailer truck at highway speed has an over-all sound level of about 90 dB at 20 feet, a pavement breaker about 115 dB at the operator's ear, and the values of 109 and 111 PNdB cited above for the SST are in the range of PNdB levels recorded indoors and outdoors during sonic booms from B-58 aircraft. On the ground the SST is significantly noisier than the 707, the 100 PNdB contour extending about 5000 feet in all directions at the starting point and from 5000 to 6000 feet on either side of the runway during takeoff roll. The data indicate that on landing and takeoff the SST can be expected to produce noise levels exceeding 100 PNdB over a distance of 13 miles. An area 4 miles long and approximately 2 miles wide surrounding the runway would be exposed to noise levels in excess of 100 PNdB.

Prolonged exposure to intense noise produces permanent hearing loss. Increasing numbers of competent investigators believe that such exposure may adversely affect other organic, sensory and physiologic functions of the human body. Noise may also disrupt job performance by interfering with speech communication, distracting attention, and otherwise complicating the demands of the task. Such disruption could cause losses in overall efficiency or require increased effort and concentration to cope with the work situation. With regard to the latter, there appears to be a close relationship between bodily fatigue and noise exposure. Noise-induced hearing loss looms as a major health hazard in American industry. However, despite numerous efforts by professional standards and criteria committees, a national hearing conservation standard governing allowable or safe exposures remains to be established. Aside from hearing loss, noise may cause cardiovascular, glandular, respiratory, and neurologic changes, all of which are suggestive of a general stress reaction. Whether such reactions have pathologic consequences is not really known. However, there are growing indications, mainly in the foreign scientific literature, that routine exposures to intense industrial noise may lead to chronic physiologic disturbances. Available information suggests that workers devoting constant attention to detail (e.g., quality inspection, console monitoring) may be most prone to distraction. Noise may mask auditory warning signals and thereby cause accidents or generate reactions of annoyance and general fatigue.

Although some reduction in SST engine noise may be expected to result from expanded research and development programs on engine design and flight operating procedures, information available at this time indicates that land use planning in the vicinity of airports is the only satisfactory solution to this problem.

On the basis of the information summarized above, the panel is of the opinion that noise levels associated with SST operations will exceed 100PNdB over large areas surrounding SST airports. It can be expected, therefore, that significant numbers of people will file complaints and resort to legal action, and that a very high percentage of the exposed population will find the noise intolerable and the apparent cause of a wide variety of adverse effects.

Hazards to passengers and crew

There is an urgent need to carefully evaluate the inherent operational and environmental hazards that will be encountered while accelerating from zero to Mach 3 and cruising at supersonic speeds in a hostile environment. Passengers and crew will be vulnerable to a number of potentially serious physical, physiological, and psychological stresses associated with rapid acceleration, gravitational changes, reduced barometric pressure, increased ionizing radiation, temperature changes, and aircraft noise and vibration.

Man cannot tolerate acceleration loads above 4 to 5 g. Visual disturbances occur between 3 and 4 g. At 5 g. loss of consciousness occurs. Turbulent flight may cause brief linear acceleration of 10 to 12 g. which could cause fractures in unrestrained persons. Angular acelerations in turns and linear-angular accelerations during turbulent flight are important causes of motion sickness. Under cruise conditions the SST's exterior skin temperature will approach 260° C. Therefore, it is necessary to insulate the cabin and to install refrigeration, whereas subsonic jets require heating at cruise altitudes because the external temperature is approximately 55 degrees below zero centigrade.

Ozone is present in a concentration of about 8 ppm at 65,000 feet. There is ample evidence that ozone is a highly toxic substance which must not be allowed to enter the plane.

A doubling of the present flight altitude reduces ambient air pressure from one-fifth to one-thirtieth that at sea level. Therefore, in order to maintain current cabin pressures equivalent to an altitude of 7,500 feet, pressurization of the SST must be increased by approximately 2.5 psi above subsonic jets. A loss of pressure at 65,000 feet would result in all aboard losing consciousness within fifteen seconds.

The radiation hazard would be approximately 100 times greater than at ground level. A flight crew exposed for 600 hours annually will accumulate 0.85 rem (roentgen-equivalent-man) from this source alone. When this value is compared with the Maximum Permissible Dose of 0.5 rem for the general public, the question arises whether SST crews should be placed in the category of radiation workers and kept under close surveillance. The advisability of allowing pregnant women, especially in the first trimester, to travel in these planes, and of limiting diagnostic x-rays for individuals who fly SST's will also need to be considered. Much higher rates of exposure associated with solar flares are to be avoided by utilizing a warning network which will permit the pilot to descend to safer altitudes. Criteria should be developed to guide prospective passengers afflicted with chornic diseases for whom the environmental stresses which might conceivably be encountered could be detrimental to their health. Lastly, special consideration should be given to the bio-instrumentation of flight crews in view of experiences in manned space flight which have demonstrated the occurrence of serious loss of insight and judgment which accompany stress such as hypoxia or fatigue. At the earliest indication of malfunction of the aircraft, especially in its pressurization, temperature control, or oxygen systems, the aircraft must be brought down to safe levels as quickly as possible either by the crew or by the automatic pilot. The health and welfare of crews and passengers are incomparably more dependent on the propoer functioning of equipment for the SST than for subsonic aircraft

Effects of water vapor in the stratosphere

The widespread use of supersonic transports will introduce large quantities of water vapor into the stratosphere. The weight of water vapor released is about 40% greater than the weight of the fuel consumed. Four hundred SST's flying four trips per day might release an amount of water vapor per day that is 0.025% of that naturally present in the altitude range in which the flights occur. The introduction of this additional water vapor into the stratosphere can produce two effects which may be important:

(1) Persistent contrails might form to such an extent that there would be a significant increase in cirrus clouds;

(2) There could be a significant increase in the relative humidity of the stratosphere even if there were no significant increase in the extent of cirrus cloudiness.

Both effects would alter the radiation balance and thereby possibly affect the general circulation of atmospheric components. Of greater significance may be the local contamination one can expect from a high concentration of flights over the North Atlantic. If half the activity is concentrated over 5% of the earth's surface, local contamination would be ten times larger than calculated above on a global basis or about 0.25% per day of the naturally present water vapor. However, the local concentration of water vapor from flights on crowded routes may spread out rapidly and be of no real significance.

Although it would appear that geophysical effects are probably minor, they certainly should not be neglected. Data required include information relevant to the horizontal mixing times within the stratosphere and to the resident time of gases within the stratosphere. With these parameters at hand, it should be possible to construct a numerical model of the stratosphere to determine more accurately the possible radiative effects on the general circulation.

*The SST Program and Related National Benefits Feb. 17, 1969, the Boeing Company, page 6-22.

The findings of the Committees referred to in the Introduction are contained in the following reports, copies of which have been provided to the Ad Hoc SST Review Committee Staff:

1. "Noise—Sound Without Value", Committee on Environmental Quality of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, September 1968.

2. "Report to the Secretary of the Interior of the Special Study Group on Noise and Sonic Boom in Relation to Man"

3. "Supersonic Transport (SST)—Potential Health Hazards to the Crew, Passengers, and Population" (Unpublished Draft) Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, DHEW.

TECHNOLOGICAL FALLOUT

PURPOSE

To examine the importance of the SST program to the overall national research and development posture, the technological fallout benefits that may result from the SST program and specifically whether such benefits have security value.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION

The SST program will advance many areas of technology and will result in technological fallout both to the aircraft industry in general and to other industrial and military applications. The magnitude of this effect is very difficult to assess, but it appears to be small. Nevertheless, there are a number of areas which can be identified as having a high probability of potential benefit, such as: flight control systems, structures, materials, aircraft engines, aerodynamics.

While technological fallout will inevitably result from a complex, high technology program such as the SST development, the value of this benefit appears to be limited. We believe technological fallout to be of relatively minor importance in this program and therefore should not be considered either wholly or in part as a basis for justifying the program. In the SST program, fallout or technological advanced should be considered as a bonus or additional benefit from a program which must depend upon other reasons for its continuation.

These views are developed in greater detail in the sections which follow.

APPROACH

In order to develop a report responsive to the tasks outlined above, the following questions were considered.

1. What are the principal areas of technology which will be advanced by the SST prototype program?

2. What value or importance do these technologies have to our national research and development posture?

3. What are the national security implications of technologies advanced by the SST program? Are they unique to the SST or will other programs provide similar benefits?

We shall discuss each in turn.

Question 1: What are the principal areas of technology which will be advanced by the SST prototype program?

Aircraft technology will be advanced in a number of areas and this will enhance future development of both military and civil aircraft. There are aspects of this technology which will not only be beneficial to future aircraft development but should have more general application as well.

Aircraft Technology

1. *Aerodynamics*—The SST will require high aerodynamic efficiency over its complete speed range. Achievement of high levels of performance will provide useful correlation between theory and experiment, and extensive experience of use in the design of future aircraft.

2. *Advanced Flight Controls*—The SST demands on airplane empty weight will assist in achieving advances in flight control systems which are being considered for other advanced subsonic aircraft. These advanced systems include: (a) fly-by-wire techniques which result in lower system weight than the conventional cable-pulley-hydraulic system. (b) Stability augmentation systems resulting in saving of aircraft weight through use of smaller control surfaces. (c) Control systems for suppression of flutter loading resulting in additional savings in aircraft structural weight.

3. *Aircraft Tires*—In order to meet airline operational requirements, an improvement in aircraft tires is required for the SST. The improvement expected will enhance tire life in general and will be applicable broadly to other aircraft.

4. *High Temperature Structures*—The design of structures that operate at elevated temperatures is a relatively new field of engineering involving new materials, new manufacturing techniques, and new test methods. The knowledge and experience gained during the development and testing of the SST will contribute to this field.

5. *Aircraft Engines*—Realization of SST performance goals requires a significant advance in aircraft engine technology. Performance gains will result largely from operation at significantly higher internal cycle temperatures than have been used commercially in the past. This area of improvement must be accomplished without sacrificing engine life or maintenance characteristics normally associated with airline operations. Advanced noise suppression techniques are required if these advanced engines are to comply with evolving noise standards.

6. *Fuel Tank Sealants*—The high temperature environment of the SST fuel tanks necessitates the development of sealants usable to temperatures of 500° F. These compounds may find broader applicability in other aircraft applications.

7. *Environmental Control System*—The SST environmental control system will require advanced development of lightweight air compressors, small high-speed turbines, and lightweight, accurate, and reliable system controls.

General Technology

1. *Metals and Alloys*—The SST Program will create a new level of demand for titanium alloys which is expected to accelerate use of this very useful material over a broad spectrum of applications. High engine temperatures will require development of new high-temperature alloys.

2. *Metal Joining Techniques*—New techniques for metal joining are expected to be reduced to manufacturing practice in the SST Program as a result of a need for efficient fabrication operations and in connection with weight reduction. Diffusion bonding is a new metal joining technique which permits high strength joining of complex surfaces without parent metal strength reduction due to heating.

3. *High Temperature Nonmetallic Materials*—The severe high temperature environment of the SST necessitates development of new materials for use in this environment, including glass and lightweight composite structural materials made of plastic binders and boron or carbon fibers.

4. *High Temperature Seals*—The SST will represent the first use of hydrodynamic or hydrostatic seals in aircraft applications.

5. *Hydraulic Fluids and System Components and Lubricants*—Because of the temperatures encountered in the SST and the long life required, new types of fluids, lubricants, and system components must be developed which are expected to have important industrial applications.

6. *Brakes*—The SST Program is responsible for a search for new brake materials with improved heat-sink characteristics. These materials when developed would be broadly applicable to many different types of vehicles.

7. *Electrical System Components*—The high temperatures encountered by the SST require advanced development of wire insulation, antenna parts, and electrical system components capable of withstanding this severe environment.

Question 2: What value or importance do these technologies have to our national research and development posture?

It has been suggested that the technological benefits from the SST program are impressive enough in themselves to provide strong justification for SST prototype development. It is our view that this statement unduly magnifies the significance and impact of the advances which will inevitably result from a high technology program such as the SST. Although past experience has in many cases demonstrated that predictions of technological fallout can be extraordinarily conservative when projected over a number of years into the future, we nevertheless find claims for technological fallout from the SST Program to be generally unconvincing. Many of the technologies are refinements of developments which had their origin in DoD or other aircraft programs. Others appear to be of such a highly specialized character that broader application to other areas of the economy are limited, and in any event many years from being realized.

What then is the contribution of the SST Program to our national research and development posture? It would appear to occur in two principal ways: manpower, challenge.

The Boeing Company has estimated that the design and prototype phase of the SST Program will require a peak level employment of approximately 20,000 people, of which 3,400 are expected to be skilled engineers and technical personnel. This is about 7% of the peak level employment in support of the Apollo program. As in the case of Apollo, but to a lesser degree, the SST Program, therefore, will both drain and stimulate the technical manpower pool in the U.S. We are not capable of judging the net positive or negative values in this area. For example, in the limited time available for this effort, it has not been possible to project other major programs into the same time period to determine whether the manpower drain will be at the expense of programs of potentially greater return. We have also not been able to judge the degree of stimulation to the training of future aeronautical engineers vital to the nation which may result from the existence of a visible and challenging SST development program. We expect in any event that the most significant effect will, in fact, result from the second factor—challenge.

The SST Program can provide considerable, but unmeasurable benefit because of the challenge, both in a technical and emotional sense which such a competitive and forward-looking program engenders. This sense of challenge, particularly if successfully met, can be a beneficial factor not only in the aircraft industry but also on a broader basis and on a national level.

In addition the technical challenge of a specific program can serve as a useful focus for research and technology programs and may thereby force new and important breakthroughs.

Question 3: What are the national security implications of technologies advanced by the SST Program? Are they unique to the SST or will other programs provide similar benefits?

The question of whether the SST advances will have national security implications is relatively easy to answer. Of course defense capabilities will be enhanced by the technology advances made by the SST. What value can be placed on these benefits, however, is *much more* difficult to answer.

Both civil and military aircraft performance and efficiency are dependent upon the achievement of such factors as strong, lightweight structures, low aerodynamic drag and high thrust-to-weight engines with low fuel consumption. The SST Program is directed

toward achieving gains in these areas. To the extent the SST Program is successful, there will undoubtedly be application of these results to help provide better military systems. In general, however, the technology rather than particular systems can be expected to be transferred to military use, because of different systems requirements.

In many areas, this technology interchange takes place from the military program to the SST. For example, in titanium technology, the military have pioneered the use of this material for aircraft structures, such as the rear portion of the P–8 fighter, and the YF–12 and SR–71. The processing and manufacturing techniques being developed for the SST have their origin with these aircraft. Similarly, the two new fighter aircraft programs being initiated, the F–14 and F–15, while of relatively lower performance than the SST and therefore not requiring titanium for its high temperature qualities, will nevertheless be ⅓ to ½ titanium by weight and will employ the latest design and fabrication techniques. These aircraft will have their first flights before the SST so this technology will be proceeding on a parallel basis.

Similarly, there are military programs directed to developing better and lighter materials, for advanced engines, more efficient cooling and design features to increase aircraft engine temperatures, just as is being done in the SST. For example, DoD has a program to develop new technology engines for the F–14 and F–15 that are more advanced technologically than the SST engine. These developments are essentially parallel to the SST engine program, and are drawing from the same data base. Similarly the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA) engine, even more advanced and coming in a later time period, will utilize the advances of both programs.

Another development that has been indicated as mutually beneficial is the fly-by-wire control systems being developed for the SST. Similar systems are being developed for military aircraft. Both systems are directed at the same objective, the substitution of electrical connections between the pilot and the controls for the present mechanical connections. Weight savings, better reliability and less susceptibility to enemy gun fire provide significant military advantages.

These are only a few of the many examples that can be cited of mutual interaction between the SST and military aircraft programs, in which each program benefits from the other. Specific applications are somewhat different in each area however, warranting separate approaches even though technology and principles are the same. Alternative approaches also provide the opportunity of developing new solutions to fundamental problems as a result of addressing these problems on multiple fronts.

In summary, the technologies advanced by the SST Program will contribute to advancement in military weapons systems but military systems will not depend in a substantive way upon the SST for such improvements. The SST Program cannot be considered as providing unique technological inputs to military programs.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: I appreciate the invitation extended at yesterday's meeting by Secretary Volpe and you to add some comments to the Report of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee. We concur in the Report's discussion under the heading "Foreign Relations Impact of US SST Decision." The following comments should, however, be added to the Report.

1. There are no overriding foreign policy grounds either for pushing ahead with the SST project now, or for delaying it, or for dropping it altogether. One specific aspect of this position is our view that it would not be proper to base the decision to go ahead with the project on any generalized concept of enhancement of US prestige, or the like.

2. We would, however, gain two possible benefits from a delay of the project:

(a) If such delay were to lessen the time pressure on the builders of the Concorde, as we think it would, it might permit them to use that time to improve the noise characteristics of that aircraft. If this were successful it would be of immense importance to us, since at present it looks as if the United States, France and the UK will become involved in quite serious differences over the operation of the Concorde in US airspace.

(b) It is clear that one important element in the thinking of the United States is the potential competition of the Concorde. A delay would permit us to discuss with the British and French the effect on the plans of the Concorde of any extended delay by us. It could well be that their plans for the Concorde are also tied to our plans to build a US SST. For obvious reasons we have not to date brought this matter up with either of our allies.

3. The Committee did not have available adequate data on the Soviet TU–144 to make a judgment on its relationship to the US SST program, but this development should continue to be followed closely.

Sincerely yours,
U. ALEXIS JOHNSON,
Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: We have taken the opportunity presented by the Report of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee to review the findings contained in the report with respect to the environmental and sociological problems which have a bearing on the pending decision regarding further development of the SST. The following is a summary of these findings and our present views on this matter.

The noise problem weighed heavily in the findings of the Panels on Balance of Payments (p. 5) and Economics (p. 8), and Environmental and Sociological Impact (p. 12). Dr. Seamans and Mr. Muse, DOD R. & E., believe noise and sonic boom potential are deterrents to the program and should be considered in the decision, not after the program goes forward. They have received approximately two hundred letters from people who think it is a deterrent. Mr. Train states that far more research is needed with respect to engine noise and noise suppressants. Mr. Volcker suggests that over the next year attention should be directed primarily to "the extent to which the noise problem may be resolved satisfactorily" among other things. Dr. DuBridge raises serious questions about the solvability of the noise problem and doubts that any reduction in noise levels which might be achieved would offset more rigid standards which a "more sensitive" public will demand.

If SST development is to proceed (even if only the prototype) as a technological venture, specific efforts to solve the environmental and sociological problems should be programmed and funded in the agencies having prime responsibilities. Close coordination should be maintained between DOT and the other agencies. Studies and other activities necessary for programs to promulgate criteria for noise, and to propose safe and acceptable limits for other environmental hazards should be initiated as soon as possible. SST and airport noise standards should be given high priority in this effort. Such standards may be needed relatively soon as a basis for decisions respecting the use of U.S. airports by the Concorde.

Continuation of a project to construct a new device can usually be justified if the feasibility of success can be based on scientific knowledge, past experience or successful research and development along similar lines. A considerable measure of risk that the device will fail to function can be balanced against potential advantages if the project succeeds. However, this may not be a sound approach if it fails to include simultaneously a rigorous evaluation of those factors which will have a profound impact on the quality of the environment and particularly on the health and well-being of very large numbers of people. In such cases it would seem advisable also to establish the feasibility of finding solutions to the environmental and sociological problems.

The comments of other individuals summarized above, therefore, reinforce our own conclusion that we would want to assure ourselves of our ability to find solutions to those problems affecting the health and well-being of people as we proceed with the developmental process.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES C. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Assistant Surgeon General Administrator.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Memorandum for Hon. James M. Beggs.

Subject: Proposed Construction of SST Prototypes.

The opinion of the Council of Economic Advisers on this proposal is determined primarily by the great uncertainties concerning the economic, technical and environmental aspects. On the economic aspects our views are identical with those expressed in the report of the Economics Panel, which was chaired by the Council. As far as the balance of payments is concerned, we agree with Treasury that all components of the balance of payments should be taken into account and that consequently the balance of payments impact of the SST is likely to be adverse. The two other subcommittee reports, on technological fallout and on environmental aspects, are also distinctly negative in tone.

In addition to these reports we were also impressed by evidence presented by witnesses to the effect that there are undue risks in the methods chosen for the development of this plane. Since at an early stage a decision was made to proceed with only one design there is a great risk of subsequent substantial modifications; in fact the necessity of going back from a swing-wing to a fixed-wing design is indicative of the problems that may come in the future. We have no reason to doubt that the design currently favored will be technically satisfactory, but we also feel that more assurance on this point is needed and that such assurance can only be obtained by further research.

We have also taken note of the case made forcefully to the Committee by General Quesada that the Government should not be involved in further work on this aircraft except perhaps in the form of research. While we do not want to rule out future Government support, there does not seem to be a sufficient case for proceeding with the prototype at the present time. While considerations of national leadership, raised especially by competition from the Concorde, are no doubt relevant, we do not believe that our prestige abroad will be enhanced by a concentration on white elephants.

Our recommendation, therefore, is that no funds for prototype construction be included in the 1970 budget. The funds still available under the old design contract, and possibly some additional funds for research, should

be used to clarify the characteristics of the SST. In particular we believe that more research should be done on the development of less noisy engines, in addition to the technical problems of flutter, etc. We also believe that the economic analysis needs to be strengthened.

Finally, we would suggest that any further research on this plane be done under the responsibility of an agency other than FAA. While we do not wish to suggest that the role of FAA in the development of the aircraft has been improper in any way, we are concerned about possible conflicts of interest in the future. Ultimately FAA will have to issue a certificate of airworthiness for this plane, and it will also be involved in the setting of noise standards for airports. It is therefore desirable that FAA not be already committed to a particular aircraft design.

HENDRIK S. HOUTHAKKER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: As agreed at yesterday's meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, this letter supersedes my letter of March 21. It is my understanding that the report of the Ad Hoc Review Committee on the SST will be made up of (a) the reports of the four working panels and (b) this and letters from other Committee members setting forth additional views and recommendations.

I wish to summarize for the record the oral comments which I made yesterday to Secretary Volpe as follows:

1. The range of uncertainty with respect to the economic benefits from the SST is such that no clear case can be made on economic grounds for proceeding with the SST development.

2. Technological spill over benefits appear to be negligible.

3. There are major environmental and social problems which have not been solved and which should be the subject of further intensive research before proceeding with prototype construction.

4. The effect of SST development on the balance of payments is likely to be negative because of the probable major increase in United States tourism abroad.

5. The net employment increase from SST production would likely be negligible and would occur in the professional and technical categories where shortages already exist. The project would have practically no employment benefits for the disadvantaged hard-core unemployed with low skill levels.

In addition, we would recommend that the responsibility for long term research and development activities related to supersonic flight should be shifted from the Federal Aviation Agency of the Department of Transportation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The basic mission of the FAA, to insure safe and efficient commercial air travel, would appear to conflict with the responsibility for carrying out a major research and development program leading to the certification of a particular supersonic aircraft to be produced by a single commercial firm.

Finally, it would be our recommendation that currently available funds for SST development be applied in 1970 to further intensive research on the environmental hazards associated with the supersonic flight and to further refinement of the economic and market studies.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD R. WEBER,
Assistant Secretary of Manpower.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
March 19, 1969.

Subject: SST Ad Hoc Review Committee Report.
From: Chairman.
To: Each Member.

At the conclusion of the Committee meeting on March 12, the subject of the Committee's Charter was raised. Specifically, questions were raised as to how the Committee's deliberations would be presented and utilized. Such questions are certainly in order in that this group was convened for a specfic purpose and it is necessarily important that such purpose be achieved.

To clarify both the purpose of the Committee and the method by which the purpose is to be achieved, a recapitulation of the relevant instructions and memoranda is useful. Such recapitulation follows:

By memo dated January 29, Secretary Volpe was requested by the President to carry out the recommendations contained in the report prepared by Arthur Burn's group.

By memo of January 31, Secretary Volpe advised the President of DOT review actions, both underway and proposed, to accomplish an all-inclusive review of the SST program. The Secretary also proposed that an Ad Hoc Committee concerned with national interest questions be instituted under the auspices of DOT with senior members from specific agencies. This memo concluded by stating that DOT could thus provide a comprehensive review of the SST question by March 15.

By memo of February 5, the President indicated his pleasure that DOT had already instituted actions in regard to evaluating the redesign of the SST. In addition, the President specified the agencies from which representatives should be included on the DOT proposed Ad Hoc Committee and requested a proposed list of representatives.

If a memo of February 13 from Secretary Volpe to the President the Ad Hoc Committee membership was proposed with the undersigned designated as Chairman.

In a memo dated February 19 from the President to the undersigned, the President established this Ad Hoc Committee to review the national interest questions of the Supersonic Transport program in line with the recommendation given by Secretary Volpe. He also designated the membership and appointed me Chairman.

The foregoing makes it very clear that the review of the Ad Hoc Committee constitutes a major input to the total SST review process, which the President has charged Secretary Volpe with conducting. Thus, it is also clear that this Committee's views must be clearly and fully presented to the Secretary, he, in turn to utilize them and incorporate them in his report to the President.

In view of the above, a draft of the Ad Hoc Committee Report is attached for your review and approval or comment. Here, let me repeat the importance of fully conveying your views to the Secretary and thus I urge your personal attention to this draft. The panels of this Committee have developed a series of findings in several areas. Recommendations, with respect to the program, will be made to the President based upon these findings and other inputs to the total SST review. If in the course of your activities on this Committee you have come to personal conclusions about what such recommendations should (or might) be, such additional comment would be welcomed in your response to this memorandum. I regret the pressure of time, but in view of the schedule it is requested that your response be received in my office by close of business March 20.

In closing I would like to assure all members that the activities of this Committee in no way precludes nor substitutes for Cabinet-level consultation on this vital subject.

JAMES M. BEGGS,
Chairman, SST Ad Hoc Review Committee.

REPORT OF THE SST AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE

On February 19, 1969, the President appointed this Committee to investigate the national interest questions associated with the pending SST decision (Attachment 1).

Four meetings were held for the accomplishment of the activities of this Committee. Four working Panels were established to examine specific areas as indicated below:

1. Economics
2. Balance of Payments and International Relations
3. Environmental and Sociological Impact
4. Technological Fall-Out

The membership is indicated on Attachment 2.

Various witnesses, both pro and con, were called to testify before the Committee. Attachment 3 provides a listing of the outside witnesses.

The following is a summation of the views of the Committee as presented on the SST national interest questions. Also included are the views, as presented to the Committee, of the outside witnesses.

ECONOMIC PANEL

Key to the findings on economics is the large amount of uncertainty associated with all the major input parameters. The fundamental technical capacity of the aircraft, for example, has been subjected to much public question, pointing to the design changes, new materials developments needed, new guidance and control technology needed and new quieter engines need—to mention a few items. The ultimate cost of the development of the SST with these intervening subdevelopments introduces a large element of doubt in the end item aircraft cost.

Estimates of demand are similarly subject to much question and divergence of opinion. Ultimate demand for supersonic travel will be subject to many variables including overall travel demand, value placed by travelers on their time, airport congestion impact on overall travel time, fare differentials charged for supersonic travel, and convenience of the possibly limited number of airports from which the SST will be permitted to operate because of noise. Each of these ponderables in turn is greatly influenced by another subset of controlling factors which defy accurate prediction. The overall US–SST market based on no overland supersonic flight is therefore variously estimated to be between 350 and 500 aircraft. Airline action to voluntarily reduce their return on investment, should the highest fare differential be indicated, could raise the minimum SST market to about 500 aircraft. One the other hand, if the Boeing Company were to attempt to maximize its profits the Panel estimates the market would decrease to about 350 aircraft at which point the government could recapture its investment. It should be noted, however, that provisions in the contract permit the government to set the price if it so desires.

An additional uncertainty lies in the projections of available capital for the production phase of the SST. If declining airline earnings ratios continue on the present trend it will be difficult to obtain the large sums required from internal sources and will require more expensive commercial financing, government guarantees or government investment.

Perhaps more than 100,000 jobs will be created by the SST program, but whether this impact will offset other declines or act

as an inflationary factor in a full employment sector cannot be foreseen at this time.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS PANEL

Two conflicting forces influence the balance-of-payments impact of the SST. On the one hand SST exports and offsets Concorde imports are favorable factors and considering the airplane account alone it was agreed that a successful American SST would give a favorable impact on the balance-of-payments. On the other side of the ledger, the increased travel expenditures encouraged by supersonic aircraft increases the outflow projection. If the Concorde were not introduced into service the combined aircraft export and travel expenditure would indicate an unfavorable balance-of-payments. If the Concorde and SST were in service the balance-of-payments would be enhanced by $11 billion thru 1990 by virtue of SST exports. One key to the balance-of-payments question therefore revolves around whether or not a commercially viable Concorde can be developed and placed into service—a point of some doubt at present. The assessment of the balance-of-payments impact was made upon the information that was presently available, much of which was obtained from surveys taken some time ago.

Insofar as international relations are concerned we have witnessed the extreme sensitivity of the British and French Governments to our actions on noise regulations and on technical and economic debates on the SST. We must seek early international agreement on noise standards which will not be judged as steps to preclude Concorde competition for our SST. Decisions made regarding SST development should also be carefully couched such that our actions are not judged to be of a nature that would force British or French decisions regarding the Concorde.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL IMPACT

The SST has the potential of intensifying certain hazards (inherent in most all transport aircraft) to passengers and crew over those that current passengers and crew are exposed to. It also has the potential of further deteriorating the environment in the environs of the airport and within the area encompassed by the sonic boom path (on the ground) when the aircraft is flown supersonically. However, this potential was not considered to be a deterrent to the SST program; instead, when and if it did move forward, this potential should be considered in detail and resolved as early as possible.

In today's time frame the aircraft should clearly be considered an "overwater" aircraft. Range, economics, and other factors should be based on this understanding. The "airport noise" problem should be based on what people near airports will accept, and design requirements established accordingly, not in the reverse order. We should not wait for the aircraft to be built, and then set standards based on what has been accomplished.

The internal environment for the passenger and crew must be the same as that for passenger in today's aircraft. Automatic controls are necessary to maintain a safe environment in case of failures and malfunction. Crew exposure to radiation should be monitored.

Increased water vapor released into the atmosphere from combustion of aircraft fuel could be a problem, in terms of local climates and changes in atmospheric circulation and must be further examined.

The foregoing environmental factors are potentially serious and therefore should not be overlooked or underestimated. They are largely known, and can be carefully examined, and a decision made to avoid them.

TECHNOLOGY FALLOUT PANEL

The SST program will advance many areas of technology and will result in technology fallout both to the aircraft industry in general and to other industrial and military applications. The magnitude of this effect is difficult to assess, and should be considered as a bonus for additional benefit from the program and should not be used for its justification. Nevertheless, there are a number of areas which can be identified as having a high probability of potential benefit. Many of these technologies are refinements of developments which had their origin in DOD or other aircraft programs. Others appear to be of such a highly specialized character that broader application to other areas of the economy are either limited or are many years from being realized.

The Panel believes the biggest fallout will result in the fields of manpower (which is difficult to assess) and in the sheer challenge of the project. This sense of challenge provided by such a competitive and forward looking program if successfully met can be a beneficial factor not only in the aircraft industry, but also on a broader basis and on a national level. In addition, the technical challenge of this project can serve as a useful focus for a variety of research and technology activities and may thereby force new and important breakthroughs.

There is no question, but that our national defense capabilities will be enhanced by the technology advances made by the SST. What value can be placed on these benefits, however, is much more difficult to quantify. The SST will draw heavily on military technology and will undoubtedly provide a technology transfer back to the military. Concurrent military aircraft development efforts will also be adding to our technology in many of the same areas as mentioned above.

The Committee heard the views of non-government representatives of the interested segments of our society. Their testimony was both for and against the SST program. The second FAA Administrator and now airline executive, cited the numerous reviews held in the past of the SST and the human tendency to focus on problems and doubts in such Committee reviews. He, however, cited the usual airline practice to invest in new aircraft before they have flown and in the case of the SST they have expressed their confidence by investing risk capital even before a final design exists. He highlighted some of the problems associated with the SST, but compared these with other national ventures of far greater difficulty, complexity, cost and risk which we have successfully accomplished. He categorically expressed his confidence in the SST project and its benefits. Other representatives of the aerospace industry and U.S. international air carriers gave frank testimony in defining problem areas but were all in strong support of proceeding with the prototype development expressing confidence that the problems highlighted are solvable and the prototype is the proving ground. The Director of the Citizens League Against the Sonic Boom, as his title would indicate, was completely against the sonic boom and hence the SST program. Other witnesses testified as to their experience in economic analysis and the problems associated with military research and development programs pointing out the common errors of underestimating the costs and time required for development.

The Committee also heard the view expressed by the FAA Administrator in office at the initiation of the SST program, that the U.S. resources, both through military aircraft development and NACA/NASA research, were very influential in providing this nation with the technological leadership and developed products which enabled our private sector to become the world leader in commercial aircraft production. However, this witness had serious reservations about the Federal Government assuming the major burden of directly developing a commercial aircraft, but rather believed that the past tradition of the government providing technological know-how and components should be continued. Normal economic demand of the market should continue to be the primary motivating force in the development of the specific aircraft. He did support continuation of the SST program, particularly in light of the fact that with flights of the Concorde and the Russian TU 144, we *are now* in the supersonic transport age. He also stated that if the U.S. SST is not developed, U.S. international carriers would buy and operate the Concorde even at a loss, if necessary, to protect their competitive status.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1969.

Memorandum for Hon. James M. Beggs, Under Secretary of Transportation.

Subject: Report of the Economic Subcommittee.

Although we participated in the work of the Economic Subcommittee, we believe the general tone of the final report is unduly pessimistic. We concur that there are many technical and economic uncertainties in the SST program and that some of the economic assumptions upon which FAA and its consultants based their case were derived from limited and questionable data.

Uncertainty is inherent in any new technological program or business venture. The magnitude of the technological jump appears over emphasized. The United States now has several years experience in working with titanium in both advanced military aircraft and missiles. The military analogy is not applicable to commercial aircraft. The large cost overruns in the F-111, C5A and other advanced military aircraft are partially due to reasons that will not be a factor in the SST program such as: frequent design changes; mission redefinitions; and, weapons systems problems. It is unlikely that all of the assumptions used in the FAA base case—aircraft prices, traffic split between SST's and subsonic aircraft, fare differentials and rates of return will prove wrong in only one direction, to the disadvantage of the SST.

ROCCO C. SICILIANO.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
DEFENSE RESEARCH ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Mr. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have reviewed the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee Report and must confess I have some difficulty in seeing how it fits in, or contributes to, the decision on the program. Perhaps this results from my having missed the first two Committee meetings. I do feel that the report accurately summarizes the material presented and discussed at the last two meetings.

I do have some concern about the clarity of the Balance-of-Payments discussion in Paragraph 3 of Page 3. Particularly troublesome is that portion beginning with Sentence 4: "If the Concorde were not introduced into service the combined aircraft export and travel expenditure would indicate an unfavorable balance-of-payments. If the Concorde and SST were in service the balance-of-payments would be enhanced by $11 billion thru 1990 by virtue of SST experts." Maybe it's me, but if others have trouble with it, I suggest consideration be given to rewording.

Also the last Sentence, Page 4, Paragraph 2, implies that we are going to ignore the noise and sonic boom potential in the decision, but will give it consideration after the program goes forward. It seems to me that this is a deterrent to the program and should be considered in the decision. As an indication, I (actually Dr. Seamans) have received a couple hundred letters from people who think it is a deterrent.

In regard to specifics I have some relatively modest revisions on our Technology Fallout Panel material which I am forwarding to Dr.

Russell Drew for incorporation with his and Bill Harper's comments as a coordinated working panel view.

I hope these rather general comments will be useful. If there is any way I can help further, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

T. C. MUSE,
Assistant Director, Tactical Aircraft Systems.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1969, relative to the participation of this Department in the activities of the Ad Hoc Interagency SST Committee.

I have discussed the matter of explicit recommendations with Under Secretary Veneman. It is our opinion that we should not make explicit recommendations either personally or as a panel which could not be considered and acted upon by the ad hoc committee. We firmly believe, however, that the collective views of the ad hoc committee based on their deliberations should be developed by the committee and submitted to Secretary Volpe as was stated in your letter of February 28. We further believe that the collective recommendations to be submitted to President Nixon should be provided to the members of the committee and the panels. This would afford the participants an opportunity to learn how their views have been interpreted and whether their efforts have indeed been useful.

The draft report, transmitted with your memorandum of March 18, has just been received. In my opinion the summary does not convey the sense of the Environmental and Sociological Panel report, and does not adequately reflect the concerns of the members of this panel. We will comment further on this matter in a separate letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Assistant Surgeon General Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: The Environmental and Sociological Panel shares the view expressed in your memorandum of March 19, 1969, to the effect that "this Committee's views must be clearly and fully presented to the Secretary, he in turn to utilize them and incorporate them in his report to the President".

We are very concerned, therefore, that the summary of our report attached to your memorandum does not clearly and fully present our views. It appears to represent a synopsis of an oral presentation given in lieu of a specific reading of the report contents at a meeting of the Committee. As such, the summary report does not convey the real sense of the Environmental and Sociological Panel's report and does not adequately reflect its concerns. On the contrary, the editorial comments, interpretations and implied conclusions in the draft summary tend to convey the impression that the panel considered the environmental factors to be of small moment. Quite to the contrary these must be recognized as being of significant concern and emphasized at every step leading to a final decision in this matter.

Our understanding concerning the development of collective views and the presentation of recommendations were submitted in our previous letter. The attached summary presents the views of the Environmental and Sociological Panel more precisely and within the approximate space you have allotted to this subject. It is requested that this summary be substituted for the version attached to your memorandum of March 19.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Assistant Surgeon General Administrator.

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL PANEL OF THE AD HOC SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE, MARCH 20, 1969

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL IMPACT

The Panel considers the principal environmental and sociological problem areas to be: (1) Sonic boom; (2) Airport noise; (3) Hazards to passengers and crew; and (4) Effects of water vapor in the stratosphere.

The effects of sonic boom are such as to be considered intolerable by a very high percentage of the people affected. The Panel is very concerned about the economic pressures that will be exerted if it is subsequently found that the economic success of the aircraft depends on overland flights at supersonic speeds. The Panel believes it is essential that the public be formally assured by appropriate authorities that commercial supersonic flight over land will not be permitted.

"The development of methods to reduce engine noise is an essential element in the development of the SST as well as subsonic jet aircraft. Reduction of engine noise, however, is more difficult for the SST. These engines are fundamentally noisier than the fan engines that are optimum for the subsonic jets."[1] On the ground the SST is significantly noisier than the 707. On landing and takeoff the SST can be expected to produce noise levels exceeding 100 PNdB directly under the plane over a distance of 13 miles. Surrounding the runway an area 4 miles long and approximately 2 miles wide would be exposed to noise levels in excess of 100 PNdB. It can be expected that significant numbers of residents will file complaints and resort to legal action, and that a very high percentage of the exposed population will find the noise intolerable and the apparent cause of a wide variety of adverse effects. Land use planning in the vicinity of airports is the only satisfactory solution to this problem at the present time. Airport personnel and airline passengers, however, will be exposed to very high noise levels regardless of land use planning. Prolonged exposure to intense noise produces permanent hearing loss and may also disrupt job performance by interfering with speech communication, distracting attention, and otherwise complicating the demands of the task. Noise-induced hearing loss looms as a major health hazard in American industry. However, a national hearing conservation standard governing allowable or safe exposures remains to be established.

SST crews and passengers are incomparable more dependent on the proper functioning of equipment for pressurization, temperature control, and oxygen systems than are the occupants of subsonic aircraft. A loss of pressure at 65,000 feet would result in all aboard losing consciousness within fifteen seconds. At cruise altitudes ozone is present in concentrations which would be highly toxic to passengers if allowed to enter the plane. The radiation hazard would be approximately 100 times greater than at ground level. SST crews probably should be placed in the category of radiation workers and kept under close surveillance.

The widespread use of supersonic transports will introduce large quantities of water vapor into the stratosphere which could alter the radiation balance and thereby possibly affect the general circulation of atmospheric components.

[1] The SST Program and Related National Benefits, Feb. 17, 1969, the Boeing Company, page 6–22.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

Memorandum to Chairman, SST Ad Hoc Review Committee (Under Secretary Beggs).

From: Under Secretary of the Interior.

Subject: SST Ad Hoc Review Committee Report.

I have reviewed the above draft report, and my comments are submitted herewith.

Having listened to the reports of the subcommittees on March 12 and the discussion which followed each report, I was struck by the lack of positive justification for the SST program.

1. While the Balance of Payments Working Panel report indicated that there is evidence that a favorable balance might result from sales of aircraft and parts, it was strongly indicated that there is no positive evidence of balance of payment benefit when all aspects of the matter, including increased U.S. travel abroad, are taken into account.

2. The representative of the Council of Economic Advisers expressed an opinion that the estimates of aircraft sales are quite arbitrary. This would bear upon Point 1 above.

3. I believe that your draft report attaches more significance to technology fall-out from the program than does the actual report of that subcommittee. The latter stated "the magnitude of this effect is very difficult to assess, *but it appears to be small.*" (Emphasis supplied.) The subcommittee goes on to say "We believe technological fall-out to be of relatively minor importance in this program and therefore should not be considered either wholly or in part as a basis for justifying the program." On the relation of technological fall-out to defense programs, the subcommittee concluded: "The SST program cannot be considered as providing unique, technological inputs to military programs." My own notes of the discussion indicate that DOD does not expect significant military application of SST.

4. The Economic Subcommittee emphasized the "uncertainty" connected with the program. The subcommittee concluded that: "Probably the single most uncertain aspect of the whole program relates to the uncertainty as to whether an SST can be built in the given time that will meet the specifications of being efficient, safe, and economical."

5. The Environmental and Sociological Subcommittee pointed to significant potential environmental and sociological problems related to the health and well-being of the people which must be considered in making decisions concerning the SST. The principal problem areas were identified as: (1) sonic boom; (2) airport noise; (3) hazards to passengers and crew; and (4) effects of water vapor in the stratosphere. I would add pollution resulting from engine discharges as an additional significant environmental problem. It is my understanding that operation at subsonic speeds, including speeds necessary for takeoff and landing, results in inefficient fuel combustion with a resulting heavy discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere. Both atmospheric pollution and ground contamination seem likely to result.

On the subject of research, it was indicated that far more research is needed with respect to:

a. Engine noise and noise suppressants;

b. Electrical control and guidance systems;

c. Market research.

On the basis of the above record, it is my own conclusion that the justification for proceeding with the program is not now apparent. There may be other considerations with which I am not familiar. The Department of the Interior has no special capability for evaluating such matters as the technological fall-out resulting from the program or its implications for balance of payments. However, we consider the environmental disadvantages to be of extreme significance. The growing environmenal deterioration in this country and abroad is already the cause of widespread public concern. We believe that the probable adverse environmental impact of the SST is such that the program should not be pursued in the absence of overwhelming evidence of positive advantages.

In the meantime, the Department would urge and support continuing research directed to eliminating or reducing to reasonable levels adverse environmental impacts.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

HON. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: This letter is in response to your memorandum of March 19, and the draft report of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee. Although my schedule prevented personal participation in the meetings of the Committee, my deputy in this matter, William Kolberg, kept me closely apprised of the Committee's work. In addition, I have carefully studied the four subcommittee reports.

My reaction to the draft report at this time is negative.

First, it is my understanding, based on the instructions to the Ad Hoc Committee members from Mr. Coy, dated February 28, that: "The objective of the Committee is to assess the impact of the SST on the national interest." The draft report fails to make this assessment. It neither reflects a Committee consensus concerning the net effects of proceeding with the SST, nor does it provide a basis for such a conclusion for Committee consideration. Instead, it merely reviews and summarizes some of the material presented by the subcommittee.

Second, the draft report presents a possibly misleading summary of the subcommittee reports. These raised numerous problems which bring into serious question the wisdom of proceeding with the SST; these problems are understated in the draft report. This is particularly true of two questions raised in the report of the Economic Subcommittee, in which the Department of Labor actively participated. The draft report understates the problem concerning the price which may be set by Boeing for the SST. The present contract with Boeing affords the government no real protection against a higher price than is currently contemplated, which could result in a substantial decrease in projected government return on its investment. The draft report also implies that the SST will make more of a contribution to desirable employment consequences than we can foresee.

For these reasons, the Department cannot support the draft Committee report. I do not know what additional steps you might want to take to rectify this situation, but I did want to state my views concerning the output of the Ad Hoc Committee to date.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD R. WEBER,
Assistant Secretary for Manpower.

(Suggested substitute language for the first five sentences beginning with the word "Two" and ending with the words "SST exports." On page 3 of the draft "Report—SST Ad Hoc Review Committee" under the section heading, "Balance-of-Payments and International Relations Panel."

Two conflicting forces—net aircraft sales, and net travel expenditures—influence the potential impact of the SST on our balance of payments.

If only the aircraft account effects are considered, a successful American SST would favorably influence our balance of payments. But a successful American SST depends on a substantial induced expansion in our net travel expenditures abroad. Therefore, the effects of the SST on the aircraft account *cannot* logically be considered independently from the travel account.

If both supersonic aircraft sales, and the related increases in our travel deficit, are taken together, there is a substantial risk that the introduction of a U.S. SST would be adverse to our balance-of-payments prospects whether or not a Concorde is produced. If the Concorde proves not to be commercially viable and a U.S. SST were introduced, the adverse effects on our balance of payments of supersonic travel would be large and entirely attributable to the American SST.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR MONETARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1969.

HON. JAMES BEGGS,
Under Secretary of the Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: I would like to take this opportunity to pass along to you the present views of the Treasury Department with respect to the Government's approach toward the SST project.

Our own review of this project, heavily reinforced by certain other views expressed at the meetings of your Committee, has raised many unresolved questions concerning both the economic viability of the SST project and the potential "side effects" on the environment, the balance of payments implications, and the value of the technological "fall out." In the light of these questions and the absence of a showing of over-riding benefits in other directions, we would be opposed to heavy further commitment of Federal funds at this stage.

Essentially, the heavy Government share in the financing of this project, combined with the very great element of doubt as to whether this Government investment will ever be recouped with a reasonable return requires that this project must be justified in terms of clear and substantial public benefits. We have not found that these public benefits exist in sufficient degree to warrant a high priority in the use of budgetary funds. Indeed, the discussion suggests that, commercial considerations apart, the balance of public benefits or losses may well be negative.

Consequently, we would suggest that, over the next year, attention be devoted primarily to: (1) support of further design and engine research and development, identifying, among other things, the extent to which the noise problem may be resolved satisfactorily; (2) more careful re-evaluation of the economic feasibility, balance of payments consequences, and environmental "side effects."

While we are not competent to make a technical judgment, our convictions on this score are reinforced by what appear to be substantial doubts that the Concorde will prove to be an economically viable aircraft and the indications that further stretch-outs in the production of the plane may be under consideration by the Governments involved. Risks that the Concorde will offer a serious threat to U.S. leadership in aircraft production and be a large burden on our balance of payments at this stage appear to be sufficiently small as not to be an overriding factor in consideration of our own SST project.

I should emphasize that continued design and engineering research should keep open the option of the U.S. Government to sponsor the production of a prototype at a later stage. Proceeding to prototype production would not be prudent at this time in view of the uncertainties cited above, and the implied large commitment of U.S. Government funds, not only for fiscal 1970 but for years ahead, very probably extending to substantial assistance in production financing.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. VOLCKER.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

HON. JAMES BEGGS,
Under Secretary of the Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: The enclosed letter from Under Secretary Volcker is in response to your letter to him dated March 17. With regard to your memorandum dated March 19 enclosing a draft of the Ad Hoc Committee Report, I understand that a number of agencies on the Ad Hoc Committee believe that another meeting of the Committee would be useful for making comments on the Report and formulating recommendations. The Treasury would be pleased to participate in such a meeting if time permits you to convene it.

I have also enclosed suggested substitute wording for the first five sentences on page 3 of the Report under Balance of Payments and International Relations Panel. Of course, these comments on the Report, even if accepted, do not imply a Treasury endorsement of the contents of the Report as a whole. Our general approach to further work on the SST is expressed in the enclosed letter to you from Under Secretary Volcker.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. COLMAN.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

HON. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: I have carefully reviewed the Draft Report of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee and have found that it does not adequately reflect the views of the working panels and of the members of the Committee. It contains primarily the most favorable material, interspersed with editorial comments, and thus distorts the implications and tenor of the reports. Unfortunately, you have not given us time enough to rewrite this draft. The report as it stands cannot be accepted as an accurate representation of either our views or those of other members. We believe that either all the reports of the working committees should be forwarded without editing to Secretary Volpe or that each panel chairman with the help of the other members should be asked to draft a summary.

In addition, as you know, I feel strongly that another meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee is necessary. In your letter of February 28 you say explicitly that the Committee "will collectively make [its] views known to Secretary Volpe." I trust, therefore, that you will call another meeting to arrive at a fair and unbiased report with appropriate recommendations.

If the committee is not to be allowed to make joint recommendations to Secretary Volpe, I want to make clear our views. While the risks both economically and technically are great, the potential benefits are uncertain. With budget needs so great, I cannot see how this program can be justified at the present time and would recommend that no new funds be devoted to the project for at least FY 1970. This would mean that about $70 million would be available after April 15 for research on noise suppression, environmental effects, and market studies.

Yours sincerely,

HENDRIK S. HOUTHAKKER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 20, 1969.

Memorandum for Hon. James M. Beggs, Chairman, SST Ad Hoc Review Committee.
Subject: Committee Report.

In response to your memorandum of March 19, 1969, I have reviewed the draft report of the ad hoc Committee. It is my view that the report in its present form is not acceptable since it does not adequately reflect the range of uncertainties and general negative character of the panel reports and committee discussions as I understand them.

I am preparing detailed comments and suggestions for modifications to the report and will forward them to you as soon as they are available.

LEE A. DUBRIDGE,
Science Adviser.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: This is in response to your invitation to make any recommendation on the SST question.

I do not feel I should file a formal recommendation at this point, but I would like to make informal comments to you.

The subject of SST has been under review by members of the President's Science Advisory Committee and by the staff of OST for several years. We have recently been going over the current reports and had a thorough briefing from the Boeing representatives last week. My own conclusions are as follows:

1. The SST is probably technologically feasible, but the very small ratio of payload to total weight is so small that unexpected problems during the development could greatly reduce that payload and make the airplane commercially unattractive. There are enough unsolved technological problems that it is risky to make specific assumptions as to what the payload will be. It may turn out to be somewhat larger or somewhat smaller than now estimated. Thus, this is still a high risk question.

2. I have been impressed by the statements which have been made about the doubtful commercial viability of an SST. I conclude that previous estimates have possibly been over optimistic as to the number of planes which would be sold, as to the price at which they could be sold (if there were no government subsidy) and whether this would have a positive or negative effect on our balance of payments. If one makes pessimistic assumptions, though still reasonable ones, it could turn out that the plane is not commercially attractive to the airlines in sufficient numbers to make it profitable either for the manufacturer or for airline operators.

3. The noise problem is still a matter for worry. Although it appears that the noise on approach and takeoff will be reasonable, the noise radiated sideways is still very high and there seems at present to be no assured way in which this noise can be reduced to acceptable levels. In addition, it is very likely that noise standards will change during the next eight years as residents in airport areas become more sensitive to the problem. If current noise standards cannot be met, it would seem to be difficult even with new technological inventions to meet future more stringent noise requirements.

4. The sonic boom problem is, of course, quite unsolved, and even at best will cause enormous public concern. Surely we must have a policy statement that there shall be no supersonic operations by the SST over any populated areas.

5. Closely related to the problem of the payload is the problem of the maximum range of the aircraft. At present this is marginal for long overseas flights, and it is not clear whether further development efforts will cause the range to increase or decrease. Past history suggests a hopeful point of view, but this cannot be assured.

6. The competition of French and Russian SST's seems to be far less serious than we thought a couple of years ago.

On the whole, I come out negative on the desirability for further government subsidy for the development of this plane and would suggest that the possibility be explored of turning the remainder of the development and, of course, all of the production expenditures over to private enterprise. Any technological benefits which would accrue from its further development, either for civilian or military purposes, would seem to be minimal.

Granted that this is an exciting technological development, it still seems best to me to avoid the serious environmental and nuisance problems and the Government should not be subsidizing a device which has neither commercial attractiveness nor public acceptance.

Sincerely,

LEE A. DUBRIDGE,
Director.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1969.

Mr. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Undersecretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: The following comments are offered by NASA with regard to the draft SST Ad Hoc Review Committee report forwarded with your letter of March 19.

The report is a factual condensation of the material presented to and discussed by the Committee. In some sections, the condensation is such that it appears difficult to grasp the sense of the Committee discussions. The section titled Balance of Payments and International Relations, is particularly difficult in this regard. The exact interpretation of comments under Environmental and Sociological Impact leaves some confusion as to the position taken with regard to the potential hazards of airport noise and sonic boom. In the first paragraph the distinction is not clear as to which hazard was not considered. The last paragraph indicates a decision should be made to "avoid" hazards, which is manifestly impossible.

At the last Committee meeting it was stated that no recommendation was expected of the Committee. It is understandable then, that no over-all recommendation appears. However, certain detailed recommendations do appear within the body of material (for example, top of page 6). Other comments are written in a way to avoid recommendations. Consistency might prevent the unacquainted reader from placing undue emphasis on those recommendations simply as a result of phrasing.

The Chairman of the Technology Fallout Panel is consolidating the specific revisions of this section as proposed by the members and will submit them independently.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HARPER,
Deputy Associate Administrator (Aeronautics), Office of Advanced Research and Technology.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Mr. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Under Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: In response to your request, NASA forwards the following comments relative to a recommendation regarding the SST prototype development program. It must be emphasized that NASA's conclusions are drawn largely from its technical assessment of the program since it has not participated extensively in any of the detailed economics analyses.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HARPER,
Deputy Associate Administrator (Aeronautics), Office of Advanced Research and Technology.

RECOMMENDATION BY NASA ON THE SST PROGRAM, MARCH 24, 1969

The decision to proceed with development of the SST prototype is dependent on the assurance with which it can be stated that the performance objectives can be met, the importance to the national economic strength of achieving this capability, and the importance to the nation of remaining competitive in this new transportation mode.

From a strictly technical viewpoint, the NASA concludes that the proposed design offers the most conservative approach that enables the mission performance objectives (range and payload) to be met while at the same time offering substantial opportunity for growth as operational experience is gained. The major uncertainties remaining do not appear to be answerable from continued research activities but require operational experience with a complete system. It is the conclusion of NASA, then, that the proposed prototype development program would now represent initiation of this phase at the logical point for the realization of this new transport capability; further delay would contribute little toward this realization.

NASA has not attempted an in-depth economic analysis of the SST as a transportation mode. However, NASA research has shown that it does offer the potential of flight efficiencies equal to that of the subsonic jets which have come to dominate long-haul passenger travel and are taking over an increasing share of high value freight transport; if operational experience can enable realization of utilization rates equivalent to present aircraft, then the SST should eventually dominate the long-range transport market where the higher speeds are of major importance. Future transportation requirements between the U.S. and the Far East and South America would seem to offer a substantial market for this class of aircraft.

An important ingredient in the decision to be made is the likelihood of success of the competition. While the Concorde prototype has flown successfully, it is far too early in the program to determine whether the mission performance objectives will be met; it will probably be at least a year before this will be known. However, from such information as is available to NASA, there seems to be no reason to expect other than the design performance to be met with proper development. The aircraft is too small to be considered economically acceptable in the long term, but a larger version could follow with considerable confidence once operational experience is gained with this first version. Further delay in the U.S. program strengthens the probability that future developments of the Concorde will have the lead to dominate this transportation mode.

It is the conclusion of NASA that delay in initiating the SST prototype program will prevent significant progress toward the achievement by the U.S. of this potentially important transportation mode. Delay will increase substantially the probability that foreign competition will achieve a strong lead that will be difficult to overcome once the operation of these aircraft is accepted by U.S. carriers; as the carriers have stated, this acceptance would be expected if a competitive position is to be maintained. It is the conclusion of NASA, then, that initia-

tion of the SST prototype program should be given high priority amongst those programs currently competing for support.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JAMES M. BEGGS,
Chairman, SST Ad Hoc Review Committee, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEGGS: In his memorandum to you of March 20, 1969, Dr. DuBridge indicated that detailed comments and suggestions for modifications to the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee Report, distributed with your memorandum of March 19, would be forwarded as soon as available.

In order to accelerate your review process, I am attaching a modified condensation of the report of the Technological Fallout Panel (pages 5 and 6) for your consideration. This material has been reviewed with Mr. Harper and Mr. Muse, the other Panel Members, and is acceptable to them. I have not, as yet, had the opportunity to discuss these revisions in detail with Dr. DuBridge nor has this office considered in detail other portions of the report which appear to require revision. I assume that you will be receiving modifications to other panel reports which have been summarized in your draft. I would expect that the most productive way to register our comments on the other portions of the report would be after receipt of your next draft.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL C. DREW,
Technical Assistant.

TECHNOLOGY FALLOUT PANEL

The SST program will advance many areas of technology and to a limited extent will result in technology fallout. Principally these benefits will accrue in those areas related directly to the aircraft industry; direct application of SST technology to other industrial or military activities does not appear large. While technological fallout will inevitably result from a complex, high technology program such as the SST development, the value of this benefit appears to be limited in the near future to a few specific rather than many general applications. The Panel believes technological fallout should not be considered either wholly or in part as a basis for justifying the SST program, but rather should be considered as a bonus or additional benefit from a program which must depend upon other reasons for its continuation.

There are a number of areas of aircraft technology which can be identified as having a high probability of potential benefit, such as flight control systems, structures, materials, engines, and aerodynamics. Many of these technologies are refinements of developments which had their origin in DOD or other aircraft programs. Others appear to be of such a highly specialized character that broader application to other areas of the economy are either limited or are many years from being realized.

The Panel believes the SST program can provide considerable, but unmeasurable benefit because of the challenge, both in a technical and emotional sense which such a competitive and forward-looking program engenders. This sense of challenge, particularly if successfully met, can be a beneficial factor not only in the aircraft industry but also on a broader basis and on a national level.

In addition, the technical challenge of a specific program can serve as a useful focus for research and technology programs and may thereby force new and important breakthroughs.

The value to be placed on the contribution of SST technology to national defense capabilities is difficult to assess since most unique advances will occur in overcoming constraints posed by the peculiarities of civil operation; advances of most importance to military aviation are likely to evolve directly from military programs. While an exchange of basic technology between military programs and the SST can be expected which will result in some degree of mutual benefit, it is anticipated, that most difficult defense problems will be specifically military in nature and not resolved by the SST program.

THE UNDER SECRETARY
OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1969.

Hon. ROCCO SICILIANO,
Under Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SICILIANO: The purpose of this letter is to provide guidance and a modus operandi for the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee. This letter supersedes the drafts that were distributed at the first two working meetings.

The objective of the Committee is to assess the impact of the SST on the national interest. This assessment is to consider both positive and negative aspects.

The results of this assessment, along with the technical evaluation conducted by Dr. Bisplinghoff's committee; the findings of the Administrator, FAA, on the government evaluation of the proposed design; and the views of the U.S. airlines who have invested in the program, will provide the basis for Secretary Volpe's recommendations.

I have designated four working panels from the staff representatives of the Committee members, to address specific areas of national interest. The working panel assignments and guidance are attached. Each of the panels will submit a report on its findings by 12 March 1969. After these working panel reports have been received, reviewed, and accepted by the Committee, we will collectively make our views known to Secretary Volpe, who in turn will make his recommendation to the President.

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 5 March 1969, at 2:00 p.m., in the Secretary's Conference Room, FOB 10A, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W. At that time we expect to have the Chief Executive Officers of the principal U.S. international air carriers appear before the Committee and discuss their views of the SST program. In addition, we anticipate that Mr. John Wiley, New New York Port Authority, may appear.

I urge your personal attendance at all subsequent meetings to assure that the Committee can discharge the responsibilities assigned to us by the President.

Mr. James E. Densmore, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Department of Transportation, will serve as secretary to the Ad Hoc Committee. You mav reach him on code 13, extension: 28677.

If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call. I look forward to seeing you at the next meeting of the Committee.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. BEGGS.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GUIDANCE FOR WORKING PANELS OF THE AD HOC SST REVIEW COMMITTEE

Four working panels are established to support the Ad Hoc SST Review Committee. These working panels are comprised of Committee members or their staff representatives identified below.

Each working panel is to prepare a written report, outlining its findings on the national interest aspects of the SST program in its assigned area. Any recommendations based on such findings will be reserved to the Committee. In preparation of these papers, each of the groups will use the necessary input information furnished by the Department of Transportation. This input will include necessary data on:

(1) Program options.
(2) Associated funding requirements.
(3) Operating costs and characteristics.
(4) Anticipated market.

It is the purpose to assess the national interest aspects of the SST program in light of the results of work performed to date. If there is serious doubt concerning the validity of inputs, then comment may also be made on alternative assumptions. In event such alternative assumptions are made, the working panel should be prepared to justify and support the reasonableness of such assumptions. The following are the four panels and their areas of responsibility:

(1) Balance of Payments and International Relations—Representatives from Treasury (Chairman), Commerce and State. This panel will address the potential impact of projected foreign sales of the SST on the U.S. balance of payments considering whether the program proceeds, or alternatively should it be abandoned.

(2) Technological Fall-Out—Representatives from the Office of Science and Technology (Chairman), Department of Defense, and NASA. This panel is to examine the importance of the SST program to the overall national research and development posture, the technological fall-out benefits that may result from the SST program and specifically whether such benefits have national security value.

(3) Environmental and Sociological Impact—Representatives from HEW (Chairman), Interior, and Office of Science and Technology. This panel will consider the environmental and sociological impact of the SST program under the assumption that supersonic flight will be restricted to overwater routes. The panel will consider the negative effects of noise on airports of the future and the social effects of the increased mobility afforded by the availability of intercontinental supersonic transportation.

(4) Economics—Representatives from the Council of Economic Advisers (Chairman), Labor and Commerce. This panel will consider the economic benefits that will accrue from the SST program. The panel is to address the employment benefits, the additional tax revenues to be derived from the program, and any other domestic economic impact.

Identical letters sent:

Honorable Rocco Siciliano, Under Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.

Honorable Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, D.C. 20330.

Honorable John Veneman, Under Secretary of HEW, Washington, D.C. 20201.

Honorable Russell Train, Under Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.

Honorable Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530.

Honorable Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20530.

Honorable Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C. 20220.

Dr. Henry Houthakker, Member, Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20500.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, National Science Adviser, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, D.C. 20506.

Mr. Charles W. Harper, Deputy Associate Administrator (Aeronautics), NASA, Washington, D.C. 20546.

AIRLINES' REPORT ON SST

FEBRUARY 18, 1969.

Mr. DAVID D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVE: I have just completed a review of the redesign features as well as the operating economics of the Boeing SST with ———. This review has resulted in some alteration of ——— position relative to the SST development program. You are aware that throughout the initial years of development ——— has taken a positive approach to this new technology and has participated fully with the airlines committee. However, the recent SST review along with an assessment of the environment in which we are currently operating has led us to take a different posture than has been the case to date. The factors influencing this change are:

First, the operating economics of the presently proposed SST indicate that a substantial fare premium undoubtedly will be required to match the economic performance of the present generation of subsonic jets.

Second, there appears to be serious doubt that the proposed SST can meet existing or proposed airport noise criteria.

Third, the SST undoubtedly will be limited to overwater operation because of the sonic boom problem.

Fourth, the final cost per airplane will undoubtedly fall in the $40–$50 million area representing an enormous risk per single vehicle.

Fifth, important and costly improvements are immediately required to bring both our airways and airports up to a capacity compatible with the current and future traffic demand.

There are other factors which weigh against unqualified commitment to the SST development schedule, but the above are the most important ones in my view. In light of the somewhat negative aspects bearing upon the SST program as of now and our existing capital commitments, I would be unwilling to recommend to Board of Directors the venturing of any additional risk capital beyond the $— million we have already contributed, in addition to our $— million deposit for delivery positions.

If our government's assessment of this program indicates that the United States must retain its dominant position in the aircraft manufacturing industry for national reasons, then it is my opinion that the development cost risks must be assumed by the government. Finally, if our country must make a choice between appropriations for improvements of our airways-airport systems or furthering the development of the SST, then there is no question that airways-airports must be the choice.

In summation, the provision of completely adequate airways and airports in this country must take precedence over any other consideration if the vigor of our economy is to be maintained. If there are funds available after the above need is satisfied, then these funds should go toward the orderly development of an SST at whatever rate of progress is possible.

I hope that the above may be helpful to Secretary Volpe in arriving at a sound decision on the future of the program.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MARCH 1, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: In reply to your letter dated January 24th, as amended by you to extend the reply date to March 1, 1969, we herein submit our comments on the proposed design and other aspects of the Supersonic Transport Program as it now faces a major governmental decision.

The SST Office of the Federal Aviation Administration, and in particular General Maxwell himself, has been most helpful to us in providing information obtained during their analysis and in briefing us on their conclusions with respect to the current proposed design of and potential for the Supersonic Transport.

The current proposed design of the U.S. Supersonic Transport is in our opinion the best which can be obtained on the drawing board. We believe that the years of study to this point have led to a design which cannot be improved in this phase but must go forward to the prototype construction before obtaining additional answers of any real significance. We believe the design is straightforward and honest and certainly represents the best of the current state of the art.

We share with your evaluation team real concern in certain areas. The airport and community noise problem is perhaps the foremost of these. However, we believe that there is time during the construction and testing of a prototype and that that would be the right time to find any available answers to this problem and to design and test suppressive devices of all types. In this regard, we believe that there must be room also for an increase in engine size and thrust to overcome what may well be found as a requirement during testing, i.e., increased thrust to meet under all conditions actual range, payload and weight conditions and, most important, to overcome whatever thrust may be lost due to the introduction of noise-suppressing devices. We believe the concern with regard to the engine inlet can be resolved through construction and testing and through the results of the prototype phase of the program. We also believe that the wing flutter problem is one which is understood and can be resolved with, of course, the increase in weight which usually accompanies such a program, thus the requirement to remain somewhat flexible in terms of total gross weight and engine thrust to accompany it. There are other problems, well-known to your evaluation team and including such items as the suitability of the current state of the art in tire manufacture and other hydraulic, electrical and flight control systems on the aircraft. Again, however, we believe that we have gone as far as we can on the drawing board and must, if we are to proceed at all, go forward into the prototype design, construction and flight, using the best United States engineering talent to solve problems as they occur during these phases.

While we are not aerodynamicists, we do believe that it is inherent in a Supersonic Transport Program to consider that certain aspects of aerodynamics cannot be solved except through actually flight of a vehicle as close as possible in size and shape to that which may be the only economic model. Thus it is our suggestion that the prototype be designed and constructed, probably in the "six-abreast" fuselage size, as closely matched as possible to what which we and the FAA have used to develop our economic viability studies. We must then in designing and flying the prototype determine the appropriate engine size and other characteristics which go with an aircraft size whose potential at reasonable load factors is to attract passengers and, again as a potential, achieve without too great a fare surcharge a reasonable rate of return for us.

If we go forward in a prototype phase program with the determination to solve problems as we now see them and to demonstrate the flight characteristics, in a model which can meet airport and community noise criteria and which is designed to carry enough payload for the required range goals, then in our opinion the timing is such that the United States could regain and hold its superiority in the world market for transport aircraft. Looking forward to such a model in the not-too-distant future and knowing that a full-scale prototype testing program is being accomplished prior to a commitment to production, we, at least as one airline, would try to hold out for the U.S. product. Furthermore, if this model is designed to sufficient capacity and range and designed to be economic in its operation, then it should have most of its own market since it will be sufficiently different from anything now proposed by the British, French and Russian interests.

While we see many problems to be solved and at least a medium degree of risk, it is our opinion that if the United States is to have a Supersonic Transport at all we should go forward into Phase III or the prototype phase of the program. A delay would be the wrong decision in our opinion. The program should either go forward or be terminated. We recommend that it go forward. In any other event, we will not know whether our goals can be achieved.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 27, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR THOMAS: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the future of the SST program.

There are four elements critical to a successful program:

1. A solution of the sonic boom problem.
2. An acceptable level of airport noise.
3. The ability to operate over reasonable distances non-stop.
4. Seat mile costs reasonably related to costs of subsonic aircraft.

Our first recommendation is that criteria be developed for each of these four elements and made a part of the SST program.

Our second recommendation is that a prototype SST be funded, developed and tested, if reasonable assurance can be given that (a) the prototype will meet the established criteria or (b) will provide research information which will enable the criteria to be met.

Members of our staff are ready to discuss with you the specific criteria that might be appropriate and to assist in any other way you may find helpful.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 17, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: As a result of our analysis of the data submitted to us by the Boeing Company, and the reports on the technical review of the SST B2707-300 and its prototype by the FAA SST Evaluation Team, we believe that sufficient progress has been made to warrant government approval of the construction and testing of the Boeing SST prototype aircraft.

It is obvious that there are still some serious problems in the areas of community noise and economics. It also appears certain that the operation of the SST will be restricted to subsonic speeds over inhabited areas because of the sonic boom. This will limit utilization and place an arbitrary ceiling on the total market for supersonic aircraft, increasing the unit cost.

In spite of the negative aspects of the SST Program, we believe it is unrealistic to assume that supersonic transports will not be built and flown over the world's airways. We further believe we have the technology and

manufacturing capability in this country to produce a superior SST.

Because of the costs involved it must be a government decision as to the priority assigned to the program. We could not in good conscience recommend the allocation of any funds to the SST Program that would delay or interfere in any way with the solution to our airport and airways congestion problems and the modernization of Airways Traffic Control equipment and procedures.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 26, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: We have reviewed the technical data describing the proposed redesign of the Boeing Supersonic Transport 2707–300. As you requested in your letter of January 14, 1969, I offer my recommendations.

The development of an economically viable SST is a logical step in the growth of the transportation industry to better serve the needs of the people of the world. I believe the program should continue.

Because the SST is such a big step in the state of the art, we should build a prototype to work out the solutions to the many technical problems facing the designers. The prototype flight testing should precede commencement of the production phase. This would aid us greatly in determining the optimum size and give a much greater possibility of success.

The construction of the first aircraft should begin at the earliest reasonable opportunity consistent with normal times required to complete the preliminaries.

The government should underwrite this project as research and development in the field of large supersonic aircraft which would undoubtedly have great benefit to other programs.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MARCH 1, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: These comments on the U.S. SST program respond to your letter of January 24, 1969.

We appreciate the briefing given our representatives by the FAA team in Washington on February 6. The views of your team have been major factors in the formulation of our own position on our SST program. All must agree with your team that there are risks in undertaking the SST program, as there are risks in any big program involving advances in the state of the art, in the engineering and in the designing of complex technical equipment. We do not believe that these risks would be substantially reduced by further abstract study or academic research.

We have no doubt that viable, civil-commercial supersonic air transportation is inevitable. Our only doubt concerns whether European industry, Russian industry or American industry will lead and when such dominating leadership will be established. The recent flights of the Tupolev 144 and the Concorde underscore this point.

Consequently, in the interest of maintaining leadership of U.S. air transportation and aircraft construction by providing the public with ever-improving, time-saving mobility, and its attendant help to our balance of international trade, we believe that we should get on with the prototype program in order to be reasonably certain of the quality of eventual production models of supersonic aircraft.

As we recognize that this procedure will require enormous additional funding, we would be less than fair if we left any implication that this airline could at this time afford to make any further contributions to the advanced funding of the research and development represented by the prototype program. Our unprecedented contribution of $1 million per aircraft, which we have already been obliged to contribute to this research and development, has for the present exhausted our stockholders capacity to finance research and development of supersonic transportation. We suggest that the position of our foreign competitors in this regard may be different. That competition consists primarily of Government-owned airlines and it is not particularly material whether their Governments finance or subsidize either aircraft development, airline operation or both.

It seems evident that a considerable amount of prototype flying must be completed and evaluated before the start of quantity production. Our analysis of the suggested production aircraft has convinced us of the necessity of proceeding through Phase III to the completion of the prototype flying. Only as a result of such a program can we achieve the substantial overall improvements which are required.

As mentioned in my wire of February 25, there is concern that if the U.S. program is further delayed, there is some possibility that the ultimate market will be reduced through greater availability of Concordes and TU–144's or, more importantly, by giving time for an improved version of either to become available.

Because of the value of time to the travellers of the world and for reasons of national interst, favorable balance of international trade, and maintaining the leadership of U.S. air transportation and aircraft construction, we believe that the SST Prototype program should be continued.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 20, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: In response to your recent invitation to provide you with airline comments regarding the currently proposed Boeing SST 2707–300 airplane, our evaluation of the design data supplied to us by Boeing and validated by the FAA Supersonic Transport Development Group is as follows:

The prototype design data defines an airplane which we believe is technically adequate for prototype test purposes, and the design should be capable of providing sufficiently accurate test data to permit the manufacturer to proceed with the development of a production airplane providing satisfactory solutions can be found for the following major problems.

SONIC BOOM

The indicated over-pressures are of sufficient magnitude to restrict by definition the aircraft's operation to overwater and hence, essentially, intercontinental use. This of course results in an airplane which has little if any use in domestic transcontinental operations.

COMMUNITY NOISE

The current prototype design as well as the planned improvements to be obtained from the advanced technology do not seem to indicate a practical means of reducing external noise to a degree which would achieve compliance with the proposed noise regulations other than by methods which certainly impose unrealistic penalties both in performance and economic values to the airplane.

SIZE

The 5-abreast 234 passenger prototype airplane design currently proposed by Boeing and validated by the FAA is not an airplane that embraces sufficient weight or space payload to be economically viable at other than substantially increased fare levels over those which we know today. The unknown changes in our economy between now and the planned availability of a production SST in 1978 or 1979 make the economic factors in this regard even more difficult to assess.

COMPETITIVE ASPECTS

The combined effects of the economic factors coupled with what we believe may be the non-competitive aspects of the small diameter fuselage, as compared to the (by then) publicly accepted wide bodied aircraft such as the 747, L–1011, and the DC–10, pose a real question as to public acceptance of the design despite its obvious speed advantage.

We are mindful that each new airplane development program to date has included a fair amount of risk, and we are also aware of the importance of our airline industry maintaining its posture of progress internationally and domestically. Recognizing that the above problem areas cannot be adequately defined or solutions arrived at without a prototype program, we feel that serious consideration should be given to proceeding with the prototype development of the presently proposed SST. From standpoint and for the aircraft to be useful over our present route system, solutions to the outstanding problems must be found which would lead to a production airplane of sufficient size, with reasonable flexible and competitive economic capabilities, and possessing performance and noise characteristics that will insure its use on a generally non-restrictive basis in the time period for which it is to serve.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 25, 1969.

Mr. D. D. THOMAS,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: We have reviewed the most recent B–2707 design submitted by The Boeing Company for a prototype supersonic transport, as well as the evaluation conducted by your Office of SST Development.

As you know ——— has invested almost $——— million and a vast amount of technical and economic effort in this program. Consequently, we have a vital interest in its success.

However, we continue to be concerned about many of the technical aspects of the program, including weight and balance, flutter and dynamics, engine inlet design, and airport and community noise.

Experience has indicated that solutions to problems of this type invariably add complexity and weight to an aircraft. Since the design payload-range characteristics already appear marginal, we question whether an economically viable airplane can be produced until these solutions are accurately defined.

We believe that some of the current problem areas lend themselves to further analysis, whereas others will require extensive hardware development and a flight testing program. We feel that the prototype flight test program as proposed may be inadequate to develop solutions to the major technical problems.

It is our recommendation, therefore, that:

1. Boeing be directed to complete those analyses which can be meaningfully undertaken prior to a final definition of a prototype aircraft.

2. Upon completion of these analyses, a two-prototype aircraft program be undertaken without a commitment of resources to a production aircraft program.

We believe that the prototype aircraft program should be conducted in a manner such that there will be no expenditure of funds

related to a production program until the prototype aircraft program has met the technical development objectives. It is our belief that the technical progress accomplished during an adequate prototype program will result in the definition of a production airplane that varies so significantly from the prototypes that any investments in such areas as production tooling, passenger interior accommodations and food service installations would be wasted.

Rather than delaying the ultimate certification date of the production airplanes, we believe that the program defined above will not only result in a better product, but is likely to gain rather than lose time and, most certainly, conserve development funds.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important program and look forward to its development at an aggressive and realistic pace.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 28, 1969.

Mr. DAVID D. THOMAS,
Federal Aviation Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: Supersonic transport program.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I am pleased to present ——— views on the proposed Boeing SST design and certain other SST program aspects in response to your letter request of January 24, 1969.

Present indications are that the SST program will not produce a vehicle as economically viable for airline use as formerly was believed to be the case. Nevertheless, in view of the efforts of other nations in the SST field, ——— remains convinced that national interest considerations, relating to the balance of payments and the competitive position of our aeronautics manufacturing industry, would be served by development and production of U.S. SSTs at an early date. Accordingly, we urge continuation of the U.S. SST program in an uninterrupted and aggressive manner.

It is ——— considered opinion that the U.S. supersonic transport program has reached a stage from which further progress can best be achieved by the construction of experimental prototype aircraft. We recommend that development, construction, and testing of the Boeing experimental prototype aircraft be authorized and that this program be expedited. It is by this means that needed state of the art advances in such significant areas as structure, propulsion, aerodynamics, and systems design and development can be achieved most reliably and quickly. Further, prototype aircraft development and testing will hasten the day when definition and production of certificated aircraft can be reliably undertaken on an acceptable risk basis.

——— recommends that the design of the prototype vehicles be defined by Boeing to achieve maximum state of the art advances in the stated areas and additionally to minimize the time required to achieve economically viable and operationally practical production aircraft. Specifically, in response to General Maxwell's question, whatever prototype fuselage size will best fit these two broad objectives should be selected. Development of the prototype should attempt to achieve payload range improvements, better noise attenuation features, and reduction in approach, landing, and takeoff speeds.

The Boeing prototype design is believed to be well suited for experimental and developmental purposes. However, it is not well suited and should not be planned for production application because of its prospective relatively poor economic characteristics. Final design of the production type aircraft should wait on the results of prototype aircraft development and testing programs.

Thus, summarily, recommends the uninterrupted continuation of the U. S. supersonic transport development program to achieve early construction of experimental prototype aircraft so as to advance the state of the art and provide the basis for the early development of fully viable production supersonic transport aircraft.

Recommendations reflect not only the results of careful and detailed technical analyses of the proposed Boeing designs, but also a high degree of technical judgment as to what may be attainable through prototype development efforts, all combined with business judgment as to general aircraft characteristics that must be produced if the program is ultimately to succeed in the international marketing arena. It is important that the production U. S. SST have superior economic viability compared not only to the Concorde as we know it today and the Russian TU 144 as we surmise it, but to prospective second generation designs of these aircraft as well, for they surely will exist by the time the production U. S. SST is available in fleet quantities. The most expeditious and soundest way to undertake to meet this challenge is to proceed at once on an expedited basis with the development of experimental prototype aircraft.

I am appreciative of this opportunity to comment. We commend the FAA for its management of the supersonic transport development program. No program which involves state of the art developments such as this one is without troublesome times and great problems. The FAA's reorientation of the program last year is most commendable. A sounder basis for moving forward has resulted.

Summary report of its technical findings is available on request.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for an indefinite period, on account of a meeting of the Dr. Eisenhower Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

To Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. REIFEL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for November 3 through November 14, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for Friday, October 31, 1969, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 1 hour, on November 12.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on November 3.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PICKLE to include extraneous matter in his remarks made in Committee today.

Mr. HANNA to include extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. ROTH in two instances.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. ERLENBORN.
Mr. MCKNEALLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. ADDABBO in four instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. STEED.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. GARMATZ.
Mr. REES in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. DORN in two instances.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. JOHNSON of California.
Mr. FRASER in two instances.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. DELANEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2062. An act to provide for the differentation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the fol-

lowing titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 337. An act to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12982. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, South Dakota";

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 337. An act to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12982, an act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22) to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON, Sixth District, Massachusetts.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1304. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions of equipment and facilities for the quarter ended September 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1305. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the 18th annual report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14621. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 14622. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the penalty provision applicable to a Federal felony committed with a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 14623. A bill authorizing a survey of harbors and rivers, territory of Guam, in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related water resource purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 14624. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 14625. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 14626. A bill to amend chapter 115 of title 18, United States Code, to make punishable certain activities affecting captive personnel of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 14627. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act to consumers through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in defraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 14628. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 14629. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 14630. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 14631. A bill to provide that common law marriages may not be contracted in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14632. A bill to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14633. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out a program of research and development relating to devices and techniques for the detection of illegal importation of dangerous drugs into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 14634. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge in California and/or adjacent Western States for the preservation of the California tule elk; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 14635. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 14636. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 14637. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 978. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

313. Mrs. REID of Illinois presented petitions signed by 3,931 residents of Youngstown, Ohio, in support of the privilege of nondenominational prayer in public schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—THE SOUTH'S HIGHWAY TO PROGRESS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the most energetic young men in my district is Mr. Charles Steiner III. He has for some time been involved in a study of the waterways of the gulf coast area. He has traveled on tugboats and barges; he has studied statistics as well as the waterways themselves. He has written several articles concerning the waterways, the most recent of which appeared in the Mobile Press Register on September 28, 1969. At my request he has summarized this article so that all Members may have the benefit of his work. I include Mr. Steiner's summary at this point in the RECORD:

THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—THE SOUTH'S HIGHWAY TO PROGRESS

AMERICA'S WATERWAYS

The influence of the waterway industry on national transportation and on the economy of the United States grows each year as tonnage mounts over our country's 25,260 miles of commercially navigable rivers, canals, bays and harbors. Over 10 percent of the nation's freight is transported over these waterways. In 1967, the last year that we have complete commercial tonnage statistics, the grand total of all waterborne commerce shipped in the United States was 1,336,606,078 tons; of this, iron and concentrates accounted for 123,265,800 tons; crude petroleum for 179,670,885 tons; coal for 214,153,740 tons and marine shells for 23,365,232 tons.

The record total of 281.4 billion ton-miles were shipped along our waterways. This included 114.6 billion ton-miles on the Mississippi River System and 60.0 billion ton-miles on the coastal waterways of which the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway accounted for 13.926 billion ton-miles. This is proof, to our nation's industries and to the general public, of the valuable economical asset that they have in their waterways and reason why they should continue to be developed and improved. Due to improved navigation and modern facilities on our waterways built since 1940, the total domestic freight carried on our nation's waterways rose from 496.6 million tons of cargo to $870.6 million tons in 1967; of this, the total barge traffic amounted to 502.4 million tons.

You have to travel these waterways to really see just what has taken place in the last 20 years. There is a fantastic growth of new industries, hydro-electric power plants, and building growth taking place along the canals, industrial parks and ports along our waterways. Our nation benefits also from man-made lakes for boating, fishing and other water recreation sports; modern locks, dams, and improved navigation channels for faster shipping, flood control and electric power; and better irrigated pasture and farm lands for cattle raising and agriculture; and the revitalization of old cities along the rivers and coasts due to better national and domestic use of our valuable waterways.

BUSINESS BOOMS

One of the most important segments of these waterways and one that can be described as being the Gulf Coast's own highway of progress is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which has almost doubled its tonnage in the last 10 years from 46,007,718 tons to 87,850,332 tons. This massive and continuous movement of basic raw materials for production of fuel oil, gasoline, building materials and steel products along this waterway has resulted in the construction of new and modern terminals for the handling of freight and bulk cargoes. The river and channel improvements by the Corp of Engineers combined with a modern interstate highway system, the spread of jet airports and a more competitive rail rates gives this Gulf Coast area exceptional transportation advantages for industry. This development and increased shipment of materials to all ports of the nation and the world is helping the growing South to become the new industrial and financial center of our nation through the tremendous activity and growth that has taken place on this particular waterway and its connecting river systems.

Rapid growth of this waterway extends all the way from the Gulf Coast areas of Texas and Louisiana up the lower Mississippi River region eastward through Alabama and Georgia and down into Florida. Serving this area of growth and expansion is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, a water highway of progress and profit that extends 1113 miles from its eastern terminal at Carrabella, Florida on the St. Marks River to Brownsville, Texas across the Rio Grande River from Mexico. Eventually this waterway will be international in scope. The Mexican government plans a protected intercoastal waterway from Tampico to the terminal of the Intracoastal Canal at the Texas Border. Plans are under way to complete the missing link in the waterway from St. Marks, Fla., to Fort Myers. Also the Cross Florida Barge Canal, when completed, will provide an even shorter protected link between the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and Atlantic Coast waterways systems. The GIWW has the most active ports in the nation.

New Orleans is rivaling New York for the nation's number one shipping center with 111,491,062 tons shipped through its 125 mile long port area; Houston is the financial and trade center of the Southwest with 58,305,362 tons of products mostly grain, marine shells, petroleum, gasoline and Sulphuric acid shipped through its Ship Channel with over three-fourths of this to foreign countries; Galveston with 41,137,933 tons of cotton, sugar, wheat, grain and fertilizer shipped through this Southwestern agricultural center's Galveston Wharves; and the petroleum centers of the West such as Beaumont with 31,001,800 tons and Port Arthur, Texas with 23,104,204 tons of cargo with over half of that tonnage being petroleum oil and its by-products; and Mobile, which is at the crossroads of this dynamic waterway and a future hub for the interchange of traffic on the Ohio, Tennessee and Mississippi River Systems once the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is built, had 22,326,318 tons of cargo pass through its port area.

This waterway is by far one of the most important links in America's network of navigable channels because it connects the industrial and agricultural heart of the nation and South with the growing ports and cities along the Gulf and with the abundant sources of raw materials that this area offers. A wide variety of mineral resources including coal, iron ore, limestone, marine shell, clam shells, gravel, sand, marble, clays, natural gas, and oil has been responsible for the immense growth of water-front industry that has settled here in the South and for the continued growth of the barge and tow industry that travels day and night along the 1100 mile long waterway and connecting rivers serving industries and households with tremendous savings from low-cost and efficient barge transportation.

Mid-west grain is barged down the Mississippi River and from Texas ports to overseas markets; from the coast comes oyster shells and from the rivers and bays comes sand, gravel and clam shells for building and highway construction; timber from the forest of Mississippi, Alabama and Florida for the South's large pulp and paper mills; coal barged down the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway of Alabama for the steam generating plants of the South; iron and bauxite for the steel and aluminum mills of Birmingham, Alabama and Baton Rouge, Louisiana and other steel mills in the South; limestone, sand and gravel from Alabama for the highway construction along the Gulf Coast; phosphate from Florida for local plants and overseas markets; sulfur and salt from the mines of Louisiana for the upstream Mississippi River ports and large volumes of oil from the Gulf and Southwest oilfields for the petro chemical industry of the nation.

Along the Gulf Coast is the nation's largest petro-chemical industry with hundreds of plants that are linked together by both a 1100 mile network of pipes and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. It is an industry that involves 6 billion dollars of investments and that contributed 40.2 percent of domestic commerce and shipped 33,770,009 tons of crude petroleum on the GIWW out of the national tonnage of 179,670,885 tons on our waterways. Millions of gallons of gasoline, fuel oil and jet fuel are moved by barge annually from coastal refineries in Texas, Louisiana, and Alabama to canning plants in the nation. Because of the low-cost barge transportation and the competition of the many independent distributors who have been attracted to this area—the farmer, the motorist, the householder and the industries are greatly benefited.

This water-borne commerce and the rapid industrialization of the Gulf Coast is a true indicator of the strength of America's economic future. For example; along the GIWW, the internal freight traffic between Apalachee, Florida and Mobile, Alabama covered gasoline, asphalt, iron pipe, marine shells and jet fuels. From Apalachee Bay to Panama City, Fla., the tonnage for the last 11 years rose from 1,377,549 to 1,418,936 tons; between Panama City and Pensacola. Fla., the tonnage rose from 2,839,511 to 4,136,342 tons and between Pensacola and Mobile, the tonnage rose from 3,156,867 to 4,989,500 tons.

From the Mexican Border eastward to New Orleans, the principal commodities shipped along the waterway covered crude petroleum, marine shells, basic chemicals, gasoline and grains. From the Mexican border to Corpus Christi, Texas, the tonnage rose from 1,025,268 to 1,671,623 tons. Between Corpus Christi and Galveston, Texas, the tonnage rose from 7,830,234 to 15,462,366 tons; from Galveston and Sabine River, Texas, the tonnage rose from 20,698,161 to 38,332,179 tons and from Sabine River to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mississippi River, the tonnage increased from 31,200,435 to 58,722,476 tons.

Between the Port of Mobile and New Orleans the tonnage for the last 11 years over this 134 mile stretch of the GIWW rose from 7,068,648 to 16,240,764 tons covering 583,861 oceangoing tons mostly phosphate rock. Internal tonnage shipped on this route amounted to 14,679,390 tons covering 3,360,238 tons of gasoline, 1,285,414 tons of coal, 907,605 tons of corn, 737,065 tons of marine shells and 627,914 tons of basic chemicals plus many other products.

With this growth, the future expansion of the South and increased usage of water

transportation as the cheapest form of transportation for bulk cargoes and the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, the Port of Mobile will become a second and most vital defense and commercial interchange route for the water highway system of America. The advantages offered by the Tenn-Tomm would more than triple the tonnage on the Gulf and provide a more stable and economic growth to America. Its completion will shorten the route of industrial goods from the American heartland to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and its ports by 500 to 1000 miles benefiting everyone including our governments missile program.

SHASTA COUNTY LONG WILL REMEMBER C. FRED SMITH

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of an old friend, a man who has contributed greatly to the development of the counties which I represent here in Congress. C. Fred Smith was born in Shasta County nearly 80 years ago.

During those eight decades the contributions which he made to his community through his outstanding public service will be remembered for many decades to come. Shasta County is a better place for his having been with us.

Fred Smith's hometown newspaper, the Redding Record Searchlight, told the story of his efforts for his community in the following report which I would like to share with my colleagues:

C. FRED SMITH

"The dean of active Democrats in Shasta County" is dead at 79.

C. (for Charles) Fred Smith died early today in Mercy Hospital.

Born Jan. 29, 1890, to a pioneer Shasta County family, Smith's involvement in civic and political activities began at an early age and continued throughout his long life.

He was graduated from Shasta County High School in 1909 and became secretary-manager of the Redding Chamber of Commerce and secretary-manager of the Shasta County promotion and development agency in 1915.

He left the position to enlist in the armed forces during World War I.

For 21 years after the war Smith was a deputy in the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. For 16 years he headed the far Northern California office of the IRS in Redding.

After retiring from government service, he was appointed an inheritance tax appraiser by then State Controller Alan Cranston. Real estate and accounting work also kept him busy in recent years.

Long active in politics, Smith was honored at a fund-raising Democratic dinner in 1966. At the dinner he heard himself described as "the dean of active Democrats in Shasta County" for his years of service in the Democratic Club and county central committee.

He was a long and staunch supporter of the formation of the Bella Vista Water District.

Smith's interests weren't only political. He served as co-chairman of the final drive for building funds for Mercy Hospital. He also headed an organization that raised $6,500 to bring the Salvation Army to Redding.

He was selected as an outstanding citizen of 1950 by the Record-Searchlight and by the Eagles Lodge.

Smith served as chairman of the March of Dimes from 1949 to 1951. He was also a member of the organizing committee to form the Shasta County Senior Citizens group and served as the group's first and second-term president.

He listed memberships in the American Legion, Redding Elks' Lodge 1073 and Knights of Columbus.

NAVY DAY—1969

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, October 27, was Navy Day—a day commemorating our Navy and her personnel. On this day in 1775, a bill was sent to the Continental Congress requesting the creation of a U.S. Navy. This day is also celebrated because it is the birthday of the father of our modern Navy, Theodore Roosevelt.

The Navy has been instrumental in preserving the peace and in maintaining our national security. Its diverse and unique functions have served the Nation well. The following article in the October 27, 1969, South Bay, Calif., Daily Breeze illustrates the potential uses of our Navy in this era of uncertainty.

The article follows:

[From the South Bay (Calif.) Daily Breeze, Oct. 27, 1969]

THE NAVY'S IMPORTANT ROLE

Rarely since the United States of America abandoned a policy of isolationism in 1914 have the pressures upon our national leaders been so great to reduce our military presence in the world.

We hear a clamor for precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam.

There is pressure in the Senate to reduce our commitments to other nations in Southeast Asia.

A critical national eye is being cast upon the presence of more than 50,000 American troops in South Korea.

Libya has said it will not renew our contract for Wheelus Air Force Base, our only military installation on the north coast of Africa.

Our bases in The Philippines are constantly under scrutiny. We have given up Iwo Jima and Japan is pressing for reduction of our presence on Okinawa.

Even in Japan itself the physical presence of the United Staes has been slowly eroded, and the beneficial use to which we put existing bases there is circumscribed.

And in Europe where we have withdrawn thousands of troops and supporting hardware—voices are being raised in Congress to continue the trend.

We cannot ignore some realities. There is an intense demand to remove the military and physical presence of the United States from strategic areas throughout the world. The pressures come from hostile governments, friendly rulers and even result from our own budgetary agonies.

As this occurs, the United States is faced with two choices.

We could retreat from our land bases overseas to the isolationism that dominated our foreign policy for the century before 1914.

Or we can continue the type of international cosmopolitanism that has given us world leadership and all the benefits this brings.

Isolationism would be a national economic disaster. Militarily it would leave the United States with only the option of nuclear response. It was isolationism that led to two world wars.

Clearly we must retain our world leadership and the balance of power which that connotes. The effects of our physical withdrawal from land bases will not be moderated if we realize the value of the oceans and our Navy.

The high seas comprise a vast area in which no single nation has sovereignty. We do not have to pay rent for use of the oceans. Base rights, concessions to others or the behavior of petty rulers are of no consequence.

And on the high seas the United States Navy is an extension of our sovereignty and our muscle. With a strong Navy we can quickly bring land forces, missiles, air power and firepower to wherever our national interest dictates for whatever length of time these are needed.

As we observe Navy Day it would be appropriate to remember this, and the fact that as a two-ocean nation we have always had the need for a great Navy. World conditions today dictate the need for not only a great Navy, but also for the most powerful Navy we ever have had.

HALL OF FAME AWARD FOR BATES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, at page 23897 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, I called attention to the Reserve Officers Association having awarded its coveted Minuteman Hall of Fame Award to our late beloved colleague, the Honorable William H. Bates of Massachusetts. At that time I did not have the details about this special award but said I would present them in due course. I am now able to do so.

On October 18 the Reserve Officers Association, holding its 47th anniversary banquet at St. Louis, devoted its entire program in paying tribute to Congressman Bates, for nearly 20 years a Member of the House of Representatives. This tribute was made before military reserve leaders from throughout the United States, with ROA president, Maj. Gen. Ray D. Free, presiding. It was a warm and highly merited honor to the memory of our esteemed friend, who throughout a lifetime of service to his country had been an inspiration to all who knew him.

The brief address of presentation was made by Brig. Gen. Homer I. Lewis, of Eagle Pass, Tex., the immediate past president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and the response was given by the widow of Congressman Bates, Mrs. Jean Dreyer Bates.

The presentation of this Minuteman Hall of Fame Award to Congressman Bates is in a real sense a tribute to this entire body. The address of General

Lewis and the response of Mrs. Bates are included in the RECORD at this point, because of the occasion's significance to the life of our country:

ADDRESS OF GENERAL LEWIS

This is an evening on which we share pride in the record of our association and its 47 years of service to the cause of national security. Traditionally, we also honor on this occasion an outstanding citizen who, in a real sense, has helped us to advance our programs. We had looked forward to sharing this evening with our good friend—that great citizen, statesman, and officer—Congressman William Henry Bates, of Massachusetts. The hand of the Lord removed him, however, and we are tonight honoring his memory and giving recognition due him and to his great career. We are honored that his widow is here with us, along with her sister and the Congressman's niece and nephew.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States, since the tragedy of unpreparedness of this country was demonstrated by the experience of World War I, has worked to keep our Nation secure, safe and at peace.

Congressman Bates, for the past quarter century himself was a part of this great movement in America. In 1940, noting the war clouds on the horizon and having a love for the sea from his life in a seafaring community, enlisted in the Navy and served throughout World War II. His outstanding leadership qualities earned him a direct commission and by the end of the war he had risen through the ranks to the grade of Lieutenant Commander. After his election to Congress, he remained in the Naval Reserve—ready to serve if again called into uniform—and at the time of his passing had been for some years a Captain in the United States Naval Reserve.

Captain Bates loved the Navy and had expected to make a career therein, but in 1949, after his statesman father died in a plane crash, he was drafted to occupy a seat in the Congress which had been occupied by his father.

Bill Bates served on the Armed Services Committee for 20 years. During the past several years he was the senior Republican on this committee and he shared in the enactment of the many sound laws governing the military service and providing for our national security. He helped with laws which were dictated by the lessons of experience of World War II and Korea. He believed strongly in the military services and himself had been ready to respond to a call to service from his position as a ready reservist. Those who know him are fully aware that had America's deterrents to World War III proved ineffective, that he would have given up his seat in the Congress to serve again in the active Navy.

Congressman Bates was a man of vision . . . a man of dedication . . . a man of deep loyalties. He was a man who believed in his country . . . believed in the causes to which he devoted his tremendous energies and talents. No man ever served in the Congress who was more genuinely beloved by his colleagues, and by those of us in all walks of life who had the privilege of knowing him personally. No man has ever merited more genuinely the place we now claim for him in the Nation's Minuteman Hall of Fame.

Mrs. Bates, I know that you share with us a feeling of satisfaction over the great and inspiring career of Bill Bates, whose example of courage, selfless devotion to duty and great work, has made this country richer in character, more safe and secure, and a finer nation for all time to come.

It is my privilege—and honor—on behalf of our association to present this citation:

Recognizing that the Honorable William Henry Bates through a long and inspiring career in the Congress, as a private citizen, and an officer of the United States Navy, has sacrifically devoted his genius and leadership to the cause of national security, and both in war and peace, has given meaning, substance, and effectiveness to the citizen-soldier tradition, vital to the safety and welfare of the United States of America, this association claims for him a place in this Nation's Minuteman Hall of Fame and this citation is awarded to him posthumously to remind other citizens of their obligation of service to country.

Approved:

The National Convention, June 1969.

Presented by Army, Air Force, Navy-Marine Corps-Coast Guard Sections, 47th Anniversary Banquet, St. Louis, Missouri, October 18, 1969.

RAY D. FREE,
Major General, USAR, National President.
JOHN T. CARLTON,
Colonel, USAR, Executive Director.

RESPONSE OF MRS. BATES

General Free, General Lewis, Distinguished Head Table Guests, Members of the Military: I feel very much at home with you tonight. I was born in Missouri, as was our daughter, Susan, during the days of Iwo Jima. The uniform has always had my love, and respect. As a Navy bride, and the wife of a Congressman during the 20 challenging years he served on the House Armed Services Committee, a significant part and purpose of my life with Bill Bates was characterized by a solemn respect for, and genuine love of our country.

I am deeply touched by the splendid tribute—in your joint salute to the memory of my husband, in recognition of his interest in, and devotion to, the military—and for his earnest and untiring efforts toward the security of our country.

During the happenings of the past week, I dwelled upon the many gatherings when I had heard my husband's pleas: "We must keep our country militarily strong in order to preserve our liberties—or become second rate—and there is no prize for second place in military struggles of world affairs today" and "We are called the leader of the free world, the mightiest force for peace, and you and I should pledge we will keep it that way".

I can still hear his voice saying: "We must deal from a position of strength, not weakness. We must not allow events of past years in Southeast Asia to blur our vision when looking at our military posture. If we err in our preparedness, it must be on the side of strength, not weakness" and "The unpopular Viet Nam war has set the peace pulse of the Nation running high. We are at a dangerous point in time when we must face the stark reality that the price of security comes high, and we must be willing to pay the bill if this country is to survive."

As a Congressman, and as my husband, Bill would be pleased to have me here tonight among such fine Americans who proudly carry their patriotism on their shoulders and in their hearts, and who strongly support our Commander in Chief in his efforts to bring an end to the war in Viet Nam to assure his survival of our great Nation. And he would be humbly proud of the honor you accord his name. I want you to know that our daughter and I, and the Bates family, thank you for this Minute Man Hall of Fame Award.

Only a few days ago, I noticed among my husband's papers, some lines which would perhaps best express a proper response, and in his own handwriting I read: "I am extremely grateful to you for the signal honor you have bestowed upon me this evening. I particularly treasure this citation because, as in your own life, in uniform or not, the military security of our beloved country has represented a very full measure of my efforts." Personally, I know that to him those efforts were very meaningful and a necessary fulfillment in his life. In his untimely passing, did it not seem almost ordained that if, on that quiet Sunday morning in June at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, he had to slip away from life, it was during the flag raising ceremony to the strains of our National Anthem?

As for me, this occasion will stand out as a heartwarming addition to the memories I cherish of my husband, who lived his life so well. If, now, I can momentarily ignore the pain of personal loss, to sense a pride in and gratification for his dedication and those contributions he made to our country, then it is you tonight whom I must salute for making this moment a reality. Thank you.

TREATED PAPER—A NEW IDEA TO REDUCE THE HAZARDS OF SMOKING

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, American Safety Equipment Corp. of New York has been conducting some interesting experiments, some of which are in laboratories, located in the Seventh Congressional District which I represent. The results of these experiments were recently released and included the following findings:

Cigarette paper treated with ammonium sulfamate reduces tumor and cancer production by cigarette smoke on the skin of mice by approximately one-third, and produces no adverse toxicological effects. These conclusions issued by ASE Corporation warrant the attention of Public Health officials because although they have urged the public to discontinue smoking, the majority of smokers have continued. In addition, the number of deaths from lung cancer, which show a statistical association with smoking, continues to rise each year.

The research findings to date on the relationship between smoking and lung cancer has not produced agreement on whether the basic problem relates to the tobacco, the paper, or a combination of these factors. To my knowledge little Government research has been directed to cigarette paper or the treatment of the paper to reduce health hazards.

According to the ASE Corp. reports the particular treatment developed by the corporation has no effect on the taste, flavor, ash, or appearance of cigarettes; and indications are that processing cost increases would be insignificant. Since the process does not result in a reduction of tar or nicotine content, the treatment of the paper has had some unknown effect on the nature of the smoke. Experts have not yet been able to define the causes of the biological activity of smoke and for that reason there are differences of opinion on the question of whether tobacco or paper produce the hazardous elements of smoking.

To date the experiments referred to above have been conducted on animals and ASE Corp. is now ready to test the product on humans. Even those who most strenuously object to smoking will admit that a large number of people will simply not give up the habit. For this reason alone it is important to research and experiment with any method of producing a less hazardous cigarette.

I urge the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research

in this area which until now has not received adequate attention. As ASE pointed out when the study was released:

Even if we cannot prove whether human lung cancer is caused by cigarette smoke, or whether the animal test results described above apply to man, the alternative must be faced: Not using such treated-paper cigarettes will leave the death rate from cancer increasing each year, whereas using such cigarettes may possibly reduce lung cancer in man substantially, and ignoring this possibility would constitute serious negligence in an urgent matter of public health.

Mr. Speaker, we have emphasized the need for people to stop smoking but I believe we should place importance on research to reduce the health hazards of smoking to those who will not stop.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM CHANGE CONSIDERED

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following letter from the chairman of Local Board 13, Rockland County, N.Y., Mr. Garry Onderdonk, who has vast experience with the Selective Service System, having been on the job for 26 years. What Mr. Onderdonk has to say is must reading for all Members of the House as they consider changes to be made in the Selective Service law and as they seek to advise the President in connection with his Executive order affecting the drafting of men for the Armed Forces.

The letter follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
ROCKLAND COUNTY, N.Y.,
October 28, 1969.

Hon. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARTIN: It has come to my attention that not only the general public, but also the local boards have become increasingly confused regarding the Selective Service System.

All of the news articles being put out by the news medias, though most of them are confusing in themselves, seem to be interpreted by the public as new regulations and rules. This, of course, does the local board no good. It only adds to their tasks.

After twenty-six years on this assignment I have come to some definite conclusions as to some of the things I would like to see changed in the present rules, regulations and manner of enforcement of the same by the government.

It would take far longer than I have time to enumerate them all. However I will enumerate some of them for your consideration when and if the government contemplates changes.

It seems to me that this service is in need of some better public relations. The image which they have created to the public is not one to be desired by them or the government. First of all, members should be made aware of the fact that their job is dual. One to supply the armed forces with the necessary manpower and secondly to make equally sure that all of the registrants rights and privileges are definitely observed. There is too much time elapsing between the period of processing the men and induction. I believe that the first thing to be done should be to make sure these men are physically fit before the classifications are started.

There should be a strict balance on the Boards; one Catholic, one Jew, one Protestant and one Negro on all Boards. There should be fewer classifications which would allow long deferments.

I feel that all young men should be called into service after finishing high school or reaching the age of twenty. It has been my observation that as it is now, after they reach the age of twenty-four, or complete four years of college they become far less subservient to discipline. Of course this would make available far more manpower than we have ever needed. Therefore a just and equitable form of lottery must be invoked. A much clearer guide line must be set down by the government regarding conscientious objectors.

A system must be developed whereby those who break the law are brought to trial and either convicted or acquitted. (This is one point which is thrown up to us all the time.)

The present system which can keep a young man out on a limb for long periods of time is not good for either him or the nation. He can't get work with a classification which may make him available at any time and in most cases right here is when he gets in trouble with the law.

As it is right now, the allowing of post graduate work to only those in the medical profession or those allied to it is wrong. You can't run our nation with just doctors.

I feel that regardless of any reasons to the contrary married men with children should not be drafted unless a real state of emergency exists. Those classified as 1Y should be made available for limited duty if only to replace the women civilians attached to the armed forces.

That if we are to become involved in a conflict that a state of war be declared so that those who are hurting their nation by their actions and speech could be stopped. That if we are in a war such as we are now, for Gods sake lets try and win it, not expend 40,000 lives and have over 200,000 wounded in a police action!

That a much closer relationship should be maintained between local boards and their state and national headquarters.

That an efficient alarm system be installed between local boards offices of Selective Service and that these terminate in police headquarters.

That microfilm records be kept on all records and that they be kept in a safe place in headquarters.

That all members of the Selective Service System be advised that no one comes before a local board unless he is in trouble and that this must be kept uppermost in their minds.

I believe the system of local boards is good and should be maintained.

I do not believe that a professional army would work and I am against it.

I believe that the law regarding interference and trying to change the determinations of the board is a good one and should be strictly enforced for the good of all.

The age limit of seventy-five for members of Selective Service is too high. I think the age of sixty-five should be the limit or twenty years of service whichever comes first.

I will not go into the physical operation of the Boards, however there are numerous changes here that I would like to see made.

I hope that you do not feel that I am too presumptuous in contacting you with these unrequested suggestions. I feel they may be of some help to you in coming to a determination regarding these proposed changes in the law.

Respectfully yours,
GARRY ONDERDONK,
Chairman Local Board 13.

THE COMMUNISTS CAN BE DEFEATED

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BAO LOC, VIETNAM,
October 19, 1969.

Hon. G. V. MONTGOMERY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I and many others have patiently waited a long time for results for *America* from all the compromising to the enemy in Vietnam. The elimination of air raids has just enabled more men and materiel to come south to kill more Americans, Allies and civilians. Everyone can now see that the Paris talks have just been used by the Communists as an extension of the battlefield. The pull-out of our troops adversely affects the war, both directly and moralewise—particularly in the largely VC-held Delta region. Also, why are we pulling vital troops from here when we still have combat units in the Dominican Republic? (Why are they there?)

The Administration's consideration of anti-military proposals by the "peace-niks" and their supporters has just cost us more lives, time and money. We cannot just tell the ARVNs to take over the war because the South Vietnamese simply are not capable, either now or in the near future. Korea showed you can't turn a mass of Asian peasantry into a modern military machine quickly, or even in several years: It has taken two decades to make the Korean Army as competent and battlewise as it is today.

The American people are rightly disgusted by the present handling of the war and a "No-Win" policy. However, it is just a vocal few (including the American Communists) who want us to pull out unilaterally. I hope you are not being influenced by the few rabble-rousers conducting the current anti-war riots in U.S. cities. I'm sure the great majority of our loyal citizens want a successful solution to the war: a great many of us want to win. War without victory is still un-American.

Our military leaders must be allowed to use the full potential of our tremendous air and sea power and other weaponry as needed to put an end to this endless war. Who is the Administration afraid of? The subversive peace-niks? Red China? The Soviet Union? None of the Communist powers could do any more in Vietnam than they already are doing. Atomic weaponry is not needed. For example, the enemy is mostly dependent on the port of Haiphong which can be easily blockaded or destroyed.

Dictator Ho Chi Minh's recent death automatically leaves a large power vacuum in North Vietnam. The time to win the war is now. The enemy is losing the war and we must now press on for total victory and not surrender any Vietnamese to the evil Communists. The Communists can be defeated: the civil wars in Malaya, Bolivia, Greece and Korea are examples.

I am vitally concerned for the future of Southeast Asia: a great mass of the world's population is here. What are you doing to help win the war? Are you going to casually let the Communists win Vietnam? (Remember how the U.S. Government, through the influences of just a few subversives, wrongfully permitted the Red takeover of mainland China?)

Sincerely yours,

Sp.6 DAVID C. CAVANESS,
APO San Francisco, Calif.

P.S.—I thought you'd like a copy of this I'm sending to entire Congress. I still remember your earlier visit to the Engineer Battalion here at Bao Loc. Keep up the good work, Sonny.

BLOOD FOR PEACE

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, the October 15 antiwar moratorium received a great deal of publicity in all news media across the country.

I would imagine the impression of the moratorium in the minds of many Americans centers about the highly vocal minority who used the occasion to berate everything from the establishment to the draft to the war in South Vietnam. I am not one of those who condemns all those young people who took part in expressing dissent, because that oversimplification can be just as damaging to the Nation's future and as unrealistic as the empty mouthings of the extreme radicals on the far left fringe who ingrain themselves into legitimate forms of peaceful protest so they can ultimately subvert and discredit them.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report to this body that October 15, the antiwar moratorium day was generally a day of moderate, peaceful demonstrations on the college and university campuses in Florida. In my own district, some students at Florida Technological University, located between Orlando and Cape Kennedy, sponsored a "Blood for Peace" drive. The drive, which is continuing and will last at least until the end of November, is being coordinated through the Central Florida Blood Bank at Orlando.

To date, 40 pints of blood have been donated by faculty, staff, and students to the blood bank. In fact, it is already being put to good use.

A Vietnam veteran in a hospital in Brevard County, Fla., has already received some of this lifesaving FTU blood from the blood for peace drive. Two FTU students, John Davis and Darryl Bannister, originated the drive and have interested student leaders at other Florida colleges and universities in expanding the drive throughout the State.

I am very proud of these students at Florida Technological University, as I am of all the responsible, dedicated students in Florida and on the campuses visited by those of us who were members of a special factfinding team earlier in the session. They represent the great majority of American students who are intelligent, responsible, and mature beyond their years.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN PAYS TRIBUTE TO GEN. GLEN J. McCLERNON

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the finest Air Force officers I ever have been privileged to know.

He is Brig. Gen. Glen J. McClernon, who today retires from active duty after a career of devoted service to the Nation.

Military officers are officers and gentlemen by act of Congress. In my humble opinion, General "Mac" is the epitome of what that statement represents.

Yet, lurking barely below the surface of the hard-working, efficient executive is a rapidfire wit of astounding range and variety. General "Mac," with a lightning quip, can lessen the tension of a complex discussion in an instant.

He leaves the stewardship of the Defense Electronics Supply Center in Dayton after an enviable record of accomplishment. The center has been accorded high marks under his leadership for meeting the demands placed upon it by the military services and for performing its function at the least possible expense to the Federal Government.

Speaking as a former supply officer, I know that there is virtually no glamor to be found in logistics. Thus, the enthusiasm and efficiency of the personnel of the Defense Electronics Supply Center represent the best kind of testimonial to the performance of a commander.

General "Mac" took on the assignment of directing DESC after service at nearby Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. There, he was the base commander, running the 2750th Air Base Unit, or, as he so inimitably phrased it "in charge of roads and commodes."

At a massive installation like Wright-Patterson, the responsibilities of the base commander easily can lead to a premature case of ulcers and other ills. But General "Mac" took to it with a relish and earned for himself the unprecedented accolade from the civilian community of "mayor of Wright-Patterson."

A burly man—a "large leprachaun" might be the best description—General "Mac" was indefatigable in confronting the many problems that came across his desk as the base commander. He also exhibited understanding and concern for the civilian community to a degree rarely found in, or required of, officers in such posts. A notable example was his decision to speak out frankly about the possibility of increased density around the base ultimately threatening its flight operations and perhaps its very existence.

He did not have to become involved. He could have let the matter go and thereby spared himself the rigors of the embroilment that was certain to follow. But he did become involved. And although the matter is today not yet resolved, the fact that he alerted the public when he did may be central to ultimate resolution.

The Nation is indebted to intelligent, dedicated military men like Gen. Glen J. McClernon. We have been most fortunate to have him as one of the leaders of the Air Force during this critical phase of our history.

We in the Greater Dayton area, in losing an esteemd military man, have gained another citizen since General "Mac" and his family have elected to reside in our community in retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I commend General McClernon to the Members of the House of Representatives. Further, I insert herewith an illuminating perspective of this good man as written by Jim Fain, the editor of the Dayton Daily News:

General Glen J. McClernon who is stepping down as Commander of the DESC out on Wilmington Pike has more one-liners than any stand-up comedian who works for money.

They call him the Air Force's Bob Hope—and with reason. Long on material, he is often bluer than Hope, sometimes it's off in the wild blue yonder.

When Mac took over at Dessie, the Chamber of Commerce threw one of its infrequent fish fries for the home grown military industrial complex. It honored both Mac and Admiral Bob Northwood who was retiring as Dessie's skipper who now lives here and works for the Mead Corporation.

The events that the Chamber has have never been starchy with protocol despite the black tie bit. But there usually have been a few little speeches by nice guys who clear their throats a lot and make a couple of "ers" in every sentence.

These soirees have not been billed as having variety and action packed entertainments. Mac and Bob changed that by coming up with gracious little speeches that didn't say they owed it all to their wives and families and their fine teams who supported them on their jobs. They danced on stage wearing blazers and straw boaters and went into a soft-shoe routine. John Torley, the Chamber's President, was saying things with an irreverant slide introduction, showing all the unflattering pictures of Mac from the time Mac was born on a farm near Springfield, Missouri. Then Mac had the microphone, on the balls of his feet like a Pro has with timing. "That was on Labor Day, the day I was born," he told Torley. "I didn't think anything about it—shucks, I thought everybody was born on Labor Day."

Then he pointed his comments to the Master of Ceremonies. "Torley is pretty skinny," he said. "He's the male Twiggy. You can't tell which way he's facing, unless you look at his feet."

There was more, not all printable. Almost everybody there was the target of an individual thrust.

When Mac first came here as base commander at Wright-Patterson he attracted attention, mainly with such exploits as putting a two-seater outhouse on the front lawn of four-star General Mark Bradley on Halloween. But all the while he was streamlining the base commander's job.

From the beginning he operated like the mayor of a big city—which is pretty much the job of a base commander at Wright-

Patterson. He developed liaison with surrounding communities, township trustees, city council members, and county commissioners. He helped Wright State University get off the ground and worked with area officials on devising a highway system for the complex.

He is a good man as well as a fun guy and it is well to know that he will be around.

THE MURPHY AMENDMENT TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to contribute my thoughts to the considerable discussion that has been taking place about the effect that the Murphy amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act would have on the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

As you know, a Governor now may veto an entire legal services program if he sees fit. The Director of OEO may, however, override that veto. It is his duty to assure the poor man the same range of legal services that are available to you and me.

The Murphy amendment would allow State Governors to veto legal services programs in whole or in part and would eliminate the existing power of the OEO Director to override the veto. By inhibiting, as this amendment would, these citizens' access to the law to seek redress for their grievances, I believe we would be closing the door to the court and inviting redress in the streets.

If this program is to protect the legal interests of its beneficiaries, and thus promote the interest of this Nation as a whole, I hope we in this House will act to retain the legal services program as presently prescribed by Congress.

In the event that my colleagues did not happen to hear a recent WMAL editorial on this subject, I submit the text of that message for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[A WMAL editorial, Oct. 22, 1969]

LEAVE LEGAL SERVICES ALONE

The Senate's recent vote to give governors veto power over Neighborhood Legal Services projects is an amazing overreaction against a smattering of abuses. The House should restore the present system, which gives only the Director of Economic Opportunity the power to eliminate Legal Services programs. In this case, we believe control of the programs should be centralized at the Federal level for the sake of equal justice.

Legal Services is the anti-poverty project that provides free legal services to the poor. As OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld has said, this project gives the poor the opportunity to take their grievances to court rather than to the streets.

The symbolic figure of Justice wears a blindfold. The Senate's vote lifts that blindfold so that Justice can take a peek. Such an action can eliminate a poor person from equal justice before the courts. This vote is unworthy of the Senate.

TEXTILES AND OKINAWA

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and excellent editorial recently appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., along with an equally splendid article from the San Diego, Calif., Union.

I commend these two articles to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to our friends and allies throughout the world:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

TEXTILES AND OKINAWA

Awhile back an editorial discussing the textile imports situation wound up with a suggestion that the United States tie the issue of Japanese imports to the question of changing the status of American occupation of Okinawa.

And now word is drifting down from Washington, via correspondents quoting reliable sources, that the Nixon administration is considering doing exactly that. If so, it's only about time this country got "hard nosed" with the Japanese on textiles.

Commerce Secretary Stans recently asked textile area congressmen for a little more time before kicking off imports quota legislation. He said the United States and Japan would discuss imports in September

Well and good, but time is beginning to run out on getting Japan to agree to voluntary restrictions on textile goods shipped into this country. Foreign textiles are flooding American markets this year, running 13 per cent higher than in 1968. Japan is the key to solution of the problem.

The Japanese are being both tough and one-way. They have refused point blank so far to even consider voluntary controls. At the same time they enforce one of the world's toughest import control systems on items allowed into Japan.

At the bottom of today's page is an excellent, concise appraisal of American-Japanese relations by the San Diego, Calif., Union, outlining the strategic, economic and political complexities. The textile problem has to be considered in context with all of these, especially the balance of trade question.

But of all the economic matters between the United States and Japan, textiles probably is the most critical for this country.

Something has to give in this situation, and give soon. Continued flooding of American markets and uncertainty for the domestic textile industry can play havoc with the economies of several states in the immediate future.

A textile slump later this fiscal year could wreck South Carolina's high, tight budget, financed by tax increases. The whole state could experience a recession, crippling many new programs designed to raise living, health and educational standards for all South Carolina.

A textile slump also would slow down, if not stop, the textile industry's continuing efforts to provide employment for members of minority groups trying to climb the economic ladder.

President Nixon promised in his campaign to alleviate the textile situation. His administration has to deliver, not only because of politics, but because the textile industry is vital to the economic and sociological health of America.

The fact is that the nation cannot put off much longer giving relief and protection to an industry whose geographic location, skill requirement level and ability to train unskilled people make it peculiarly valuable in the national effort to raise people from poverty and wipe out racial job problems.

The textile industry is every bit as important to America as Okinawa is to Japan—if not more so. Linking the two may be the way to obtain a solution to a pressing problem.

Meanwhile, textile area congressmen should keep their quota bills handy just in case all else fails. If the Japanese have shown no sign of cooperation by October, both the administration and Congress should move to take unilateral American action.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union]

AMERICAN-JAPANESE RELATIONS

The signs are unmistakable that relations between the United States of America and Japan are approaching a serious climax.

Best known of the problems is the issue of Okinawa. The Japanese have made a major case out of regaining full control of the strategic island—insisting, in some cases, upon having the final decision as to its military use.

The United States has indicated its willingness to relinquish some civil authority of the island. But under the present volatile conditions in Asia, the security of Japan, as well as of the United States, requires that we have full military flexibility in the use of our strategic defense bases on Okinawa.

Looming equally large as a source of major difference between Japan and the United States also, are economic problems that have reached emergency proportions.

The efficiency of Japanese industry, the quality of its goods, its labor advantages, coupled with inflation in the United States—and Japan's protectionism—are visible symptoms of a condition under which the United States last year spent $1.5 billion more in buying Japanese goods than Japan spent in the United States.

In another area of concern there appears to be a slowly maturing atmosphere of understanding. Japan is living in growing fear of the ominous shadow of a developing Communist Chinese atomic capability.

As a result, her relations with the United States now are colored less and less by radical student rioting and spurious leftist clamor. The Japanese see clearly the stabilizing nature of a United States presence in the area and, conversely, fear the vacuum that our departure will create.

Our discussions are thus down to the bedrock issues of economics and defense. And we are holding them at the highest levels. Two American cabinet members have met in Tokyo recently with their Japanese counterparts.

The high level conferences will continue in Washington next month. Prime Minister Eisaku Sato has scheduled a meeting with President Nixon later this year.

In addition to Okinawa defense and trade, Mr. Sato and Mr. Nixon will have before them the important question of Japan's role in Asia after the Vietnam War ends, and the possible renewal of the defense treaty.

No small part of Japan's economic advantage lies in the fact that she spends less per capita for defense than any major nation. On the other hand, Japan is a bridge between the United States and Asia. Her well-being is vital to the United States which spends billions for Pacific security.

It is plain that the mutual interests of the two powers are many, the problems between them are not insoluble. Now is the time, as President Nixon's Asian policy is in the emerging state, for the two great nations to drive forward to an enduring accord which will enhance the security of the entire Pacific basin.

PRAYER AGAINST POVERTY WEEKEND

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the conditions of poverty are becoming more acute for many disadvantaged members of our society. Recently, a number of States decided to cut back on welfare, health, and education payments. Unfortunately, my own State, New York, was one of these. The Governor and the State legislature saw fit to reduce the payments while increasing expenditures for relatively insignificant programs. The result of such an ordering of priorities is all too easily predictable. Our problems stemming from widespread poverty will only be aggravated.

On October 23, in the National Conference for Christians and Jews national headquarters, 43 West 57th Street, I met with a group of concerned clergymen of all faiths to protest the decision of the Governor and Legislature of New York State. The occasion was moving and memorable. My colleagues, especially those on the Ways and Means Committee, will find the following statement of the Prayer Against Poverty Weekend most helpful:

PRAYER AGAINST POVERTY WEEKEND

As clergymen representing the three major religious faiths of New York City, we are compelled by conscience and faith to speak out in one voice regarding the suffering inflicted upon so many of our citizens—children, the disabled, the elderly and the poor—as a result of State budget cutbacks.

We feel that it is our moral obligation to communicate to our congregations our first-hand knowledge of the widespread suffering in New York City caused by the recent State budget cuts in health, education and social services. We are extremely concerned that too few New Yorkers recognize the intense hardship being experienced by low-income and welfare-recipient families as a result of these cutbacks in basic services.

For example, do most New Yorkers realize that each person on public assistance receives only *66¢ per day* for food; that there is *no* provision for transportation, furniture and clothing, telephones, school supplies, or laundry and cleaning needs in the present State welfare budget?

Are most New Yorkers aware that by lowering eligibility levels the State eliminated 200,000 low-income persons from the Medicaid rolls? Or that low-income (non-welfare) families must pay the first 20% of their medical costs before they become eligible for Medicaid?

We believe that the funds to meet this crisis can be made available without additional taxation on the working man. Since 1959, Governor Rockefeller has imposed 43 new revenue tax measures, only one of which raised levies specifically on high income groups and only one of which increased taxes on business. *All other taxes* adopted since then hit hardest at middle-income families by raising sales, use, and excise taxes. As a concrete proposal, we suggest that perhaps some of the required funds could be derived from on-going non-essential programs, such as:

(1) *The Albany Mall*—the first estimate for its construction was $600 million; the present estimate is $1.5 billion.

(2) The Golf Course at $1.5 million.

(3) The snow-making machine at $35,000.

(4) The hundreds of millions poured into the uncontrollably expanding State highway network.

We will be asking our congregations to respond to this *"Prayer Against Poverty Weekend"* because we are convinced that the people of New York City have a humanitarian and religious concern for their fellow man and will not stand idly by as millions of poor, aged and disabled suffer. We cannot afford to ignore the despair and the decay gripping the disadvantaged in our midst. We therefore call upon all men of good will to pray, in their own way, for an end to the needless poverty and human indignities that exist in our affluent America of 1969.

Finally, we call upon all New Yorkers to commit themselves to taking positive steps to correct this situation by urging Governor Rockefeller and the State Legislature to convene a special session to reverse the budget cutbacks.

Participants at the announcement included Fathers John Drew and John Mortell, designated by Msgr. Gustav Schultheiss, Dean of the Bronx Catholic Clergy, to represent all of the Catholic priests in the Bronx; Father Donohue, Our Saviour Roman Catholic Church; Rabbi David Hollander, Mt. Eden Center of the Bronx, President of the Metropolitan Board of Orthodox Rabbis; Rev. Dr. Dan Potter, Executive Director, Council of Churches, City of New York; Rev. Roy Larsen, Executive Secretary, Bronx Division, Council of Churches of the City of New York; Rev. Robert Meyer, Bronx Presbyterian Church Program Counselor; Father David Wayne, St. Edmund's and St. Simeon's Episcopal Churches, Bronx; Rabbi Abraham Krantz, Tremont Temple; Jerome Levinrad, Director, Bronx Regional Office American Jewish Congress.

Also represented were leaders of the Bronx Alliance for Adequate Living, a coalition of social service agencies, social workers, community and neighborhood organizations, religious leaders and elected public officials allied to seek reversal of the State budget cuts. Miss Marjorie Mazel, Director of Forest Neighborhood House Service Center and Executive Secretary of the Bronx Alliance for Adequate Living, was also present.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Veterans Day, November 11, will be an appropriate time for us to call on Hanoi once again to release the names of American prisoners of war. Accordingly, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter I sent to President Nixon earlier this week:

OCTOBER 30, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my letter to you of August 15, I expressed my concern for American troops who are currently being held prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I said then, and I believe now, that the very real tragedy is that Hanoi's obstinate refusal to release the names of prisoners of war and abide by the Geneva Convention, has left families of missing servicemen without any idea whether their loved ones are even alive. I thank your office for the thoughtful reply I received on September 4, and I thank you, Mr. President, for the Administration's efforts on behalf of our soldiers who are prisoners of war.

Unfortunately, Hanoi's secrecy has not changed; unfortunately, families still live from day to day in uncertainty, refused information about their friends or loved ones, knowing nothing about the soldiers who may or may not have given their lives in the Vietnam conflict. It is for this reason that I willingly join my distinguished colleagues in urging you to declare this Veterans' Day, November 11, a "Day of National Concern" for missing servicemen and prisoners of war in Vietnam. I also urge that you make such a proclamation during the course of your planned address to the Nation on November 3.

I agree with you, Mr. President, that as a Nation we should lower our voices. I earnestly believe, however, that November 11 will be a time to raise all our voices—in unison.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

COUNTRY MUSIC GROWS IN TIDEWATER

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, Norfolk and the Tidewater area of Virginia are rapidly achieving national recognition as one of America's historic centers of country music.

This achievement of national recognition is due in large measure to the energetic efforts of one of Norfolk's native sons, Irvine B. Hill, the executive vice president of Norfolk's distinctive and highly regarded music station, WCMS, and to the imaginative leadership of the station's president, George A. Crump.

Mr. Hill discovered that the founder of the Grand Ol' Opry, Judge George Dewey Hay, was buried in Forest Lawn Cemetery in Norfolk. Mr. Crump and Mr. Hill felt it would be appropriate to build a memorial to the man who guided the Grand Ol' Opry's destiny for 30 years, from 1925 to 1955. As chairman of the Hay Memorial Fund, and from the contributions of country music lovers, including thousands of nickels and dimes, Mr. Hill fulfilled his dream for an appropriate memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to be present for the unveiling ceremonies of the Hay memorial, along with country music singing star Minnie Pearl, Mr. Hill, and many others.

On that occasion, I recall Mr. Hill said:

The memorial represents a public effort to give recognition to a man who had a great influence on the world of music.

Subsequent to the unveiling ceremonies, Mr. Hill has brought numerous country music stars, such as Johnny Cash, to Norfolk to pay tribute to Judge Hay.

During Johnny Cash's visit to Norfolk last month the singing star told why

country music had suddenly become so popular. Cash said:

More folks are realizing that this music is of the people and of our time . . . good country music, that is . . . Historians should be able to hear these songs 100 years from now and tell something about what we were like.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend George Crump and Irvine Hill for the excellent work they are doing to build and to expand the legend of country music, and more specifically, for what they are doing in the Tidewater area. Mr. Crump has developed WCMS from a small, local station into one of this country's finest proponents of country music, with the most able assistance of Mr. Hill.

The fact that they have accomplished this while directing the daily operations of radio station WCMS and at the same time providing excellent and versatile leadership to various civic groups, including Old Dominion University, makes their achievement all the more remarkable and commendable.

Country music lovers are indeed fortunate to have such effective and persuasive advocates as Tidewater's George Crump and Irvine Hill, and Mr. Crump and Mr. Hill, in turn, are fortunate to have such picturesque and worthy music to inspire them.

WRITE YOUR LAWMAKERS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article gives some advice on how our constituents can help us to reflect their sentiments most accurately.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News]

WRITE YOUR LAWMAKERS

Under the United States' form of representative government it is imperative that each member of Congress truly represent his constituents. The whole system breaks down if he fails to understand the wishes of the "folks back home."

It is the complaint of most congressmen that the average citizen doesn't take the trouble to let his representative know what he thinks or wants. On the other hand pressure organizations, when an issue is pending, flood senators and members of the House with letters, telegrams and phone calls, most of the messages identical, showing the organized form-letter pressure method. One senator said recently he had rather get a penciled note on a sheet of dime tablet paper than a thousand form letters. . . .

A letter beats a phone call because it constitutes a written record and requires a written reply. Reaching a member of Congress by telephone is difficult because he spends so much time in sessions and attending committee meetings. He will, however, read and initial nearly every piece of mail.

Don't write a long letter. Make it short and snappy and to the point. Make sure the name and address are legible.

Know your position and back it up with valid reasons.

Don't make threats. They're offensive and ineffective.

A personal letter is better than a form type, or even a petition.

However you feel, congressmen say, please write—and often. They want to hear from you.

If you don't write, then don't go around town orally blaming Congress for what happens.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Trenton Evening Times; the Jersey Journal; and the Hudson Dispatch, in the State of New Jersey. The editorials follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, July 18, 1969]

TRUCK LOBBY NEVER QUITS

The big-truck lobby in Congress is at it again, trying to hog a larger share of the crowded public highway space.

Last year a bill permitting the operation of bigger and heavier trucks on the Interstate system passed the U.S. Senate but died in the House in the face of heavy opposition from the newspapers and from the American Automobile Association, no mean lobbyist itself.

But again this year a big-truck bill has been rolled out and is currently the subject of hearings before a House Public Works subcommittee.

The bill, H.R. 11870, would not of itself mandate the new size and weight limits. But it would permit the states to adopt them, thus enabling the truck lobby to turn its full attention to the legislatures, many of which are setups for the kind of pressure this industry can bring to bear.

Among other things, the bill increases single axle weights from 18,000 pounds to 20,000 pounds; increases tandem axle weights from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds; increases width limits from 8 to 8½ feet plus additional width for tire bulge and exterior mirrors and lights; sets length limits at 70 feet, and replaces the maximum gross weight limit of 73,280 pounds with a formula that would make it possible for a nine-axle monster to carry 108,500 pounds.

Trucks are already far too big and heavy. The sight of a full rig highballing down the highway is a frightening thing, and for good reason. A double-trailer combination requires 440 feet to stop at 60 m.p.h., compared to 182 feet for a passenger car. The trucking industry's own figures show that while heavy trucks comprise only 1.54 percent of total vehicle registrations and drive only 5.33 percent of vehicle miles, they are involved in 11.6 percent of fatal accidents—and in a collision between a truck and a passenger car, the occupant of the car is the one who gets killed.

What heavier trucks would do to highway pavements, shoulders and bridges is something else again. The Bureau of Public Roads says a 2,000-pound increase in tandem axle load limits on federal aid highways would require $1.6 billion in road upgrading costs. The Interstate system's bridges aren't built to carry axle loads of more than 32,000 pounds tandem; state, county and city bridges, which the monsters would also use, were built to hold much less.

Passage of this incredible bill would open the way to the triple-trailer trucks and truck trains that are the industry's dream. If that happens, ordinary drivers might well consider abandoning the highways altogether for the sake of life and limb.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Journal, July 22, 1969]

BIG TRUCK BILL BACK IN HOUSE

WASHINGTON.—To the motorist who shudders when he sees a big tractor-trailer truck pounding down a hill from behind or approaching a narrow road ahead, take heed.

The bill to permit even bigger trucks on the highways, which nearly slipped through Congress last year until public outcry killed it, is back again.

A House public works subcommittee headed by Rep. John C. Kluczynski (D–Ill.), a former truck driver and an enthusiastic sponsor, is conducting hearings on the measure to permit wider, longer and heavier trucks on the interstate highway system. The bill won committee approval last year, but some members now appear to be having second thoughts because of public criticism.

The bill was denounced as an "anti-safety bill" by the American Automobile Association.

It was defended by trucking interests as a means of enabling construction of safer trucks and as a long overdue unfreezing of truck size limits set by the 1956 Highway Act. For truckers, bigger vehicles mean bigger loads and more profits.

The bill would allow an increase in maximum width from 8 to 8½ feet (plus side mirrors and other outcroppings), and it contains a formula that would increase maximum loaded weight from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds.

The bill contains a length limit—70 feet.

[From the Union City (N.J.) Hudson Dispatch, Sept. 20, 1969]

THE SKYWAY NO PLACE FOR TRUCKS

Two weeks ago this newspaper pointed out the dangers inherent in the federal moves to allow larger trucks to use our already overcrowded highways. Now, Hudson County is face to face with an equally dangerous proposition involving these behemoths of the roads; allowing them, along with buses, to use the Pulaski Skyway between Jersey City and Newark.

This is incredible when you realize the dangers and problems involved and we agree completely with Hudson County Police Chief Fred J. Kropke in standing firm, despite any state move, not to allow trucks and buses on the elevated highway as a "temporary" alternate to using a Newark pike bridge which has been declared unsafe for them because of their weight.

The skyway, a marvel when it opened in 1932 and still an engineering triumph, was not constructed with today's king-sized vehicles—both trucks and cars—in mind. It is a good road but not suitable for trucks and buses. It seems narrow enough when you're driving along and seeing those cars coming at you in the other direction with no high divider to separate traffic.

Can you imagine what it would mean to have slow-moving trucks crawling along the grades with their loads? And then buses trying to pass them on the two-lane road? This is no superhighway with three or four lanes in one direction—it just has two each way and that's it, no room for expansion unless you want to spend millions upon millions for another skyway.

After several bad fatal accidents on the skyway in the beginning involving trucks it was extreme pressure from the then Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City that brought the state ban on trucks and buses several years after the highway had been opened. This was a wise move and unquestionably has cut down on the number of potential tragedies. It should not suddenly be changed.

The state has acted unfairly with Hudson for many years as far as proper roads and safety installations. Just drive down to the shore, for instance, and note the nice, safe, wide highways—do we have that here in Hudson? So, in this case, New Jersey probably felt that any ukase to shift trucks and buses from Newark pike to the skyway should be accepted without question—it's only Hudson.

Fortunately, Chief Kropke after the story on the proposal appeared in Hudson Dispatch this week, took an immediate and firm stand: No trucks or buses on the skyway. He is right and we support him in his decision, primarily on the basis of safety. As he pointed out, if a multiple truck-car collision ever took place on the skyway how would help swiftly and effectively reach the crowded scene?

The chief meets on Monday with a representative of the state Department of Transportation on the impasse. It is to be hoped that he will not be forced to back down by more "promises" or orders from the state. The skyway is no place, whether "temporary" or not, for trucks. If the state doesn't care about the safety of the average driver, at least Chief Kropke does.

WHO IS THERE TO SPEAK FOR US?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, "Who is there to speak for us?" is the question asked of me by one of my constituents, Mrs. G. A. Oberg. In my opinion the answer is Mrs. Oberg, and people like her. For she is part of the "silent majority" of Americans who are beginning to speak out.

Mrs. Oberg's letter is a welcome sight to my office as it gives me confidence in the American people that they are not just sitting idly, but are concerned for the Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may share the wonderful feeling I received from Mrs. Oberg's letter, I hereby insert it in the RECORD:

DEAR MR. ZWACH: Who is there to speak for us? We are the simple, honest, decent tax-paying folks who spend our entire lives caring for families, working for them, reporting every penny of our incomes to the government and paying taxes asked of us, not involved with black markets or hidden bank accounts in Switzerland, not sitting in high places, letting hoods and hoodlums use our names or influence, not fleecing our own government right and left.

We are the folks who send our loved ones to fight wars not of our making—we are the ones who support the home town schools, welfare programs, fund drives, churches, and help our neighbors in time of sorrow or stress.

Who is there to speak for us?

Don't ever forget, that if there ever is a revolution in this country, we millions of simple, honest, tax-paying ordinary folks might decide that we have had enough of the sort of thing that seems to be going on in Washington these days.

We do not own oil wells nor large enterprises to use as tax-dodgers. We report every dime of our income and is it too much to ask that others do the same?

Who is there to speak for us? Our voices will be heard some day. Please, please—let it not be too late!

MRS. GUST A. OBERG.

REJECTS REPARATIONS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a member of the militant Black United Front in Washington visited the National Baptist Memorial Church at the morning worship service on October 19, in order to read a statement and demand the sum of $250,000 for "reparations."

The minister of the church, Dr. R. Stuart Grizzard, who is, I am proud to say, a resident of my congressional district, responded with a written statement in which he totally rejected the "reparations" concept.

As I believe Dr. Grizzard's remarks would be of interest not only to our colleagues, but to all who read this RECORD, I insert them in full at this point in the RECORD:

REPARATIONS, RESTITUTION AND REPENTANCE

(By Dr. Stuart Grizzard)

II Corinthians 5: 17—"If any man be in Christ he is a new creature . . . all things are become new." Revelation 21: 5—"Behold, I make all things new."

A. INTRODUCTION

Since the Black United Front has come to us and presented these demands for what they call reparations, it seems fitting that I, as Pastor, should make some reply to them.

We do appreciate the fact that they told us they were coming and that last Sunday, when they wanted to come, they were considerate enough to postpone their coming because we had a service of ordination for Mark Tracy, which involved six ministers, and it would have lengthened that already long service unnecessarily.

In time of revolution, as in war, the first casualty is truth. Revolution has a logic of its own but common sense, objectivity, reasonableness, is turned aside for passionate emotion, confrontation and change, whether it is purposeful or not. The voice of moderate progressiveness, which tries to keep the fabric of life from being torn apart during change, is not heard. Yet, I will be heard on this for I know that ultimately it is the voice of reason that will prevail.

I quite understand the emergency of black nationalism. It is a needed corrective for the intransigence of a stubborn racism that is inflexible in granting simple human rights to people. But that kind of separatism will only result in a polarization of society which will continue animosity that will perpetuate hostility forever. We are going to have to learn to accept one another and live with one another with mutual respect.

Evidently we have been selected because we are designated as the National Baptist Church and, therefore, representative of all Baptists. Perhaps through us you hope to reach other Baptists. We are not the oldest, richest, largest or most Caucasian of all Baptist churches, as I shall show in the course of these remarks.

A Baptist church, in structure, is a democracy. I cannot speak *for* the church, I can only speak *to* it. This obtains not only for this occasion but for all. What I am to say does not officially represent a reply by this church or Baptists. It does represent the deep feelings of my own heart, given after prayer and study. The demands, as presented, will be received and acted upon by the church itself at a later meeting.

Evidently, those who composed these demands know little of this particular church. I would not, for anything, defend the past history of prejudice or inequities on the part of the white majority in this country in its relationship with ethnic minorities. It is writ in a record of shame that brings blushes to the cheek, and in this record the Church of Christ has not acquitted itself too well in trying to right these wrongs. Let it be said, however, that always there were those, laymen and ministers, who did speak out against the evils of racism and slavery. But these voices and examples were not heeded.

The indictment brought here today are not always correct as far as this church is concerned. A candor and a sense of fairness makes it necessary to set the record straight.

I do not want to be misunderstood in this. Our church is by no means perfect in its adjustment to these revolutionary days. We have not done a great deal but what we have done and are endeavoring to do should be set forth.

I fully realize that we are just beginning to get ready, to commence, to start. Most respectfully, I ask that you know of what we have done and are doing.

(1) *We are an open, inner city church.*—We have, for more than 7 years, gladly received all who will come into our fellowship and qualify for membership in our church, without concern for racial, cultural or national background. Our only concern is that they accept Jesus Christ as Saviour and pledge to serve Him as Lord of Life. Not only are there scores of black children in our Sunday School, there are about 100 people who are internationals from all over the world who have affiliated with our church. At least half of the people who now join our church are black. Many of these are now assuming places of leadership and responsibility. If you look around you today you will see that approximately one-third of this congregation is black. Here are some of the community involvements of our church.

(a) *The Columbia Heights Church Community Project.*—This is a structure of community churches to do community work in which we have put about $15,000 in the last four years. For three years the director of it was a black woman of great charm, accomplishment, education and compassion. This project has concerned itself with clothing distribution, push-cart Bible program, teenage clubs, tiny tot clubs, and a day care center which meets in our church. During the riots in 1968, along with other churches of this area in the project, we attempted to alleviate suffering through the providing of food, clothing and housing.

During the Poor People's Campaign we made available a part of our property as a registration center and groups within the church ministered to the needs of the poor people.

(b) The five houses in the next block were purchased for the purpose of doing community work and the hope that we could help upgrade the community.

(c) Recently, part of our reserve money was placed in the *Change Credit Union*, a black-owned and -operated institution to provide blacks with business opportunities and capital.

(d) The church will consider soon our participation with responsible groups in the rebuilding of our burned out area.

(e) Last summer, two members of the staff of this church, one part-time and one full-time, were black ministerial students.

Of course, we have not done enough to minister in these difficult days. But we are open and we are earnestly trying to be relevant to our situation in the name and spirit of Christ.

More than this, there are other things that have to be said.

(1) *Reparations is not a Christian concept.*—It is a legalism which is antithetical to the teaching of Christ. It seems to say that the payment of money can make right the past. I must repudiate this concept because it becomes ridiculous in application.

If all the injustices of past centuries are to be dealt with in this way, we will never settle the score. Should the descendants of the Indians, who reputedly sold the Island of Manhattan to the Dutch for a measly $24.00, be properly compensated now? Shall the descendants of the Union soldiers who were killed in the Civil War, fighting to free the slaves, be remunerated now? Shall women, white and black, until recently the most discriminated against group in society, be paid for their generations of servitude as the minions of man? I do not think this can be done.

If you are going to play this game, I have what seems to me to be a just complaint. My saintly father, the latchets of whose shoes I am not worthy to unlace, preached for 40 years for Baptists in Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Kentucky and Indiana. Early in his sixties he had a stroke and was never able to function very well after that. There was no provision for his retirement, disability or support. I was forced to leave this city, interrupt my education, go home, work in the cotton mills in Danville, Virginia, and on an ice truck to support the family. This I was glad to do, but it shouldn't have been necessary. Baptists should have provided for that contingency. They could have and should have.

Reparations never catch up with injury. It cannot by its nature do so, and it heals nothing.

(2) *Restitution is a Christian concept.*—In this, by the requesting and granting of forgiveness, relationships are healed and one tries to make up to the injured for wrongs done him. This is accomplished by love, sympathy and perhaps by material things too. It is done to the person wronged and not to his descendants.

(3) *Repentance is a Christian concept.*—In fact, this is the beginning of forgiveness. One is genuinely sorry for his sins, for his acts that were wrong, for his hateful attitudes. In genuine contrition he turns from them, asks forgiveness of God and the people he has wronged. God's grace in healing power comes when we ask for it and repent. It is God's grace that makes it possible for there to be healing and a new beginning. His grace makes it possible to forgive each other.

(4) *Renewal.*—Renewal comes from repentance and forgiveness. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature, all things are become new." (II Corinthians 5:17). Then we are told in Revelation 21:5, as God speaks, "Behold I make all things new."

The greatest injustices of all time, the cruelest also, was the rejection of Jesus Christ, God's Son, who, as a result of rejection by those he came to save, was crucified. In this foul act, God, through Christ, became completely identified with sinful man and, through the suffering of Christ on the cross, made possible man's redemption from his sinful nature. God vindicated Christ by raising him from the dead. Each of us by an act of faith may appropriate the salvation of our souls and lives through trust and acceptance of Christ.

There is a positive lesson that we in this church must not miss. Demands like these should forever disabuse this and every church of the illusion that we can shut ourselves up behind our cloistered walls and lose ourselves in obscurantism while social change whirls around us. We are going to have to become more and more supportive of those forces that are trying to bring meaningful change into our world.

Racism is a rejection of persons as persons and is a grave sin against people and God. I am resolved, so help me God, to continue to stand out against racism of any kind, as I have endeavored to do for 30 years.

Here in this church we are dedicated to what is regarded by many militants as passe, but we believe in it. We are committed to a belief that in the local, parish church people of differing ethnic, social and national backgrounds can come together under the Lordship of Christ, accepting Him and each other on the basis of our hopes to serve Christ and our day as the community of the concerned. In this fellowship we will, ever, strive to change as led by the Holy Spirit of God to be God's instrument in this place for the betterment of all His people.

SMOG AND OTHER POLLUTION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, smog has raised the ire of America. The Justice Department decided to settle their case against the conspiracy of the auto manufacturers out of court. Thus, the judge of the district court in Los Angeles had to decide whether to accept the consent agreement or to conduct a public trial. I, along with many Members of the House, petitioned the judge to conduct a public trial to determine if the auto manufacturers had conspired to delay research, testing, development, and installation of effective air pollution control on motor vehicles.

In deciding to accept the consent decree, the court stated that "Smog simply isn't a legal problem. It's a governmental problem. It's simply not a problem the courts can deal with."

Be it governmental or legal, the problem is here and must be solved. We cannot continue to tolerate fish dying in our streams, and the dumping of pollutants into the atmosphere.

I would like to include in the RECORD two articles that, I believe, have merit and deserve my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1969]

SMOG TRIAL

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—Lawyers came from all over for the Smog Trial. They represented New York City, Connecticut, Maryland, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana and New Mexico. The Attorney General of Illinois showed up complaining that the air in Chicago is so foul the bears in the zoo are coming down with lung cancer.

Everywhere people are coughing, wheezing, gasping for air, straining their circulatory systems, grasping for something decent to breathe. This was going to be the trial that would begin curing our national case of black lung disease. This was going to be the case in which the automobile manufacturers would be tried for conspiring to prevent the development and installation of antipollution devices on their machines. Ralph Nader calls it "product fixing."

Some people would have preferred to see the tire manufacturers, the gas companies, and the freeway profiteers in court too, but this would be a beginning. The government might do something, and the country could sigh and breathe again.

No.

The first words the judge said when the hearing opened were, "It's apparent that the general public is aroused, and rightly so, but it may come as a shock that this isn't a hearing about smog. I wish there was some order I could make, some decree I could sign that would put an end to smog. Smog simply isn't a legal problem. It's a government problem. It's simply not a problem the courts can deal with."

As he spoke the smallest expression of approbation sneaked on and off the face of Lloyd N. Cutler, counsel for the Automobile Manufacturers Association. Mr. Cutler, of Washington's Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering, looked quintessentially Eastern in his dark suit with a vest. There were many other lawyers for the car companies, and they may charge equally high fees but Mr. Cutler was the boss. It was he who had negotiated the defendants out of antitrust conspiracy indictment and into a harmless consent agreement.

It was this agreement that the visiting lawyers had come to object to on the ground that it would exculpate the manufacturers for what they may have done in the past while making it unlikely they would do better in the future. The question hanging before the court was whether the agreement would be acceptable to the judge or whether there would be a trial with evidence and witnesses and a jury to determine if Ford, Chrysler, General Motors and the others had conspired to dirty the air. The judge's words were the tip-off Mr. Cutler had won. Not that he relaxed when he heard them. He sat tightly upright in his chair, making vigorous little whispers to his co-counsel, Eastern man, club man, genteel man, but sharp and combative for all his good manners and politeness.

When he got up to speak he was stiff at the lectern. His words were smooth and hard and quiet, silvery gray words, expensively fitted, made-to-order custom words. He rested his arms on the sides of the reading stand, but his hands wouldn't stay quiet. They have a life of their own, the way they slipped and flashed and twitched. "This is the first case that has ever been brought against an industry for trying to solve a public health problem," he said, and the hands floated limp and then flicked out in the air as though their function was to use up the excess competitive energy in the man.

He talked about how these big rich states with skillful lawyers only wanted the government to convict the car companies to make it easier for them to move in later and sue the blood out of the automobile manufacturers. But General Motors alone is richer than any state. In the esoteric field of antitrust law it could outbid any governmental body for the most skillful and devious attorneys. Mr. Cutler finished by saying, "I want to return to the importance of getting on with the job of making progress in pollution, the job of scientists achieving a major breakthrough," as if the bad air were not made by men, but was an act of nature like polio or multiple sclerosis.

This picture of the industry devoting great numbers of technicians and sums of money to pushing back the frontiers of knowledge is contradicted by Dr. John Goldsmith of the California State Department of Health at Berkeley. An expert in the physiological effects of smog on man, Dr. Goldsmith says, "They keep talking about research but no person identified with the motor vehicle in-

dustry has made a contribution to the field. They have very few researchers working for them." The truth of the matter was plainly stated by the representatives of the three biggest corporations in a 1967 Commerce Department report (Automobile Air Pollution: A Program for Progress): "There has been inadequate incentive for an individual automobile manufacturer to apply pollution control technology to the automobile in advance of its competitors."

But these considerations are froth; Mr. Cutler had the law with him. The lawyers for the smog shrouded cities and states tried to interest the Court in higher and broader consideration of public welfare, but privately they admitted the law was against them. Mr. Cutler had all the precedents; all the citations were over on his side because, for 70 years, all the money, all the most adept legal brains have gone into shaping and warping the law so the judge would say he was awfully sorry there was nothing he could do about the smog.

The bad air does not know about this. It kills without court orders. In the San Bernardino National Forest 46,000 acres of Ponderosa-Jeffry pine trees have already suffered heavy damage from the killing air. Their needles turn yellow and they die, or their resistance is weakened and they can't fight the pine bark beetle which finishes them off. Of the forest's 1,298,000 trees, 82 per cent are now moderately damaged, 15 per cent severely injured and 3 per cent are dead. The experiments at the air pollution center of the University of California at Riverside (where these figures come from) show that smog reduces an orange tree's yield by about a half; a grapevine growing in good air produces 17 pounds of fruit, in bad air, only seven.

Some of the worst smog is invisible. It comes in the form of ozone and is particularly prevalent in sunny, warm climes like Los Angeles, but it will be an increasingly dangerous compound in the air over cities such as Phoenix, Dallas, New Orleans, Atlanta and Miami.

Ozone is oxygen with an extra, unstable molecule. It is created when sunlight hits certain automobile exhaust pollutants. Ozone weakens the cell membranes of the lungs and blood. It increases the obstruction of air flow to emphysema patients and cuts down the performance of athletes. When the ozone content of the air reaches .35 parts per million, doctors advise that children be restrained from strenuous play so that they don't breathe heavily, and therefore cut down on their ozone intake. Since July 3 of this year, Los Angeles has had to close its school playgrounds 39 times because the ozone content had gone over .35.

It's because air pollution is not a theoretical problem, but a real one that is killing and weakening people and animals and vegetation now that governmental bodies from everywhere tried to stop the Justice Department from settling this case out of court, but the law says they are wrong. The judge was even a little miffed that they had made the attempt. The politicans had endeavored he said, to "divert the fire and heat of their constitutents onto this court."

[From American Bar Association Journal, October 1969]

POLLUTION CONTROL: WHY HAS IT FAILED?

(By Arnold W. Reitze, Jr.)

In recent years nearly every literate person has become cognizant of the "quality" deterioration of our environment.[1] However, this knowledge has not been translated into the meaningful societal actions necessary to halt the fouling of our habitat. At one time the destruction of our environment was merely an aesthetic problem. Now it threatens the survival of mankind as a species.[2]

When compared to the age of the earth, the period of man's occupation of our planet has been very short. While man has been destroying his environment throughout his recorded history,[3] his ability extensively to alter his surroundings to the point of complete destruction has developed during the last century. It is therefore imperative that man's myopic view should not obscure the insignificance of this span of time.[4] Assuming he survives his radiological, biological and chemical war toys,[5] he still must face the long-term effects of pesticides,[6] air pollution,[7] destruction of the soil[8] and the many other effects of abusing his habitat. War is a danger, but peace too may be deadly. Man should not be sanguine. Why then is he acting against his long-term interests?

The most obvious reasons are the ubiquitous nature of the problem, its complexity and the concomitant cost of combating it. Professor Kenneth Galbraith put it this way: "Pollution may well be the nation's most broadly based and democratic effort."[9]

Today, virtually every identifiable social or economic interest group is actively engaged in the destruction of our environment. The average citizen functioning as the operator of an automobile and as a waste-producing machine is the most significant source of air and water pollution. Industry is a large user of water and a contributor of vast quantities of pollutants. Whether it is the air and thermal pollution of the power industry, the acid pollution of the steel industry or the organic wastes that the food processors discharge, nearly every industry is a significant contributor to the pollution problem.[10] So too is agriculture, with its pesticide residuals, chemical fertilizers, organic wastes and silt.[11] The mining industry is responsible for much of the destruction of Appalachia,[12] while the construction and road-building industries follow practices inimical to soil conservation, adding to our silt pollution problem.[13] The Federal Government is a major polluter from its military installations,[14] ships,[15] and through the activities of agencies charged with other aspects of resource development.[16] With everyone contributing to the pollution problem, it is difficult to assign responsibility.

While the universality of polluters complicates abatement procedures, it would be simplistic to attribute the failure of control efforts solely to the size and diversity of the body to be regulated. Restraints on "aggressive activities" that result in limitation of individual freedom for the benefit of society are common. Traffic laws are an example. As population density increases, these limits on individual freedom continue to become more totally encompassing. The furor over firearm control legislation is an excellent example of the conflict between the necessity for group control in areas of dense population and the individual freedom that could more readily be maintained in a bucolic society.[17]

SPENDING A FORTUNE TO DEFEND WHAT WE WON'T PAY TO CONSERVE

The argument that the high cost of pollution abatement precludes adoption of controls is also unconvincing when one realizes that what is at stake is the livability of our environment. The expenditures from the public sector of our economy for defense and agricultural price supports are examples of the high fiscal commitment to policy goals for needs deemed sufficiently great. But if we consider the vast fiscal resources of the private sector of the economy, the handling of our environmental problem is certainly within our capabilities. The problem is getting the money allocated to the task.

In our society, the traditional controls have been unable to cope with the continued deterioration of our environment basically because of our failure to recognize pollution for what it is: a form of aggression against society as a whole and our neighbors in particular. Existing or possible control methods are of three types: informal (our mores), formal or legal and economic. The informal controls are those most capable of producing a high general level of conformity to the demands of society, while legal controls operate primarily to establish a minimum standard of acceptable conduct. Economic controls hardly exist. The informal controls are the most effective, as the regulated individual conforms as a result of his ingrained socialization. Ultimately, in a democratic society, all control should be based upon this societal consensus of what is permissible the conduct. The strength of such mores is aptly expressed in the ditty about

The young lady named Wilde
Who kept herself quite undefiled
Through thinking of Jesus
And social diseases
And the dangers of having a child.[18]

IF WE WOULD VIEW POLLUTION AS VICTORIANS VIEWED SEX

If pollution could be regarded as "dirty" in the Victorian sense, then our environmental problems would soon be solved. But this is not likely to happen. In general, polluting is socially acceptable conduct. Many of the wealthiest suburban communities inflict their inadequately treated wastes on their downstream neighbors. Eleemosynary institutions such as hospitals and universities are often major air polluters. The names of the major industrial polluters read like a who's who of industry.[19] Yet the corporate directors and officers who are responsible for these chemical and biological attacks on the rest of us are often considered the leading citizens of their communities.

This acceptance of pollution is deeply embedded in our societal psyche. The Judeo-Christian tradition is a most anthropocentric influence. The man and nature unity of ancient paganism and primitive animism has had no part in our historical tradition. As a society we still believe that man can exploit nature interminably. Our technology and one predominant social institutions have evolved in this tradition, and it is this outlook that is held today by nearly all Americans. Despite Copernicus, our relationship to the environment is still based on a man-centered universe. We reject the Darwinian notion that we are part of nature.[20]

This rejection may have been useful in creating the mental framework necessary for settling the wilderness and developing a nation from a relatively unpopulated frontier.[21] But today, in our densely populated, interdependent, twentieth-century nation, this attitude can lead to our destruction. Man cannot persist in creating an environment hostile to his continued existence.

Economic controls to protect our environment do not exist. The reason is simple: Pollution increases profits to individuals and corporations. Conversely, pollution control is expensive. When the environment is defiled by a business, the cost of production includes a harm inflicted on society for which no payment need be made. Air and water are treated as elements of production that are essentially free and are, therefore, abused or wasted with impunity. Pollution controls, when avoided, do not become a cost of production. Although the cost to society of pollution, even in economic terms, may exceed the costs of abatement, the individual polluter making the decision of how to operate his business must decide whether he will abate pollution with his own financial resources or pass the costs and harm on to the public as negative externalities of his business operation. Even if the businessman possesses a highly developed social conscience, his competition is unlikely to be similarly constrained. In a competitive world the lowest level of morality, if consistent with the desire for maximizing profits, tends to become the norm.[22]

IF PRODUCTION DOESN'T POLLUTE, THE PRODUCT DOES

Even if the production of the goods does not cause pollution, the product itself can

---

Footnotes at end of article.

be designed so as to become a pollution problem. Polaroid film, aluminum beverage cans, detergents and chemical pesticides are some of these. The responsibility of a manufacturer for the environmental problems caused by the use of his product is a subject that must become of increasing concern if we are to protect our water and air. The requirements for controls on automobile emissions are but a beginning.[23]

Pollution abatement is hampered, of course, by the often astronomic costs of control. The capital investment necessary to control industrial wastes can represent a substantial portion of total capital investment. Many businesses, particularly those that are small or inefficient, just do not have access to such capital. It is usually difficult to make pollution abatement financially attractive. Even if a profitable by-product can be obtained through pollution control, the economic return is rarely equal to the return which could be obtained from investing the necessary capital in more traditional investments or else in other polluting industries.[24]

Not only are capital requirements substantial, but operating costs for pollution control are significant. For most communities, proper waste treatment would engender a substantial increase in operating costs as well as a vast increase in capital expenditures. For the Lake Erie Basin, proper phosphate removal alone would double present waste treatment expenses.[25] The costs to industry for abatement programs would have to be passed on to the consumers in the form of increased costs for nearly every item purchased. The cost to municipal government would be reflected in higher water and sewage rates.

The economic cost of environmental protection is so high that a commitment of the citizenry similar to that created by war is necessary if this problem is to be successfully resolved. Environmental protection is an expense that only wealthy nations can afford, but today it is an expense we cannot afford to avoid. The capital accumulation necessary for a modern economy is obtained by exploiting natural resources. But the limits of exploitation for developed economies have been reached.[26] We no longer can afford to allow this exploitation process to continue. Rather, the process must be reversed. Continued expansion of the gross national product, if achieved at the expense of our environment, is irrational. For example, producing gas masks and distilled water for city dwellers will increase the gross national product, but it is difficult to understand how the required use of these products improves our well-being. As the production of goods of dubious value and planned obsolescence continues, it is often at the expense of our environment.

ERODE ENVIRONMENT OR PERSONAL FREEDOM?

Since economic consideration provide an incentive to pollute our air and water, only strong formal constraints have any chance of success, and these can only be considered temporary expedients. If the mental attitude necessary for developing the informal constraints is not developed, the formal regulation in the long run will not be successful. While the continued expansion of governmental powers and the erosion of personal freedom that this implies cannot be welcomed, the penalty for increased population density must be paid. The choice is either *laissez faire* treatment of the environment, followed by its destruction, or governmental regulation sufficient to prevent such destruction. The polluted condition of our air and water makes it clear that efficacious regulatory powers do not exist.[27]

The concept of governmental regulation of our waters is nothing new. From the beginning of our nation, the Federal Government has been concerned with our water resources. Most of its activity, however, was to encourage development and exploitation of these resources. Not until the end of the nineteenth century did the concept of governmental protection of resources enter our political philosophy.[28] Yet this long history of involvement in the various aspects of resource management is significant, for it helps explain the lack of a unified, coherent government policy toward our water resources or toward the larger problem of the management of all our natural resources.

DOZENS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES MOSTLY AT CROSS PURPOSES

Today water resource regulation and development is carried on by dozens of federal agencies. Many of these agencies work at cross purposes: The Department of Agriculture has paid North Dakota farmers to drain land, while the Department of the Interior spends money to create and protect such wet lands for wild fowl breeding; the Department of Agriculture pays to remove lands from agricultural production, while the Bureau of Reclamation spends large sums to create agricultural lands; the Army Corps of Engineers dredges harbors in such a manner as to increase the pollution problem the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is attempting to abate. Examples of these inconsistent government activities are legion, and they are largely the result of numerous agencies that represent specialized economic interests.[29]

Today, most progress toward pollution control is carried out by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) of the Department of the Interior. This is one agency dealing with water resources that does not represent an economic bloc. It has been active for but four years. Its power is limited, and it has a small budget. But considering the limitations imposed on it, it has done an excellent job. Some progress finally is being made, but this progress is inadequate. As the Queen said to Alice: "[I]t takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."[30] Our growing population and increasing rate of urbanization require an estimated expenditure of $22 billion for municipal sewage systems by 1975 and an additional $10 billion for industrial waste treatment.[31]

We must run to stand still, yet we are barely crawling. The estimated expenditures and net lending for 1968 by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are $190 million. Of this a little over $6 million will be allocated to Ohio.[32] The ten largest agricultural subsidies exceed Ohio's allotment.[33] With this sense of priorities, little progress can be expected. Reductions in federal outlays can be anticipated to be taken from natural resource programs out of proportion to their percentage of the total budget.[34] Few economic blocs lobby to protect water pollution control funds. Even without reduction, the present federal expenditure for water pollution is only approximately equal to the interest that could be earned on the interest that would be paid on the defense budget if invested at 5 per cent.

The state governments' attitude toward pollution control parallels that of the Federal Government. A profusion of conflicting state agencies dealing with these problems is common. Even more common are the lack of effective power and minuscule budgets.[35] Under present law the responsibility for enforcing most laws dealing with water pollution is with the states. In Ohio the Water Pollution Control Board operates with a budget of less than $500,000.[36] Though there is danger in making comparisons between systems that are not identical, it is interesting to note that the budget for the German Ruhr District Authority—the district is a fraction of the size of Ohio—is about $50 million.[37] Air pollution control in Ohio is expected to advance with a budget of $150,000. State grants to local governments in Ohio for pollution control have not materialized,[38] and this in turn denies local governments federal matching funds. Expenditures of this nature predetermine the result.

SOCIETY MUST KEEP SCIENCE'S PACE

The failure of our environmental protection program is obvious. The ability of our social organizations to deal with today's problems has lagged substantially behind our science and technology. But the reason for this failure is due largely to the lack of any consensus to effectuate the necessary change. The political pressures that encourage a high level of expenditure by the Department of Defense tend to minimize environmental controls. The general public has had but minimum concern; when its concern grows to the point where it manifests itself in a willingness to approve expenditures commensurate with the task before us, then, and only then, will there be a chance for reversing the deterioration of our environment.

Recent voter approval of bond issues for pollution control is a hopeful sign, but after two centuries of neglect and exploitation, the challenge is so substantial that these sums, while welcome, are but a beginning.[39] We can only hope meaningful recognition develops throughout the nation while the problem is capable of being solved.[40] A danger is that society will adjust to levels of pollution that apparently have only a minor nuisance value, but that this apparent adaptation will eventually cause much pathological damage.[41] Further, the ability of man to adapt to the continuing qualitative deterioration of his environment creates a political climate that makes reversal of this deterioration difficult. After a period of time citizens seem to accept as normal a long journey to areas where fish still live and swimming is safe.

It is the belated recognition that time may not be on our side that is most ominous. The air we breathe is the same as that utilized by Neanderthal man, only now 65 million tons of deadly carbon monoxide are discharged each year by automobiles in this country.[42] The long-term effects of this pollution on man's physical, neurological, and even genetic make-up cannot be determined. What will the 133 million tons of pollutants that are sent into the atmosphere each year in the United States do to weather patterns and eventually to the temperature of this planet?[43] No one can be sure. Water pollution may also become irreversible. The present deterioration of Lake Erie from phosphate—mostly from detergents—that encourages vast algae growth and greatly speeds eutrophication may continue even if additional nutrient inputs are curtailed.[44]

ABILITY TO DESTROY WHAT WE CAN'T CREATE REQUIRES HUMILITY

Our technology is allowing man to upset ecological balances without having developed the degree of technological *expertise* necessary for a new artificial ecological balance to be created that can be predicted and controlled so as to assure that a place remains in our man-defiled environment for man. Until this can be achieved, we must humble ourselves to reinstate a man-nature unity. We must being to live in harmony with our environment.[45] When this concept is accepted, the necessary money will be forthcoming and social institutions will rapidly provide the means for carrying out the mandate of the citizens. In a democratic society these attitudes can only be created through education and persuasion. Until the consensus of our citizens is that an environment undefiled by man is highly desirable, the reckless abuse of natural resources will continue. The law, particularly when large sums must be appropriated, can move only a short distance beyond the desires of the governed. Unless those who are led become convinced of the wisdom of the course of action, even limited leadership will have an ephemeral existence. Until Americans decide they want a livable

Footnotes at end of article.

environment, we cannot have one. Our survival may depend of their decision.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Numerous publications lamenting the destruction of our environment have been written in the past several years. Two general books of value are S. UDALL, THE QUIET CRISIS (1963) and RIENOW & REINOW, MOMENT IN THE SUN (1966).

[2] In 1952 the London smog killed 4,000 people, more than the number killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. In late October of 1963, a stagnant air mass over the Northeastern United States caused toxic gases to increase to more than five times the normal level. Only a change in wind direction prevented disaster. LEWIS, WITH EVERY BREATH YOU TAKE viii, xvii (1965).

[3] The decline of numerous ancient civilizations, for example, is attributable to poor irrigation practices. See generally CARR, DEATH OF THE SWEET WATERS (1966).

[4] Estimates of the age of the earth vary between 5 and 6 billion years. LEET & JUDSON, PHYSICAL GEOLOGY 29 (3d ed. 1965). Human evolution began only 1 million years ago, and all of recorded history encompasses but 7,000 years. STORER, GENERAL ZOOLOGY 195 (1943).

[5] Weapons can, of course, effect the environment without being used in war: Contamination from nuclear testing is a well-known danger. A more dramatic example of the danger posed by modern weapons is the death of 6,500 sheep caused by the Army's nerve gas experiments in Utah. NEWSWEEK, April 1, 1968, at 53; Hersh, *Chemical and Biological Weapons—The Secret Arsenal*, The New York Times, August 25, 1968, § 6 (Magazine), at 25.

[6] See generally CARSON, SILENT SPRING (1962); HEADLEY, THE PESTICIDE PROBLEM: AN ECONOMIC APPROACH TO PUBLIC POLICY (1967).

[7] See generally U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AIR POLLUTION PUBLICATIONS, A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 1963–1966 (1966).

[8] See generally MORGAN, GOVERNING SOIL CONSERVATION (1965).

[9] Galbraith, *The Polipollutionists*, ATLANTIC, January, 1967, at 52, 54.

[10] See generally JACOBSTEIN & MERSKY, WATER LAW BIBLIOGRAPHY 1847–1965 (1966); NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL COMM., NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WASTE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL, No. 1400 (1966).

[11] See generally UDALL, supra note 1; HERFINDAHL & KNEESE, QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT 35, 65 (1965); STILL, THE DIRTY ANIMAL 239 (1967).

[12] See CAUDILL, NIGHT COMES TO THE CUMBERLANDS (1962); LIFE, January 12, 1968, at 54.

[13] See W. DOUGLAS, A WILDERNESS BILL OF RIGHTS 147 (1965).

[14] Nationally, in 1966, at least 237 federal installations were still improperly discharging wastes into United States waterways. The New York Times, January 3, 1968, at 96.

[15] U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR, WASTES FROM WATERCRAFT, S. DOC. No. 48, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 3 (1967).

[16] See generally DOUGLAS, *supra* note 13.

[17] Here the conflict over regulation as a responsibility of government should be distinguished from the merits of any specific regulatory proposal.

[18] Lewis, *The High Court: Final . . . But Fallible*, 19 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 528, 568 (1968), quoting from *A symposium on Morality*, 34 AM. SCHOLAR 347, 360 (1965).

[19] See generally U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR (FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION), LAKE ERIE REPORT (1968).

[20] See White, *Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*, 52 SIERRA CLUB BULL. 123 (1967); White, *What Hath Man Wrought?* SCIENCE, March, 1967, at 11; NASH, WILDERNESS AND THE AMERICAN MIND (1967).

[21] MANAGING THE ENVIRONMENT, REPORT OF THE SUBCOMM. ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE HOUSE COMM. ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS 13 (1968).

[22] See generally CONTROLLING POLLUTION, THE ECONOMICS OF A CLEANER AMERICA (Goldman ed. 1967).

[23] Clean Air Act of 1963, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1857.

[24] For detailed information concerning industrial pollution abatement costs see 3 U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR (FWPCA), THE COST OF CLEAN WATER (1967).

[25] Statement of George Eagle, Conference on Pollution of Lake Erie and Its Tributaries (June 4, 1968). Perhaps these additional costs may be subject to considerable reduction. See MICH. DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH, WASTEWATER SECTION DIVISION ENGINEERING, & DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY, STUDIES ON REMOVAL OF SUSPENDED MATTER AND BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND (1967).

[26] This does not mean that underdeveloped nations do not have pollution problems, but only that their economies are less capable of absorbing abatement costs.

[27] Present government control over pollution is much better than it was prior to 1965, and we are beginning to develop a body of law capable of dealing with some of our environmental problems. However, the law has just begun to function. See Reitze, *Wastes, Water and Wishful Thinking: The Battle of Lake Erie*, 20 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 5 (1968).

[28] *Id.* at 49.

[29] See generally Moss, THE WATER CRISIS (1967).

[30] CARROLL, THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS, quoted in Lewis, *supra* note 18, at 566.

[31] Figures for pollution abatement costs vary substantially. There are some estimates from COHN, SEWERS FOR A GROWING AMERICA (1966).

[32] BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES 108 (Fiscal 1969).

[33] Moore, *Slaves for Rent*, ATLANTIC, May, 1965, at 109, 118.

[34] BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES 109 (Fiscal 1969).

[35] This is only a generalization. Los Angeles County has an effective air pollution control, though not effective enough to solve the problem. New Jersey has begun a vigorous abatement program.

[36] Reitze, *supra* note 27, at 80.

[37] Fair, *Pollution Abatement in the Ruhr District*, in COMPARISONS IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 143, at 171 (Jarrett ed. 1961).

[38] Reitze, *supra* note 27, at 79.

[39] Bond issues for water pollution control were approved in Ohio, Michigan and Washington. The $1 billion bond proposal in Illinois was rejected. BUSINESS WEEK, November 9, 1968, at 104.

[40] A number of environmental pollution problems include a possible irrevocable destruction. A wilderness destroyed by man-created drought cannot be restored. Pennekamp, *Disaster in Everglades National Park*, 50 SIERRA CLUB BULL. 4 (1965). Air pollution may change world weather patterns. Cole, *Can this World Be Saved?*, The New York Times, March 31, 1968, § 6 (magazine), at 35.

[41] Dubos, *Adapting to Pollution*, SCIENTIST & CITIZEN, January-February, 1968, at 1, 3.

[42] PROGRESS IN THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION, FIRST REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, June 28, 1968, at 16.

[43] Faltermayer, *We Can Afford Clean Air* FORTUNE, November, 1965, at 159. See generally U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, POWER SYSTEMS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES (1967); CARR, THE BREATH OF LIFE (1965); 1 AIR POLLUTION (2d ed. 1968); Iglauer, *The Ambient Air*, THE NEW YORKER, April 13, 1968, at 51.

[44] Reitze, *supra* note 27, at 19; see also *supra* note 39.

[45] For further discussion, see generally MURPHY, GOVERNING NATURE (1967).

SOVIET SCENE 1969: RUSSIANS FEAR MAO BUT HATE GERMANS

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in this article, Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman, continues his series on the Soviet Union today. He discusses the views expressed by Russian citizens on the current world political situation.

This is the fourth installment I have entered in the RECORD, and the series will be concluded:

RUSSIANS FEAR MAO BUT HATE GERMANS

(By Charles L. Bennett)

"We don't think Mao has the rockets to reach us here," said a Soviet journalist in Novosibirsk, a Siberian city about 1,250 miles from the troubled border between the U.S.S.R. and Red China.

"There was absolutely nothing wrong with what we did in Czechoslovakia," said a man in Kazakhstan.

"Why should we help the U.S. to get out of Vietnam?" asked an official in Minsk. "After all, you didn't ask us about going in there in the first place."

A Soviet radioman, taping an interview with a U.S. newsman, asked a pointed question about why Americans were fighting in Vietnam. The American responded by saying he thought the U.S.S.R. was getting into the same kind of entanglements in the Middle East. The radioman later said he guessed he'd take all that part of the interview out of the tape "since my question on Vietnam wasn't a very good one."

"Won't you and the British and the French ever learn your lessons about the Germans?" asked a young woman in Leningrad. "They are very dangerous people."

Everyone in our group of touring editors had some idea of Soviet attitudes toward China, Vietnam, Czechoslovakia and the Middle East, before we started on our 16-day tour in the U.S.S.R. What most of us were not prepared for was the Soviet citizens' deep hate and abiding fear of the Germans—the Nazis of World War II and the West Germans of today. We heard this hate and fear from nearly everyone to whom we talked about today's questions of war and peace.

There is little question that the Chinese border incidents and the bad relations between the U.S.S.R. and Red China are the Soviet citizens' No. 1 concern at the moment.

Then, some officials obviously are bothered by the trouble they are having with their "difficult clients" in the Middle East—the Arab nations—in trying to get them to reach some kind of acceptable settlement with Israel.

Farther down the line, it appears, is worry over what the United States may do. This doesn't appear to be a fear of any direct attack against the U.S.S.R. Instead, it is the worrisome question of what the U.S. might do that would affect Soviet interests in some other part of the world or, worst of all, the possibility that the U.S. might join hands with Communist China against the U.S.S.R.

But we kept getting the impression that most Soviets were less worried by any of these problems than by the long-term danger of the military resurgence of an aggressive West Germany.

"The Chinese problem is very serious," said Gennady Novitsky, an English-speaking journalist in Minsk who once served in the U.S. with the Soviet diplomatic corps. "But it can't compare to West Germany. I can't explain what the Chinese leaders are after. We helped the Chinese for many years, even on their nuclear work. But they have Germans helping them now."

We heard this over and over. In Alma Ata, editor Feodor Mikhailov said: "They (the Chinese) are working now on the means of delivery of nuclear weapons . . . rockets. The bad thing is, someone is helping them—most probably West Germany.

"The Chinese have been mad at us for not helping them on nuclear development. They asked us for help but we didn't give help. (A contradiction of what we heard from other Soviet citizens.) The West Germans have been helping them for several years. Officially, West Germany denies this. But West German technicians are going to China and they are building up their trade."

"We hear they are selling arms to the Chinese," another Soviet citizen said of the Germans.

Even without the irritation of today's accusations that the Germans are helping the Chinese, the Soviet hate for Germans might be almost as strong. That's because of the emphasis continually put on the country's losses to the Nazi armies in World War II.

War memorials are everywhere. Trips are organized by school children to visit them. Each one we saw had some visitors and several were crowded. As reported earlier, one of the Soviet journalists commented that the lessons of World War II "are hammered into" the students every day.

"After all," was one comment, "twice within living memory Germany has almost wiped out Russia, and now two-thirds of Germany is the most powerful nation in Europe."

Soviet feeling about the death and destruction Germans caused in their country during World War II is deeply bitter, intense and purposely being kept alive.

"The Brest Fortress was surrounded in the first days. They fought three weeks and finally had no water or food. The garrison was killed off, from 3,000 down to 300."

"One out of every four people in Byelorussia died in the war."

"This diorama shows the Kostanetz death camp."

"I was wounded seven different times; I was in the Army seven years."

"All of the Jews who did not retreat with the Red Army were taken to the death camps and killed. Four million people died at Auschwitz."

"They destroyed 83 per cent of our city. All our houses were gone and people lived in earthen huts."

"Twenty-six of us left this school to go to the Army. Five returned."

"Our economy at the start of 1945 was back to the 1913 level."

"The German slogan was: 'The Russians must die, that we may live.' "

"They surrounded this village and herded all the women, children and old men into a hay barn. All the younger men were away fighting. Then they set the barn on fire. Three people out of the 149 managed to escape."

"This city had a population of 400,000 in 1939, but 10 per cent died in the war. That was 20 per cent of the men."

"Altogether, our country lost more than 20 million people killed during the war and these were the best of the people we had, mainly aged 21 to 35."

"Sixty-two thousand cities and villages were wiped off the face of the earth. The country lost one-third of its national worth."

All of these are direct quotes from people to whom we talked in the U.S.S.R. National officials, city officials, newsmen, ordinary citizens—it didn't matter to whom you were talking—there was an insistence that you hear the war toll and see whatever vestiges of it might be nearby and still visible.

Outside of Leningrad, the Piskarevskoe Cemetery holds the mass graves of two-thirds of the more than 600,000 people who died in the siege of Leningrad.

Carved on a wall of the cemetery, where the thousands of visitors each year will be certain to see them, are the words: "Let no one forget. Let nothing be forgotten."

Soviet citizens are not forgetting—or being allowed to forget—the tragedy and loss inflicted upon them by Germans. That flow of hatred is a quieter stream, at the moment, than the torrent of anger over the Red Chinese border incidents. But the feeling toward Germany and Germans appears, even if quieter, to be deeper, wider and much more powerful.

With all the trouble you're having with China, we asked an Alma Ata editor, "has the U.S.S.R. position changed as to supporting Red China for membership in the U.N.?"

"No, it hasn't changed," said Kurmanbek Sagindikov. "We are for their admission. China, as such, is not Mao. It is the people. Maos come and go; the people remain."

Some Soviets calmly say, "This thing with China is temporary. We do not relate it to the Chinese people, but to Mao's government. Eventually, they will come to their senses. After all, it is a Socialist country as is ours."

What really has been happening along the long borders between China and the U.S.S.R. is, of course, only partially known. We asked—in Moscow, again in Novosibirsk, again in Alma Ata—to go to one of the border areas to see for ourselves. We were not surprised at the answers. They were usually hinged on "There are no accommodations there," or "Transportation is very difficult to arrange," or "You might not see anything if you went; we never know where these things are going to happen, or when", and, finally, "It's not safe there." But the answers always added up to "No."

Without the opportunity to see for ourselves, we learned what we could about the border situation from the Soviet people to whom we talked. As might be expected, the versions we heard reflected the stories that had been printed in the Soviet press.

"I think our government leaders decided properly to give them a crushing rebuff so they wouldn't intrude on our peaceful life," said a mining engineer we found sunning on a beach at Sochi, far from his home in Komi, near the Arctic Circle.

"I doubt they'll actually resort to war," commented an official in Minsk. "Both the economic chaos and the political division they have won't allow them to mount a major effort."

"They are doing it to divert attention from their internal troubles," said a journalist in Alma Ata, only about 250 miles from the border with China.

"They have nuclear weapons, we know, said Uzak Bogaev, another editor in Alma Ata. "Their test area is not so very far away—at Lop Nor in the middle of Sinkiang province. They have about 74 nuclear units. They may not be very powerful or perfected, but they have them. They say the latest ones are hydrogen. But they are still working on their delivery systems."

Still another Alma Ata newsman added: "The main thing they are trying to do is to instill hatred of the U.S.S.R. in their people. I don't think they can do that with the older generations. They mostly are working on the youth groups to brainwash them. We call them 'greenhorn hooligans'. . . ."

A radio correspondent who had been at the border shortly after one of the fighting incidents, said: "At first the Chinese prisoners refused to say anything. Later, they admitted that they had brazenly come across the border. As usual, our border guards peacefully tried to talk them into going back across. They paid no attention. The Chinese came with movie cameras to take pictures, to be used in anti-Soviet propaganda. Two of our men were killed. That was published."

But when we asked how many Chinese were killed, no one seemed to know. Reports we had heard elsewhere indicated that perhaps as many as 5,000 Chinese were killed in one incident at Demansky Island in the Ussuri River.

"It happened this way," said Editor Mikhailov. "The island is uninhabited. There are no buildings of any kind on the island. According to official documents and maps, from the 19th Century, the island is U.S.S.R. territory. Chinese used to ask the border guards if they could cut hay on the island, or have fishermen use it. We let them do it. China doesn't need the island; it's a question of principle, for both sides. If peaceful negotiations were carried on and they asked us for the island, we'd most probably give it to them.

"But instead," he went on, "they used force and took the island and shot, point-blank, several men who had gone up to them to talk. The border guards then had to drive them away."

A March 8, 1969, article in the national newspaper, "Pravda," said of this incident: "This was a pre-planned attack on Soviet frontier guards . . . Peking authorities deliberately perpetrated this armed provocation with the aim of further aggravating Soviet-Chinese relations, once again raising a wave of violent anti-Sovietism in China, and kindling chauvinistic feelings to suit the adventurist great-power aspirations of Mao Tse-tung and his group. . . ."

The article continues with the official Soviet description of the incident—the honorable performance of the border guards, the Peking propaganda that the Chinese unit was attacked by the Soviets, and the apparent reasons for the Chinese provocation—internal dissension, "political flirting" with the imperialist states, "above all the USA and Federal Germany," and "treachery against the forces of world socialism."

Behind all the rhetoric of both sides in the border disputes, the facts of true ownership of much of the vast territory of central Asia—eastern Siberia and western China—are clouded in history.

When the Chinese Empire was at its height, much of the region was under its influence and China extracted tribute from those who lived there. But the Soviets base their claim on maps and documents which, they say, were formally adopted and approved in the 18th and 19th Century—giving them clear title to the disputed areas by treaty.

But as far back as 1964, the Soviets say, the Red Chinese started changing the maps and descriptions in their school textbooks—to make it appear that about 600,000 square miles of Soviet territory actually had been Chinese right along.

The Soviets say, in the words of Editor Sagindikov at Alma Ata, "There have been as many as 400 border violations in three or four years. It is a willful heightening of tensions with the U.S.S.R."

Reports since our editors' group left the U.S.S.R. have mentioned some lessening of tension between the Soviet and Red China but what we heard made it appear any real settlement would be unlikely, so long as Mao and his immediate group stay in power in Communist China.

Even more serious border incidents are predicted by one man knowledgeable about the Soviet scene—a man convinced that Red China considers the Soviet Union its real enemy, not the United States.

Is the real source of the trouble Chinese pressure for more and better land to support some of its 800 million people?

"Not really," says one Soviet editor. "Most of their people are crowded into the coastal areas, and that does cause problems. But they still have many areas that are underpopulated. The climate in those areas and the agricultural potential is as good as in our territory."

Is the dispute a sincere expression of something Red China believes it's legally entitled to?

An Alma Ata editor: "They claim their ancestors came into Kazakhstan as conquerors. They are claiming as far as 500 to 600 kilometers inside our borders. They never settled here. They were hit-and-run raiders, coming into our territory to rob.

"These raiders are the only things they can use to back up their claims. Some of the Khans, and the Mongols and Tartars all raided into this territory. But they were all kicked out. The Chinese have only these robber raiders to support their claims.

"When relations between our countries were good, the Chinese never mentioned the border."

Do the border disputes have their roots in the ideological split between Soviet and Chinese ideas of what communism should be?

This may be nearer the point. Stalin, one Soviet resident told us, really thought the future of China lay with Chiang Kai-shek—and urged Mao and his friends not to take over China. But they did, and based the future communism of their country on the peasants—rather than upon the "industrial proletariat" in the Soviet style (mainly because there was no industrial proletariat in China at the time).

"Khrushchev tolerated Mao longer than Stalin would have," this source said. "The real open break came in 1960 when the U.S.S.R. stopped admitting new Chinese students and withdrew the technicians who had been helping China."

Since then, relations have worsened rather steadily and, it would appear, the end of Soviet-China tensions is not yet in sight.

One Soviet journalist said his nation really wasn't worried about China and another added: "China has made 501 warnings to the United Nations about U.S. violations of its territory."

When we commented that those warnings apparently weren't worrying the United States, either, Anatoly Lisovsky said: "Don't think that an ocean is a barrier."

When an American suggested the Soviet Union could help with the Vietnam situation, and commented it was unfortunate the Soviet had not de-escalated its shipment of arms to Vietnam, a top Soviet official of the Journalists Union answered:

"You want to draw out of the Vietnam war and you don't know how to withdraw. You want to make us responsible to promote a method of withdrawal . . . Our advice is: Pull out. But we are not government leaders and cannot solve the destiny of Vietnam at this table."

"We can't tell the Vietnamese what to do," a Minsk editor said. "The people of the U.S.S.R. don't think the people of the United States want wars, but some of the things you do worry us."

"It's the same with us," one of the Americans replied, "Some of the things the U.S.S.R. does worry us, too."

A Minsk editor said: "The long-term interests of the U.S.S.R. and China will prevail. The long-term interests coincide."

What are China's long-term interests in Southeast Asia, then, we asked. "Would you like to see China take over Vietnam?

"I can't imagine such a situation," Editor Novitsky said, "The Vietnamese people can stick up for themselves."

"The American people," we answered, "support South Vietnam because we felt China was about to swallow up Southeast Asia. In view of your current troubles (with China) it seems we would have a common interest in preventing China from taking over all of Southeast Asia."

"Our interest," said Fyodor Kletskov, head of the Byelorussian journalists, "is only in letting people determine for themselves. We support the 'five points' including self-determination."

"But what about Czechoslovakia?" interjected one of the American editors.

"There is nothing comparable between Czechoslovakia and Vietnam," said Kletskov. "Soviet forces liberated the Czechs. Late events show the Czechs can put their house in order without the use of force. We know who stands behind this . . .

"Who?", we asked . . . "West Germany?"

"A newspaperman should not ask such a question," Kletskov snapped.

An American: "When the Germans marched into Czechoslovakia, they said they were doing the same thing you are now doing!"

Kletskov: "And U.S. Forces entered France, Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg and other countries."

American: "Yes, and we turned them all back to the people of those countries."

Kletskov: "And we will turn back Czechoslovakia . . .!"

American: "When?"

Kletskov: "Before the U.S. forces leave Europe."

I think you will sense that, by this time, the discussion had become an argument.

"Hey, wait a minute. You're all talking at once," shouted Joe Adamov, our intrepid interpreter. He pounded a glass on the table to restore order. It broke. One of the Americans pulled off his shoe, handed it to Joe and Joe pounded on the table with that.

The obvious recollection of the famous Khruschchev shoe-pounding at the U.N. broke the tension—and everyone laughed.

"Let us all drink to peace and friendship," said one of the Soviet hosts.

And we all did.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place my latest opinion poll in the RECORD:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL, NOVEMBER 1969

The 91st Congress has been in session 10 months and once again I seek your views. This poll is being sent to every home in the 23rd Congressional District. I welcome your additional comments, however I regret that time and staff limitations will not permit me to personally respond to each return. Results will be made known in my next "Washington Report". Please mail your completed questionnaire to Minshall Opinion Poll, 2243 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515. Let me know if you need additional copies.

1. Do you believe President Nixon is following the correct course to bring the war to an honorable end?
2. Did you approve the recent "Moratorium" demonstration?
3. Do you favor the President's proposal to replace Selective Service with a draft lottery?
4. To curb inflation, do you favor:
   (a) Cut-backs in military spending?
   (b) Public construction cut-backs?
   (c) Greater efficiency, with resulting economy, in poverty programs?
   (d) Wage and price controls?
5. Do you approve of my amendment to increase water pollution funds from $600 million to $1 billion for 1970?
6. Should Congress permit heavier, wider trucks to use interstate highways?
7. Do you think the Nixon Administration has done a good job during its first nine months?
8. Should penalties for sale and use of marijuana be made less severe?
9. Do you favor my bill H.R. 12555 to raise personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,200?
10. What is the most critical problem facing the Nation today? (Comment.)

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we had a demonstration in my 20th congressional district. More than 1,000 youths took part. They carried signs and they marched. They marched not to destroy American ideals but to recreate American history. They were Boy Scouts of America not members of the SDS. Their signs were not of protest but of pride, denoting the many troops who took part.

They belonged to the Monogahela Valley Scout Council and they formally dedicated a 15-mile section of what officially now is the "General Braddock Trail," a 50-mile route which begins in Westmoreland County and ends at the scene of the General's famous defeat in the community of Braddock in the 20th district.

The new trail was carefully plotted for accuracy by leaders of the Scout council. It took them 2 years to research the line of march, map the trail and pinpoint campsites, and obtain necessary legal clearances.

On Saturday, October 25, more than 200 years after Braddock marched through the same hills and woodlands, 1,000 Scouts followed the flight of an arrow and began tracing his historical footprints. They stood in the gray light of a cloudy dawn, ignoring a chill wind and a drizzle, to listen to a synopsis of what befell the Braddock army of 1755.

They heard how Braddock and his troops, accompanied by a young colonel, George Washington, stopped at the site on which they stood on July 8, 1755. The next day the army, 1,600 strong, crossed the Monongahela River and moved on Fort Duquesne. Where they crossed the river the city of Duquesne now stands

and at the junction of the Monongahela, Ohio, and Allegheny Rivers, where the fort once stood, now rises the skyline of the city of Pittsburgh.

Braddock and his army never reached the fort. A much smaller force of French soldiers, supplemented by approximately 600 Indians, ambushed the general at what now is the Borough of Braddock. Utilizing the natural cover of the terrain, bushes, trees, and rocks, the French and Indians slashed at the column of redcoats. They annihilated approximately half of Braddock's men, mortally wounded the general, and routed the remainder of his troops. Braddock himself died 4 days later, July 13, and is buried at a site known as Great Meadows near Uniontown on U.S. Route 40.

The last campsite of Braddock before his defeat now is a part of White Oak Regional Park, one of several parks established by Allegheny County Commissioners to preserve the natural beauty of the Monongahela Valley's rolling, wooded hillsides.

It is appropriate, therefore, that special attention be given to preserving the Braddock trail as well. Such an idea was conceived primarily by two men—William Kearney, scoutmaster of Troop 9, and the late Robert Lewis, camp program director for the Monongahela Valley Scout Council. These men, aided by many others, including John MacLuskie and Thoms Hurrel, district commissioners; Philip Slaugh, scoutmaster; and J. Herbert Platts, council executive, spent long hours researching historical records in the interest of accuracy.

Scouts who made the dedication trek this past weekend, and those who will make it in the future, received a special patch in commemoration of their achievement. It is a colorful shield-shaped emblem designed by William Gaughan, a member of the council's executive board.

The patch is emblazoned with English and French flags of the period; a tomahawk representing the Indians who took part in the battle; a powder horn symbolizing the participation of Americans and a regimental drum signifying the Braddock march was a military expedition.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say I took part in the dedication ceremonies and I take this opportunity to commend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Boy Scouts of America, in general, and the Monongahela Valley Scout Council, in particular, for a true reflection of the spirit, character, and moral fiber of this Nation's youth.

DRAFT REFORM SHOULD NOT BE SHELVED

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the House passed Thursday draft reform legislation, H.R. 14001, the Democrat majority leader in the other body was quoted as saying the Senate will not act this year on this much-needed legislation requested by President Nixon.

So it is that draft reform apparently will take its place on the shelf with so many other important legislative proposals advanced to this Democrat-controlled Congress by the Nixon administration.

We all are aware of the disruptive impact which the draft poses to young American men under the present Selective Service System. Through this legislation Congress has the opportunity of minimizing as much as possible the uncertainty and disruptive impact of the draft on the individual lives of our young men.

Yesterday efforts were made here in the House to make extensive changes in the Selective Service System. Although they were not successful, it is obvious that the Democrat leadership in the other body would have shelved them anyway.

Unless there is a change of heart and priorities in the other body, I urge the President to follow through and implement these needed changes in the Selective Service System by Executive action. I hope the time soon will come that the draft no longer will be necessary. However, until that day arrives, it is essential that it be made as fair as possible now.

THE TREASURES OF VIRGINIA

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, generations of Virginians have known it, of course, but we of the Old Dominion take satisfaction from the confirmation by countless visitors that Virginia is "the State with everything."

In this connection, I take the liberty of inviting all Members of the House, and their constituents to visit our Commonwealth.

While I am confident they will include Thomas Jefferson's country, the Skyline Drive and the Shenandoah Valley in any itinerary, I am happy to acknowledge that there are many areas of historic and scenic interest outside the district I have the privilege of representing, and I include, under leave to extend my remarks, an article which appeared in the September issue of Holiday magazine, as follows:

VIRGINIA—THE STATE WITH EVERYTHING

(By Charlton Ogburn, Jr.)

"Perfect travel, for me, demands two qualities of a country," says E. V. Lucas, "that it shall be full of beauty; and that it shall be full of ghosts." That there are states with more spectacular beauty than Virginia's, I am quite sure. There may even be some that are equally haunted. But I insist that no other state is at once so haunted and so consistently beautiful.

The part of Virginia I inhabit could hardly be expected to have beauty or ghosts, for in recent years it has become a province of Washington, a nesting ground of government workers. After every hard rain a film of mud from construction work for a new subdivision or highway is deposited by Difficult Run on the flood plain in the woods below our house. But—brass buttons, a sword hilt, the rusted steel parts of a rifle, all from the 1860's, still turn up on Difficult Run; the shadowed banks still put forth purple fringed orchis, the deep and lofty woods—as they still are—still resound at night to the voodoo performance of barred owls; and this within thirty minutes of the huge new foreign-policy factory of the Department of State.

Virginia is tenacious. In Alexandria, a Colonial port city now swallowed up by Washington, blocks of Georgian and early Federal houses above the somnolent harbor (once busier than New York's) have been redeemed by those who love history. The blocks are bright and bursting with greenery in their alleyways and over their old walls; even Gadsby's Tavern, "the best house of entertainment in America" in the infancy of the Republic, has been brought back to flourishing life. Down the river at the end of a parkway as handsome as any in the nation, Mount Vernon commands a magnificent sweep of the Potomac's estuary. The vista is not greatly changed since Washington's day, thanks to a group of newcomers, notably former Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, who saved the opposite shore from an apartment house development. If from time to time, moreover, a bald eagle drifts by on prodigious wings like the totem of a proud and wild America that was, that is because another group fought and saved a promontory in the Potomac called Mason's Neck from the builders.

The promontory where the national bird still breeds is the site of George Mason's Gunston Hall. A third architectural treasure nearby is Woodlawn Plantation, where Nelly Custis—but once you embark on that road there is no end.

Beauty and ghosts: these are the properties of the old houses, early or late Georgian and antebellum, of mellowed brick or white clapboard, that are scattered all over Virginia except in the extreme west. Many still belong to the families that built them generations ago: "Keep it in the family" is a Virginian ideal. Others are now the property of well-to-do outsiders, captives of their charm. For these houses call to you insidiously to settle in one of them, anchoring your life in it, making it your abiding interest.

The new gentry have been drawn principally to the Piedmont and to the part of Virginia called the hunt country, which extends from Leesburg, Middleburg and Warrenton (all west of Washington and a bit beyond comfortable commuting distance) south to Charlottesville. Boldly rolling country, of meadowlands and woods with tree-lined streams, combines views of far hills that lift the spirit with a sense of space and closed-in dales that comfort it with a sense of home. The Virginia Piedmont comes as near as any landscape could to the Arcadian idyll that has touched men's dreams since the day of the Greek pastoral poets. Evidently it is just right for fox-hunting, and that has been its lure for many, including the Orange County Hunt Club of New York, which emigrated *en masse* around the turn of the century and still retains its name. Bill Grayson, who refers to his farm at Upperville as a horse motel, explains the appeal of foxhunting this way: "You scud over the landscape like part of a stream over rapids, carried along by a collective will, so that you sail over jumps both you and the horse would think twice about attempting by yourselves."

Recently I attended my first hunt meet, at Oatlands, near Leesburg. The events were point-to-point races in which the contestants in jockeylike attire, including a few young women riders, put their mounts over a gruel-

ing four-mile course around the grassy hills. What surprised me was the size and heterogeneity of the crowd that turned out to watch. Its garb comprised every garment that aristocratic eccentricity and the faddishness of youth could suggest. At the paddock where the thoroughbreds with their long, brittle legs, flaring nostrils and edgy deportment were being led about, I asked a young English woman if the atmosphere were anything like the equivalent in Britain. It turned out she was a riding instructor at Foxcroft School in Middleburg, where girls are taught what they will need to know in the society of this elegant countryside. She said it was exactly like, except that it wasn't as cold.

In dimensions, Virginia is hardly to be recognized as the colony that, according to its royal charter, extended from the Atlantic coast westward, and northwestward, widening progressively, "to the South Sea." But the Old Dominion still covers a fair amount of ground. From its eastern to its western tip the distance is 500 miles; its western point is twenty-five miles west of Detroit. A circular tour of the state I made this year, to see what Virginia's total effect would be, ran to 1,500 miles.

Driving south from Washington on Interstate 95—I took a clockwise direction on my trip—one has forest much of the way. More than three-fifths of Virginia is in woods, and except in the northwest these are never without the green of pine, mountain laurel and holly or of rhododendron; in autumn, paced by the reds of Virginia creeper, sumac, dogwood and black tupelo, they turn all the colors of ripe apples. Connecting Washington and Richmond, the highway covers the same hundred miles the Army of the Potomac took four blood-soaked years to achieve. Less than half way you come to a place where more of the war was fought than in any other—Fredericksburg and its western environs; the town itself changed hands seven times. Fredericksburg stands at the head of the Northern Neck, a long peninsula between the Potomac and Rappahannock Rivers. This land produced one of the most concentrated outpourings of talent for politics and leadership the world has ever seen: George Washington, James Monroe, James Madison, George Mason, "Lighthorse Harry" Lee and Richard Henry Lee all had their roots here.

The older parts of Fredericksburg are valiantly holding out against engulfment by the present. The noises of motor traffic seem to fall on a cushion of quiet, the old houses sheltered by trees appeal to the passer-by. The 200-year-old Rising Sun Tavern and stagecoach station, once frequented by Virginia's great, brings home to you how touchingly small-scale and intimate was that candlelit Colonial society, how thinly spread over the vast distances of the day.

In the National Battlefield Parks of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Courthouse, you can be alone on deserted roads. The quiet fields and the somber, steadfast pines seem to echo to the presence of those legions of young men of North and South facing death in the headiest tide of life. The forest seems to stir with troops just beyond the edge of your vision, the marching column seems to have cleared the ford just before you came.

State Highway 5, which takes you to Richmond's defense works from the miles of giant warehouses and railroad yards of the present deep-water port, leads on to the early plantations of the James River and to the 18th Century mansions of Shirley, Berkeley and Westover, all three still lived in. The broad fields are nearly level and your gaze lingers on them when you reflect that some were under cultivation 350 years ago. At Shirley you might be at an elegant 18th Century country house overlooking the estuary of the Thames, indeed, the James was virtually an extension of the Thames when Shirley was begun by a branch of the Carter family in the 1720's. "And is that——?" I asked of the knowledgeable colored woman who was showing me the house, nodding in the direction of a pretty, blond little boy playing on the floor as a gaunt Negro waxed it beside him. "Yes, he's one of the Carters' children": the tenth generation. It was a Carter also, who, farther down the James, built a dwelling sometimes called the most beautiful in the nation—the plantation house of Carter's Grove.

The richness of this corner of Virginia is astonishing. Of Jamestown, the 17th Century capital, nothing remains, it is true, but the ivy-covered belltower of the 1639 church, a graveyard and some foundations. Yet there the site is—our first toehold on the continent. And at Jamestown Festival Park, where the state has portrayed the settlement's background in admirable exhibits, there are full-sized replicas of the three small vessels that brought the first 104 settlers across the sea in 1607, and of the fortified village they built. "You can tell from the headroom that they were all under five feet tall," says a retired naval officer on duty with *Susan Constant*, the flagship, in period sailor's dress (a Bedouin-style garment of awning material). In one six-month period ending in March 1610 all but sixty of 490 colonists perished; the knowledge that these adventurers were child-sized adds a further touch of improbability that so momentous an event as the English settlement of the New World could have had so utterly unpromising a beginning. Jamestown is linked by the Colonial Parkway with the Yorktown battlefield high above the York River, a rolling green meadowland, where British empire in the thirteen colonies ended just fourteen miles from where it had begun. Between the two is Williamsburg, Virginia's 18th Century capital.

I must confess that I am deeply stirred by Colonial Williamsburg—by the recovery, in the smallest detail that exhaustive detective work can achieve, of the charming town in which the nation's heartbeats were first felt. With a childlike lightness of spirit I wandered among the 150 buildings with their pampered gardens, and watched artisans work to exquisite effect in all-but-forgotten crafts. (To the charge that Colonial Williamsburg is an artifice, the answer is that eighty-five of the buildings are originals and if the others are reproductions, so are any renditions of musical classics you may hear.) At the end of the Duke of Gloucester Street is the oldest academic building in the country, built by the College of William and Mary after a design by Sir Christopher Wren. I take it as a hopeful augury for America that the merchants of the commercial end of the street have respected the character of the place in the architecture of their shops, in the modest signs they display and in foregoing neon lights. Yet there is a disturbing irony in the realization that while thousands a day may pay homage to the town, while the American Republic so dotes on it as to have made it the regular first point of call for kings and presidents from abroad, there would be no Colonial Williamsburg but for the extraordinary means and public spirit of one family, the Rockefellers, who made the Reverend W. A. R. Goodwin's dream of preservation come true.

To grasp the scope of the island sea that is Chesapeake Bay, perhaps one should look down on it from the air. A great river system invaded by the ocean some ten thousand years ago, the Bay extends 200 miles north to south, and reaches westward in the broad estuaries of the James, York, Rappahannock and Potomac rivers. Sand beaches, marshes, leafy coves and little harbors at the end of village streets, and behind, woods and fields where gulls follow the plow: that is what littoral Virginia of the inland sea still offers. A captive salient of the Atlantic Ocean up to forty miles across, an unsurpassed playground for the nautical, a major fishing grounds, home of the nation's last commercial sailing fleet—the oystermen—and winter resorts of a still fairly numerous remnant of the ducks, geese and swans that William Strachey in 1612 found so abundant that "I dare avow it no country in the world may have more": such, in part, is Chesapeake Bay.

Separating Chesapeake Bay from Delaware Bay and the open ocean is the Great Peninsula, whose narrow, seventy-five-mile-long tip is a detached part of Virginia. Just offshore are the silver strands of lower Assateague Island—one of the long sand-reefs of the East Coast on which beach-grass or sea-oats, bayberry or sand-myrtle, juniper and pine vie with the eternal winds for dominance of the dunes. Southward of Assateague stretches a jumble of uninhabited islands accessible only by boat. Developers from New York have recently turned covetous eyes on three of the most important of these, and conservationists, shocked by the projected macadamization of Assateague under the National Park Service, are rallying to their defense like leucocytes against alien bodies in the bloodstream.

Inside the islands is the village of Oyster. I mention it because, attracted by its name, I visited it and was captivated. A collection of low houses, small packing plants and piles of oyster shells around an inlet filled with little white boats, Oyster was what you might expect on Cape Cod, but with no sign of tourism or summer people. It was strictly a working port. Robust, talkative fishermen in open craft piled with wire crab-pots waited their turn at a gas pump and rallied one another with bursts of horseplay in the little cafe and general store. A sturdy woman with clear gray eyes and a total air of cheerful self-sufficiency served me coffee and a doughnut. I tried not to stare, but unsuccessfully, so taken was I by these booted outdoorsmen, conspicuously untouched by the malaise of our times, whose families had been plying the waters for crabs, oysters, clams and mackerel for two or three hundred years.

At Cape Charles, at the tip of the peninsula, U.S. 13 puts out to sea. You commit yourself to the seventeen-and-a-half-mile long bridge-tunnel combination spanning the mouth of Chesapeake Bay with no other shore in sight. From another bridge-with-tunnel across the mouth of the James, just inside the bay, you see one of the world's finest natural harbors and the nation's third busiest—Hampton Roads. Here, bordering the Roads, is maritime Virginia—the Norfolk Naval Base, home port of the Atlantic Fleet, and the huge shipyards of Newport News and of briny, historic Portsmouth, where the sunken *Merrimac* was refloated and rebuilt as the first-ironclad, *CSS Virginia*.

On the southern shore of Chesapeake Bay there are live oaks, stunted and with foliage sheered back by the spume-laden winds—outposts of the Deep South. There is also the state's prime ocean resort, Virginia Beach, with miles of hotels and motels (neither term quite right for the glass-walled, balconied vacation temples) and, separated from them by a belt of greensward, a concrete promenade above the beach. There are also hundreds of private homes. But after thirteen miles of resorts, a national wildlife refuge begins, putting an end to the spread of cottages. From there on you have before you open beach backed by dunes and, at a distance behind them, the waters of Back Bay.

U.S. 58 will take you from Virginia Beach to the state's westernmost point, at Cumberland Gap. The best-known feature of the route comes soon after Norfolk. The time to see it is at day's end with the sun like a live coal behind the dark shapes of a forest grown high in bamboo grass. This is the edge of the thousand-square-mile boggy wilder-

ness of the Dismal Swamp. "Long by the old Dismal Swamp have I wandered"; this is the Old Virginia of *Carry Me Back* where, on the flat farmlands, "the cotton and the corn and 'taters grow"—and peanuts, and more peanuts.

The chief popular attractions of Southside Virginia are doubtless the six man-made lakes of the Roanoke River Basin. The largest, equal to the others combined, is Buggs Island Lake, whose main branch is thirty-two miles. And it does appear to be all a lake should be—at least before mid-summer when, a grocer at Clarksville told me, the stopper is partially pulled out for water to keep the generators turning. Had there been much local opposition to the condemnation of land for the reservoir? "I'll say there was!" he replied. And surely 1,600 square miles of choice river valley is enough to drown, and one hopes that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which has a "system of eleven reservoirs planned," may find less destructive tasks for its staff.

Continuing west on Highway 58, you cross the ever more unconfined, more exhilarating landscape. Soon the Blue Ridge Mountains rise before you. Reaching their foothills, the highway winds, climbs through rock-cuts. You are shut in by wooded slopes falling off to a tumbling stream. At 3,000 feet or more you may come out in an open spot and, in the clean, cool air faintly spiced by the woods, find yourself in a world of mountains, of rounded peaks under a mantle of forest. At Meadows of Dan, 58 crosses the Blue Ridge Parkway, a road to lighten your heart of the cares of years.

This unassuming two-lane road leads south to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee, and north (with its upper segment, the Skyline Drive) to within twenty-five miles of Virginia's northern border. It follows the crest of the Blue Ridge for 575 miles in a tranquil world of its own, removed from the clatter and clutter of civilization. The Parkway clings sinuously to the curve of mountain and gap, slips circumspectly past mountain meadow and the massed, lichen-covered trunks of the high woods, delights you with wildflowers—trillium, columbine, mountain laurel, pinkster and flame azalea, catawba and rosebay rhododendron—or the Indian-festival colors of autumn.

Virginia's highest summit, the site of its newest park, is Mount Rogers, rising 5,729 feet on the western side of the Blue Ridge chain. U.S. 58 approaches it up gradients so steep and twisting that trucks are advised not to try them. Darkness fell as I climbed, and lightning periodically created an effect of instantaneous apricot sunsets among the heavy clouds. I camped at about 4,000 feet and went the rest of the way in the morning. A frail-looking but doubtless tough enough mountaineer, climbing with an armful of wood to an unpainted cabin, told me that you could freeze up there even in summer.

On the other side of Mount Rogers is the attractive, 19th Century town of Abingdon, site of the Barter Theater. I could not drive through without paying my respects to the theater's remarkable founder, Robert Porterfield, a large, rather large-featured, gentle Virginian whom I found in a desperately cluttered office. Mr. P. accomplished the feat of moving from a remote Virginia farm to the Broadway stage; then he performed the infinitely more unlikely feat of returning with twenty-two other actors in train, at the nadir of the Depression, to exchange theatrical entertainment for meat and vegetables. For thirty-six years the Barter Theater—the only state-supported theater in the nation—has presented current and classical plays with topnotch casts, not only in Abingdon but in many other parts of the South. I asked him how he had ever had the nerve to imagine he could do it. He said, "I wouldn't today."

Interstate 81, which skirts Abingdon, takes you up the Great Valley of Virginia (of which the Shenandoah Valley is a part). This great trough, which divides the tumultuously contoured Blue Ridge from the even succession of ridges and valleys to the west, contains Virginia's great caverns. These were dissolved out of subterranean limestone by flowing water, then the caves filled with frozen cascades of limestone slowly redeposited by water dripping from above, in formations of fantastic shapes.

The Great Valley route is a handsome one, but I chose to follow smaller roads through smaller valleys to the west, which are less caught up in the present. Split-rail fences still survive among them and they may afford you the sight of a man harrowing behind a team, a woman in a sunbonnet and 40-quart milkcans beside the road.

In Goshen Pass, north of Lexington, the boulder-strewn Maury River snakes around the overlapping, rocky abutments of a succession of lofty ridges. With its silvery, rushing waters, hemlocks and subforest of rhododendron, it is the epitome of western Virginia, a place of such beauty and grandeur that Matthew Fontaine Maury, the pioneer oceanographer, asked that his body be carried through it before burial. Bath County, at the western end of Goshen Pass, is the site of Virginia's best-known inland resorts—the historical Warm Springs Inn, and Hot Springs, where The Homestead stands ready, it seems, to enfold the new arrival to its ten-story central tower in its spreading, five-story wings. What The Homestead does not offer a vacationer is easier to catalogue than what it does, and all I can think of is an ocean beach. (It has a sand beach.) A significant attraction is its 3,200-foot trestle-car ski-lift. There is, by the way, another notably well-equipped run at Basye, near New Market. Artificial snow is making skiing country of Virginia's mountains. And there are maple-sugar groves in Highland County, in the state's extreme northwest. There, in a sudden storm of rain, hail and snow at the 4,271-foot pass on the West Virginia border, I decided I had gone as far as I could and turned back toward home.

My route led down into the Valley of Virginia, up through Rockfish Gap in the Blue Ridge, directly to the door of my last objective—the University of Virginia at Charlottesville. I arrived tense from battling rush-hour traffic and maddened by the exultant cacophony that is the expression of America along its commercial arteries. But in a matter of minutes the seizure had passed. To enter the great Rotunda of the University and to pass through it to the green quadrangle beyond—The Lawn—is to experience the restorative power of structural and landscape architecture at their best.

So that was it. Driving north on the Skyline Drive, and having the mountains largely to myself in the failing light, I could see much of the state: the Piedmont in deep shadow, the Shenandoah Valley in which the lights were beginning to form shimmering constellations of extraordinary beauty, the strange, dark, distant mountains behind which the sun had set: Virginia. Not, to be sure, the "Virginia, Earth's Only Paradise," that the poet Michael Drayton had promised in 1606, but still—Virginia.

OKEFENOKEE SWAMP

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, of this year, I introduced legislation for the purpose of bringing the Okefenokee Swamp, which lies in the Eighth District of Georgia, into the wilderness system for the purpose of preserving this unique and beautiful swamp, one of America's truly natural wonders, for posterity and for the enjoyment of people for time to come.

My bill was sent to the Interior Committee for consideration and the chairman of that committee requested a report of the Interior Department.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Interior finally responded to the Interior Committee chairman in a letter dated October 16, a copy of which I received in my office on October 29.

It is because of that letter, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to speak today. I want each of my colleagues in the Chamber to know that they had best use all caution in dealing with the Department of the Interior and although I hate to admit this about one of our Federal agencies which is subject to the jurisdiction of this body, I also caution my colleagues never to take even the written word of Interior officials to be relied on.

I want to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the correspondence which I received from the Department of the Interior on July 8, 1968, along with a copy of the letter which the Department transmitted to the chairman on the 16th of this month, and a copy of the letter which I have had hand-carried to the chairman's office today.

These letters clearly point out that I worked with Interior officials for over a year in drafting a bill which would be mutually acceptable to that Department and to me. When we had reached agreement I introduced H.R. 4853.

Now, the Department has gone back on its word completely and disagrees with the legislation I have introduced and sent their own version of a bill which simply gives the Department that say.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that many of the problems we are having today are caused by our failure to be more specific in drawing legislative proposals and leaving so much to the interpretation of the departments or agencies. I urge each of my colleagues to give close attention to the correspondence included at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. October 29, 1969.

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ASPINALL: Today, I have received a copy of the letter transmitted to you on October 16, 1969, by the Department of The Interior concerning my bill, HR 4853.

It is inconceivable to me that the Department of The Interior would take such a position in opposition to my bill. Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter which I received from Interior officials on July 8, 1968, stating the Department's agreement with my proposal and including suggested language, which I incorporated in my bill, HR 4853.

Also enclosed is a copy of an official publication of the Department, entitled, "Okefenokee National Wilderness Study." This publication states the intent of the Interior Department for preservation of the Okefenokee. The bill which I have introduced does no more than spell out this intent specifically rather than leave it to the discretion of some agency official. As a matter of fact I believe that many of the problems we are having today are caused by the lack of Congress to

be more specific in drawing legislative proposals and leaving so much to the interpretation of the department and agency officials. If Interior officials truly believe what is printed in this booklet which was published out of their offices then I certainly see no reason for their objection to my bill which simply specifies their intent.

Paragraph three of the Acting Secretary's letter says that HR 4853 is unnecessarily confusing and restrictive. I see no basis for this statement. My intention in the legislation was to make sure that the intent expressed by the Department of The Interior would be carried out and that the beauty and enjoyment of the Okefenokee Swamp be preserved forever according to the law not to the administrative decision of some agency head.

To the further statement in paragraph three of the Acting Secretary's letter which states that HR 4853 deviates from the established pattern of wilderness bills relating to the National Wildlife Refuge System, I say, the Okefenokee differs from any other area in the National Wilderness system because it is the only area that is predominantly covered by water.

In essence, the position of the Department of The Interior is, "We want legislation which simply gives The Interior Department complete say with no legislative specifications."

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration of my bill, HR 4853 by the Committee.

I believe that my colleagues in the House share my belief that legislation should be drawn by the Congress, not by the Agencies who are to administer the legislation. And, while I respect the opinion of various officials in the Department of The Interior, I believe that the Congress is better qualified to write the law. Also, the bill which I have written merely spells out in specific terms the stated position of the Interior Department with regard to the Okefenokee Swamp.

I will not stand by and have an area that is as unique and as meaningful to this country turned over to the administrative whim of some bureaucratic officials.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1968.

Hon. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STUCKEY: Enclosed, pursuant to your discussion last week with Messrs. Buell, Crandell, Finnegan, and Wheeler of this Department, is a revised version of your draft bill relative to the Okefenokee Wilderness proposal. Also enclosed is a copy of Secretary Udall's very recent policy statement on hunting and fishing in areas administered by this Department, including the Okefenokee area.

We have again reviewed the matter of access to the sill area which we discussed with you in some detail. We agree that public access to the end of the canal at the south end of the Suwanee River sill, which is outside the proposed Wilderness area, is appropriate. We intend to provide this access just as soon as possible. We expect there will be substantial numbers of fishermen and sightseers wanting to use this access route. Vehicular traffic on the sill itself, however, will not be permitted.

The minimum facilities required to handle the visitation we expect are a graded and surfaced road, boat slip, turn-around area for cars and trailers, sanitary facilities, and a parking area. A preliminary estimate of this cost, made without benefit of engineering studies, is between $75,000 and $100,000. We want to do a creditable job in providing for visitors, or none at all. It is our experience that anything less will leave the visitor, us, and the Congressional delegation dissatisfied and with continuing problems.

Stephen Foster State Park officials are not pleased by this proposed development, but we understand they see that this second access to the west side is inevitable.

We expect to charge for boat launching at this access point, probably consistent with that of the Stephen Foster State Park. Additional personnel will be required. In addition to heavy use expected by fishermen with boats, we anticipate the fishermen that now walk to the sill will insist on driving their cars into the area.

We view the above as a commitment to provide this access, subject to the above conditions and the availability of funds. Accordingly, we believe that a provision in the bill on this subject is unnecessary. If, however, you believe it desirable, we would not object to the following language:

SEC. 5. In the area of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge not included in Okefenokee Wilderness, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide, at reasonable times, public access to the end of the canal at the south end of the Suwanee River sill, upon completion of reasonable public facilities needed to accommodate such public use. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necesesary to construct such facilities.

We will be glad to discuss this matter further with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. PAUTZKE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132(c)) the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, as the boundaries of such refuge existed on April 1, 1968, except for the following areas:

(1) a 2,800 acre swamp area in the vicinity of Camp Cornelia;

(2) an 8,400 acre swamp area at the west entrance to the swamp including Stephen Foster State Park, the Suwannee River sill, and the intervening area affected by these developments;

(3) refuge management units comprising about 9,800 acres of uplands above the swamp line, including, but not limited to, Cowhouse Island near the Okefenokee Swamp Park, The Pocket, the upland area at Camp Cornelia extending out to State Highway 23, Chesser Island, Soldier Camp Island, and other refuge management units along the outside boundary of the refuge;

is hereby designated as the Okefenokee Wilderness comprising an area of approximately 319,000 acres.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after enactment, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and a legal description of the Okefenokee Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may thereafter be made.

SEC. 3. The Okefenokee Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act. The system of boat trails existing on the date of this Act shall continue to be maintained to provide reasonable waterway access for public enjoyment of the area and for proper administration. The use of motor boats of 10 horsepower or less on such trails shall be permitted in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary applicable to such trails. Fishing shall continue to be permitted during daylight hours in the Okefenokee Wilderness in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from prohibiting or restricting public access to all or part of the Okefenokee Wilderness for reasons of public safety and administration.

SEC. 4. Except as necessary to meet minimum requirements in connection with the purposes for which the area is administered (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), and except as provided in this Act, there shall be no commercial enterprise, no temporary or permanent roads, no use of motor vehicles, no landing of aircraft, and no structure or installation within the area designated by this Act as wilderness.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1968.

Mr. WALTER T. SHANNON,
President, International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR MR. SHANNON: I would like to take this opportunity to advise you that, after our very helpful discussions of last week, I have issued the following policy statement relative to the management of fish and resident wildlife on lands administered by this Department:

"GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

RE: FISH AND RESIDENT WILDLIFE ON INTERIOR LANDS

"A. In all areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation, except the National Parks, the National Monuments, and historic areas of the National Park System, the Secretary shall—

"1. Provide that public hunting of resident wildlife and fishing shall be permitted within statutory limitations in a manner that is compatible with, and not in conflict with, the primary objectives as declared by the Congress for which such areas are reserved or acquired;

"2. Provide that public hunting, fishing, and possession of fish and resident wildlife shall be in accordance with applicable State laws and regulations, unless the Secretary finds, after consultation with appropriate State fish and game departments, that he must close such areas to such hunting and fishing or restrict public access thereto for such purposes;

"3. Provide that a State license or permit, as provided by State law, shall be required for the public hunting, fishing, and possession of fish and resident wildlife on such areas;

"4. Provide for consultation with the appropriate State fish and game department in the development of cooperative management plans for limiting over-abundant or harmful populations of fish and resident wildlife thereon, including the disposition of the carcasses thereof, and, except in emergency situations, secure the State's concurrence in such plans; and

"5. Provide for consultation with the appropriate State fish and game department in carrying out research programs involving the taking of fish and resident wildlife, including the disposition of the carcasses thereof, and secure the State's concurrence in such programs.

"B. In the case of the National Parks, National Monuments, and historic areas of the National Park System, the Secretary shall—

"1. Provide where public fishing is permitted, that such fishing shall be carried out in accordance with applicable State laws

and regulations, unless exclusive legislative jurisdiction[1] has been ceded for such area, and a State license or permit shall be required for such fishing, unless otherwise provided by law;

"2. Prohibit public hunting; and

"3. Provide for consultation with the appropriate State fish and game departments in carrying out programs of control of overabundant or otherwise harmful populations of fish and resident wildlife or research programs involving the taking of such fish and resident wildlife, including the disposition of carcasses therefrom.

"In any case where there is a disagreement, such disagreement shall be referred to the Secretary of the Interior who shall provide for a thorough discussion of the problems with representatives of the State fish and game department and the National Park Service for the purpose of resolving the disagreement."

I hope that with the adoption of this general policy statement covering not only public hunting and fishing—that is, hunting and fishing by the general public—but also direct management activities in these areas both this Department and the Association will be able to lay to rest this controversial issue and turn our energies to the attainment of other pressing conservation goals. I have asked the directors of each of the above agencies to take whatever procedural steps are necessary to implement immediately this policy statement fully.

I hope that this statement will be endorsed by your Association at its next meeting in September. I recognize, of course, that even with this statement, some few problems may arise in the field and may be difficult to resolve within the general ambit of this statement. In such instances, I hope that the appropriate members will bring them to the attention of either my directors or myself.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1969.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Committee has requested the views of the Department on H.R. 4853, a bill "To designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness." The comments herein apply equally to identical bills H.R. 7793 and H.R. 8031, which also are pending before your Committee.

H.R. 4853 designates some 319,000 acres of swampland within the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as a wilderness area to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The bill specifically exempts from Wilderness designation certain swamp areas and refuge management units totaling some 21,000 acres. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior, in administering the wilderness, (1) to place no restrictions on the use of motorboats of 100 horsepower or less; (2) to prohibit all hunting; (3) to permit fishing in accordance with state law; and (4) to maintain public boat trails at described locations.

While we fully support legislation to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refugee as a wilderness area, we believe that H.R. 4853, as presently drawn, is unnecessarily confusing and restrictive. Further, it substantially deviates from the established pattern of wilderness bills relating to the National Wildlife Refuge System. We see no justification for including many of the provisions which are aimed at the Department's management of the area.

The enclosed draft bill follows the pattern of all other wilderness bills with one exception and we urge its enactment. The exception relates to the use of motorized watercraft of 10 or less horsepower. We have included this provision in the bill in recognition of the fact that such motorboat use is now permitted and has been for many years. This is a historical use and is necessary for maximum public safety and public use.

The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey of this Department have made a survey of the mineral resources of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge and have published the results in Geological Survey Bulletin 1260–N. The report concludes that there has been no commercial mineral production from the area. Vast quantities of peat occur in the area and phosphate-bearing sediments probably underlie the refuge, but the extent and quantity of these deposits are not known and could not be determined without widespread drilling.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the presentation of this report would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 890, 892; 16 U.S.C. 1132 (c)), certain lands in the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia, which comprise about 319,000 acres, and which are depicted on a map entitled "Okefenokee Wilderness—Proposed" and dated October 1967, are hereby designated as wilderness. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The area designated by this Act as wilderness shall be known as the "Okefenokee Wilderness" and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act.

SEC. 3. Except as necessary to meet minimum requirements in connection with the purposes for which the area was established and for the purposes of this Act (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), and as provided in Section 4, there shall be no commercial enterprise, no temporary or permanent roads, no use of motor vehicles or motorized equipment, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within the area designated as wilderness by this Act.

SEC. 4. Within the wilderness designated by this Act, the use of powered watercraft, propelled by motors of ten or less horsepower, on approximately 75 miles of existing watercraft trails, may be permitted to continue, subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of the Interior finds necessary.

[1] The term "exclusive legislative jurisdictional" is applied to situations wherein the Federal Government has received, by whatever method, all the authority of the State, with no reservation made to the State except the right to serve process resulting from activities which occurred off the land involved. This term is applied notwithstanding that the State may exercise certain authority over the land, as may other States over land similarly situated, in consonance with the several Federal statutes. This term is also sometimes referred to as "partial jurisdiction."

NARCOTICS: ROOT OF URBAN TENSION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a number of articles have been published in recent months concerning the problem of drug abuse. I insert at this point of the RECORD some articles which merit particular attention:

[From bimonthly review of Urban America, June 1969]

NARCOTICS: ROOT OF URBAN TENSION

White America, middle-class America, suburban America, recently discovered that the nation had a drug problem. The discovery came through the communications media, which was attracted to the joyful hedonism of a turning-on generation, and sometimes through conversations with the police or one's own children.

Black America has known about the problem for some time.

White America's reaction to finding the problem suddenly on its doorstep has been one of shock. Conservatives call for stronger law enforcement and a restoration of parental authority. Liberals call for understanding of the alienation of youth and more rehabilitation centers.

Black America watches the peddlers openly ply their trade on its streets.

There are now two turned-on subsocieties in the nation, quite separate, and, of course, unequal. The white kids pool their allowances for pot and an occasional trip on something harder. The black kids, particularly in the big Eastern cities, get hooked earlier on the ghetto staple of heroin, stay hooked, wind up needing more money to support their habit than they have time or health to earn.

Narcotics officers, federal and local, chase the peddlers and users of pot, raid campuses, clean up the hippie havens and send the runaways home. This leaves less time to patrol the ghetto streets or trace the source of heroin supply—or cope with the street crime that feeds the habit.

Narcotics are a prime contributor to the tensions that grip our urban society. Crime, bred by narcotics to a degree that is unmeasured, builds white fears. Whites, with tragic accuracy, associate dope with the black ghettos, and some regard it as an interracial import to their world. Blacks, for their part, seethe at what seems the ultimate corruption of the minority by the majority—who runs the dope trade? They watch the police watch the peddlers; they curse; and respect for white society and its agents dies.

What follows is a summary of the narcotics situation in America—its history, its dual nature, and what is and is not being done about it. The premise is that doing more must be a very early step toward healing our cities and society.

The United States has long been a drug-oriented society. European settlers in the Southwest found the original Americans tripping on peyote, a type of cactus with hallucinogenic properties. A religious ritual among numerous Indian tribes still involves the sucking and swallowing of "mescal buttons," slices of the peyote which are rolled and dried in the sun. Early Spanish missionaries tried discouraging the practice, saying it led the user to the pit of hell, to which the Indian replied it really took him several steps closer to heaven.

Opium first came to this country with the English settlers who had learned the habit of opium eating from the Chinese. Oriental immigrants instituted the first opium dens in America, which became somewhat fashion-

able in the mid-1800's, chiefly in San Francisco and New York City. The drug first became illegal with the passage of an ordinance in San Francisco in 1875; the New York State Assembly prohibited opium traffic in 1882.

Morphine had been isolated from opium in 1816, but addiction only became a major problem 32 years later with the invention of the hypodermic needle. Direct injection greatly magnified morphine's effect, and its use spread throughout this country and Europe.

In 1874, a chemical modification of morphine was developed in England, called heroin, and said to be 10 times more potent. There was little interest in the drug until 1898 when German scientists, in a classic miscalculation, put heroin on the market as a remedy for morphine addiction. The cure proved 10 times more deadly as well. Another "remedy" for morphine addiction appeared at the same time: cocaine, an alkaloid of coca leaves.

Barbiturates—depressant drugs usually prescribed as sleeping pills—were introduced in 1903, and by 1937 the American Medical Association warned against "Evils from Promiscuous Use of Barbituric Acid and Derivative Drugs." Deaths from barbiturates rose alarmingly in the mid-1940's—about half suicides and half accidental. In 1949, a quarter of all poisoning cases admitted to hospitals were due to acute barbiturate intoxication. Some 1,500 derivatives have been synthesized over the years, and as each new brand was introduced illicit pill poppers gave it a name: Nembutal is known as "yellow jacket," Seconal is called "red bird" or "red devil," and Amytal is bootlegged as "blue heaven."

Amphetamine was synthesized in 1927 and later recommended in its vaporous state for treating colds, hay-fever, and other respiratory infections. The Benzedrine inhaler was first marketed in 1932. In 1936, students at the University of Minnesota, who had been conducting experiments with Benzedrine, sampled the drug and found it helped keep them awake for cramming. Truck drivers and night guards soon became steady consumers. A song entitled "Who Put the Benzedrine in Mrs. Murphy's Ovaltine" revolved on many a victrola while bored socialities popped bennies along with their barbiturates for a "bolt and a jolt." Narcotic addicts even found that these "thrill pills" could intensify a heroin high.

Perhaps no other drug has been more shrouded in mystery or encrusted with misconception than marijuana. In Arabia, it is known as "hashish" and still carries with it the lurid tales of Hasan and his assassins who were credited with performing their most revolting atrocities under its influence. Marijuana was introduced to this country by Mexican laborers in the Southwestern states, and its use soon spread throughout America. And as it spread, stories began to appear in the press concerning its effect, reporting a variety of incidents where individuals supposedly lost their control and committed unpremeditated acts of violence.

Synthetic hallucinogens make up the most recent addition to the drug scene. In the late 1930's Albert Hofman and his colleagues in a Swiss laboratory were working on chemical modifications of ergot alkaloids when they produced a compound known as LSD. In 1943, Hofman accidentally ingested or inhaled some of the substance and experienced the first LSD trip. It was used in controlled studies for its mind-altering properties, but by the time studies were undertaken in 1960 to determine just how LSD works, illegal production and distribution had mushroomed. Researchers at Harvard are said to have given LSD to students outside of proper research environments. Its use spread further when Timothy Leary and Richard Alpert, the former Harvard psychologists, founded the International Federation for Internal Freedom, which encourages use of hallucinogens.

The lack of scientific knowledge pertaining to drugs for so many years has been reflected in the hit-and-miss history of drug regulations. The first international effort to control opium traffic was in 1909 when the International Opium Commission convened in Shanghai. International narcotics control rested in the hands of the League of Nations from World War I until after World War II, when the United Nations adopted a Narcotic Protocol, giving the authority to the World Health Organization.

The Harrison Narcotic Act was passed in the United States in 1914, but not until 1930 was the Federal Bureau of Narcotics established. Opium dens could still be found in most American cities, and the bureau's first commissioner, Henry J. Anslinger, was under fire from Congress and the public from the time of his appointment until his retirement in 1962.

Anslinger, always outspoken, said this concerning his successful 1937 campaign to include marijuana under the Harrison Act: "As the marijuana situation grew worse, I knew action had to be taken to get proper control legislation passed. . . . On radio and at major forums, such as that presented annually by the *New York Herald Tribune*, I told the story of this evil weed of the fields and river beds and roadsides. I wrote articles for magazines; our agents gave hundreds of lectures to parents, educators, social and civic leaders. In network broadcasts I reported on the growing list of crimes, including murder and rape. I described the nature of marijuana and its close kinship to hashish. I continued to hammer at the facts."

In 1944, New York Mayor LaGuardia empowered a special committee to study the matter in his city. Most of the marijuana smoking was found in Harlem, where about 500 "tea pads" were operating. The committee reported that there were no visable withdrawal symptoms when "tea heads" or "grasshoppers" discontinued smoking reefers; that there was no significant relationship between marijuana use and crime; nor was there evidence that marijuana was the first step to hard-drug addiction. "The publicity concerning the catastrophic effects of marijuana smoking in New York City is unfounded," the committee concluded.

Evidence today shows that conclusion to be more nearly accurate than that of Commissioner Anslinger. The President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse in 1963 spoke of the "relatively trivial" nature of the marijuana evil and suggested that all mandatory sentences be eliminated from crimes involving its consumption alone, and many officials now propose that the law deal with marijuana users along the same lines used with persons who drink alcohol.

The dispute continues. The early laws still prevail, and the number of people who smoke marijuana has grown to an estimated five million.

Use of the more potent hallucinogens began in 1960 and reached a peak in San Francisco's Haight Ashbury in 1966. Timothy Leary, an early experimenter, wrote: "I think that psychedelic drugs, marijuana, peyote, LSD, STP—are sacraments. I think they are developed by a divine process, the DNA code to help man survive. . . . If it flips you out, turns you on, blows your mind, it's holy."

Encouraged by Leary and others, students flocked to San Francisco in the spring of 1966, where, it was rumored, one might find himself, the meaning of life—and love. Everyone turned on. They smoked pot, dropped acid, shot speed. They saw inside themselves and beyond—in living color. They found new beauty in flowers; in poetry; hard-rock bands, like the Grateful Dead, played high on acid; the music was distorted and the stoned listeners liked what they heard. They lived together in communes, sharing what they had. *Time* magazine reported: ". . . in their independence of material possessions and their emphasis on peacefulness and honesty, hippies lead considerably more virtuous lives than the great majority of their fellow citizens."

Money and dope changed hands openly and without fear, for laws were virtually suspended in the Haight. There was an air of lunacy as the kids tasted the forbidden fruit. "We are the people our parents warned us against!" they scrawled incredulously, exuberantly, on coffee-house walls.

Nicholas von Hoffman, an over-30 columnist, glommed onto the catch phrase as a title for his book, a staccato account of their life style. "The Haight offers plenty of elucidating philosophy," he wrote. "These ideas are important, but they don't encompass what the people on the street do. What they do, regardless of philosophy and world-view, is deal dope."

This description was not acceptable to the folks back home who preferred to think of their wandering offspring not as drugged lawbreakers, but as flower children; the love generation. The nation thought the Haight was a festival. Those coming home from the Coast taught those who couldn't go to set up small replicas of the Haight in their own community, and little hippie communes began to spring up in every major city.

As medical evidence began linking LSD with chromosome damage and birth defects, its popularity waned and kids began tripping on amphetamine and methamphetamine—"speed." They found that the pills and capsules that had kept them awake to study, when used in large enough quantity, or dissolved and mainlined (injected), produced a feeling of elation, omnipotence, increased capacity for physical activity, and sometimes hallucinations.

Again, medical facts and witness to bum trips that led to personal destruction or permanent psychosis resulted in an effective "Speed Kills" campaign that has practically eliminated its use in California, and kids there have turned now to barbiturates—"downers"—for a confident, tranquil, euphoric kind of high. Sudden withdrawal from barbiturates is more serious than from heroin. Vomiting, uncontrolled tremors, and grand mal convulsions which may be fatal are common symptoms which increase in intensity in direct ratio to the dose used.

Heroin is scarce and expensive in the West because of the route of the supply, and while unauthorized research continues to find a suitable substitute, one youthful expert says: "There is no smack (heroin) in California; not much acid. Out here it's definitely the year of the downer. But it's not the same. Reds (seconal) make you mean. There've been 20 murders in the Haight this year."

Despite the efficiency of the underground communications network, Eastern kids are still balling on speed, dropping acid when its available, and taking a generally less sophisticated approach to drug use than their Western counterparts. There is one major exception: they have been introduced to the delusive delights of heroin.

Organized crime, unable to control distribution of the hallucinogens, amphetamines, and barbiturates, saw an untapped market among the middle-class kids for the product it held exclusive rights to: heroin. Unlike the impoverished youngsters in the slums who had, in desperation, embraced "H" since the turn of the century despite the high cost of escape, the white kids had seemingly boundless resources with which to indulge their fancies. Pushers were directed to mix small amounts of heroin with the marihuana they sold the white kids, which would produce a stronger high and eliminate the need for overcoming the social stigma against *horse, boy,* or *Harry,* as it is variously called. The kids would become hooked before they knew they were using the dread drug of the ghetto.

Heroin use among high school students in Eastern cities has grown at an accelerating rate, with estimates ranging as high as 50

per cent of the student body in some schools in Washington, Baltimore, and New York City, and 35 per cent in Philadelphia and Boston. Many of these are suburban, not inner-city, schools.

Ex-addicts say the kids are getting "garbage"—heroin that has been cut so many times it is incapable of causing more than a psychological addiction. But the pusher tells them they're hooked. They think they are, and continue to use the drug in ever stronger doses as their body develops a tolerance.

As heroin becomes the drug of preference, a role it has long enjoyed in the black community, its ignominy diminishes, along with aversion to the needle. Warnings about "the friendly stranger" may be irrelevant as kids, anxious to share their experiences with friends, become pushers themselves.

The phrase "don't trust anyone over 30" didn't come about by accident. White youngsters lost respect for mature evaluation of drug dangers during their frolic in San Francisco. The streets of Harlem, however, are considerably less joyous than the streets of the Haight.

Heroin administered intravenously (mainlined) produces a feeling of elation similar to that produced by the amphetamines, and in addition, a brief euphoria, tranquility, and a momentary "thrill" or turning of the stomach—a warm, tingling sensation similar to orgasm. Following the initial effects, the subject "goes on the nod," a state of imperturbability. This pleasant drowsiness lasts, in the beginning, several hours. As one's body develops a tolerance, it requires larger and more frequent doses to produce a high, until finally the addict experiences few or none of the desirable feelings, and continues usage only to prevent withdrawal symptoms which vary in intensity from yawning and perspiration to moderate tremors and insomnia to severe vomiting and muscle cramps and spasms.

To keep from feeling ill, an addict's body may require up to 15 bags of heroin a day, though most get by on about 10. Prices vary, but average about $5 a bag. The addict cannot work. It is not only a physical impossibility, but he couldn't earn enough to support his $50-a-day habit. So he turns to pushing or other crime. Female addicts are usually prostitutes; males mug pedestrians, hoist taxis, hold up small-business men and steal merchandise. They must steal about five times the amount they need to sell their goods to a "fence" at below-wholesale prices.

Addicts, however, are not the maniacal criminals many fear them to be. They are rather docile individuals, deprived of their sex urge or almost any aggressive emotion, concerned primarily with where they'll get the money for their next fix, and secondarily with the companion fear of overdose.

The black community learned opium eating around the turn of the century from Oriental immigrants who made their way across the country and settled among the Negroes, co-segregated in Eastern ghettos. Most of the heroin that comes into the country now originates in Turkey and goes then to Corsica. The Corsicans have efficient contacts with the Mafia in New York City where it goes to receive its first cut before being parceled out around the nation. A Turkish farmer receives about $350 for 10 kilograms (about 25 pounds) of raw opium. That amount produces one kilogram of roughly pure heroin, which is cut first with milk sugar and then further diluted by each of seven or eight handlers, with anything from talcum to cleanser, and by the time it reaches the street, it sells for about $225,000.

It is estimated that half the heroin addicts in the country are in New York City, but it is impossible to determine the total number. Official statistics are unreliable due to varying definitions of drug use and addiction, random reporting methods, and the obvious fact that a very large percentage of drug users do not come to the attention of either law enforcement or medical authorities. Nevertheless, the National Institute of Mental Health estimates 100,000 addicts, and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs had 67,011 active addicts officially registered as of December 31, 1968. A spokesman for the bureau said that the number "could realistically be multiplied by three."

Using the NIMH estimate of 100,000 addicts, multiplying it by $200—a conservative estimate of the amount each must steal per day to net $50—heroin addicts steal a total of $20 million worth of merchandise a day, or roughly $6 billion per year. The price the nation pays in "involuntary social costs" to combat drug abuse, also by estimates of NIMH, is $541 million annually. This excludes thefts, but includes law enforcement, theft insurance, property crimes, and productivity losses.

Behavioral scientists use certain criteria for determining factors that cause an individual or a group to have a greater than average potential for drug abuse. Among these are one's IQ; his degree of respect for himself; his family's status within the community; his own status within the family; presence or absence of a father in the home; and the economics of his family and the community. Residents of city slums meet all the criteria for being considered a "high risk" population.

A study was done recently in St. Louis by Drs. Lee Robins and George E. Murphy of 235 young men, selected from public elementary school records beginning 26 to 30 years ago. The criteria for eligibility for the study were: being male, born in St. Louis between 1930 and 1934, attending a St. Louis Negro public elementary school for six years or more, having an IQ of at least 85 while in elementary school, and parent's or guardian's name and occupation appearing on the school records.

The record showed half with school problems, half without; half with father in the home, half without; half with parents or guardians who were unemployed, domestic servants, or laborers, and half with parents or guardian in better jobs. The study was limited to those men who had lived in St. Louis between 1959 and 1964 to insure they had exposure to the same drug market and had all had a risk of being known to local law enforcement and health agencies. Drug addiction seldom begins after age 35; age 16 is considered a critical age for introduction to heroin among disadvantaged youth.

The population studied was expected to have a high rate of drug use, but it was surprisingly high: 14 per cent had an official record for selling, use, or possession of narcotics. Of the 86 per cent *without* a record, nearly half reported having taken drugs and nearly all had tried marijuana. Seventeen per cent had taken amphetamines, and 14 per cent barbiturates. Thirteen per cent of the sample reported having tried heroin, and 10 per cent had been addicted to heroin.

Based on this and other detailed samplings, many experts believe this to be a fairly accurate pattern of drug use in the ghetto. However, the number of addicts in New York's slums is undoubtedly considerably higher, perhaps double the national average—or 20 per cent of the population.

For many years there was official opposition to factual drug education on the ground that knowledge would stimulate more widespread use. The national policy has changed over the past decade, but despite this, in a speech in January, 1969, John Finlater, associate director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, said: "There is evidence that the slum children of New York who are the prime subjects for addiction actually do *not* know the facts. Isidor Chein's study, 'The Road to H,' shows that only 17 per cent of a group of 133 young users in the New York slums reported learning anything cautionary about drugs before first experimenting with heroin."

Federal statistics are not broken down in such a way as to define how narcotics affect the crime rate, or at least such statistics are not available to the press. Of the 187,613 persons arrested in New York City in 1968, however, 17,039—or 9.1 per cent of them—admitted using illegal drugs. Of those arrested for burglary, 11.9 per cent admitted drug use; 14.5 per cent arrested for possession of burglars tools, 16 per cent arrested for auto theft, 8 per cent arrested for robbery admitted they were drug users. Of the 17,039 admitted users, 86 per cent used opium derivatives and 5.2 per cent smoked marijuana.

There is considerable public pressure on the police department to make narcotics arrests. It is unquestionably easier to bust a pot party than to arrest an elusive heroin pusher in the ghetto, much less to gather enough evidence to convict a member of the Mafia.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs reports that federal arrests for hard-drugs in 1967 were 1,506, while in 1968 they dropped to 1,225. Yet there is no evidence that the supply was diminished. With more and more federal and local police units assigned to the hippie and student drug-using subculture to protect them from the dread evils of pot, the Mafia was making its arrangements to take heroin into psychedelia.

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark said in an interview in January, 1969: "There is no question that organized crime cannot flourish without at least the neutralization, if not the corruption, of segments of local government." *Life* magazine said after the Chicago melee during the Democratic Convention. "In Chicago, it's a risky thing for a policeman to take on the Mob. The reason is obvious: the Fix, which links crime with politics, is widespread. A Chicago cop is expected to 'bend' with the political forces of the Fix, not push investigations right into it." The story quoted a young rookie: "There is no way you can be on this police force and not take payoffs. I'm offered money every day. Now I get a payoff from my sergeant."

Rev. Channing Phillips of Washington, D.C., the first black put up for major-party nomination for President, says: "Anyone who's been around the ghetto for 10 minutes has seen a policeman turn his head at a dope transaction, or accept a payoff from a pusher. With the sophisticated investigative devices we have, I don't see how anyone could believe for a minute that the law enforcement officials don't know who's behind the dope traffic. It's not a lack of knowledge; it's a lack of will to move against it. Look, if the FBI can bug Martin Luther King's phone right after the day of his death, you can bet they can bug the Mafia's—unless they're saying Martin Luther was a more dangerous guy than the dope peddlers."

Even the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has not been immune to the opportunities for corruption inherent in the drug traffic. John Ingersoll, former Charlotte, N.C., police chief, was appointed head of the bureau in August, 1968. "We haven't prevented enough drug abuse," he said at the time. "We haven't apprehended enough drug peddlers. We haven't rehabilitated enough drug abusers." A few months later, a third of the bureau's New York City agents "resigned" and the Department of Justice said it had found "indications of significant corruption during the past decade."

In California, the Department of Criminal Statistics recently announced that 37,513 arrests were made in connection with various marijuana charges during 1967. (Of these, 10,987 were of youth under 18). These "pot busts" represented 60 per cent of the total drug-related arrests for the state.

In Washington, D.C., there were 460 narcotics arrests between November 1, 1967, and

January 25, 1968. Sixty per cent of the arrests involved marijuana and the hallucinogens. For similar periods in 1965–66 and 1966–67, 65 per cent of the arrests involved heroin and other addictive drugs. Moreover, in 1967, the District of Columbia conducted at least nine separate investigations of several months' duration involving "hippies." There was only one similar investigation of heroin traffic during the period.

Individuals turn to drug use for a variety of reasons. Many feel that, no matter what the rationalization, people turn on for fun. Bernard Finch has written: "The pursuit of pleasure, as with animals, was primitive man's goal." Some see the drug scene as evidence that ours is a hedonistic society.

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, contends: "To understand scientifically the problem of drug abuse, one must look beyond the specific problems to some of the underlying causes of widespread drug use and abuse. . . . Behavioral scientists use the term 'alienation' to describe the cross-generational disease epitomized by the youth-coined term 'don't trust anyone over 30.' Alienation has been characterized as a refusal of what is, without a vision of what should be. The current problem of alienation in the United States affects the rich and the poor, the college student and the school dropout, the urban and the rural youngster. A study by Drs. Alfred M. Freedman and Richard Brotman points out, "Some youngsters who feel helpless to accommodate or change an unacceptable world, consciously choose to alter their own. . . . Since you cannot alter the world or determine the direction in which it will go, you must alter your state of consciousness and perception, that is, see the world and experience the world through a 'high.' Drug use and abuse touches our deepest values, hopes, aspirations and fears. As the problem is complex and changing, so must be the strategies designed to understand and cope with it."

The development of such strategies in the United States has been hampered by rigid laws and public attitudes. The laws have prohibited extensive human research on drugs. The findings of much of what research has been done, in federal hospitals at Lexington, Ky., and Ft. Worth, Tex., can be released only to the World Health Organization or the United Nations.

In 1966, the United States launched its first major national program to control addiction and rehabilitate persons already addicted to narcotic drugs, basing its strategy on the premise that an addict is a sick person in need of treatment. But the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act (NARA) demands total abstinence: relapse, a 90 percent factor in former federal rehabilitation programs, is punishable by dismissal from the program and transferral of the patient back into the hands of the law.

The act provides for civil commitment of addicts, both those charged with or convicted of violating a federal criminal law and those who desire to be committed for treatment in lieu of trial on the criminal charge. It provides hospitalization, therapy and aftercare for addicts when they return to their communities. If the patient's improvement is steady, from institution through outpatient care, he may be discharged from treatment at the end of three years and the criminal charges against him dismissed. There is also a provision for addicts not charged with a criminal offense but who apply for treatment. Voluntary patients are admitted infrequently, however, due to limited space.

Addicts are not admitted, under any circumstances, until they have been examined and the determination is made that they might be successfully rehabilitated. Since the first patient was accepted under the act on June 29, 1967, a total of 1,889 addicts have been examined and 840 committed for treatment.

The feature of NARA expected to produce the most positive results was the provision of contracting with local facilities, either private or government operated, for aftercare services. It is believed that even when an addict successfully kicks the habit in a hospital, when he returns home and tries to deal with everyday problems, he often resumes contact with his druggie friends—and his habit. This provision, unfortunately, has not yet been widely used. Few communities want to be the site of a drug rehabilitation center. The provision also sets rigid requirements for staff and procedures, which some private agencies resist on the ground that their success in rehabilitating addicts has been primarily due to avoiding use of professional staff and traditional methods of therapy and surveillance.

Synanon is perhaps the best example of an agency which has had proven success in rehabilitation but is unwilling to qualify for federal funding. Begun in 1958 by ex-alcoholic Chuck Dederich, first in a storefront and later in a converted armory in Santa Monica, Calif., Synanon has been widely criticized for its unorthodox treatment techniques. The organization is made up of and managed entirely by ex-addicts; some return to the community, but many take up permanent residence in the Synanon society. Group pressure, "attack" therapy, and development of confidence and self-control are among the methods used in curtailing addiction. Synanon at first existed almost entirely on handouts of food, clothing, and occasionally cash from addicts' families and a few others who saw merit in its approach. Citizens of Santa Monica tried to bar licensing of the first center on grounds ranging from zoning violations to charges of operating an illicit house of prostitution.

Synanon now operates six centers in and out of California. Applications for federal funds have been turned down because of Dederich's refusal to employ a professional psychiatrist as director and institute urinalysis as a means of detecting an addict's relapse to drug use. "Trust," he says, "is one of the principal reasons for Synanon's success. You can't measure human dignity in percentages." As for the professional staff, he has medical advisers, but feels one reason other programs have such a high failure rate is that psychotherapy does not work with addicts: the therapist and addict don't trust each other and have no common frame of reference. Ex-addicts, on the other hand, professionals in the con game, are as persuasive in rehabilitating others as they were in finding the means to support their own habits. They know when they're being put on; having gone through withdrawal themselves, they know what works best in individual cases. They know, too, according to Dederich, when an addict has had a relapse and how to deal with him "without having him pee in a bottle and have some chemist tell him he's back on dope."

Daytop Lodge, with two locations in New York, patterned itself after Synanon and hired away some of its staff. The major difference is that it does comply with federal regulations, and receives government funds.

Daytop administrators feel that neither punishing the addict by jailing him nor "slobbering over him with sympathy and pity" has shown much rehabilitative value. Their philosophy is to consider the addict an adult acting like a baby—childishly immature, full of demands, and empty of offerings. The addict holds himself blameless for his addiction and is convinced he has been thrown into life not as well equipped as others. Heroin enables him to escape the unfair battle, and in pursuit of heroin he is able to muster extraordinary cunning, shrewdness, and acting ability. He is untouched by psychotherapeutic approaches and is rarely motivated toward any kind of treatment except as the lesser of two evils: rehabilitation or jail.

Before he is admitted, he must telephone for an interview and initially is told to call back the next day at a specified hour. If he forgets and calls later, he is turned down. If he calls promptly, he is told to call again at another specified time. If he makes the second call on time, he's given an appointment for an interview and then kept waiting for as long as four hours before anyone sees him. He is told in the interview that he will be treated like a three-year-old, because that's the way he has acted. He is cautioned about asking questions about things he doesn't understand: "Your brain is not strong enough for that kind of exercise just yet. In time you will understand." He is told to *act as if* he understands; to *act as if* he wants to do the right thing, cares about other people, etc. His withdrawal distress is treated matter-of-factly with no payoff for histrionics.

He is given a very low-status job at first, scrubbing floors or cleaning toilets. He may progress to any job within the organization; all except that of the director are held by ex-addicts. Three times a week, all Daytop residents undergo a group encounter therapy session. This is the only time residents may use profanity and they do so enthusiastically. One member after another assumes the "hot seat" and is attacked and criticized for failing to be 100-percent honest, for being insensitive to others' feelings, for failing to adhere to basic precepts of Daytop.

The director refuses to quote numbers of rehabilitated addicts. In addition to some 300 who live drug-free in the two Daytop residences, one on Staten Island and the other at Swan Lake in the Catskills, there are at least 60 who have returned to the community to lead normal lives.

A program of drug maintenance, similar to that used in England, is gaining support in this country. Methadone, a synthesized opiate that is itself addictive, has recently been advanced as a promising way to help addicts back into society. Manufactured legally in this country, it costs about 10 cents a dose, and if carefully administered, seems to allow the patient to lead a normal life without a desire for added stimulation. He relies on it much as diabetics depend on insulin.

New York City is the first to approve an extensive methadone maintenance experiment, under the direction of Drs. Vincent Dole and Marie Nyswander. Of the 108 patients admitted prior to February 1, 1966, 20 are still in the program. The first phase of treatment involves hospitalization of the addict and withdrawal from heroin. The patient is then started on small doses of methadone, in gradually increasing proportions until he reaches a plateau of relatively great strength. It is important that methadone be given in doses adequate to block the euphoric effects of heroin. It does not itself produce euphoria, sedation, or distortion of behavior—as long as it is ingested and not mainlined. The patient remains alert, functions normally, and is not psychologically aware of his addiction unless the drug is withdrawn, and then he experiences withdrawal distress similar to withdrawal from heroin—cramps, chills, nausea.

In the maintenance program, the methadone is dissolved in fruit juice and taken orally under supervision. It is always dispensed from a hospital pharmacy; out patients are given no prescriptions and are required to return each day for their dose and urinalysis to determine whether they're using auxiliary drugs. Methadone only blocks the effects of the opiates. The addict may still get a kick from the amphetamines or barbiturates, and despite rigid precautions, there is always a considerable amount of illicit methadone on the streets.

Many think methadone will revolutionize the handling of heroin and opium throughout the world. Others doubt the morality of a deliberate lifetime commitment to drugs and recall the enthusiasm with which heroin was accepted to treat morphine addiction.

Apart from the disagreement among the experts as to the merits of the methadone maintenance program, it is unknown whether it will be accepted in the black community to any great degree. Militant leaders already are voicing concern that it is another subtle means of control over the black man, whatever its value to society as a whole.

DRUG ABUSE: THE CHEMICAL COP-OUT

THE DRUG SCENE

A group of high school students gather in their jointly-rented basement apartment in a seamy part of town. A school teacher and his wife are entertaining friends in their modest suburban home. An aging professional football player is getting ready for one of those cold Sunday afternoon games that America will watch on television. A man in New York is huddled in a dimly-lit warehouse trying to sell stolen merchandise to a fence.

Each of these divergent types shares one common denominator. Each is on drugs.

They don't all use the same drugs to be sure. But they are all dependent. And the drugs they use range from the popular marijuana and amphetamines to the highly publicized LSD and heroin. While the first two present society with serious problems, the latter two also pose grave dangers for those dependent upon their use, and for the society they blame as making it necessary.

It's true not everyone is going the drug route in an attempt to "cop out" on society. Nevertheless, the abuse of drugs and narcotics is on the rise in this country, and those who should know are becoming concerned about the threat this trend poses.

There was a time when one could easily generalize about drug users in the United States. They generally belonged to the lower socio-economic class, lived in a large metropolitan area, and the drug most often abused was heroin.

Now, however, generalizations don't come easy, and even when they are offered at all, it is with considerable scientific caution.

Today's drug dependent can be found in all socio-economic classes in any major American city, and with increasing frequency in many smaller cities and towns. Now when one looks for the most popular drugs being abused, he encounters such names as marijuana, amphetamines, LSD, DMT, mescaline, cocaine, and heroin.

The same search that uncovers the identity of these drugs also reveals some other disturbing information, the most disappointing of which is that drug abuse is rapidly and dramatically increasing among young people. From junior high school through college age, they seem to be making strong commitments to drugs and to the unreal world drugs help them create.

The question is not whether today's youngsters are using chemicals as a means of escape with alarming frequency, or even which drugs they are using. These things are known to be true. The significant question is: Why?

Why do they find it necessary to escape from the world around them? What happens along the way that causes them to slam the door on society? Why do they choose to ignore the dangers of drug abuse?

There are also other questions being raised. Questions that concern themselves more with adults, such as: How can parents continue to remain uninformed about important matters like drugs and drug abuse? What causes parental complacency toward drugs and the environmental factors that help shape their children's attitudes?

These are the real questions and the answers are difficult to come by. Nevertheless, there are some people operating close to the situation who speak freely on the subject, and who should be heard. However, before examining the sociological and psychological aspects of drug abuse, we must first look at the drugs themselves. What are they? Where do they come from?

In dealing with the subject, there is one very common denominator that can be found for many who seek to establish a buffer between their minds and the world around them. That common denominator is marijuana, or better known by those who seek its mind-bending effects as . . .

Pot

Marijuana has a long history and a reputation of having over 300 million devotees throughout the world, 20 million of whom are estimated to have used the drug in this country.

Marijuana is variously known, among other things, as pot, grass, Mary Jane, and hemp. The latter name has botanical roots since marijuana comes from the female hemp plant known as *cannibas sativa*. The flower and seed heads yield a resin containing *cannibas* chemicals, and that resin in its pure form is known as hashish.

Hashish, or hash, is some 10 times more powerful than marijuana, and authorities say its use in the United States is not nearly so great as in other parts of the world. Therefore, they believe comparatively little hashish is imported into this country.

If hashish has not become a threat, marijuana is something else. This popular Hallucinogen finds its way into the United States with little difficulty. Most of it crosses the Mexican border with a regular rhythm that has Americans responding to the tune of over $100 million annually, and its users can be found among some of our most unlikely citizens.

Marijuana is generally shipped to the United States in bricks weighing a little more than two pounds. While it is most frequently rolled into cigarettes—or "joints"—and smoked, it can also be eaten.

"Roach pipes" are popular among marijuana users, too. These pipes provide an opportunity to get those last euphoric puffs from marijuana butts once they become too short for conventional smoking.

Why smoke pot?

Without delving into all of the sociological and psychological aspects of marijuana smoking, a Gallup Survey conducted for the New York Times found that some 38 percent try it simply out of curiosity. Others gave reasons like wanting to escape from reality, the desire to retreat from tension and worry, or that famous end run around life—rebellion.

Whatever the reason, marijuana is being used with a much greater frequency than at any time in history in high schools, colleges, and even that old American institution, the family living room.

Those who have tried marijuana find its effects soothing, say the first time one inhales smoke from a "joint of grass" he may find that nothing really happens. This may be because he expects too much from his first experience and because of an ineffective smoking technique.

However, once the user has learned to take in the smoke and has developed the required technique, he is likely to experience a sudden feeling of well-being as frustrations begin to dissolve. Drowsiness is often noted as time slows itself like a giant locomotive and the world outside may take on the effect of being viewed through a water-filled fishbowl.

While under the influence of marijuana, the individual feels that his senses have become keener, and he may grow very hungry. Food reportedly will taste better. In addition, there may be an imagined sharpening of the senses so that the person is apt to overestimate his abilities due to an exaggerated feeling of awareness, thus posing a threat to his physical well-being.

A producer who spent hours filming drug abusers and pot parties for a television special described the scene as "a bunch of young people sitting around, talking and giggling, and getting pretty sleepy."

A science writer says a friend of his, whom he reported to be a clergyman, persuaded him to try pot once. According to the writer, nothing really happened other than "I felt a little lightheadedness and drowsiness."

In Washington, a young hippie girl described it as a "great feeling." She said, "It just makes you want to go out and walk through the streets and experience as many different things as possible."

A psychologist at the National Institute of Mental Health makes broader generalizations about why young people smoke marijuana.

"It varies considerably from kid to kid. There are some individuals for whom drug use, teenagers or adults for that matter, is one symptom of serious psychological disabilities or problems. Obviously we all know in our circle of people, some for whom alcohol becomes a drug of abuse and who have serious psychological difficulties. With them, alcohol sometimes becomes a solvent or apparent solvent for the problems.

"Certainly for some kids, marijuana serves something like this kind of function; a kind of chemical 'cop-out,' if you will. At the same time, for many other kids, it's a matter of simply wanting to try it.

"There is also an element of rebellion. That is, youth feels angry and at the mercy of a world they see as not of their own making." The psychologist says youth often thinks they have been incorporated into a dehumanized, governmental, industrial, academic structure. Consequently, he believes the use of marijuana is a way of demonstrating their unhappiness with The Establishment.

It's pointed out, though, that the number one drug abused on campus today is alcohol, with marijuana running a distant second.

Why the strong reaction to marijuana?

If nothing much seems to happen when someone smokes pot, what, say its proponents, is all the fuss about? Why can't it be bought at the corner drugstore, or from a well-known mail order house as was once possible?

The fact is, something does happen once the technique of smoking marijuana is developed, and it usually leads into one of two directions. First, when he becomes high on the weed, the individual frequently gets very friendly and gentle. On the other hand, he may become belligerent and aggressive. It depends on certain personality traits that existed prior to his coming under the influence of marijuana, but which the drug is likely to release.

The case of whether or not the drug itself is harmful is still before the jury, and no one can make medical statements one way or another with absolute certainty. But research is going on and the answers to many questions about marijuana should be forthcoming in the not-too-distant future.

Even though the medical investigations of marijuana have not yet led to any definite conclusions, most agree the drug should not be termed a desirable one to use for a number of reasons. The most practical of these reasons is the fact that the possession, use, or sale of marijuana is illegal and detection will lead to arrest. If conviction follows, stiff penalties result that can seriously mar an individual's future.

A young woman in the southeast has learned the painful truth of being arrested on a marijuana charge. Director of a county poverty agency's Head Start Program, she has been charged with possessing marijuana after the weed was found growing in her back yard. The charge alone was enough to force her resignation from a position to which

she apparently brought much talent and from which she derived her own special rewards.

Marijuana, or the reaction to it by our society, can have serious consequences for the user. If for no other reason than a long jail sentence or a disrupted career, the use of marijuana poses grave dangers for those who seek its mind-bending qualities.

Of course, the possibility that marijuana is medically harmful to the individual is still a strong possibility and should not be quickly discounted.

Other questions frequently asked about marijuana are: Does the use of marijuana lead to addiction? Does it lead to the use of a stronger drug such as heroin?

Again the answers lack scientific certainty. It is believed that marijuana does not possess addictive qualities, although one can become psychologically dependent upon its effects. Once this psychological dependence is established, withdrawal may become very difficult.

It is not now generally believed that the marijuana smoker goes to hard narcotics as a logical progression in his drug experience. Even so the danger does exist for some, since pot is often smoked in an environment that is not conducive to highly predictable behavior.

Pot parties are usually attended by several people and sometimes the group is large enough to be considered a small crowd. Group behavior, and certainly crowd behavior, is frequently predicated upon something less than sound judgement.

People are known to act, and react, quite differently in groups than they do as individuals. Perhaps it is the atmosphere, the emotional contagion, and the presence of strong drug users in such groups that poses a danger of marijuana smokers going to a dreaded narcotic.

Marijuana, however, is not the only drug being abused even if it is the most popular. There are others which are easier to get and whose use is more difficult to detect. They belong to the amphetamine family.

Amphetamines

On a chilly afternoon in a New Orleans bar, two young people are about to turn off the society outside and turn on a make-believe world of euphoria through the abuse of a drug known as methamphetamine ("speed"). The girl is particularly interesting because of a willingness, even eagerness, to talk about her disenchantment with The Establishment. About the mother and father who she believes have failed as parents.

During her early childhood, Dani had been pretty much like any little girl. Among other things, she liked parks, animals, and daddy. Especially daddy.

And those were the years when Dani got her kicks from a box of candy, or an ice cream cone, or from a gentle lick on the cheek by her dog. But not anymore. Now kicks come from the melted crystals of methamphetamine surging through a dirty hypodermic needle.

Dani has become a "speed freak" who regularly shoots methamphetamine into her veins as a means of escaping the realities and frustrations with which she is no longer able to cope.

Methamphetamine, or "speed" as it is known, has become enormously popular among the drug users seeking a new high. It is the alternative which has been chosen by large numbers of those who turned from LSD following evidence that the latter could produce long-term mental and genetic deficiencies.

Pep pills

Other amphetamines being regularly abused include benzedrine and dexadrine. These two have historically been popular with truck drivers for keeping awake on long hauls that require more abundant energy sources than the body naturally possesses. The dangers in abusing these drugs are many, and police files tell some gruesome stories of tragic accidents caused by drivers who demanded more of their bodies than it was humanly possible for them to give.

Mood producers

The amphetamines are popular mood-producing drugs and can be helpful when taken as prescribed over a short period of time. Not only do they halt fatigue, but they also give one a feeling of limitless energy. Following a dosage of 10 to 30 mg. of amphetamines, an individual will experience a sense of elation, and a new-found self-confidence. Physical and mental work undergoes marked improvement in performance for short durations.

When the use of amphetamines continues over a long period of time, or when overdoses are taken, an undesirable effect takes place in the mind and body. The user begins to suffer mental fatigue and long periods of depression. In addition, headaches set in along with dizziness, agitation, apprehension, delirium, and confusion.

Therefore, what actually begins as a new high with extremely pleasant results can end in a depression whose recesses are deeper than those from which escape was originally sought.

A social pill

An attorney once explained to a reporter that amphetamines are becoming popular among friends at his parties and that he keeps them around for social occasions much the same as he keeps liquor. This is just one such report that indicates increasing popularity of the drug. Statistics on the abuse of amphetamines and barbiturates are difficult to gather because their widest use seems to occur within a part of society that does not otherwise break the law or associate with the criminal element.

These users include the tense executive who must have a pill at night to sleep and one in the morning "to get going"; the show business personality who can catch only a few hours sleep as he flies across the country between appearances; the bored housewife; and the athlete who needs a little help in "getting up" for that important game.

Methamphetamine

But the most frightening of all the amphetamines is the one described previously as "speed," or generically as methamphetamine. This chemical has risen to new heights among those looking for a drug experience, and its increased familiarity has caused concern among those who know of the dangers. These are fears caused by the fact that those who "mainline"—take intravenously—methamphetamine are apt to develop paranoid psychoses and certain organic syndromes, or even suffer death.

Then, of course, there is the danger of hepatitis when dirty needles are used.

Barbiturates

Barbiturates are widely-known drugs used as sedatives for relaxing the central nervous system. A depressant made from barbituric acid, barbiturates were first produced in the 19th Century.

It is estimated that over one-fourth of all prescriptions written by doctors for drugs that affect the mind are barbiturates. These include the long-acting preparations phenobarbital and amobarbital, although the shorter-acting drugs are more popular with abusers.

The barbiturates are used medically for relaxing nerves and muscles, and can be used by anyone seeking a very special feeling, or an urge to dull awareness of the environment. Although in normal doses these drugs tend to reduce blood pressure and heart beat, when taken in large doses they impair the ability to think and concentrate.

According to a survey conducted by the New York Times, the amphetamines and barbiturates are most often abused by those in the upper and middle classes of society. Among the reasons given for using the pills by those interviewed, was that they serve as a means for escaping boredom and discovering self-awareness as well as aiding in the struggle to obtain sexual freedom.

While the amphetamines apparently do not lead to any physical dependence, the barbiturates do. Withdrawal, which should be done only under supervision and which usually takes weeks to accomplish, can be agonizing.

Medical values

Both the amphetamines and the barbiturates have medically-designated purposes which include, for the latter, treatment of insomnia, high blood pressure, and epilepsy.

The amphetamines are used for such conditions as obesity, depression, fatigue, and narcolepsy (the compulsion for sleep).

It is unfortunate, but true, that many drugs capable of producing constructively for medical science can also have value for those who seek their qualities for less constructive purposes.

Both amphetamines and barbiturates are popular with drug abusers for a number of reasons. They are easy to obtain, relatively inexpensive, and difficult for authorities to control.

The abusers increase

When a drug is easy to obtain, inexpensive to purchase, and difficult to detect in illegal hands, it is natural to expect those who seek its pleasures would turn in that direction. For this reason, an official at the National Institute of Mental Health's drug study center said he would not be at all surprised to see the amphetamines become more popular than marijuana.

Other highs

The quest for a new high is what most young people who use drugs are seeking, and this has given rise to some startling information about what is being used. Investigation has turned up such unusual occurrences as teenagers drinking deodorant; eating nutmeg; smoking crushed aspirin; and injecting meat tenderizer, white wine, bourbon, and vinegar, just to mention a few.

No one is quite sure what the ingenuity of youth will develop next in its quest for the euphoric unreal. Nonetheless, those who must deal with the problem are certain there will be a next unless adult education leads to bridging the so-called and extremely complex "generation gap."

Much attention is given to youth in regard to the drug problem since this is where the greatest increases are being detected. But then again, it must be pointed out that young people comprise the group where drug abuses are most likely to be recognized because of youth activities, and the propensity social scientists have for studying this group. However, it is strongly indicated that the drug problem is also showing significant increase among adults, although this is more difficult to substantiate.

Hallucinogens

While marijuana and the amphetamines are the most popular drugs in use today, some attention must be given to hullucinogens such as LSD, if only to examine the reduction of the latter's importance among drug users.

Acid

The front page story about a young New England girl, who was found dead in the Greenwich Village apartment she shared with her hippie boyfriend, was perhaps one thing that helped to focus America's adult attention on "what the kids are doing."

The girl came from a well-to-do Connecticut family with whom other middle class parents could readily identify. Many realized

for the first time that this tragedy could have happened to almost any family in America. A few realized it could also have been prevented.

What, then, happened following this unfortunate death when adults had their attention diverted momentarily from television to Greenwich Village and Haight-Ashbury? Many agree that little changed except those who were leaving homes all over America for big city hippie haunts were getting more publicity. It made good copy for the newspapers and even better pictures for television.

Nevertheless, a few people became aroused and wanted to know what these young people were doing, and why. More studies of the problem began and others already underway were intensified.

Those who began examining the hippies more closely found that an alarming number had begun using hallucinogenic drugs such as LSD. The story of its popularity was being told on psychiatrists' couches in some of the nation's best-known mental institutions.

LSD

The abbreviation LSD scientifically designates d-lysergic acid diethylamide. However, it is better known in the hippie cult simply as "acid," and has become the most written and talked about of all the synthetic hallucinogens.

LSD was first produced in 1938 as a research drug which was being used as an aid in the study of psychoses. Extremely small doses—as low as 25 micrograms—have been found to be active. This amount is equivalent to 1/40,000 of a gram, although about four times that amount constitutes the average dose.

LSD cannot be legally purchased now since the Food and Drug Administration has sanctioned its use only for research purposes. However, there are those who believe LSD will eventually have such potential medical uses as aiding chronic alcoholics, schizophrenics, and persons with various terminal diseases.

Such clinical purposes are of little concern to those who seek LSD's strange and mysterious powers for taking "trips" on an occasional weekend, or to its more consistent users who have become known among the trade as "acid heads." These people are searching for a change in time and space perception that recklessly abandons logic and reason.

The dangers

When one takes LSD, he enters an unreal world that is said to range from simple pleasure to complete ecstacy. Sometimes, however, it is different.

Good "trips" are not always the case, and sometimes what was hoped would be a magnificent new experience becomes an indescribable horror that results in panic or paranoid reactions. These can have serious, sometimes fatal, consequences.

There are stories about individuals under the influence of hallucinogens who stepped from a tenth story window or walked in front of a speeding automobile, in order to prove their invincibility.

One recent newspaper account tells of the potency of LSD and some of its harrowing consequences. A five-year-old girl accidentally swallowed a sugar cube, which had been soaked in LSD. Reportedly, the child was suffering the ill effects of her "trip" some nine months later, and it took over five months for her IQ to return to the level it had been prior to the "trip."

But now a more harrowing story about the unpleasant effects of LSD are being told. It involves the unborn children of women who have used the popular "acid" to "see music and hear pictures" existing only in the world of the unreal.

According to medical authorities, it is all too possible that LSD will cause certain chromosome breaks resulting in grotesque physical characteristics of babies yet to be born. This fate, they say, is even likely to appear in the user's grandchildren since heredity passes the chromosome separation along to yet another generation.

Chromosomes serve as the body's blueprint in that they contain genes which determine certain physical characteristics inherited from parents.

LSD is an extremely dangerous drug with a paradoxical potential for mental destruction and rehabilitation both of which are yet unmeasured. Only time and continued research will tell whether or not this drug has greater capacity for the re-orientation of the individual to society than it has for his disorientation.

The supply

But with LSD outlawed, how can those who still persist in experiencing its mind-bending qualities find a source of supply?

Actually, LSD is easy to synthesize by almost anyone who possesses a working knowledge of chemistry. And that is where today's illicit supply is being produced, in kitchens and makeshift laboratories all across the country.

Use decreasing

Those who are producing and selling LSD, however, seem to be encountering a decreasing demand for their chemical. Confronted with the dangers of homicidal and suicidal tendencies, as well as its genetically and mentally destructive capacities, those who were using LSD are now often turning to one of two alternatives for new mind-expanding experiences.

One of these alternatives is to seek freedom, if you will, through mediation in a guru-led society. Here the guru's followers seek to expand their minds through its exercise and without the use of chemicals.

The other alternative lies in the use of drugs that produce effects similar to LSD.

Peyote

Peyote, which comes from the cactus plant, is another of the well-known drugs associated with mind distorting properties.

Peyote buttons are usually chopped and brewed with tea or chewed while drinking wine or some other highly flavored drink in order to mask its bad taste.

Peyote is also known as "moon," "the bad seed," and "P."

Mescaline

Like peyote, mescaline is obtained from the cactus plant. Even though the use of mescaline is now in the experimental stage, it is believed this drug provides powerful effects almost identical to those of LSD. The effects of mescaline may last as long as 10 hours or more.

"Mesc," or "big chief," as this drug is known, is usually taken orally, but it may be shot into the arm.

Because of its unpleasant taste, mescaline is taken along with some other substance such as hot cocoa or orange juice.

Psilocybin

Psilocybin was first believed to have been used by primitives for certain spiritual communion with the supernatural. It comes from a Mexican mushroom and is taken primarily through the mouth. Its effects are extremely close to those of LSD, as are mescaline and peyote.

DMT

"The businessman's trip" is how most people in the drug crowd describe DMT, probably because its effects are much more short-lived than LSD. Reduced dosages are reported to "turn on" a user for as little as 30 minutes. However, a normal dose provides a "trip" that often lasts for about six hours.

Although it can be found as a natural constituent of the seeds of various West Indian and South American plants, DMT is more frequently obtained as a synthetic derivative of tryptamine.

There are several other hallucinogens whose effects closely resemble LSD, even though they are used to a lesser extent than those previously mentioned. Among these are MMDA; DET; psilocin; STP; and 68, or sex juice, as it is more popularly known.

The use of Morning Glory seeds should also be mentioned in this section since their use in the United States began to take on some prominence shortly after the advent of this decade.

Morning Glory seeds were first used by South American tribes for ritualistic experiences. About one-tenth as powerful as LSD, they can be chewed to obtain their effect on the mind.

Like all other hallucinogens, however, their consumption is dangerous and can result in suicidal reactions as well as certain physical discomforts.

The trip

Hallucinogens mentioned in this section all produce what users refer to as "trips." When asked to describe a "trip," they talk about "hearing pictures and seeing music," and about freeing mind from body. Such descriptions give the average person little with which to relate when he tries to picture in his own mind what actually happens during a "trip."

It, therefore, becomes necessary to turn to a clinical discipline in order to extract a more meaningful description. According to government research sources, the first thing to take place apparently is a change in the physical senses. Colors appear more vivid and may begin to form unusual patterns. Walls wave back and forth in a gentle rhythm, and flat objects suddenly leap forward into the third dimension.

The individual under the influence may be led to believe his senses have become keener.

One strangely paradoxical effect reported is the ability to feel two opposite emotions at once such as happy and sad, or elated and depressed.

Highly unpredictable in the effects they will have on the individual, these hallucinogens are extremely difficult to control even under strict laboratory conditions.

Confronting the law

Whatever the particular medium, hallucinogenic drugs pose a grave danger to those who seek to prostitute their medical purposes for personal escape.

In addition to the physical and mental dangers already discussed, there is another threat made against those who are found illegally dealing in the drugs.

There are severe penalties for anyone convicted of disposing, selling, or producing dangerous hallucinogens such as LSD. Many state laws penalize anyone who is convicted of possessing such drugs.

To hard drugs

A discussion that begins with marijuana, and proceeds through the amphetamines and the hallucinogens, almost naturally ends with the opiates.

This is not to imply, however, that one who smokes marijuana automatically proceeds through these steps.

Hard narcotics-heroin

Heroin is familiar to an estimated 65,000 addicts in this country who depend on its effects to escape the realities of life.

This drug is also variously known as H, Boy, White Stuff, Harry, Joy Powder, and Scot. It is actually synthesized from morphine, although it is several times more powerful than the mother drug.

While many argue that marijuana does little to harm the body or mind permanently, few people are willing to grant such wide berth to heroin because of its capacity to lead the individual to a life of social and physical self-deterioration. Strangely enough, and unlike marijuana, heroin can be judged most harshly by those who have fallen prey to its strong addictive powers.

A woman in her middle forties who had been dependent on heroin for over 20 years was talking about the abuse of drugs in general and heroin in particular. She vividly described how use of the drug had resulted in the deterioration of all her family relationships, as well as her social life. Talking about how addicts must continually steal and shoplift to support their habit, this woman described the excruciating story of how she had been forced to spend a major part of her life as a prostitute in order to pay for the needed heroin.

The habit is first

It is reported that heroin addicts steal over $1 billion worth of goods each year to support their habits. This merchandise is sold to a fence who pays only about one-fifth of its actual worth. It is easy then to imagine how much a "junkie"—as heroin addicts are known—must steal to finance a habit that may easly run to as much as $50 or more a day.

In New York, where over half of this country's heroin addicts live, there are thousands of personal tragedies each year, such as the one involving a young father who could not subordinate the habit to his own family's welfare.

One night, the young man left his cheap apartment where a seven-month-old baby would soon awaken and begin crying for food.

With the money he had been saving for his family, the dark-haired addict purchased a small cellophane package of heroin and quickly ducked into the men's room of a local bar. The door locked behind him, he began to dissolve heroin in a hot spoon, and then shakily injected it into his arm. Shortly afterwards, he was dead from an overdose.

Death—the result of overdose

This is a tragic story, but it is not unusual in New York where authorities estimate that one addict dies each day from an overdose of heroin.

One reason for such a high mortality rate is the manner in which heroin must be obtained and the sources from which it comes. Lacking the scientific discipline of a laboratory technician, the dealer crudely cuts his heroin down to weakened units with milk sugar. Sometimes, however, a user will unknowingly purchase a package that is almost pure heroin. Its use will prove fatal.

Another reason for death is the neophyte's ignorance about heroin and how much he should "mainline," or shoot into his vein. It is easy for him to get an overdose.

Still another contributing factor to the high death rate is that a user who has been jailed on a narcotics charge is separated from the supply and thus withdrawn from heroin. Upon being released, the addict's tolerance has diminished to such an extent that his normal dose may result in death.

"Joy Poppers," as those who shoot heroin only occasionally are known, usually begin with a dose of 5 to 10 milligrams. However, as the need increases and it is shot more often, the body builds up a tolerance that eventually may require as much as 450 mg. per day.

Although heroin is generally "mainlined," it may also be taken orally or inhaled. There are cases where workers who mixed and packaged heroin regularly became addicted from inhaling the dust over a prolonged period.

Why the first fix?

It is difficult to explain why heroin addicts seek their first fix. The need seems to vary with the individual. However, most of the hard narcotics addicts are found in the lower socio-economic classes of large metropolitan areas. It may simply be that heroin serves as an escape from the boredom and hopelessness that exists in a ghetto environment.

Then, too, there are stories about the addict who began with less dangerous drug "just for kicks," and wound up with the opiate monkey on his back because he sought a bigger and better jolt.

Of course, there is the familiar story about running with the wrong crowd.

One addict told the following story in a Connecticut newspaper.

According to the report, the young men had come out of Korea on a fast track. He was married and a few months later his wife suffered a miscarriage.

"I felt terrible," he said. "Some of my friends who were addicts offered to give me something to steady my nerves. They suggested I try heroin."

He did, and it was the beginning of an abrasive existence which saw him incarcerated five times for various offenses. His life of crime which became necessary to support the habit had him stealing up to $2,000 worth of merchandise each day.

The Korea veteran is now on his seventh cure.

The cure—Does it work?

Unfortunately for the heroin addict, the end of his affair with drugs is more likely to be death, and not cure. More than 90 percent of all addicts who take the cure are said to return to drugs following their treatment.

Perhaps the best known treatment center is a federally-operated hospital at Lexington, Kentucky. Alexander King, one of the hospital's famous and most erudite patients, described it in his book, "Mine Enemy Grows Older."

The late King, who had been addicted accidentally through medication he was taking for a kidney ailment, was admitted to Lexington three times, a further dramatization of the difficulty in really curing the addict.

The prognosis remains poor today for an addict ever knowing a heroin-free existence. The methods and medications being used at present have not solved the problem of curing addiction.

Nevertheless, much work and research is being done, a large part of which is made possible through grants from the federal government.

Treatment

One such grant has been made to the Narcotics Addiction Service Center of Southwest Fairfield County in Connecticut where an experiment is being conducted with a chemical known as methadone. This is a synthetic narcotic that actually shuts out the effects of heroin and, at the same time, fulfills the addict's physical need for the drug.

At the Narcotics Center, there are about 20 opiate addicts who have switched from heroin to methadone. A dose of this chemical costs only about 14 cents and it is estimated that the program saves the city of Stamford some $1 million annually in costs that involve welfare, stolen goods, and arrests.

The Center does more than simply provide addicts with access to methadone. It also helps them to make psychological adjustments and re-establish some solidarity in their lives. Most of those at the Center now hold steady jobs.

Authorities are quick to point out that methadone is just one experiment being conducted and that it, in itself, does not offer the ultimate answer. Also, the long-term effects of using methadone are still unknown.

Another interesting experiment involves a group of addicts who are attempting to make the psychological break from narcotics at a place known as Daytop Village in New York.

Daytop is run by the addicts themselves since they are adjudged to be in the best position for determining what a "junkie" needs in the way of discipline and responsibility.

Even though the addicts are physically separated from drugs and their dependence is no longer a physical requirement, Daytop helps them tear down the psychological barriers that exist between themselves and their ability to handle social problems. Each member at Dayton must play a therapeutic game designed to help discover his psychological reasons for turning to heroin.

Another similar treatment center on the West Coast is known as Synanon.

Withdrawal

The most difficult part of curing the addict is the psychological divorce which must take place after physical withdrawal has occurred. There are countless thousands of cases where the physical addiction has been broken by withdrawal only to find the addict returning to drugs once he is back in an old and familiar environment where sociological factors remain the same.

Withdrawal can be accomplished in one of two ways—through supervision at a hospital where the habit is reduced gradually; or by going "cold turkey" in an attempt to escape the habit without the use of drugs in a gradual withdrawal program. The latter method usually takes place when a frustrated addict elicits the help of a friend to assist him during the withdrawal.

When an addict goes "cold turkey," the body reacts violently as the drug retreats from the system. The body has built up a tolerance to heroin and is now shocked by the drug's sudden absence.

The "junkie" going "cold turkey" begins to suffer chills, diarrhea, and convulsions. There have even been cases where the reaction was so unbearable that the addict, who felt the return to narcotics would be a fate worse than death, decided instead on the latter.

It has been pointed out, however, that such descriptions of self-withdrawal are not now typical or common, especially with the small percentage of heroin available in today's average "fix."

Other hard narcotics

In addition to heroin, there are other drugs in the hard category that help to compound the problem. These include morphine which, as heroin once did, has the relief of pain as its prime medical application.

When heroin is difficult to get, the addict may frequently turn to morphine to fill the need until his favorite supply is once again available.

Morphine, too, is dangerous in that physical and psychological dependence develop and a tolerance is established by the body.

While there are numerous drugs such as cocaine that can, and are, abused, the other major one is codeine. Developed for the relief of pain and one of medicine's most effective cough depressants, codeine is not nearly so addictive as heroin and morphine. It also does not provide the same powerful surge of euphoria that can be found in the other two drugs.

The problems posed by addiction reach their gravest proportions with the narcotics described in this section. It is here that those who may have begun on a softer drug with less serious intentions could possibly end their association with drugs.

And it must be remembered that with today's methods, the cure cannot be assured in the vast majority of cases.

Drugs pose great social problems for those who choose their easy offer of a better way, as well as for the society which gives rise to personalities and conditions that lend themselves to the drug problem.

These problems are not new to the world. But even with a long history of opiate addiction, science has done very little in the way of offering real solutions.

The problem to date has largely been left to enforcement people and addicts have nearly always been considered criminals. But enforcement does not concern itself much with the sociological aspect of drug addiction. That is not its function.

Enforcement authorities must concern themselves with arrest and control, and thus

they are closely involved with the problem caused by those who transport and sell drugs for a profit.

DRUG TRAFFIC

Soft drugs

Where do they come from; these drugs for which Americans commit hundreds of millions of dollars? The answer to this question must be related to the specific drug, since each finds its way somewhat differently into the mainstream of the drug market.

Marijuana, for example, mostly comes into the United States by way of the Mexican border at California. However, there is still a large amount which comes across the border at Texas. And how it comes! By the tons, and in amounts estimated to reach retail values of $100 million or more each year.

Of this, only an infinitesimally small amount is confiscated by the authorities at the borders. So little, in fact, that those who deal in the weed for a living receive only the slightest discouragement.

It must be pointed out, however, that the reason for so much activity is not because authorities are lax in discharging their responsibilities. The biggest part of the enforcement problem at the border is created by the large number of vehicles crossing daily for business and pleasure. In California alone, for example, an estimated 25,000 vehicles pass over the boundary between the United States and Mexico in any one day.

Marijuana also comes into this country by airplane as well as auto, both commercial and private. Anyone who has the desire will encounter little difficulty in crossing the border in a clandestine manner due to the expansiveness of the line itself.

Profits in marijuana

With Americans spending some $100 million each year on marijuana, it is interesting to look at the distribution system and the profits it yields.

A Mexican farmer who grows marijuana will receive from one to two dollars for a kilo (35 ounces) of the grass. He, like farmers growing other products in other countries, receives less than anyone else in the distribution system.

The next person to become involved is usually a town dealer who buys directly from the farmer. He will sell that same brick, or kilo, for about $9, and will, in turn, peddle it to a regional broker who subsequently sells it to a dealer in this country for about $20 or $25.

Once in the United States, the brick will be sold to a pusher who pays according to a number of factors, one of which is geographical. That is, if the purchase is made in Los Angeles, the brick will cost about $65; in Denver, it sells for around $110; in Chicago, approximately $160; and in New Orleans, about $300. Of course, supply, demand, and "heat" from police also affect the market.

The pusher, once he has bought the marijuana, will break it down into ounces, and in some cases, cigarettes, or joints, as they are known. These in turn will be sold to local users with an ounce usually selling from $25 to $35, and "points" bringing about $1 each, again depending on factors that affect the market price.

At any rate, a kilo of marijuana which starts out selling for about $2 will wind up bringing as much as $500. The marijuana dealer also has the advantage of almost always negotiating in a seller's market because of the demand.

Some dealers who start out in marijuana occasionally can be found moving to the lucrative methamphetamine market. This is much easier to handle since it is not as bulky as marijuana. Also, the sale of marijuana brings with it a felony charge and penalties ranging up to life imprisonment. "Speed," on the other hand, is more easily handled and the penalty for dealing in this drug is less severe than for marijuana.

Methamphetamine is produced in makeshift labs and costs only about $30 per pound to produce. However, it is wholesaled for around $1,200 per pound, and brings some $150 to $200 an ounce on the retail market. Retailers, who break it up into about 35 spoons to the ounce, sell the drug for about $20 per spoon.

The mark up on "speed" is even more dramatic than marijuana. From a production cost of $30 per pound to a retail cost of about $700 an ounce explains why methamphetamine dealers have become enormously wealthy with a few dealers making up to $1,000 per day.

There are other amphetamines on the market that pose a traffic problem for authorities, and these are primarily in the nature of pills. Many of these amphetamines can be bought by obtaining multiple prescriptions from several doctors and then making the purchases at more than one pharmacy. Officials in Washington estimate that nearly half of all amphetamines produced in legal laboratories reach the black market. The percentage is believed to be somewhat smaller for the barbiturates.

These otherwise legal pills reach illegal hands through hijackers who get them during shipment to wholesalers, thieves who steal from the labs, and buyers who purchase from laboratories by using phony orders from wholesalers.

Many of these pills are produced illegally in makeshift labs since their chemical formulas are easily obtainable. Pills generally sell on the black market for at least five times their pharmacy value.

Much is being done by federal enforcement and control authorities in the way of investigation and arrest. But they concede the problem is a big one that can best be solved not by enforcement as such, but by eliminating the illegal demands for the amphetamines.

The manufacture of LSD takes place in much the same way as does methamphetamine; that is, through production in makeshift laboratories or kitchen rigs. According to a report in the New York Times, a California chemist was arrested by authorities who said he manufactured 10 million doses of LSD in his San Francisco home!

The entire distribution system in the areas of amphetamine and LSD appears to be loosely organized and run by many small-time operators. To date, it is believed the Mafia has not concerned itself very much with the sale and distribution of these drugs mostly because there are so many small-time dealers that the market would be difficult to control.

Hard drugs

If the distribution system of soft drugs is loosely organized, the same does not hold true for hard narcotics such as heroin. Here is an elaborate and closely-knit network that can be fairly well defined.

There are two kinds of heroin used by addicts. One is brown, or Mexican, heroin; and the other is white, or French, heroin. The French product is far more popular than its Mexican counterpart.

White heroin actually originates in Turkey where farmers are licensed to grow opium poppies for scientific and medical use. Of course, in the absence of strict control, the allotments are overplanted and the surplus is sold by farmers to those dealing in the black market. Once the black marketeers obtain the illicit opium, it is loaded on the backs of camels for a long, but quiet, journey. It usually continues on its way to Lebanon or Syria where morphine is extracted and condensed into much smaller units, thus making it less troublesome to handle.

When morphine is extracted and condensed, it soon begins an association with the French from which the white heroin will get its name. Once it is shipped to the laboratories in France, these illegal operations start the process which sees the white heroin that is produced from morphine shipped to the United States largely through clandestine schemes involving some steamship and airline companies.

Like so many other things, heroin enters the United States primarily through New York. There it usually comes under control of the Mafia to whom it is a lucrative business.

THE PROBLEM

Enforcement's view

"We need to know a lot more about marijuana than we do. This may seem strange to say, but it's a fact. We have known about marijuana, man has, for thousands of years, because he has always been looking for some mind-bending drug that affects the central nervous system, thus his mind. And with all of this experience, we still scientifically say that we don't know the long-term affects of marijuana. There has been a great deal of interest in our nation today to try and find some answers to this. It has been studied in other countries by foreign scientists, but not by us.

"Now I think this is what the young people would really like to know, as well as we. That is, what are the effects of marijuana? How serious, how deleterious are they? And what are the *long-term* effects?"

These are the thoughts of John Finlator, Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. While they are not altogether new thoughts, they do seem somewhat different in tone from those of most enforcement authorities.

Even so, Finlator is not soft on this problem, merely soft spoken. Nor does he advocate the use of marijuana when he points out the fact that more knowledge is needed, for in the same voice he speaks of strong indications that the use of soft narcotics can cause a dependence that creates difficult problems for the young user.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has four main functions within its jurisdiction. Enforcement comprises a major part of the Bureau's responsibility, and there are some 600 agents scattered throughout the United States. In addition to enforcement, however, there are three others including training (state, federal, and local agents); education; and scientific divisions.

John E. Ingersol, Director of the Bureau states:

"The Bureau is concerned with all aspects of drug abuse—social, psychological, physical. However, our major concern is with its criminal aspects, for the primary responsibility of this Bureau is to enforce the narcotic and drug abuse laws of this country.

"A greater effort will be expended now and in the future to apprehend and prosecute major drug traffickers and also to prevent violation of the drug and narcotic laws, especially among the young, the naive, and ordinarily law-abiding public."

Expanding on what is termed the "drug syndrome" in this country, John Finlator says there has been no direct evidence to support the theory that smoking marijuana leads to the use of hard narcotics such as heroin. He further states that only a relatively few heroin users have been discoverd on the college campuses, although he is quick to acknowledge that these findings should not lead to complacency about the dangers of drug abuse. He points out that it is probably too early to tell what effect the increased popularity of marijuana has had on the incidence of heroin addiction, and says: "It would be a terrible thing if we let the drug syndrome go on until we get into heroin."

The drug syndrome seems to belong to the new generation even though it has existed to a lesser extent with previous generations. In commenting on drugs being "their thing," Finlator says, "While it is difficult for older

generations to understand why youth would play around with something of this nature, they come back and say it is very difficult for us to understand how people in the thirties and twenties got hooked on alcohol as strong as they did."

The enforcement people hope the truth about drugs can ultimately be determined and that the story when told, will be accepted by young people.

Finlator, himself, feels that this true story, when it comes, must be told by the scientific community as well as the government. He admits this "discovery of truth" may lead to a revision in the marijuana laws which places extremely high penalties upon anyone caught using, possessing, or selling the drug. Finlator emphasizes that it is not his job as an official of the Bureau to question laws now on the books; but to follow them. However, he says, "One would be blind if he didn't look at the problems that are being raised by the severities of the penalty (referring to marijuana) and what they might be doing to us."

Others are more outspoken about the present laws that find marijuana included with narcotics insofar as jail sentences are concerned. One man who is doing something about what he feels are penalties not commensurate with the offense is Judge Kenneth Wendt of Chicago. He says:

"I believe the first offense of marijuana use, when committed by an individual with no criminal record, should be considered a misdemeanor rather than a felony."

Judge Wendt has led a drive to get the law changed in his state by the Illinois legislature.

It is the hope of many that studies urged by former President Johnson will do much to remove the crazy-quilt pattern of laws now existent, and that new and more meaningful legislation will be drafted that is universally acceptable. As Finlator puts it, he is hopeful that these studies will "bring things into better perspective."

In commenting on a solution to the problem, Finlator pays close attention to the knowledge gap and the problem this causes for society.

"There is one thing I think we are all missing the boat on. That is, we who are in authority find ourselves pretty ignorant about the drug problem around us. The school teacher, the parent, the school administrator, the businessman, and the housewife are all ignorant about the problem. Thus, when a young person starts talking about drugs, neither his parents nor his teachers are really able to keep up with him.

Although most of his information is misinformation, the responsibility is still upon the shoulders of the parents and teachers to know something about one of the most devastating problems we have in our society. Yet we find ourselves too lacking in knowledge about what's going on, and in our ability to even discuss it with young people. As long as we have an uninformed public, parents, and teachers in this area, we're not going to make much headway. We will with the criminal, but he's going to pop up again and again. If we are going to solve the drug problem, we must do so through an effective educational process and one that can be accepted."

The sociological view

Indeed, as John Finlator indicates, education plays an important part in the answer, although the educational process is difficult. It is agreed that education is not just for the young people, but for the adults as well. And the education must not confine itself to learning more about drugs and narcotics and what they can do to the individual. It must also concern itself with the sociological and psychological aspects as they relate to the motivation for using drugs. Many say that adults are lacking in their understanding of today's youth and what motivates them and this "generation gap" contributes greatly to the problem.

There can be little doubt about the necessity for discouraging young people from using drugs or about the necessity for discouraging them from committing their lives to a purposeless course. Instead, as it is put by Dr. Alfred Freedman of the New York Medical College, "We must encourage them to withhold their commitments for something more important." He adds, "We will desperately need the abilities of these young people in the future."

The question is asked, "Where does the blame belong?" And the answer seems to be that it must be shared by everyone to some extent since these children are products of an environment adults helped create. That they see the shortcomings and ask for better is commendable. That they see the gaps and seek to escape the reality of helping to fill them is, however, less than commendable.

Dr. Freedman observed: "As I see it, I think the problem in terms of where the concern is, is the fact that some of our most talented, gifted, and most creative young people are making a major commitment and involvement in the drug scene rather than involving themselves continually in the real world issues. I don't think this world or our country can afford to do without their value."

But, if as the doctor says, many of today's young people are making their commitments to drugs rather than to a more constructive means for helping to solve society's ills, they have what they believe to be justifiable reasons.

As one young drop-out on society put it, "Nobody wants us to get involved with anything, it's all so ridiculous. Just look at the political campaign with everybody being coy and playing the game of political football, and who gets kicked around? Us, that's who. None of them really give a damn."

Perhaps they have a point in that adults do not give them responsibility, yet plead with them to be responsible. Times have changed greatly since previous generations were reared in an atmosphere that was largely rural and where children by necessity assumed an important role in the family. They had to begin making contributions to the family unit at an early age and their purposes in life were fairly clear, at least for the the short view.

Now, however, Americans live in a largely metropolitan country where youth's role has been diminished to the extent that parents frequently place reduced emphasis on the child's making an economic contribution to the family. Their responsibilities frequently are little more than to "be good kids and don't get into any trouble." Because these children are physically in better health and mentally more alert than previous generations, this lack of delegating responsibility to youth not only confuses, but frustrates, as well.

Another thing that helps to compound the problem is the strong effort adults make to identify with youth activities. This reduces those things with which young people feel secure in calling their own. That is, if the youngster develops a language, the adults soon adopt it. If youth comes up with a new dance, the adults take it over. If teenagers begin a new hair style, the moms and dads quickly copy it.

With such adult raiding of the youth world, teenagers may be sent scampering to new areas which they can identify as their "thing." Of course, those who are out to really shock "The Establishment" join together in unusual dress and barren apartments to form hippie clans. Many of them get attention by assuming non-conformist roles.

On the subject of attention and caring, one young unpublished hippie poet in Washington, D.C. wrote a few verses. The following is excerpted from his creation.

"Man, it's a hassle
But I don't care.
'Cause when I walk down the street
And a thousand plastic eyes stare
At me, I stare back at them.
And I laugh back at them, and
They thank their God that
I just don't care."

Perhaps care is the real key. And then must come awareness, understanding, and education. However, it is important that these elements not be misused as a platform from which to preach; but instead, a platform for establishing a common ground upon which youth and adults can approach their mutual problems.

Young people today, experts agree, are vitally concerned with the fact that to them social progress has failed to keep pace with technological advances. Young enthusiasts say that under The Establishment's rules they must look to adults to bridge these gaps, and that so far most of them don't feel optimistic about the prospects. It is here that one opportunity exists for seeking a common approach to problems.

At present, some social scientists say adults often fail to give young people a meaningful role, a responsibility for helping to bridge the gap between social and technological progress, a fault that perhaps can be corrected. But adults alone are not to blame. Much of youth is at fault for taking the less responsible drug route as a means for escaping the difficult realities. Many authorities say that, instead of committing themselves to drugs, youth should become more actively involved in a constructive means of bring about change.

Dr. Freedman comments on this aspect of their lives.

"It's not so much the physical dangers of drugs which do exist, or that they will become criminally insane, which is ridiculous; but rather the fact they are developing an inward reality that is most meaningful to them rather than maintaining a concern with society in general. We are in very difficult times it seems to me and the participation of everyone, particularly the younger people, is extraordinarily important. If the focus of their lives becomes centered upon drugs, which often happens, then I think we're losing something."

If caring is the key, education is the hand that holds the key, both in terms of young people and adults. But discussion of the problems that lead youth to a drug existence does not come easy, nor does discussion of drugs themselves. This emotional reluctance to approach the problem objectively often stands in the way of an effective educational program.

Dr. Robert Petersen, a psychologist with the National Institute of Mental Health, says: "One of the real problems, of course, is that drug abuse is an emotionally-loaded issue." He points out that many teenagers and adults have strong emotional investments making it difficult to deal with them on the subject. He also says:

"Among parents of some of the kids in the neighborhood, I have heard several of them say that their kids would most certainly never think of using drugs, and in situations when I was reasonably certain their kids were actually using them."

It is this attitude of "not my youngster" that also contributes to the problem. The use of drugs is not confined any longer to one particular socio-economic class; nor is it confined to hippies. Drug abuse is prevalent among all classes and is increasingly becoming a problem in America's middle class towns and suburbs.

The question frequently is asked about why parents react emotionally toward the use of drugs rather than seeking knowledge that permits intelligent discussion. Perhaps Dr. Petersen has the answer:

"Parents are frightened and you can certainly understand why they are concerned, if for no other reason than they tend to believe the notion that a joint of marijuana is the first step to becoming a hopeless "junkie" or something of this sort, to the very realistic dangers of the kid getting arrested. If he gets arrested, a felony conviction, or even a felony arrest, can dog his career for the rest of his days."

Therefore, fear plays a role in the reaction to drugs, especially as it relates to a parent's child. Dr. Freedman, again, comments that the biggest threat to society where marijuana is concerned lies not in the drug itself, but rather in society's reaction to its use.

Society, it is pointed out, must take the initiative in changing attitudes about the emotionalism of drugs and the factors in the environment which motivate young people to seek them as a means of escape. Parents, it is agreed, must be careful not to underestimate the ability of their children and must also make greater attempts at getting youngsters involved in responsible family and community roles. Many say that youth will respond favorably to a society which gives them meaningful roles to play and new responsibilities that lead to some identifiable sense of purpose.

But for the moment, and in brief, the question remains as to the best method for discouraging young people from "copping out" with drugs. As already stated, authorities conclude that parents should learn as much as they can about drugs and then tell their children the truth; that is, the real dangers and not the myths that may have existed in the past.

Dr. Petersen says it is a mistake to try and persuade youth into believing something that is not true about drugs, especially since they probably know more about it than their parents anyway. He says:

"My inclination with my own kids and with other peoples' kids is to tell them the truth. When kids ask me about marijuana, I tell them what is the present state of knowledge, that it is indeed at best partial. I make a point that when you say something is not clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of all to be harmful does not by any means say that it is harmless."

"And I try to point out," the psychologist continues, "that whether you really believe this is the one social issue of our time for which you want to put yourself on the line. However unrealistic you regard the penalties to be, they exist. They are enforced some of the time and you can't be certain you aren't going to be caught. Also, do you really want to get into the habit of resorting to any kind of chemical for a sense of well being? Do you really want to be dependent on a drug in any sense?"

This last question probes deeply for a responsible reply from the potential drug user. Those close to the situation who deal with the realities of the mind's reaction agree that there is a better way for youth to "turn on" and experience a new feeling. It has been found by many of today's young people who are actively involved with social change in a variety of ways. These are the people who face up to the challenge and seek to find a more realistic hope for themselves than drugs can offer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE QUACKERY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the ink barely dry from the Supreme Court's latest social injustice decree, we are already advised that the Justice Department mechanics are ready to open a blitzkreig against schoolchildren and destroy what remains of public education in the South. It seems as if they were prepared to lower our schools to the level of those in the District of Columbia, even before the Supreme Court handed down its decision.

Ironically, the same Justice Department activists who themselves have defied the laws which exist defining "desegregation," and who now control the unlawful attempts by the Supreme Court to destroy freedom are calling upon all citizens to show "full respect for the law" and obey the High Court decision—knowing full well that it is lawless.

That is like saying, "We don't have to obey laws, but you must obey whatever we choose to call laws."

Everybody wins except the decent, hard-working citizens—the mothers and dads, the children, the educational system and the future of the United States and, to some, these come last.

I include an article from this evening's paper, as follows:

U.S. OFFICIALS ACT TO SPEED SCHOOL DESEGRATION PACE

(By Lyle Denniston)

Federal officials moved today, at an apparently quickened pace, to follow President Nixon's lead in a new effort to desegregate public schools.

The main activity seemed centered at the Health, Education and Welfare Department, where some 150 school districts have been chosen for priority handling in the wake of the Supreme Court's demand Wednesday for "immediate" desegregation.

At the Justice Department, officials were said to be studying over-all policy developments while waiting to hear what the 5th U.S. Court of Appeals will require in a test case involving 33 districts in Mississippi.

The signs of new movement came within hours after the President had called on the nation—officials and private citizens alike—to show "full respect for the law" and obey the high court decision.

The White House was making special efforts to show that Nixon was insisting that the decision be carried out and was not displaying any hesitancy about it.

Ronald L. Ziegler, the President's press secretary, stressed that "the administration will carry out the mandate of the court, and will enforce the law as stated by the Supreme Court decision."

He discounted speculation, apparently stirred by some of the language of Nixon's official statement, that the President was reacting hesitantly to the court ruling. Here's what Nixon said:

"The Supreme Court has spoken decisively on the timing of school desegregation. There are of course, practical and human problems involved.

"With all of us working together, in full respect for the law, I am confident we can overcome these problems.

"I intend to use the leadership resources of the executive branch of government to assist in very possible way in doing so.

"I call upon all citizens and particularly those in leadership positions to work together in seeking solutions for these problems in accordance with the mandate of the court."

Ziegler said the mention of the problems did not mean any lack of commitment to enforce the decision.

Nixon's pledge to use "the leadership resources of the executive branch . . . in every possible way" to implement the ruling was followed by similar promises from the two officials directly responsible for desegregation policy: Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch.

Mitchell, whose department has had the main job of defending the administration's policy of seeking some delays in desegregation, said his agency will "bring every available resource to bear" to carry out the court decision.

Insisting that the justices' ruling involved only a question of timing, and not any issue of law on desegregation, the attorney general remarked:

"All Americans, state and local officials, judges, federal officials and citizens, will be called upon to understand, cooperate and comply. If we believe in a society based upon the rule of laws, we will do so without hesitation."

Finch, while not mentioning any efforts that citizens or officials in general would have to undertake, did vow that his own department will devote "maximum resources" to get "educationally sound and prompt desegregation."

The secretary, whose Aug. 19 decision to seek delay of desegregation in the 33 Mississippi districts led to the high court decision, commented:

"By the language of the decision itself, neither the courts nor this department should tolerate any further delays in abolishing the vestiges of the dual system."

There were painful grumblings from the South, meanwhile.

Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia called the Mississippi schools decision a "criminal act" and appealed for a taxpayers' revolt.

George C. Wallace, former Alabama governor and the 1968 third-party presidential candidate, called the decision "scurrilous policy."

Sen. James O. Eastland said, "the decision spells disaster for public education in Mississippi and many areas of the South."

Atty. Gen. A. F. Summer of Mississippi said, without amplification, his state will fight to change the ruling.

And Mississippi Gov. John Bell Williams said the school children of his state had been "cruelly offered as sacrificial lambs on the altar of social experimentation."

The schools most likely to be affected first by the new ruling are those in the 33 Mississippi districts. Federal Judge John R. Brown of Houston, who will preside over the 5th Circuit's three-judge panel to enforce the ruling in those schools, said he will get the panel to work "expeditiously."

Brown, in Washington to attend a series of federal judges' meetings yesterday through tomorrow, said it was a "safe sort of estimate" to suggest that the earliest his panel will get together is Monday.

He said he did not yet know whether the panel—which also includes Judges Homer Thornberry of Austin and Lewis R. Morgan of Newman, Ga.—would hold any more hearings on desegregation plans.

Lawyers for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, who won the Mississippi test case in the Supreme Court, were sending desegregation plans to Judge Brown's panel for study.

In addition, fund lawyers were weighing the steps they could take to get the high court decision applied to districts other than those involved in the Mississippi case.

While Justice Department staff members were awaiting orders or requests from Judge Brown's panel, HEW assistants were making plans to give priority to 150 districts which have been negotiating with HEW over desegregation plans.

Of the 4,476 school districts in 17 Southern and border states, the department now figures that 3,327 are totally desegregated.

Court orders requiring integration are in varying stages in 374 districts, and another 336 districts are carrying out HEW-approved desegregation plans to end segregation either this school term or next.

While some of the districts under court order or HEW desegregation plans may have to step up their pace because of the high court ruling, HEW officials are aiming their initial new efforts at the districts which have done nothing to desegregate so far.

Of 439 districts in that category, 154 have been negotiating with HEW. Those will be given first attention, it was indicated. Another 133 are facing a cutoff of federal funds if they don't move toward desegregation, and an additional 120 have had their federal money cut off. Another 26 face possible court action by the Justice Department.

EDUCATION—"THE KEY TO SURVIVAL"

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the national benefits derived from education are well known and generally recognized. That our public schools in low-income areas are in a fiscal bind is also well known, but the implications of which are not appreciated. The Washington Post editorial of yesterday goes directly to the point.

First, we have candidate Nixon expounding on education as "the key to opportunity and fulfillment" and also our "key to survival."

Second, Commissioner Allen calls for a campaign to eradicate illiteracy in America while pointing to our incredibly shameful failures in this Nation to provide for an equitable educational system.

Third, the House of Representatives, this year, responded—albeit meager—to these past failures by authorizing an additional billion dollars for Federal aid—the majority of which will go to low-income areas where functional illiterates are concentrated.

However, irony would have it that again a program which should clearly be at the top of our national agenda is being threatened with sacrifice on the altar of fiscal responsibility.

I would like to appeal to Mr. Nixon's sense of priorities. I ask Mr. Nixon what are his relative priorities—what is more critical to our survival as a nation—the education of our youth or the construction of a supersonic transport?

I would like to insert the Post editorial at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 1969]

EDUCATION—"THE KEY TO SURVIVAL"

"Jefferson knew that the destiny of America was inseparable from education—that in the fulfillment of the promise of this new nation education would be the key. . . . Education, long the key to opportunity and fulfillment, is today also the key to survival." So said Richard Nixon just a year ago when he was a candidate for the presidency. And he went on to pledge that "my administration will be second to none in its concern for education."

There has been no discernible movement to redeem that pledge. Indeed, in the fierce competition for attention and for federal funds in a period when economy is an administration watchword, education has been treated as a pesky poor relation. The President has come forward with a dramatic new welfare proposal; but he has displayed only indifference to the urgent needs set forth by a distinguished urban education task force. He has proposed immense expenditures for a new maritime program designed to "replace the drift and neglect of recent years and restore this country to a proud position in the shipping lanes of the world"; but when the House of Representatives during the summer enlarged by a billion dollars the meager appropriation he requested for federal aid to education, he opposed the increase and threatend not to spend it if the Senate should endorse the House action.

The President and his Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare persuaded one of the ablest and most thoughtful educators in the country, Dr. James E. Allen Jr., to leave the New York State superintendency of education and come to Washington as U.S. Commissioner of Education. But Dr. Allen has been accorded scant influence since he came here, as though the administration desired a symbol of excellence rather than a promoter of it.

This country, a pioneer in mass public education, is now second to many of the countries of Europe in literacy, the most elementary index to educational attainment. Calling last month for a campaign to eradicate illiteracy in America, Commissioner Allen pointed to the shameful fact that in large city school systems in this country up to half of the students read below expectation and that about half of the unemployed youth between the ages of 16 and 21 in this country are functionally illiterate.

"Drift and neglect" have been much more—and much more seriously—the portion of the public schools in this country than of the merchant marine. For nearly half a century on one pretext or another—two world wars, two Asian interventions, a depression, an inflation—the public schools of this country have been allowed to sink further and further in arrears of the demands made upon them. School construction has not kept pace with a growing school population; the number and the caliber of teachers—and of the counselors and equipment required to complement the teachers—have lagged increasingly behind the known needs of school children.

The management of public schools is, and should be, a local responsibility. But the long neglect of the school system can be repaired only through a dramatic program of federal financial aid; the resources are simply not now available at the local level. More important still, the drive and innovation and planning for a revitalization of the public schools must come on a nationwide basis.

With the need for federal aid so urgent and so great, it is a tragedy to hear from within the administration phlegmatic talk about concentrating on research instead of on action. It is true of course, that intensive study of educational needs and aims must continue constantly. But the schools themselves—and the children whose childhood opportunities for education can never recur—cannot now wait upon research. There are plenty of pressing and indubitably constructive uses for the billion dollars of additional money a concerned Congress wants to apply to public education. There is plenty of knowledge in the U.S. Commissioner's office to put that money effectively to work at once.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a major battle between Congress and the administration may be looming in the near future, and once again, the issue at hand comes from differing views of "national priorities"—this time, in the medical research area.

Two months ago the Nixon administration announced that its latest round of budgetary cutbacks meant that a number of projects in the general clinical research program would either be reduced or eliminated completely. And, gauging from the tone of Dr. Roger Egeberg's remarks justifying these cutbacks, it would appear that billions of dollars were involved; according to Dr. Egeberg:

We are proceeding on this basis at this time pending final action on the appropriation bill and will re-examine our position after action is final.

Medical research has not been treated any differently than any of the other programs of the Department. We have endeavored to apply reasonable and limited restraints across the Department's programs to the extent possible in order to (1) effect required expenditure savings and (2) minimize the adverse impact of any one program.

We regret that it is necessary to reduce these important and desirable programs. We recognize the problem which caused the Congress to establish an overall limit on expenditures and caused the President to take strong action to restrain expenditures.

We fully support these efforts, not only to share in the total Government effort, but because we are convinced that it is best for the programs administered by H.E.W.

These reductions are the product of the inflationary situation which the President is firmly committed to bring under control. The ravages of inflation strike hardest at the beneficiaries of H.E.W. programs: not only the poor, the aged, the disabled, those dependent on a limited, fixed income, but also the non-profit institutions dependent upon limited and fixed budgets. The administration wants to do everything it can to halt the erosion of their spending power.

The problem which has been aired about a possible limitation on the number of clinical centers should be viewed in a different context. Here the budget provides for the same funding level in 1970 as in 1969. We are developing plans for administering that budget. Rising costs, changing technology and changing programs have caused us to examine the possibility that it might further the program objectives to operate fewer clinical centers of higher quality rather than spread the funds among all centers. This examination is under way. Meanwhile, the centers which might be affected have been notified of the possibility of adoption of this policy.

Yet, all this uproar centers around a difference of from $3 to $5 million.

For fiscal 1969, the Johnson administration asked for $35.7 million for clinical research programs and received an appropriation of $35 million—an increase of some $5 million over the 1968 operating level. But, even at that rate, rising costs necessitated a decrease in the number of active research beds.

Now, for the current fiscal year, the Nixon administration called for a continuation in the downward trend in these important research areas—in fields such as heart disease and stroke, cancer, arthritis, and diabetes, neurologic and sensory diseases, respiratory diseases, hormone abnormalities, and chromosomal and hereditary diseases.

The Nixon budget requested only $35 million, a total at which all centers could not be maintained even at minimal operating levels. However, an additional allocation of between $3 to $5 million would bridge the gap and allow all 93 centers to move ahead with research operations.

Thus—as predicted—we come to the matter of priorities. The Nixon administration never hesitates recommending billions of dollars to build "high priority" items such as the Safeguard ABM and the supersonic transport. And we certainly "need" all those highways, bridges, and dams.

I question by what means the public interest gets furthered by commitments to such obvious boondoggles as ABM and SST. But where do the budget slashes come? First we had the severe Job Corps cutback; now, it is medical research. Education has not fared too well either.

Indeed, there have been reductions in the military budget—as well as in other areas. But, the brunt of cutbacks is being borne by critical human investment programs, and, over the long run, this course probably will be the most costly of all.

Certainly, Congress has not failed to recognize the foolishness of budget reductions in these vital areas. First the Joelson amendment and then this week's Cohelan resolution stopgapped potential dangerous cuts in education programs. So far, the prospect is also encouraging for medical research.

In the House-passed Labor-Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill, the proposed medical research slowdown was halted by an addition of some $3.9 million—enough to fully fund all ongoing programs. The Senate Appropriations Committee is now working on the measure and, according to latest reports, at least the $38.9 million level will be approved.

The onus now falls upon the administration. How will the administration act if Congress approves the higher figure? That is the main question I have raised in a letter sent today to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch, a copy of which I place in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1969.

The Honorable ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee will recommend that the higher figure of $38.9-million be allocated for fiscal 1970 General Clinical Research Centers programs.

Acceptance of the $38.9-million amount should more than serve to make up the forecast funding gap which would have led to the slowdown and elimination of a number of clinical research projects.

According to the plans announced in September by Dr. Egeberg, the General Clinical Research Center at the Los Angeles Children's Hospital would have been affected by the cutback. I believe that such a move would have many adverse results, and that this research deserves a much higher priority.

If the higher $38.9-million level is approved by the Congress, will the administration still progress in its plans to reduce the General Clinic Research Centers program, and will the Center at Children's Hospital still be closed?

I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible on this important matter.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Of course, I am alarmed over these possible cutbacks because of the effects it might have on research and treatment in the Los Angeles Children's Hospital. Yet, in conclusion, my concern is even deeper, for I think the cavalier attitude of the Nixon administration on the subject of across-the-board budget cutting reveals the distortions through which our leaders view their sense of national priorities.

CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH FOUNDATION

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the phenominal achievements of our scientists and technologists in propelling man to the outer reaches of space have enkindled a feeling among many that there are no problems which man cannot solve.

Yet, despite our sophisticated advances in outer space, we know there are many unresolved problems in the inner cities, and the "inner space" of the hearts and minds of men.

In this regard, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to my colleagues' attention an interesting and provocative address on this subject delivered by Mr. Charles H. Silver, chairman of the Alfred E. Smith Foundation, which he delivered at the foundation's annual dinner in New York recently:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN, ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA, OCTOBER 16, 1969

Some time ago, several days after the unforgettable landing of America's space explorers, I had the good fortune to spend several minutes in rewarding conversation with His Eminence.

I was profoundly moved by the things he said concerning this incredible exploit. There came back to me some lines I had once read in a science book when I was just a boy:

"A day will come when men will walk upon the moon—but you and I will not live to see it."

Well, that day has come. Men of our nation have walked upon the moon—and you and I have lived to see it.

We have demonstrated a dramatic breakthrough . . . in breaching time and space, traveling undreamed distance at unbelievable speed to reveal the mysteries of the universe within the margins of a television screen.

You must thrill—as I do—to the presence on this occasion of that great and inspired guiding spirit of our space program, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Thomas O. Paine.

I am sure that Dr. Paine will appreciate the sentiments that move me as I say that one picture out of all those hours of prayer and suspense remains indelibly in my mind—and I do not mean the overwhelming excitement of the moment our spacecraft landed—nor even when civilization held its breath as the first men from the planet Earth set foot on the lunar surface.

The scene—forever beyond forgetting—is that of a small globe suspended in space—caught in the lens of the camera countless miles out in the vast celestial void. We saw a tiny sphere so perfectly formed—spinning with its oceans and continents, its mountains and rivers, its natural wonders, its man-made wonders, bearing upon its face billions upon billions of people of every race and nation, culture, color and creed.

This was a view of the world that men had never seen before—and we knew, as we watched, awed and perhaps even shaken, why God, when He created the earth, had said it was "good."

And so, in greeting you this evening at the 24th annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, I feel that as we gather in tribute to the memory of democracy's "Happy Warrior" we, too, achieve a new attitude of the intellect.

From it, we survey the surface of our earth—perhaps even the state of things a bit below the surface. We seek to learn from what we know of our world and ourselves—and from the words of those great figures of our time assembled on this dais—whether we have kept faith and can truly say today of the things left in our keeping that they still are "good."

Oh, we have worked miracles. We have probed the secret soul of the cosmos.

But let us, for these precious moments, return from outer space and probe our own souls. Let us answer to our conscience which echoes the burning questions raised on countless acres of college campus and in so many schoolrooms only yesterday . . . the questions of a new generation and generations yet unborn:

"What have you done with the 'inner space' of humanity's self respect . . . man's right to home . . . and happiness . . . to equality, liberty and justice . . . his right to share the blessings of God and of the life God gave him?"

We have let things go from bad to worse and now it is late—very late. And it is sad that men who can soar to the limit of the skies cannot maintain a climate of order, peace and justice on their own planet.

If there is hope, it is in the exalting example of such models of mankind's better self as our host this evening—that Prince of God and Prince among men—His Eminence Terence Cardinal Cooke.

Rare souls, like our cherished friend, His Eminence, can, perhaps, chart our way on earth as others have charted the heavens.

If our world must change—and our way of life—it is not merely to assure a better tomorrow for our children—but any tomorrow at all for anyone.

We live in an abundant society and thousands starve—not just in far-off lands that weigh lightly on our responsibility—but within our very borders.

We live in an age of scientific and medical marvels—yet our streets crawl with drug addicts and despair. Innocent victims of af-

flictions that we have the means to cure are dying because they lack the means to pay.

I am not talking in exaggerated or sensational terms. I am telling it "like it is"—and each day's headlines say it must not stay that way much longer.

Let us make this the kind of world that ought to be for every creature on God's earth . . . every man, woman and child that needs a change for the better, new standards, new opportunities, health, homes, education, dignity and hope.

Before we abandon any of our brothers who are hungry, helpless, in want or in fear—let us, if need be, change the world.

Let us make it the way God created it to be—so that he may look at it once more, a clean, perfect sphere spinning in space—and say again that it is "good."

The prosperity and privileges of our land, the opportunities of education, health, good housing and good jobs must not be enjoyed only by a particular part of our people.

If there is enough for everybody, let's make sure that everybody has enough of everything.

Thus we may paraphrase the wording on the plaque that now rests upon the surface of the moon and say that—in our time—men of the planet Earth first set foot upon a brave, new path to peace and justice for all mankind.

And, please God, we shall live to see it.

LSD A KILLER

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread abuse and illegal traffic in depressants, stimulants, and hallucinatory drugs. The users of these drugs have little or no conception of the sometimes dangerous and permanent effects of such use. The users can become physically or emotionally dependent upon these drugs, but they do not yet have the same social stigma that is associated with the use of narcotic drugs.

For example, the use of LSD has been openly and irresponsibly promoted for its alleged mind-expanding effect. However, experience has shown that users of LSD may actually lose their capacity to think clearly, to create, to reason, or to use their minds productively. In addition, LSD can cause serious and permanent mental changes, nervous breakdowns, and lead to violence and self-destruction.

One such unfortunate incident has reached the headlines of our newspapers. I am including in my remarks a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Star pertaining to the untimely death of the daughter of Art Linkletter. This story tells far more eloquently than I the dangers inherent in merely experimenting with such drugs as LSD.

It is my hope that many of our young people and parents will read this article and come to the realization that the only result of the use of LSD is tragedy to their families and to themselves. Lives are being shackled in chemical chains because the users do not recognize the potential dangers of these drugs.

The article follows:

LINKLETTER TELLS OF DAUGHTER'S SUICIDE: DRUG DEATH DRAMA UNFOLDS AT WHITE HOUSE

(By Garnett D. Horner)

Art Linkletter recited the personal tragedy of his daughter's suicide to a White House conference today in an effort to alert parents that their children will be tempted to take drugs.

President Nixon, administration officials concerned with the dangerous drug problem and congressional leaders of both parties listened in rapt silence as Linkletter told how LSD had taken the life of his daughter Diane.

At the end of the nearly 2-hour meeting, there was general agreement among the senators and congressmen that the administration's proposals for a new law to tighten up efforts to wipe out traffic in dangerous drugs and to provide flexible penalties for marijuana users and first offenders in particular would be spurred to passage.

Linkletter, a television personality and old friend of Nixon, told the group that "two weeks ago my beautiful 20-year-old daughter leaped to her death from her apartment, while in a depressed, suicidal frame of mind, in a panic believing she was losing her mind from recurring bad trips as a result of LSD experiments six months before."

Linkletter said he decided that "this tragic death would not be hushed up" and that he would "speak out to shock the nation—that this wasn't happening to some other people's children in some poor part of town—that this could happen to a well-educated, intelligent girl" of a traditionally Christian and "straight" family.

He emphasized that Diane was not a hippie, not a drug addict, but "had everything to live for and no problems not normal growing-up problems."

Linkletter said one of the dangers of LSD is that it "works in the bloodstream like a tiger—you never know when it is going to hit."

He said his daughter had told him months ago that she had experimented with LSD and found "bum trips" frightened her. She thought use of LSD was ridiculous and that she was not going to do it again.

But, even though she took no more LSD "those trips kept recurring," and led her to think she was losing her mind, Linkletter said.

During the last 10 days, he said he has received "an alarming number" of letters from parents who say they know this is happening in their families and asked him what they should do.

"I was horrified," Linkletter told the group in the White House Cabinet Room, "to find out that I don't know what to tell them."

He said the trouble is that children are reacting to the "drug society." He said they see people on television "popping things into their mouths whether they want to get thin or fat or happy or go to sleep or wake up or erase tensions or take away headaches, or whatever."

He said children in the fourth, fifth and sixth grades should be taught that "you no more put something into your mouth or bloodstream than you walk in front of an automobile or set fire to your dress."

If this is not warning enough to both parents and youth alike of the inherent dangers of LSD experimentation, let me cite some statistics which have been accumulated by Dr. Donald B. Louria, head of the Infectious Disease Laboratory of the Bellevue Hospital in New York. Dr. Louria accumulated statistical data on 114 individuals who used LSD and were admitted to Bellevue Hospital. Of these 114 users, some used LSD as little as only one time and others as often as three times.

There were 13.1 percent of the users who experienced overwhelming panic, 12.3 percent resorted to violence, 8.6 percent of the users endured homicidal or suicidal impulses, 34.2 percent experienced underlying overt mental disease, and 15.8 percent required extended hospitalization.

Surely it should be clear to anyone that even experimentation with LSD is but an invitation to destruction of life. To the youth of America I would say your life lies ahead of you. It will be an exciting one, full of pleasant experiences; do not destroy your chance to enjoy it to its fullest extent. Do not gamble with tragedy.

PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the mail I have been receiving in my office, and the comments I have heard from my constituents when I tour my district, have greatly increased my concern for the plight of the elderly in our country. To find out what might be done to help ease the burden for the elderly, I am sending the following questionnaire to several areas of my district:

From: Congressman CLARENCE D. LONG.

DEAR FRIEND: The plight of the elderly disturbs me deeply. Many have no income other than Social Security. Rising prices make it difficult—even impossible—to get by.

The Nixon Administration proposes a 10% increase in Social Security, including a raise in minimum primary benefits from $55 to $61—effective next year. Too little. Too late. More—much more—is needed now. My bill would increase average benefits by 15%, minimum primary benefits by 45%, from $55 to $80 a month—effective when the bill passes.

My bill is admittedly stop-gap; it will not fully solve the problems of the elderly. Help me learn what else can be done to help. Please fill out the questionnaire below and return it to me.

Warm regards,

CLARENCE D. LONG.

How old are you? ——— Sex: M ——— F ———

Married? ——— Other? ———

Health? ———

Source of income?

——— Earnings from job?

——— Social Security?

——— Disability payments?

——— Pensions? What type? ———

——— Relatives?

——— Savings?

——— Welfare?

How do you live?

——— Own your home?

——— Rent?

——— Live with relatives?

——— Other? ———

I. Do you get enough to live on? ——— If not, what are your biggest problems?

II. Should Social Security Retirement and Disability benefits be liberalized? ——— How?

III. Should Veterans pension and compensation benefits be liberalized? ——— How?

IV. Are you satisfied with Medicare? ——— If not, what should be done?

V. What can the Federal government do to help you make ends meet?

SLOWING PAINS

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has introduced an era of commonsense and hard realism in the handling of our Nation's affairs. It has transferred the emphasis to the back shop rather than the show window.

One of those who has pinpointed the significance of the fight against inflation is Loyal Meeks, chief editorial writer of the Milwaukee Sentinel. Mr. Meeks is not one who speaks only from book knowledge and Ivory Tower meditation. He knows how Government works. He came to the Milwaukee Sentinel from the staff of Senator JACK MILLER of Iowa. He has been here. He knows the problems of Government, and the vagaries of politics. His editorial "Slowing Pains" is food for serious thought, and a call for support of tough, responsible anti-inflation Government policy.

The editorial follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Oct. 20, 1969]

SLOWING PAINS

Good economics doesn't make good politics. President Nixon fully recognizes this but, to his everlasting credit, he is courageously choosing to practice good economics instead of good politics in the battle to control inflation.

It is more fun, while it lasts, to tromp down on the accelerator than it is to step on the brakes. For the last five years, the American economy has been driven with the gas pedal on the floor. Once in a while the brakes have been slammed on at the same time, a simultaneous stopping and going that nearly caused a fatal accident.

In his radio address on the high cost of living, Mr. Nixon put the blame for the spiral of wages and prices squarely where it belongs: Fundamentally on the last policies of your government.

For the last five years, he said, "the federal government spent a lot more than it raised in taxes. . . . To put it bluntly, the frequent failure to balance the federal budget over the last five years has been the primary cause for unbalancing the family budgets of millions of Americans."

Mr. Nixon outlined a three pronged attack his administration is making in the fight against inflation. One is to hold down government spending. He points out that "we cut proposed federal spending by more than $7 billion." The second is to continue the tax surcharge at 10% until Dec. 31 and, if congress approves, at 5% for the next six months. The third is to keep it hard for people to get credit.

This, Mr. Nixon admits, "is not the kind of policy that makes friends for people in politics." Nevertheless, this is the Nixon policy, neither to slam on wage and price controls nor to continue tromping on the accelerator of deficit spending, but to "gently, but firmly, apply the brakes."

In this gradual process, Mr. Nixon concedes, the people are going to experience some "slowing pains" which, like growing pains, "are a healthy development—but pain nevertheless."

The question now is whether Americans are going to be able to endure slowing pains. After an eight year joyride, living it up on credit cards, America has grown soft and accustomed to thinking that pain has been outlawed forever.

But if America won't endure the slowing pains, it is likely to suffer economic pains so excruciating as to make Mr. Nixon's inflation fighting policy seem pleasurable by comparison.

HAZARDOUS TELEVISION SETS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the National Commission on Product Safety on the highly professional manner in which they are handling their investigation into the fire hazards associated with television receivers, particularly color sets. In arriving at their conclusion that there is a hazard associated with particularly color receivers, and that this hazard is potentially significant, they have adhered to the letter as well as the spirit of the law which we enacted to establish the Commission.

Sometime ago, the Commission requested that the major television manufacturers submit, on a confidential basis, records available on the incidence of fires in their products. Most but not all the companies contacted cooperated. The Commission's finding that there is a severe hazard particularly in color receivers was based on this information, spot checks of fire departments in major cities which retain records on the causes of fires, and from estimates which were provided by the National Fire Protection Association and the International Association of Electrical Engineers.

Taken together, the data which the Commission has developed indicates that there are at least 10,000 home fires each year caused by television receivers. This figure could very well be much higher since the 10,000 figure is an estimate based on samples from the States of New Hampshire, Illinois, and Oregon and because many large cities such as Philadelphia were unable to provide the Commission with information on television fires because of the way in which their records are set up. Another reason why I believe that this figure could be much higher is because consumers may well have a fire in their set and extinguish it before it spreads to the full house. After such a fire, I know they will not, as a general rule, notify the manufacturers because more often than not their warranty has expired.

The Commission's findings indicate that the component parts of television receivers which cause fires are the transformer, the high voltage case, the a.c. switch yoke and other parts to a lesser degree. The parts mentioned have caused over two-thirds of the reported fires.

This past Tuesday the Commission agreed unanimously that the data they had received showed that the public interest demanded its release. Accordingly, the Commission sent a telegram to the following manufacturers and asked that they meet with the Commission this Friday to hear its recommendations and comment on its findings prior to release of the Commissions' complete finding to the public:

Admiral Corp.
Ford Motor Co.
General Electric Co.
Hitachi Sales Corp. of America.
Olympic Division, Lear Siegler, Inc.
The Magnavox Co.
Matsushita Electric Corp. of America.
Motorola, Inc.
National Union Electric Corp.
Packard Bell Electronics.
Philco-Ford Corp.
Radio Corp. of America.
Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Sony Corp. of America.
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Toshiba of America.
Warwick Electronics, Inc.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Zenith Radio Corp.
Electronics Industries Association.

This morning the Commission recommended that the manufacturers overhaul their recordkeeping procedures so that complete and accurate records of product fires are kept. The Commission also noted that it could not release to the public the names of the chief offending companies because of the wide disparity between the recorded data submitted by them. The Commission felt that one company should not be penalized for accurate recordkeeping while another company received an unfair competitive advantage because of a lackadaisical attitude towards keeping their records. Other recommendations of the Commission were that in addition to industrywide recordkeeping procedures, the companies engage in immediate redesign of their receivers to eliminate fire hazards.

The Commission is to be commended on its continuing excellent service to the public. If all our Government commissions did their job as well as this one, the taxpayers would be getting more than their money's worth. I have indicated before that I believe it is perfectly conceivable that the Commission could save one life or save one adult or child from a debilitating injury for each dollar we spend on its operation. That is quite a return on any investment. The people of the Nation have a responsible and effective champion in the Commission on Product Safety.

HANOI'S DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Life Lines, a patriotic voice of freedom, presented a most thought-provoking report on October 27, entitled, "So You Want to Get Out of Vietnam."

The leadership of "Operation Bug-Out" has been unfailingly wrong in every activity from SDS to LSD, from Ho to Hue. There is no reason to suppose that it is less wrong now.

I include this report following my remarks:

SO YOU WANT TO GET OUT OF VIETNAM

So you want to get us out of Vietnam? You hate this war, this war in the wrong place at the wrong time. The killing of helpless Vietnamese citizens.

Well, a lot of people hate war, but they are not confused by the intellectual lies and the foul reports that pass as news reports and "news" interpretation.

The people who hate war as much as you also hate what will happen to the South Vietnamese when the sweet "nationalists" as you call the Communists, take over. And take over they will, because the word is out now about what the peacenik solution to Vietnam will be if you have your way. That word is *coalition*, or death to any South Vietnamese who isn't a Communist.

The Communists proved that when they took over the ancient city of Hue during the Vietcong TET offensive. The sweet harmless "nationalists," as you call them, killed hundreds of peasants. With a shot in the head at close range.

Let us go back to the reasons why you are so wrong, so reckless with the truth and the fate of millions.

You say we are killing Vietnamese. You bet your last McCarthy button we are. We are killing Communists who have invaded the south with the full intent of taking it over and Sovietizing it. The south will become an unlivable hell. Why do you ignore Hue? Why, in lauding the sweet nationalists don't you call them Communists who build walls and kill teenagers who try to escape to freedom? How many times has that happened at the Berlin Wall?

Why have you lauded Ho Chi Minh and criticized South Vietnamese President Thieu? Do you know you are praising a bloodthirsty cutthroat who learned everything he knew about killing at the Russian Communist Comintern's school for revolutionaries in Moscow in the 1920's? You didn't know that because Mike Wallace and Eric Sevareid and Huntley and Brinkly and Walter Cronkite and Frank Reynolds never mentioned it. The Library of Congress mentioned it, back in 1965 when they released his biography. Ask yourself why the liberal news media ignored it. You should be rather angry, because you have been given only the information the news and entertainment media wanted you to have. Still, they and you think Ho was a great patriot. You say Thieu and Ky are corrupt. You have it all bass ackwards.

Thieu and Ky are the leaders of a country whose countryside filled with refugees who fled south to escape the communism in the north. They are not corrupt: they represent the last bastion in a divided country for people who don't want to be Sovietized. You would deny them their right to their life as they want to lead it.

You say Americans are tired of this war, because it is a bad war, raised by the imperialist Americans. If you haven't said that phrase yourself, and you are demonstrating, salivating at the Pavlovian anti-intellectualisms of the McCarthies, Fulbrights and Churches, why are you demonstrating? They are helping the Communists. Why are you?

Americans *are* tired of this war. They are tired of the incessant propagandizing of doves, dupes, soft-headed pacifists and friends of Soviet communism whose voices have been amplified by a news media that doesn't deserve the name. The constant, bloodthirsty cries to get us of out of Vietnam are nothing more than those of a mouse with an amplifier. And you think it is the voice of the virtuous majority.

Have you looked around to see who's with you in this?

Well, there are the men in the Kremlin who captured a third of the world's population since 1917 by killing, starving or imprisoning upwards of 30 million people since they went into business. They are "nationalists" too. They have sent the tanks back to Hungary and Czechoslovakia to preserve freedom such as it is known in North Vietnam. And you say we are "imperialists."

Like some Congressmen pointed out the other day, Hanoi is on your side. You have allied yourself with the butchers of Hue—indeed with the executioners of thousands of South Vietnamese. The record has been documented: there are literally thousands of *recorded* instances of beheadings, bombings, disembowelments. But you can't have known about that—Chet, Walter and Frank never told you, because they were busy telling stories about napalm and Dow Chemical Company.

Speaking of Hanoi, if the North Vietnamese are such patriotic "nationalists," why are North Vietnamese troops swarming all over Laos, Cambodia and Thailand, why are they executing people in those countries just as they have beheaded and disemboweled those in South Vietnam? How much of a threat do these countries pose to the patriotic "nationalists" in North Vietnam? Who invaded whom? For what purpose? Good questions. Try to put Fulbright and McCarthy and McGovern out of your heart for a while and sort those questions out in your mind.

North Korea is on your side, too. It constantly sends saboteur teams into South Korea to "nationalize" the south. North Korea also treats American prisoners with delicate care—remember what the crew of the *Pueblo tried* to tell you about how unspeakably inhuman a Communist, a North Korean, can be? North Korea is rooting for you every time you take to the streets or indulge your fantasies in a Vietnam Moratorium.

The East European satellites are on your side because they are supplying the tools with which to kill the "imperialist" Americans and South Vietnamese. Of course, the East Europeans don't have much choice in the matter. They can't leave their countries in protest. They can't speak out in the press and television. The Communists in Moscow won't let them. Remember Dubcek? Czechoslovakia? The writers Yuli Daniel and Sinyavsky? That's the kind of freedom you are fighting for. Daniel and Sinyavsky are in prison.

Look around you again. Why, the clergy is even with you, albeit a microscopic portion of these disciples of God, who deny Him, who talk of doing your thing in church, such as rockin' and rollin'. They are the same ones who talk about human rights over property rights, which sounds good until you realize a lot of people were Sovietized before they realized such a thought was Communist to the core.

Who are the scholarly types beside you in the crowd? Professors who wouldn't recognize a Communist if one hit them with a hammer and a sickle. They counsel draft evasion, SDS courses, and a peculiar "freedom." They have taught many all they know, which isn't much. They teach permissivism and irresponsibility, but they don't teach about real American values or representative democracy. Many of them have written textbooks notable entirely for attacks on the free enterprise system which has kept you in the state of affluence to which you became accustomed but now try to destroy, textbooks which achieved a new high in omission of such names as Nathan Hale, Caesar Rodney and "I have not yet begun to fight." They are intellectual cretins, of such insubstantial substance that they never knew how good the American system is. And they taught you all they know. They are sick and have created legions of students who don't read well, and reason even less.

The *New York Times* is with you, but then, you know all about *it*. This great newspaper said Fidel Castro was the George Washington of the Caribbean, a great man. Other people didn't believe the *Times*, and have left Cuba at the rate of thousands each month for the last two years. With newspapers like this behind you, how could you possibly be right? The *Times* did as much to put Fidel and those missiles on that now miserable island as Khrushchev ever did. In fact, Khrushchev couldn't have done it alone.

Oh yes, Fidel is solidly behind you. Fidel believes in "nationalist patriotism" of the North Vietnamese variety. He orders that people who escape from his island on innertubes and creaky rowboats be machine gunned to death. Are you beginning to feel uneasy?

The Americans for Democratic Action is right in there pitching too. It believes in and pushes every program Marx ever thought of. If the ADA gets its way, we'll be just like the Soviet Union—but we'll have to get rid of most of our telephones, 80% of our consumer goods, all of our pot and LSD, and all our four freedoms to be as "good" as the Russians and the North Vietnamese.

Absolutely bubbling with enjoyment over the war dissent is the American Civil Liberties Union which has represented just about every Communist and anarchist who ever broke a U.S. law. Are you uncomfortable?

Those are some of your fellow dissenters. We feel, however, that they haven't been entirely honest with you.

This Vietnam war dissent is mostly sham, a means to an end. It is only one of the programs dreamed up by the Communists who have a very great vested interest in seeing us "bug out" of Vietnam, then they will know we haven't the guts to fight them anywhere. Go to Hawaii in five years—if we do get out of Vietnam—and you might just get arrested by a Bolshevik for surfboarding when you should have been picking pineapples for the glorious future of Socialism (communism). Fidel has a similar program going in his sugarcane fields. You cut cane or get planed.

The Vietnam war dissent is baked over Bolshevism, chocolated chicanery, sugar-coated communist. It takes your normal abhorrence of war, twists it all around, and uses it for the benefit of the most practiced killers of freedom the world has ever known.

Look around you and wonder if you are in the right place. What you are doing is making history. Just don't make the wrong bloody kind.—KK**

THE NINTH NEW JERSEY DICTRICT RESIDENTS SPEAK OUT

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out my annual questionnaire to the 155,000 families of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, a district which I have the honor and privilege to represent. From this mailing, I received 27,307 responses, a very gratifying number. This, I feel, is indicative of the widespread interest and great concern that the American people have for the problems facing our Nation and the world today.

The annual questionnaire method of sampling district opinion has and continues to be an informal and convenient means for my constituents to express their views and judgments on the issues. For me it serves as a guide in reflecting

the desires of the people of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey.

The results of the questionnaire more than compensate for the time-consuming work of preparation and tabulation, and are an invaluable aid in providing a good index of public opinion on the various issues.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to all the Ninth District residents who took the time and effort to study, evaluate, and respond to the questionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, tabulating the over 27,000 responses was a tremendous task. Now that it has been completed, I intend to have the results circulated within my district, so that my constituents may compare their views and thoughts with those of their neighbors and friends.

I would like to make a few brief observations on the responses and trends of opinion which are evident in certain areas.

In 1966, 1968, and now, in 1969, I asked the question, "Would you support a negotiated settlement in Vietnam which provides for participation by the National Liberation Front—Vietcong—in a coalition government?" The results over these years reveal a strong upward trend toward permitting the Vietcong to participate in any discussions. In 1966 there was a 51.7 favorable response; in 1968, it rose to 53.6 percent, and the latest response is 58.4 percent. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the people want an end to the war.

Another aspect of the Vietnam question indicated that 66.4 percent of my constituents favor support of economic aid to Southeast Asia if a "satisfactory" solution is found to the Vietnam problem. The same question, asked in 1968, had a 60.8 percent favorable reply. Thus, while my constituents desire an end to the war, they are willing to extend economic aid to help the people of that area.

The returned questionnaires indicated a deep interest in the role of the military in our Nation; 81 percent of my constituents believe that military spending is excessive and in some cases wasteful; 14.6 percent feel that present levels of spending are adequate and 10.1 percent are undecided on this subject.

In connection with the military, my constituents were asked to reflect their views on the present selective service system. To completely overhaul and reform the system was advocated by 46.8 percent; an all volunteer army was supported by 22.3 percent; the lottery system was approved by 16.2 percent; and 14.4 percent indicated their willingness to see the system operate in its present manner.

My constituents were asked what attempts should be made to solve the Mid-East question; 64.4 percent of the replies favored a face-to-face negotiation between the Israeli-Arab nations, while 35.5 percent supported the concept that a four-power sponsorship of negotiations between these nations should be undertaken to guarantee peace in that area of the world.

In regard to domestic problems, 37.8 percent of my constituents support the reduction in military spending as one method of curbing inflation; 19.4 percent expressed themselves favorably toward cutting Federal spending and cutbacks in Federal programs, and 42.8 percent favored both approaches.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of voting and elections, I presented two questions to my constituents. The first was whether we should allow 18-year-olds the right to vote. The replies indicated 51.9 percent favorable to this action, 42.2 percent against the proposal, and 5.8 percent were undecided. In comparison, the same question in 1968 was favored by 43.7 percent of the people, 49.8 percent opposed it, and 6.4 percent were undecided. This latest poll indicates a shift of over 8 percent in favor of granting our younger men and women the right to participate in our electoral processes.

The second question was directed to the process of electing the President and Vice President. In 1968, 74.8 percent of the replies favored the direct election of our Nation's two highest officials. However, the questionnaire for this year showed an increase to 81.4 percent in favor of direct elections. Those favoring the electoral college system based upon congressional district votes amounted to 12.8 percent and the retention of the present system was advocated by 5.8 percent of my constituents.

In view of the disturbances on college campuses, I asked the question whether college administrations have sufficient authority and legal recourse to curtail these disturbances. On this, 56.9 percent of my constituents feel that they have; 33.7 percent believe that they do not, and 5.7 percent were undecided.

Many of my constituents had written some additional views on this subject and a good number felt that, while the power to curb disturbances is available, the school administrators were hesitant or reluctant to exercise it to the fullest advantage.

The growing problem of the use of drugs among our younger people prompted me to ask the question whether the use of Federal funds in elementary and secondary schools for special drug education should be permitted. On this question I received a 62.9 percent favorable reply; 28.7 percent were opposed and 8.3 percent undecided.

It was evident from the replies that the average consumer desires additional protection from being exploited by unscrupulous merchants. In that respect 74.4 percent of my constituents favor the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs; 18 percent are opposed; 7.5 percent were undecided on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, there is a continued interest in our space program, but apparently not at the same pace as was indicated in the past. The responses on this question were fairly evenly distributed. In response to the question, "Should the space program be continued with planning for further moon landings and exploration of other planets?", 42.4 percent of the replies favor a continuation of the project; 42.3 oppose it and 15.2 percent are undecided.

In two of my questions, I asked my constituents to list the order of their preference for priorities to be undertaken regarding our national problems and the pressing need for tax reforms.

Since my constituents had the opportunity to evaluate which programs, in their judgment, was uppermost and since 17 were being rated, this was the most difficult part of the questionnaire to tabulate. Education and crime control elicited the greatest interest, and foreign aid, as a first choice, was last on the list. The complete listing of these priorities, as expressed by my constituents and according to their rank are included in the tabulation as question 11.

Also, on the subject of taxes, my constituents had several options to list their choices on the subject of priorities in tax reforms. Reduction of the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance for the petroleum industry was the first choice of 36.4 percent of my constituents, and eliminating the special tax treatment for stock options was endorsed by 23.3 percent. The remainder of this category is listed in the tabulation as question 15.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting these results, I feel that they represent a good cross-section of opinions and views. I value the time and care my constituents took in completing the questionnaire. I am grateful for the splendid cooperation that was extended to me on this matter.

I would like to include at this point, Mr. Speaker, the complete tabulation of the question covered in my 1969 legislative questionnaire.

The tabulation follows:

THE 1969 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE, 9TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

[In percent]

VIETNAM

1. Which do you favor:

(a) following the present military course in Vietnam and at the same time U.S. participation in the Paris peace talks, 11.3.

(b) an increase in the U.S. military effort, 9.6.

(c) continued gradual withdrawal and phasing out of U.S. troops beyond the contemplated 25,000, 24.7.

(d) unilateral withdrawal of all U.S. troops to be replaced by the South Vietnamese, 32.2.

(e) a U.S. declaration for a mutual cease fire to be supervised by the U.N., 17.8.

2. Would you support a negotiated settlement in Vietnam which provides for participation by the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) in a coalition government?

Yes	58.4
No	30.4
Undecided	11.1

3. If a "satisfactory" solution of the Vietnam problem is found, would you support continued U.S. economic assistance in Southeast Asia?

Yes	64.4
No	24.3
Undecided	9.2

MILITARY

4. With regard to the ABM system, which do you favor:

(a) deployment now, 22.2.

(b) continued research and testing but no deployment, 31.7.

(c) no deployment pending the results of nuclear arms talks with other powers, 35.8.

(d) undecided, 10.1.

5. Is military spending at the present time

(a) excessive and in some certain areas wasteful, 81.

(b) adequate at the present levels, 14.6.
(c) insufficient and needs to be increased, 4.3.

6. Which do you favor:
(a) continuation of the present Selective Service System, 14.4.
(b) a lottery system for inductions, 16.2.
(c) an all-volunteer army, 22.3.
(d) a complete overhaul and reform of the System, 46.8.

INTERNATIONAL

7. Should the U.S. play a larger role in efforts to alleviate the widespread starvation in Biafra?

Yes	54.6
No	34.5
Undecided	10.7

8. Would you support Israel's refusal to withdraw her troops until she has firm guarantees of her sovereignty, peaceful existence, and access to all waterways by the Arab countries?

Yes	68.8
No	20.9
Undecided	10.1

9. Should attempts to solve the Mid-East question be made by:
(a) face to face negotiations involving Israel and the Arab Nations only, 64.4.
(b) Four-Power sponsorship of negotiations with guarantees of peace between Israel and the Arab Nations, 35.5.

10. After the disorders during Gov. Rockefeller's recent trip to South America, which policy should U.S. follow:
(a) re-evaluate our present aid program, 85.4.
(b) discontinue aid to South America, 10.
(c) continue present policies, 4.6.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

11. If the Vietnam war is ended, what should our order of priority be. Please rank the following (1, 2, 3, etc.):
Education—public schools and higher education.
Public works—highway construction, etc.
Conservation and recreation.
Federal support for State welfare costs.
Urban mass transportation.
Veterans benefits.
Antipoverty programs—including job training.
Increased social security and medicare benefits.
Pollution control.
Space exploration.
Health care and health research.
Tax cuts.
Crime control.
Narcotics control.
National defense.
Housing and urban development.
Foreign aid.
Other.

Tabulation results:

Education	11.4
Crime control	10.1
Antipoverty programs—including job training	9.5
Tax cuts	9.3
Pollution control	9.1
Narcotic control	8.8
Health care and health research	8.1
Increased social security and medicare benefits	7.6
Housing and urban development	7.1
National defense	5.2
Urban mass transportation	4.2
Public works, highway construction, etc.	3.4
Veterans benefits	2.4
Space exploration	1.3
Conservation and recreation	1.1
Federal support for State welfare costs	.9
Foreign aid	.2

ECONOMY

12. To stop inflation, Congress has been asked to continue the income surtax at the current rate of 10% from July-December, and at a rate 5% from January to June 1970. Do you support this plan?

Yes	40.1
No	51.9
Undecided	7.8

13. As one method of combating inflation do you favor:
(a) a reduction in military spending, 37.8.
(b) a reduction in federal spending and cutbacks in programs, 19.4.
(c) both, 42.8.

14. Do you favor increasing the personal tax exemption beyond the present $600 to $1000 or $1200.

Yes	87.2
No	7.5
Undecided	5.2

15. Which, if any, of the following changes should be made in the tax law in order to close tax loopholes. Please rank the following (1, 2, 3, etc.):
Reduce the 27½% depletion allowance for the petroleum industries.
Make capital gains taxable at death.
Eliminate special tax treatment for stock options.
Repeal the tax exempt status of municipal bonds.
Require all people earning more than $50,000 yearly to pay a minimum tax equal to 20% of their income, regardless of source.
Review the tax exempt status of foundations.
Tax religious and charitable organizations.

Tabulation results:

Reduce the 27½% oil depletion allowance for the petroleum industry	36.4
Eliminate special tax treatment of stock options	23.3
Require all people earning more than $50,000 yearly to pay a minimum tax equal to 20 percent of their income, regardless of source	13.1
Review the tax exempt status of foundations	9.6
Tax religious and charitable organizations	7.4
Repeal the tax exempt status of municipal bonds	5.1
Make capital gains taxable at death	4.0

ELECTIONS

16. New Jersey will have a referendum this November on the 18 year old voting age. Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution allowing 18 year olds to vote?

	Percent
Yes	51.9
No	42.2
Undecided	5.8

17. Which system of election for the President and Vice President would you favor:
(a) direct election by the people, 81.4.
(b) an electoral college system based on Congressional Districts (The person carrying a District would receive one vote in the Electoral College), 12.8.
(c) the Electoral College system as it now stands, 5.8.

DOMESTIC

18. Do you believe college administrations have sufficient power and legal recourse to curtail any disturbances?

Yes	56.9
No	37.3
Undecided	5.7

19. Should federal funds be used for special drug education courses in elementary and secondary schools?

Yes	62.9
No	28.7
Undecided	8.3

20. Now that man has landed on the moon, should the space program be continued with planning for further landings and explorations of other planets?

Yes	52.4
No	42.3
Undecided	15.2

21. Should a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs be created to protect consumers from exploitation?

Yes	74.4
No	18.0
Undecided	7.5

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE: 25 YEARS YOUNG

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot, Israel, is one of the major centers of scientific research in the fields of natural and applied sciences. The school has an international reputation and enjoys links with leading institutions of its kind throughout the world. Scientists from major universities in the United States and Britain in particular like to spend their sabbaticals at Rehovot.

Sunday marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the institute and the date of inauguration of Dr. Albert B. Sabin, who developed the oral polio vaccine, as Weizmann's new president.

The New York Times carried an article by James Feron assessing the dramatic accomplishments of this great scientific institution on Thursday. That article follows:

WEIZMANN INSTITUTE: 25 YEARS YOUNG

(By James Feron)

REHOVOT, ISRAEL, October 29.—Like many 25-year-olds, the Weizmann Institue of Science seems full of energy and ambition these days.

A group of American friends of the institute led by Dr. Albert B. Sabin, who is taking over as president, will arrive tomorrow for 25th-anniversary celebrations that will begin on Sunday.

The heart of a good research institute is its research, of course. The Weizmann Institute has become a major center in the fields of molecular biology, theoretical geophysics, nuclear physics and the study of arid zones.

The school has an international reputation and enjoys links with leading institutions of its kind throughout the world. Scientists from major universities in the United States and Britain in particular like to spend their sabbaticals at Rehovot.

There is a complement of 1,600, including 250 full-time scientists, and the work is supported by grants, gifts and sponsored research. The institute has a brain drain in reverse, attracting more staff members than it loses.

The institute's vigor is evident in the laboratories and offices on the tree-shaded campus—in the visions, for example of a man like Prof. Michael Feldman, who comments:

"What makes us different here? Well, the crosscurrents, perhaps, for one thing. It's simply that everyone is interested in what everyone else is doing."

Professor Feldman, a 43-year-old Israeli, is dean of the Feinberg Graduate School and chairman of the cellbiology department, one of the institute's largest.

The uniqueness of the place, one of the world's leading research centers, may be its "interdisciplinary aspect," he said, adding: "We have all the specialties here, and this is unusual—perhaps even unique—for a research institute."

He spoke of the early days and confirmed the impression offered by a colleague that it was here that the sabras, the native-born like Professor Feldman, came into their own in the field of scientific research.

Technion (Israel's institute of technology) and Hebrew University, began with professors from Germany, and elsewhere, he said, while the Weizmann started with young men who were getting their doctorates. "We still have a young staff," he said: "Most of our department heads are in their late thirties or early forties."

Another professor, Joseph Gillis, British-born and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, speaks across a desk littered with papers:

"When I came here there were two buildings and this is one of them. Now I lose my way around the place. The roads don't even go in the same directions any more."

Professor Gillis, 58, chairman of the institute's equivalent of a senate, has seen the development of new disciplines, such as nuclear physics, and of new devices, such as the Golem computer, designed and built at the institute and named for the legendary artificial man.

"One of the most important changes was the decision to have a graduate school," he said. "We started it in 1958 and it changed the atmosphere considerably."

The atmosphere may change soon again as the institute named for Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the scientist who was Israel's first President, prepares for new administrative and scientific leadership. The prospect is awaited with some uneasiness.

Meyer Weisgal, the colorful and dynamic president, is retiring at the age of 75. The top administrative post will be taken by Dr. Sabin, the 63-year-old American scientist who developed the oral vaccine for poliomyelitis.

"We don't know how he will see the role of president," an institute official said. "Weisgal was not a scientist but Sabin is, and a distinguished one. We don't know how deeply he will penetrate into the scientific work here."

Last month the institute lost its most influential scientist with the death of Prof. Amos De Shali, an internationally known nuclear physicist, who was 43. One of the institute's leading spirits, he had given up the post of scientific director not long before. His death rocked the Weizmann.

"He had tremendous speed of perception," a colleague said. "You could convince him of something over the phone, and the next morning it was being implemented. And he had great vision."

He has been replaced by Prof. Gerhard Schmidt, head of the department of chemistry. "Professor Schmidt works more through organizational means," the same colleague said, "but maybe the time has come to work that way."

The institute has been changing since Dr. Weizmann, a leading chemist and a Zionist leader, and his supporters created a research center at the edge of the desert in a town that has a population of only 40,000 today.

ZIONIST ANTI-INTELLECTUALISM

It came into being before the birth of Israel in 1948 and, strangely, in the face of an early Zionist attitude of anti-intellectualism. Those were the days when a professor would remark with pride that a brilliant student had given up mathematics to work on the land.

Some of the present leaders see that attitude as one of the motivations for the peripheral interests of many staff members—a feeling that pure research is a luxury neither the nation nor the institute can afford.

On the other hand, the institute serves Israeli needs in such areas as research in desalination and other water problems, in the development of grains and plastics and in the solution of highly complex problems for the Israeli Air Force.

The graduate school is an example of the need to provide service. Another is the work inspired largely by Professor De Shalit in the teaching of science, now a department at the institute. New textbooks are being developed and new teaching techniques established.

"The future should not be an imitation of the past," Professor Feldman says, speaking of the need to direct students to undeveloped areas of science—modern neurophysiology, applied physics, computer sciences—and also to expose students of the natural sciences to the social sciences in a more meaningful way than the inclusion of minor subjects.

Professor Gillis, whose field is applied mathematics, conducts a mathematics olympiad, a nationwide competition for children up to the age of 18. He also publishes a mathematics quarterly.

Dotting the hills and roads nearby are 10 science-based industries, the most advanced such cluster in Israel. They produce membranes for desalination, bio-medical instruments, optical components and educational aids—as well as secret devices for the air force.

The landscaped grounds, almost tropical in places, attract 200,000 tourists a year. There is a scientific summer camp for gifted children. About 100 visiting scientists are on hand nearly all the time.

Some of the industries were founded by scientists from the institute, men whose interests were not satisfied even within its generous grounds.

LUCILE KOHN CELEBRATES HER 87TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful month is October, for its natural beauties of course but also for some of the people it gave to the country and the world—people like Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Eisenhower, Senator Frank Graham, and Dr. Lucile Kohn.

Today, I want to talk about Lucile Kohn, who is perhaps less widely known than some of the others born this month, but whose life has been as great a boon to those who have been touched by it as any life can be. She marks this month her 87th birthday, still teaching, still toiling, still twinkling—still enchanting—always ready to help any in need, always applying her great ranging intellect to enlighten those about her.

The vast array of groups and individuals that have enjoyed and profited from Lucile Kohn's wisdom and energies extend over so many areas—and so many decades—that it would be risky for any one person to try to list them. Her niche in the history of the American labor movement is unique and secure, and her contributions to American education overshadow those of many who have held higher office and have received far wider recognition. She is, in fact, not one to worry about recognition. That is one of the reasons she has become a legend to the thousands of young people who first met her, as I did, through the Encampment for Citizenship, itself an enterprise of enormous value to the Nation.

But Lucile Kohn, and her equally legendary sister, Mrs. Alice Pollitzer, now nearing the century mark, belong to that tiny band of mortals who, having become legends in their own lifetime, remain better in person than in legend.

We can congratulate ourselves that we are a nation that produced such people. But we should pause a moment, too, to thank them for all they have done for us. They are surely the most remarkable pair of sisters in the United States, if not in the world. They ought to be on TV, on stamps, in magazines with great circulations. How much we could all learn from such dauntless and vibrant spirits, from human beings who in these tempting and querulous times remain incapable of dishonor or deception, and continue to leave the glow of their goodness wherever they go.

I include in the RECORD at this point a poem by Mrs. Linda Gordon. Those who know Lucile Kohn will marvel at how this poem captures what they love about her. Those who do not know her will sense from it how fortunate the rest of us have been:

"Never seek to tell thy Love,"
Lesson learned in season sober,
Honor we in breach thereof
With the coming of October.
Though we know she can't be told,
Yet upon her Natal Day
Festive spirits make us bold:
Birthday guests will have their say!
And, from Reason's rule exempt,
The impossible attempt.

Wisdom, love, and inspiration;
Happy gifts of conversation,
Ice cream, cookies, games and fun;
Charity to everyone;
Ignorance of affectation;
Self-regardless dedication;
Benefactions manifold;
Common bond of young and old—

Lessons in the art of living
And of unreserved giving;
Circulating compliments;
Never sitting on the fence!
Drink of water, breath of air,
Meaning of the verb "to care":
Hope for poor Humanity—
These are things she means to me:

These, and so much more as well
I could never seek to tell,
Barely hint at what I feel
On the subject of Lucile!

REORDERING OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, some 10 million Americans are inflicted with hunger or chronic malnutrition, and 20 million Americans live in substandard housing. What a pity it is that we can not seem to aline ourselves properly to commit an infinitesimal amount of our vast

national resources to solve these very solvable domestic problems. But we can see fit to invest over $30 billion and thousands of American lives annually in fighting for "freedom" in South Vietnam. How often do we ask ourselves—how free is a 6-year-old American, suffering from chronic malnutrition—which may or may not cause future brain damage—who attends substandard schools and lives in a substandard house? What choices will be opened to this child at the age of 18 when he most likely will be a functional illiterate and face extended periods of unemployment?

The city council in Pittsburgh adopted a resolution calling for an end to our involvement in Vietnam and an immediate reordering of our national priorities.

I would like to enter this resolution into the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION No. 237

Whereas, American armed forces have been engaged for over four years in combat in Vietnam, and have distinguished themselves for their valor despite vague and sometimes conflicting expressions of national purpose and objectives in that war; and

Whereas, Combat deaths for American forces now exceed the death toll in the Korean War, and the nation continues to spend $100,000,000 per day to finance the war; and

Whereas, The direct American involvement in the war in Vietnam—never intended in our original intervention—has reached the point where it brings an intolerable financial and personal burden to all Americans; and

Whereas, The pressing needs of our nation's cities are being slighted, Congressional appropriations are being cut and urban programs are being curtailed in the face of increasing need for substantial government action; and

Whereas, It is apparent that the national government has not yet formulated a definite plan to end direct American involvement in the Vietnam war;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Pittsburgh City Council hereby memorializes the administration of President Richard M. Nixon to declare and carry out a definite program to terminate direct American involvement in the war in Vietnam and to put into effect the systematic withdrawal of major forces in America, to be completed before the end of 1970; and

Be it further resolved, That the Pittsburgh City Council does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide through its legislative and budgetary powers that the administration of President Nixon quickly begin to extricate the United States from its crushing, disastrous involvement in Vietnam and to devote national resources to programs which meet the needs of cities in housing, education and public transportation.

In Council October 14, 1969, read and adopted.

JOHN F. COUNAHAN,
President of Council.

Attest:

LOUIS C. DINARDO,
Clerk of Council.

Mayor's Office, October 21, 1969.

Approved:

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor.

SENATE—*Monday, November 3, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the light of the pure in heart who see Thee, the life of the souls that love Thee, the strength of the minds that seek Thee, from whom to turn is to fall, to whom to turn is to rise, and in whom to abide is to stand fast forever, be Thou to us light and life and strength that our labor may be secure in Thee. Keep us alive to all true values and enable us to grow in the ways of Thy spirit.

O Lord, be with this Nation. Guide in Thy pure ways all who bear positions of trust, that they may know and do Thy will, and daily set forward Thy kingdom.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 30, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 31, 1969, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed the bill (S. 2917) to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. BELL of California, and Mr. SCHERLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference;

That the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14001) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.";

S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired);

H.R. 337. An act to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12982. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 30, 1969, the bill (H.R. 14001) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act, was considered as having been read twice by its title, and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 30, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-189)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby submit the Second Annual Report of the Department of Transportation, covering Fiscal Year 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 31, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.