

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NIXON ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENT TO U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of Interior Russell E. Train on October 6, addressed the Third Annual Fisheries Exposition in Seattle. I was pleased that this exposition was conducted in my hometown and honored that I had the opportunity to participate in it.

But, in Secretary Train's remarks, he reiterated the commitment of the Nixon administration to the U.S. fishing industry which is close to the pledge made by candidate Richard Nixon prior to the 1968 general election as he was campaigning in Seattle. Secretary Train said:

I pledge to you that the Nixon Administration is determined to manage and conserve the resources off our coasts in the best interest of the American people, to develop new opportunities for the fishing skills of the commercial fishermen of this Nation, and finally to see a new day dawn for the fishing industry of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the fishing industry needs dynamic leadership from the executive branch, combined with wholehearted support from the legislative branch. I hope Secretary Train's words soon will become reality and that "new day" of which he spoke will make itself known to the U.S. fishing industry.

Under unanimous consent I include the text of Secretary Train's speech at this point in the RECORD:

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES—MEETING THE CHALLENGE

(Remarks by the Honorable Russell E. Train, Under Secretary of the Interior, before the Third Annual Fisheries Exposition at the Seattle Center, Seattle, Wash., Oct. 6, 1969)

I am delighted to be with you tonight at this splendid banquet and this great gathering of people from across the Nation who are associated with our Commercial Fishing Industry. It is fitting that this Third Annual Fisheries Exposition should be held here in Seattle, the great port city of the Northwest whose growth and vitality, and doubtless its future, are so intimately associated with the resources of the sea.

On Saturday a week ago I visited Gloucester, Massachusetts, to see at first hand the problems facing the fishing industry there. I inspected the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' experimental trawler, Delaware II; toured the harbor; boarded several of our Gloucester fishing vessels; and talked with a number of our fishermen. There were a number of modern foreign vessels at the docks—particularly from Iceland and Canada—and the comparison with our own obsolete vessels and equipment was positively shocking.

Tonight I am glad to have the opportunity to speak on the subject of commercial fishing because I believe that this industry faces many challenges which must receive top priority attention. The marine resources of our nation represent a challenge and an opportunity of major dimensions. The wis-

dom with which we manage those resources could well decide the future well-being of the American people. During the eight months I have been in office, I believe that I have devoted personally more time to marine matters than to any other program area. I have recently been the chairman of an interagency task force on coastal zone management, which is examining the proposals of the Commission on Marine Science Engineering and Research, as well as alternative plans for more effective management of the estuaries and other coastal areas of the United States. I have been directly involved in the consideration of United States policy toward the sea bed, including the question of the physical limits of national jurisdiction and also the question of possible international arrangements for the management of the deep ocean floor.

Let me assure you tonight that this Administration is firmly committed to the protection and development of our marine resources. They are of crucial value not only to your industry, but to the entire nation. This is a subject of special concern to Secretary Hickel.

The position of world leadership occupied today by the United States results in large part from the rich natural resources of this country. Our rapid growth, our physical prosperity, and our current strength rest upon this base. The future of our nation position also will depend upon our access to and use of natural resources. We disregard this principle at our peril. Marine resources are among the most important of our natural resources. In terms of petroleum, natural gas, and hard minerals development from the sea bed, our nation probably leads the world in the sophistication of its technology. However, when it comes to the living resources of the sea, our record is a sorry one. We rank sixth among the nations of the world in fish production. As the people of the world turn more and more to the oceans for energy, for minerals, and for protein, we simply cannot afford to abdicate American leadership in this fashion.

Before I tackle the specifics of commercial fisheries, I should like to take a very few minutes to set your problems in perspective; to set them within the broad spectrum of environmental problems that face our Nation today.

The Department of the Interior has key responsibilities in the water-land-air complex that forms the livable skin of the planet. It is a thin skin; and so must ours be, if we are to sense its problems and react wisely.

This thin skin of land and air and water, loaded as it is with the resources that support life, is being pressured as never before to serve increasing numbers of people in an ever-growing variety of ways. Where once we only required it to feed us, now we demand that it fuel our automobiles, light our cities, carry away massive loads of pollutants, yield its metal for our creature comforts, and provide a playground to meet the increasingly sophisticated demands of an ever more affluent and leisurely society.

All these factors have a multiplier effect. The fabric of our world is straining at its seams. In some cases it is ripping apart.

The interrelationships of all parts of the environment—land, air, water and also all forms of vegetation and animal life—should perhaps be understood best by commercial fishermen. Your living depends largely upon preservation of our estuaries and other marine habitat, and I know you are keenly aware of the difficulty of preserving a productive and uncontaminated environment in those areas. The Department of the Interior is concerned with all factors which may ad-

versely affect the environment. With regard to the fishing industry we are concerned with protection of the marine habitat which forms the essential foundation for the fishing industry.

Fishery problems are present on every coast of the country. These include the following:

1. The appearance of massive foreign fishing fleets off our coasts.
2. The rising cost of vessels and operations.
3. The need to compete with heavily subsidized foreign vessels.
4. The resource failures in certain major species.
5. The restraints imposed by various governmental regulations.

In recent years the cost of vessels, equipment and operations has increased more rapidly than the prices you receive for fish. This has burdened our fishing industry with a serious economic squeeze. The vessel construction subsidy program, initiated in 1969, has not been adequate. For example, during the period the subsidy has been in operation, only one vessel has been completed in the Pacific Northwest and only two more are even under construction.

The presence of huge foreign fleets with which we must compete on the fishing grounds is a critical threat, since these vessels are in a position to exploit heavily the resources on which our fisheries depend.

In recent years we have faced some major resource depletions. Off the West Coast, Pacific ocean perch stocks—once a mainstay of the local trawl fleet—have been greatly reduced as a result of international fishing activities. Certain agreements for international management now have been implemented, but it could be years before these depleted stocks return to a level economically feasible for commercial harvest.

In New England, haddock stocks have declined to a point where the Secretary recently declared a resource disaster and took emergency action to restore the stocks and assist fishermen in that area.

Many other of our fishery resources appear to have suffered the same fate. The yellowfin, sole, and king crab resources of the Bering Sea are examples. The resolution of this problem requires the development of international management schemes which can make effective decisions and make them in time.

The Department of the Interior is working to develop alternate resources to fill in for these depleted stocks. The Department is also conducting research in new technology.

Harvesting studies are being carried out on sablefish, which now must be caught on long lines. King crab pots, now tragically empty, seem to work and indications are that some such method will soon serve to increase substantially sablefish production.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' Exploratory Fishing and Gear Research Base in Seattle in carrying on resource assessment work on Pacific saury, hake and clams. Gear research from this Base is emphasizing improved efficiency of shrimp separator trawls. Use of lights to aggregate and purse seining for harvest of saury are likewise being tested at the Seattle Base.

The Juneau Exploratory Fishing and Gear Base research has been rewarded by a much increased use of the latent tanner crab resource, mainly by fishermen from the declining king crab industry.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' Technological Laboratory in Ketchikan, Alaska, is developing techniques for processing the Alaskan pink shrimp. Problems with color and texture under some mechanized processing techniques need solving, but the resource is a large one and the potential more

than justifies the research and experimental effort involved.

Work is proceeding in Seattle on fish protein concentrate methodology, in conjunction with the plan to construct the first experimental and demonstration plant in this area. Currently in the design phase, this plant should open the way for eventual full use of many underutilized species.

While I have been emphasizing projects related to the Pacific Coast, comparable efforts are under way with respect to the Gulf and Atlantic fisheries.

We also intend to complete the long-overdue inventory of our own fishery resources. What is there, and where is it most likely to be found? In many instances, it has been embarrassingly apparent that the research activities of foreign fleets have provided them with better information about the magnitude and distribution of fishery resources off our own coasts than has our own Nation. In the first three-year period during which the Soviet Union engaged in fishing our coastal waters, the resource information they compiled was double that of all the U.S. research efforts over the last 30 years.

The United States should not find itself sitting at an international conference table telling another power they are overfishing our resources, only to find they know more about these resources than we do. We are determined to reverse that situation.

I also wish to refer briefly to the mass of regulations, both Federal and State, which apply to commercial fishermen. These regulations raise many questions.

Are they based on good scientific information?

Are they indeed needed for sound conservation?

What do they do to the efficiency of the fisherman, and is this effect justified by the results?

These regulations affect numbers of allowable fishing hours, types of gear and kinds of technology. They often have the effect of limiting efforts and efficiency and raising costs. We intend to make a fresh review of the Federal regulations to determine whether modifications would be appropriate.

Please do not misunderstand me. I did not come here to paint a glowing picture of performance by the Department of the Interior in protecting and developing the Nation's fisheries. Far from it. The fact is that the record of past years is not one of which we can be satisfied.

What I want to make clear is this—the new Administration is determined to do a far better job and is, in fact, moving ahead in a number of positive ways.

The Department of the Interior is taking the lead in the entire marine resources field. As the former Governor of Alaska, a State which depends heavily on its fishing industry, Secretary Hickel knows at first hand the value and potential of fisheries and the problems that face it. During the few months he has been in office, he has taken positive action to give fisheries more assistance than they have had in the past. We intend to develop new and imaginative programs for our national fisheries.

As a personal sidelight, I would like to mention a trip I made in August with several members of President Nixon's Cabinet to participate in a Joint United States-Japan Cabinet meeting on Trade and Economic Affairs. As the Department of the Interior representative, the subject of fisheries took much of my attention during our sessions. You will be interested to know that my wife and I got up at 5:00 a.m. one morning to visit the Tokyo fish market, the largest fresh fish market in the world. This market covers many acres and requires thousands of employees to handle the huge catch which pours in to the city each night, is auctioned off and taken away by the following noon-time. To personally witness this efficient, high-speed operation was an eye-filling,

nose-wrinkling experience I am sure I shall never forget.

While I was in Japan, I met with the Minister and Vice-Minister for Agriculture and Forestry, who have responsibility for commercial fish. I also talked with the President of the All-Japan Fisheries Association. I urged liberalization of Japanese restrictions on United States fishery imports, focusing my appeal on pollock, hake, herring, kelp, saury, salmon and salmon roe.

The responsible ministers agreed to actively encourage Japanese trading firms to increase the imports of these U.S. fishery products. We are now preparing to transmit a list of the items and quantities that we feel we can export to the Japanese market. They in turn have said they will distribute this list to Japanese importing firms. We hope this may lead to an expansion of our exports to Japan.

In my remaining few minutes I am anxious to discuss with you the threat posed by man himself, to the renewable resources of the ocean. These resources are dependent on an environment which man constantly seeks to alter. Whether measured by volume or by value, the species that spend at least part of their lives in estuaries account for 65 percent of the commercial fish harvest. The annual catch of these species totals more than 3 billion pounds, with a value of \$260 million. Yet these estuarine areas, so valuable to you as fishermen, are also increasingly in demand for transportation, for mining, for the dumping of human waste, refuse and industrial products, for housing developments and for marine recreation facilities.

Some ecological systems can withstand a variety of usages without damage. Estuaries are not among them. They are among our most fragile resource zones and uses which put too much pressure on them generally causing irreversible loss.

More and more the need today is to see our resource problems from a broader context. We can no longer look upon the resources of the sea, land, and air as separate resources presenting isolated problems. We must instead recognize all resources as related points of a complex whole which is the total environment. In addition to the efforts of the Department of the Interior which I have described to solve immediate problems of the commercial fishing industry, the Department is also conducting a broad range of other programs in the fields of oceanography, marine science and marine engineering. We are also making an effort to integrate our programs which focus on land problems with those which focus on marine problems to provide better management of resources along our coastal zone—the interface between land and sea.

The Federal government is presently giving close attention to the need to give greater emphasis and better organization to its programs relating to marine problems.

A matter of great current interest is the proposal of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources (the so-called "Stratton Commission") for the establishment of a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA).

This new agency would consolidate most of the Federal Government's civilian oceanographic activities. As I am sure you are well aware, the proposal envisages the transfer of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries from the Department of the Interior to NOAA. The President has referred the proposal to his Committee on Executive Reorganization for study, as well as for consideration of other alternative reorganization proposals dealing with marine resources.

In the Department of the Interior we are seriously concerned by the proposal to establish this new agency. We are convinced that it would be a mistake to separate management of our fishery resources from the other marine and marine-related programs of the

Department of the Interior. We strongly believe, however, that it is essential to give better coordination to the marine programs of the Federal Government. We also applaud the objective of the Stratton Commission to give the Nation a new sense of commitment to the opportunities and challenges of our Nation and the sea.

I pledge to you that the Nixon Administration is determined to manage and conserve the resources off our coasts in the best interest of the American people, to develop new opportunities for the fishing skills of the commercial fishermen of this Nation, and finally to see a new day dawn for the fishing industry of our country. For too long, we have turned our backs to the oceans. We can afford this neglect no longer. From the sea, came much of the strength and vitality of our nation when it was young. We must turn our face to the sea once more. The success with which we learn to utilize wisely the resources of the seas will directly affect the leadership of the United States abroad and the well-being of our people at home.

RED WATER REX: NATIONAL FIELD TRIALS CHAMPION

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, at the National Championship Field Trials in Grand Junction, Tenn., the performance of a Mississippi bird dog was nothing short of sensational.

Red Water Rex, long heralded as a champion pointer won this coveted national championship collar over an outstanding field of 46 of the best bird dogs. During the day, Red Water Rex, a white and liver pointer, showed himself with eight perfect single back of his brace mate in a 3-hour trial at Ames Plantation.

Red Water Rex's triumph scored in that it made his handler, Mr. J. H. Eaton of Booneville, Miss., a contender since 1961 to put national titles back to back. This outstanding Mississippi sportsman won the same event last year with Riggins White Knight, now retired.

I take personal pleasure and pride in this outstanding achievement. Red Water Rex's owners, W. T. Pruitt and E. B. Alexander of Jackson, are personal friends who have contributed greatly to outdoor conservation and recreation. They are avid sportsmen who deserve recognition for their endeavors.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including Concurrent Resolution 114 of the Mississippi State Senate in recognition of this achievement. The resolution was sponsored by Hon. Jean Muirhead, senator from Hinds County:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 114

A concurrent resolution commending W. T. Pruitt and E. B. Alexander, owners, and Dexter Hoyle Eaton, handler of Red Water Rex, National Championship Field Trials winner.

Whereas, at the 1969 National Championship Field Trials in Grand Junction, Tennessee, Mississippians came home with the championship trophy; and

Whereas, Red Water Rex again captured the Ralston Purina Award for the Top Field Trial Bird Dog in the Nation by winning a

total of 2,740 points in field trial competition; and

Whereas, Red Water Rex, a Mississippi bird dog owned by W. T. Pruitt and E. B. Alexander of Jackson, Mississippi, won the coveted national championship collar, bringing honor to his owners and the Magnolia State; and

Whereas, Dexter Hoyle Eaton of Prentiss County, Mississippi, handler and trainer of Red Water Rex, trained the 1968 national champion, Riggins White Knight, now retired to stud, as well, with Red Water Rex providing Eaton with the fourth Continental Trials champion under his tutorship; and

Whereas, Red Water Rex is the only Mississippi bred, Mississippi raised, Mississippi trained and Mississippi owned dog to win the coveted National Championship; and

Whereas, Mississippi through its Game and Fish Commission has for many years exerted a positive influence in the improvement of and encouragement of hunting, fishing, and field trials, and enhancement of these sports as attractions to tourists and homefolk alike; and

Whereas, the interest of Mississippians officially and individually has resulted in increased efforts and results in all areas of endeavor connected with nature sports as is evidenced in Eaton's recent feat:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That we do commend and congratulate W. T. Pruitt and E. B. Alexander of Jackson, Mississippi, and Dexter Hoyle Eaton, handler and trainer, for their recent conquest in having their Mississippi bird dog, Red Water Rex, "collared" as the champion in the 1969 National Championship Field Trials.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be supplied to each of the owners and the trainer and to members of the Capitol Press Corps.

HONORABLE PETER RODINO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we were all thrilled by the decision of the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor, to drop courtmartial proceedings against eight Special Forces troops. These men were, in effect, charged with criminal activity simply because they performed their duty no matter how unpleasant that duty may have been.

The cause of justice, I am happy to say, was amply served by a Member of this House, the distinguished Member from New Jersey, Representative PETER RODINO. Congressman RODINO, having been made aware that a gross miscarriage of justice was unfolding, immediately set into motion the necessary machinery to avert such a development.

We shall perhaps never know the full details of this unfortunate case. Suffice it to say that in war, unlike some of the nobler human endeavors, the activities of those who bear the brunt of battle are essentially brutal, simply because war itself is brutal.

It appears that the Army at first chose the course of punishing men whose actions were dictated by good conscience and pure motives. Fortunately, Congressman RODINO, a man who has dedicated

his public life to justice for his fellow man, saw in his conscience that any punishment of these men would constitute a gross violation of the elementary principles of our system of law.

Congressman RODINO joins a long list of devoted legislators who, through the history of this Republic, have loyally supported their constituents, faithfully lived by the principles of justice, and bravely opposed injustice.

I can only hope that such ill-advised decisions by the military, or any other public agency, will always be avoided. In the event that this does not prove to be the case, we may at least rest assured that gentlemen of the calibre of Congressman RODINO will be present to right wrongs.

HOLD OUT FOR CLEAN WATER

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the action last week by the House Committee on Public Works in recommending an appropriation of \$600,000,000 to aid local units of government in construction of sewage treatment projects is a significant step in the right direction. But \$600,000,000 is not nearly enough to cover our need. The more than 200 Members of Congress, including myself, who have joined with various citizens groups in an effort to secure full funding of \$1 billion for sewage treatment construction have been cheered in recent weeks by expressions of support by the Nation's press. A great many newspapers have offered editorials demanding that the full \$1 billion be made available by the Congress and the administration.

An example of this concern for the preservation of our environment appeared in the September 29 issue of the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent. I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

HOLD OUT FOR CLEAN WATER

In the past several years an alarmed America has been making a lot of noise about its dirty air, water and land—all of which are getting dirtier. But this country has not done nearly enough to clean itself up.

As we mess up our world with the waste products of our living, we talk, talk, talk. But we will not get anywhere until we put up the money.

Look back to 1965 when Congress set clean water as a national goal, and decided that it would cost money to reach that goal. Ever since the federal bureaucracy has been blowing its horn about clean water, and stirring up the populace.

Yet Congress and the administration have repeatedly failed to budget the amounts authorized. If President Nixon's proposed allocation for 1970 goes through, less than one-third of the \$2.1 billion authorized over the past three years will have been approved.

That is a very poor performance, especially when you look at the volume of our waste problem. Right now municipal ties are waiting for \$2.2 billion in federal funds so that they can construct improvements to their sewage treatment plants. The \$214 mil-

lion Nixon has asked is less than one-tenth of the amount needed.

Finally a great deal of pressure is being applied to budget \$1 billion for 1970, the full authorized amount. A coalition of interested groups is waging a war for clean water in Washington. More than 200 congressmen now have signed up to support the full \$1 billion figure. Meanwhile there are indications that Nixon will again try to take the middle road, suggesting that the budgeted amount be raised to about \$600 million.

That kind of compromise just isn't enough now. It is already too late to compromise, for pollution, peace and population are the chief problems facing this world. Even the full \$1 billion is only a fraction of what is needed. We urge the clean water crusaders to hold out.

DISSENT GOES TOO FAR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we note the thoroughly organized PR campaign being built around the October 15 anti-Vietnam demonstration, an understanding of the full impact of this situation must be realized. The San Diego Union in an editorial Friday, October 3, hits the nail on the head with a penetrating commentary on the way the country will be affected by the demonstrations being planned.

The editorial follows:

DISSENT GOES TOO FAR—ANTI-VIETNAM BLOC REGROUPS

There is something ugly about the new wave of anti-Vietnam pronouncements emanating from Washington.

The tones range from near hysteria to pious pulpit-pounding, but the words add up to the same thing: the United States of America should cut and run. It is proposed that we not only abandon the people of South Vietnam to communism, but that we turn our back on formal treaties, moral commitments, and the standards of decency that have made this nation something that men in other lands have looked up to since 1776.

Isn't it strange that in a day when the world has grown frighteningly small, when our enemies' weapons of mass destruction are only 20 minutes away from every home in America, that a certain brand of citizen wants to divorce us from the problems of our planet?

And now, an unsavory note of partisanship is added because the same largely Democrat bloc of liberals who earlier tormented President Johnson is baying at a Republican president. But it would be a mistake to write off the "abandon Vietnam" shouts as merely party politics. The temptation to capitalize on the Vietnam War is not confined to one party. Witness Sen. Charles Goodell's bill that would cut off all appropriations for the Vietnam War at the end of 1970.

President Nixon was charitable. He called Goodell's suggestion "well intentioned."

He may apply the same term next week when 24 Democrats—12 in the House and 12 in the Senate—submit their promised resolutions calling for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces. The term, "well intentioned" may be used, too, by others on Oct. 15 to excuse the student mobilization committee's demonstrations against the war.

But we cannot be that charitable.

Honest differences of opinion are one thing. Dissent, when expressed within the bounds of decency, is to be defended. But

what is now being espoused by the anti-Vietnam clique in Washington has moved far beyond these boundaries. We actually are hearing members of Congress endorsing the contemplated Oct. 15 demonstration with full knowledge of the past history of such displays, the type of people who foment them and the melancholy effects they have on people, property and decency.

Certainly the American people are tired of this war. Think how tired the people of Vietnam must be after 20 years of fighting, and a half million dead. But their love of freedom, their hatred of communism, their determination to have a destiny of their own has inspired them to incredible sacrifice.

This is a moment when our national and political figures can demonstrate their fiber. Certainly some will find it easy to encourage frustration and discontent. Some will find it tempting to seize a cheap way out of trouble.

But it isn't Vietnam that they would give away by their actions.

It is the United States of America!

MISSING LATIN AMERICAN POLICY MUST DEAL WITH POPULATION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I fully recognize that there are many tough problems that must be considered in constructing and enacting foreign policy. However, the problem of overpopulation must be considered as the most urgent of these problems. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, I understand the difficulties of propagating population control for foreign countries when the United States lacks a population policy of her own. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that the lack of success in economic development in too many countries is directly related to a population explosion.

President Nixon, in his population message, emphasized the need to enlarge the scope of our responsibilities through international cooperation. The President also put his administration machinery to work on better coordination of domestic family planning programs and requested the Congress to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. It seems to me that this initial broadcast of American concern over the problems of population growth justifies increased earmarkings of AID funds for population programs in recipient countries.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following article from yesterday's Washington Post for the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

MISSING LATIN AMERICAN POLICY MUST DEAL WITH POPULATION

(By Marquis Childs)

In a curious atmosphere of unreality the Nixon administration seems increasingly to be trying to cope with the problems not of the future nor even of the present, but of a past that is in itself irrelevant to the point of unreality.

The White House and the State Department are currently brewing up a policy for Latin America which has been nonexistent in the first nine months of the Nixon dispensation. Presumably, the new mixture will be grounded on the findings of Gov. Nelson

Rockefeller, whose unhappy mission to the Americas to the south generated violence and destruction in almost every capital.

What Rockefeller could have added to the voluminous reports of the diplomatic and aid missions the United States maintains throughout the hemisphere was never clear. For the simple truth is that there is one overwhelming reality and it is written in letters of fire across the southern sky—the population explosion. The figures for 1969 from the Population Reference Bureau show Latin America with the highest net increase of any area in the world.

This tidal wave of human fertility swamps the grandiose plans of the Alliance for Progress. All that the Agency for International Development pours in is absorbed by new mouths to feed and the pressing demand for education and technical training that fall so far short of the need.

Unless population planning on a vastly enlarged scale is central to a new policy for Latin America, it will be wasted money and effort. The old politics and the old diplomacy are as outmoded as the stagecoach. The takeover by a military junta, the rise of another dictatorship, a bloody revolution put down—these are symptoms of a deep underlying malady that will never be cured by merely more transfusions of aid, whether in money or goods.

Little Costa Rica holds the record with a net increase of 3.8 percent, which means doubling the population in roughly 20 years. But the big countries of South America are not far behind. Colombia and Ecuador are each 3.4 and, given the nature of statistics in underdeveloped areas, the actual figure is probably closer to 4. Brazil is 2.8; Chile, where population planning has at least had a start, 2.3; Paraguay 3.4; Peru 3.1. By comparison, in Western Europe where the rate of increase has been steadily dropping, Belgium is 0.1, West Germany 0.4, France 1, the Netherlands 1.1. The rate of increase in the United States is 1 per cent.

Throughout Latin America illegitimacy is steadily rising, as is the incidence of illegal abortion. In desperately poor countries, such as Colombia, septicemia and other illnesses growing out of crude induced abortions absorb the painfully small supply of penicillin and other therapeutics. The human misery that results is incalculable. It is one more penalty for the poverty in which most Latin Americans live.

With half the population throughout most of the nations to the south under 25 or even under 20, education and training are all but impossible, measured against the need. Crime and subversion are the end result, as more and more of the young find no place in organized society. Even a highly developed nation with advanced technology would find it difficult to absorb the flood of youths in search of education and some means of livelihood.

President Nixon, in his message to Congress in July on the population problem, went further than any chief executive has gone to stress the urgent need for action at home and abroad if the shattering consequences of the people explosion are to be contained. He called for stepped-up efforts by all agencies concerned with aid and cooperation abroad. With rather more complacency that seems justified, the President said, "Already we are doing a great deal in this field." Actually, only a small proportion of aid funds goes into population control. This must be rapidly expanded, not only in Latin America but in Asia and Africa, if AID is to mean more than a temporary and feeble barrier to hold back the flood of poverty with its dire concomitants of hunger, instability and eventual breakdown.

Whether AID could be made conditional on expending programs of population control is a ticklish question. This gets into a national pride and religious and political prejudice. But it should not be impossible to

find a way to relate the menace of the tidal wave of people to the form that American assistance takes.

The pessimists can find many reasons why population control will never work—inertia; prejudice; the inability, including lack of funds and trained personnel, to set up proper methods of birth control; and ignorance. These may defeat the best intentions and mock the direct warnings. But unless the enormous strides in death control are matched by population control, the world by the year 2000 will founder with an estimated seven and a half billion people.

PHILIP SANG TO BE HONORED BY THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chicago Sunday Tribune carried an excellent article about Philip Sang who has spent a lifetime in search of historical truths for students and scholars of history.

Mr. Sang is himself one of our Nation's most highly respected and distinguished scientists.

The Chicago Tribune article quite properly calls attention to the fact that Philip Sang will be honored for his great contribution to historical research by the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot, Israel—one of the top 20 scientific institutions of the world.

I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today this penetrating article about Mr. Sang's meaningful contribution in the field of historical education.

Miss Kathy Burns, author of this article, has captured the true spirit and the true contributions of Philip Sang.

We in Chicago are proud to list him among our most illustrious citizens and the honor being paid him by the Weizmann Institute is well earned and well deserved.

The Chicago Tribune article follows:
SCIENTIST SPENDS 45 YEARS COLLECTING HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

(By Kathy Burns)

To the uninformed, the young, the haphazard student, or the strict modernist, the study of history may be nothing but a boring rundown on little-remembered dates, strange places, and entirely too many people.

To others, history may be a life's work, fraught with the care of a surgeon, the patience of a scholar, and the perseverance of saint.

Philip Sang of River Forest, a scientist by training, has applied this same methodical approach to his pursuit of the past.

In addition to his business affairs, Sang has spent 45 years gathering historical documents for use of students and scholars throughout the world. His efforts will be recognized by the Weizman Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel, one of the top 20 scientific institutions of the world.

HONORED ON NOVEMBER 4

Rabbi William Novick, midwest director of the institute, explained the reasoning behind Sang's selection. "Several committees consider many names of outstanding con-

tributors in the sciences over a 3- to 12-month period before anyone is chosen. This year, 10 men from all over the world will be honored on Nov. 4, the 25th anniversary of the institute.

Sang is the first Chicagoan as well as the first native resident west of New York to be honored. "In him there has been a marriage between the sciences and the humanities," Novick said.

The institute is named after Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first president of Israel. Born in Russia in 1874, Weizmann migrated to England where he was involved in high level chemical research. He discovered the bacteria that convert sugars and starches into acetone and butyl which lead to the mass production of industrial chemicals and commodities.

BEGAN COLLECTING DOCUMENTS

While a student at Crane High School, 2250 W. Van Buren St., Sang began collecting historical memorabilia on a small scale. Later, as a student of mechanical engineering at the Illinois Institute of Engineering, Sang had a teacher who he remembered simply as Mr. Hutchinson.

"That man really encouraged his students to pursue history," Sang said. "He was so exciting and had such an infectious approach that he sparked my interest."

In 1923, after his graduation, Sang began to pursue historical collecting as a serious hobby. One of his first "important" finds was an original photo of Mark Twain, with the inscription, "Be good and you'll be lonesome," written in the corner.

Sang said his study of history has been based on the written word, especially as recorded in letters. "The sweep of American history can be found in letters. In former years, writing was the art of the day. These people were great correspondents. Language was their handcraft."

One of his first concentrated areas of research was America. He decided to collect letters written by all 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence.

"It was a great challenge because some of the signers had lived much longer than others. One of the most valuable is that of Button Gwinnett who was killed in a duel a year after signing the document," he said.

In the 1930s Sang said he began to realize that the American Presidency was "the most powerful position in the world and would have much to do with the shaping of the world." He started gathering personal letters written by the Presidents. He now has a collection of documents from Washington thru Nixon. In 1960, he and his wife, Elsie, an avid historian and antique collector on her own, assembled an exhibit of presidents and near presidents for display in colleges and universities throughout the country.

At the University of Kentucky exhibit alone, 10,000 persons came to see the presidential panorama. He received letters from both 1960 candidates, praising the display.

ASSEMBLED DOCUMENTS

In 1966 he arranged to have a broadside [one large sheet, with writing on one side only] printed of Lyndon Johnson's Thanksgiving message. One thousand copies were sent to educational institutions. Sang himself received a dedicated copy, signed by the President and the secretary of state.

Other contemporary memorabilia now include: "As We Remember Joe," by John F. Kennedy, one of the limited copies published by the President on his older brother; signed copy of Kennedy's inaugural address; Eisenhower's monogrammed golf balls; personal notes to Sang from Lady Bird Johnson and Jacqueline Kennedy; signed copy of Truman's "Years of Decision," and the only prayer which he ever wrote; one of the official copies of the U.N. charter, signed by the secretary of state; and L. B. J.'s doodles explaining war strategy in Viet Nam, drawn

on May 17, 1966. They were made aboard Air Force One as the President was briefing some senators and congressmen en route to a Democratic dinner.

Altho the major trend of Sang's historical perspective is directed towards Americana, he also has materials of a world-orientation. He has Mussolini's copy of "Thus Spoke Zarathustra," with the parts on the Superman philosophy marked off.

ACQUIRED BOOKS

In his collection of international materials are books from the Index and Bibles dating from 1609. He also has acquired four-edge books from 19th century Europe which have paintings on the gold gilt edges, visible when the pages are slanted together.

A modern link with past are some scientific treatises by Newton and Galileo. Quite unexpectedly, the Sangs' acquired an unusual book recently which predicted the moon voyage 300 years ago.

"We were in London, in an old book store, the day of the Apollo 11 moon shot, when we found 'Discovery of a World in the Moone,' which was written by the Episcopal bishop of Chester in 1638," Sang said.

According to the scientific bishop, some "other means for conveyance to the moon [would be created] tho it may seem a terrible and impossible thing ever to passe thru the vast spaces of aire. Yet, know that there would be some men who durst venture this as well as other" undreamed of feats.

RECEIVED HONORARY DEGREES

The River Forest historian is not limited to collecting written records only of others. Turning back the pages of his own life is like leafing thru an encyclopedia of top-notch achievements, both in quantity and quality.

Sang has received honorary degrees from five colleges and universities. In 1945, he co-sponsored the founding of Freedom Hall, Oak Park, which has received national recognition three times in the last six years.

His diverse interests extend to the Modern Poetry association, Alliance Francaise, Chicago Symphony orchestra, Chicago Medical school, and the Illinois State Historical society, to name but a few.

In commemoration of his recognition by the Weizmann, Sang and his wife are donating a continuing research grant for leukemia study at the institute. Mrs. Sang said several members of her family had died from the disease and as such was the basis of their choice.

History, as a life's work for Sang, has not been one without humor. He was asked somewhat facetiously by Rabbi Novick why he hadn't yet acquired the stone tablets Moses had brought down from the mountains.

"I won't take them cracked," he replied.

WHY?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent of mine, Mr. Franklin H. Bolton of Springfield, Va., sent me a copy of a poem written for his wife, Ruth, by their oldest of three daughters, Judy, who is now grown, married and teaching school away from home.

Like so many young ladies, Judy now looks back on her formative years with a different view than that she held as a teenager. Mr. Bolton feels, and I agree,

that many of our young people today could benefit from Judy's reflections concerning her mother. I, therefore, insert her poem at this point in the RECORD:

WHY?

My mother used to say to me,
"When you're older you will see.
When you've grown and gone away
You'll understand what I say."
The years have steadily passed by, now it is I
who wonders why.
Why did I in years before not see her waiting
in the door?
Why did I not see her there working at
homely chores with care?
Why did I not heed her call as she prayed for
both big and small?
Why did I not sense or feel the love for me
that was real?
Why did I not thank each day she who held
my hand along life's way?
Now I ask myself, dear mother, since I would
never have another,
Why did I not say to you those simple
words—I love you!?

JUDY.

STABILITY AND CHANGE IN AFRICA

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, His Excellency, Julius K. Nyerere, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, delivered a major address at the University of Toronto, Canada.

President Nyerere's speech, entitled "Stability and Change in Africa," was basically a message to the North American continent, a warning to the leaders of the Western world. His message was the essence of the Africa position: He said that the principles of self-determination and national freedom are the goal of every African nation, and that these are great Western traditions and Western values. The West thus has an opportunity to assist African nations in reaching with a minimum of violence those goals for which we too have struggled.

But President Nyerere is deeply concerned about the potential consequences of the West's failing to support the achievement of these principles. Under such circumstances, he says:

The freedom movements will therefore get their arms from the Communist powers.

President Nyerere cautions:

We know our own motives in these actions. We are not Communists; we are nationalists desiring freedom.

President Nyerere's words are ones which I hope our Government will heed. I recently had the privilege of meeting President Nyerere in Dar es Salaam, his capital, and I was impressed with the integrity of his position and with the strong leadership he has provided in Tanzania and in East Africa. His authorship, with others, of the Lusaka Declaration is a case in point. I came away from our meeting convinced that change will come to Africa and only if we, the United States and other nations, act now will that change be peaceful and with a

minimum of bitterness. Tanzania's internal policies in this regard were summed up by President Nyerere in his address when he said:

Tanzania is attempting to achieve change by deliberate policy, and to maintain stability by involving all the people in both the direction and the process of change.

It is my belief that it is essential that the United States come down on the side of majority rule and the consent of the governed, and that to do otherwise is to betray their principles.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long America has ignored Africa and the changes that are bound to come on that continent. We cannot afford, as a people and as the leader of the free world, to continue that policy. A review of our African policy is now underway at the State Department and the White House, and I hope that from it will emerge a much higher priority for Africa. I hope, too, that President Nyerere's address will be given serious consideration during that review, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

STABILITY AND CHANGE IN AFRICA

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is my first visit to the University of Toronto but it is very far from being my first contact with it. People from the University have worked at our University College in Dar es Salaam and in many different sectors of our Government; they have made great contributions to our progress. We have many old and valued friends here: people to whom we are indebted for good service gladly rendered.

Let me begin, therefore, by expressing to this University our appreciation for the co-operation and assistance we have received. You have released good people to work with us, and not just sent the people you could gladly spare! Let me also say "thank you" to the individuals concerned. They have helped us to implement our policies; they have helped us to see and to understand the problems we are faced with; when we have asked, they have suggested alternative solutions to these problems—though I must hasten to add that they bear no responsibility for our failures. The decision to accept or reject their suggestions is one we have always reserved to ourselves!

This kind of technical assistance is very valuable to us. It also has a by-product which is, I believe, important to Canada as well. For not only have we learned something about Canada from these workers. As intelligent people who have lived with us and worked with us, they have learned something about us. When they return to this country, they are therefore frequently able to spread an understanding of what we are trying to do. They can tell of our successes and our failures; more important, they can also put our actions into the context of our circumstances and our motives. I believe this to be important to both countries. For Tanzania's policy of self-reliance does not imply that we dream of isolating ourselves. We recognize that we are involved in the world and that the world is involved in us.

Involvement without understanding, however, can be embarrassing and even dangerous. And while the involvement is inevitable, a lack of understanding about Africa is only too easy. Our very existence as nations is exotic. And now our voices on the international scene are strident; we complain about things which others take for granted; we make demands on other nations of the world, which appear unreasonable to more traditional habits of thought. The reaction is natural. Our actions and our demands are looked upon with all the suspicion which is normally directed towards upstarts. And everything we do is judged in the light of attitudes which grew out of the aftermath

of the second world war. In other words, every possible attempt is made to squeeze African events into the framework of the cold war or other big power conflicts.

The big question is always: "Is this or that African country pro-East or pro-West?"

These kinds of question are understandable because of the recent history of Europe and America. But they are the wrong questions for anyone who wishes to understand what is happening in Africa. They are based on a very fundamental mistake—and, I would add, an unwarranted degree of arrogance! They imply that Africa has no ideas of its own and no interests of its own. They assume the exclusive validity of the international conflicts which existed when we achieved nationhood. They are based on the belief that African actions must inevitably be determined by reference to either the Western liberal tradition or to communist theory or practice.

In fact, I hope that Africa has learned, and will continue to learn, from total human experience—from peoples in the West, East, North and South, whether we use these compass points as political or geographical terms! But what we are, in fact, trying to do is to solve the problems of Africa—and in our case, of Tanzania—as we experience them. And we are making this attempt as Africans and as Tanzanians: as people who have been shaped by a history which goes back further than the century or so of colonialism. Further, we look at the world as people who believe that they have something to contribute to mankind, as well as something to gain from it.

OUR NEED FOR BOTH CHANGE AND STABILITY

Yet we are new nations. Like every other people in the world we have always had a desire to be our own masters. We lost our freedom through defeat by the technically superior forces of Europe. Our first concern was to regain it, and our first priority now is to guard that freedom and to make it a reality.

When we did regain our freedom, however, we gained control over a different structure. In Tanzania it was more than one hundred tribal units which lost their freedom; it was one nation which regained it. By the forces of history we have been brought politically into this twentieth century world; our new freedom can only be maintained if we adopt other aspects of twentieth century life as well.

Another fundamental change makes other demands upon the national government which were not made on the traditional tribal governments. The Tanzanian people now know that our property, our ignorance, and our diseases, are not an inevitable part of the human condition. Once we accepted these things as the will of God; now they are recognized as being within the control of man. Political freedom is therefore no longer enough for us.

We in Tanzania are thus conscious of two over-whelming needs. We are determined to maintain our mastery over our own destiny—to defend our national freedom. We are also determined to change the condition of our lives. It is to meet these two needs that we must have both change and stability. Somehow these two must be combined, because in the circumstances of Tanzania, and indeed of Africa, neither is possible without the other.

CHANGE TO MAKE FREEDOM A REALITY

For although political and social stability is necessary to any real national or personal freedom, so too is change in our circumstances. At present our national freedom often exists on paper only, for our country is so poor, and so weak relative to other nations, that we do not play our rightful part in the human community. Decisions on matters which vitally concern us can be—and often are—made without any reference to us. And this is understandable. Even defending

our national integrity against the intervention of foreign powers strains us to the utmost. A very great change in our economic well-being is necessary before we can meet these responsibilities of national freedom.

Nor is it only in national terms that real freedom is undermined by our poverty. What freedom has our subsistence farmer? He scratches a bare living from the soil provided the rains do not fail; his children work at his side without schooling, medical care, or even good feeding. Certainly he has freedom to vote and to speak as he wishes. But these freedoms are much less real to him than his freedom to be exploited. Only as his poverty is reduced will his existing political freedom become properly meaningful and his right to human dignity become a fact of human dignity.

This essential economic change will not, and cannot, take place in isolation. It depends upon, and it brings, social and political change. It is not even possible simply to expand the social and political organization which was introduced into the country by the colonial power. These were based on an individualistic philosophy which is contrary to both our traditions and our aspirations for human equality. And they were directed at the problems of imposing and maintaining an alien law and order, not at securing mobilization for the improvement in living conditions which our people now demand.

THE NEED FOR STABILITY

Yet stable government, and stability in the society, is also essential to our freedom. For without political stability African countries will remain the playthings of others. Without it, alien forces can influence our policies for their own benefit, and outside powers can wage their wars on our territories and with our peoples. It is perfectly true that many of us in Africa are in danger of getting a phobia about foreign plots, and of attributing to foreign machinations all the evils we suffer from. But although the original failures may be ours, no intelligent and knowledgeable person would deny that outside forces do take advantage of African division for their own benefit, or that they exacerbate our conflicts when this suits their purpose.

Quite apart from the defense of our national integrity, however, stability is also essential for economic development. We cannot increase agricultural production, organize markets for home-produced goods, meet export orders, or arrange for the supply of essential investment goods, unless there is stability and security in the country. An effective administration, secure communications, and personal safety, are prerequisites for any attack on the poverty which now oppresses us.

In brief, change causes disturbance and thus upsets stability, but positive change is impossible without stability. And stability is itself impossible in Africa without change. Africa's task is therefore to achieve a difficult balance between the conflicting and complementary needs for change and stability.

TANZANIA'S INTERNAL POLICIES

Tanzania is attempting to achieve change by deliberate policy, and to maintain stability by involving all the people in both the direction and the process of change. We are under no illusions about the difficulty of the task we have undertaken. With few socialists we are trying to build socialism; with few people conscious of the basic requirements of democracy we are trying to achieve change by democratic means; with few technicians we are trying to effect a fundamental transformation of our economy. And with an educational elite whose whole teaching encouraged motives individualistic advancement, we are trying to create an egalitarian society!

It is not my intention to speak about these internal policies today. I will only say that so far we have retained our balance. But I am optimistic about our future, provided that

factors outside our control do not prevent us from continuing with our efforts.

CHANGE AND STABILITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

For Tanzania is one small part of Africa, and our future is linked with that of the continent as a whole. Even if we wished, we could not be unaffected by what happens on this land mass. But in fact none of us in Africa has learned to think in exclusively nationalistic terms—we still think of ourselves as Africans. It is, of course, true that there are some conflicts between African states and within African states. Yet these are like the conflicts between the Provinces of Canada—important provided there is no overwhelming external challenge to the principles on which the existence of each state is based. Our part of Africa feels itself to be involved with all other parts. We are learning—indeed I think we have learned—that the people from one free state have no right or duty to intervene in the affairs of another free state. We recognize that each nation has to deal with the conflicting needs of stability and change in its own way. If we think other free peoples are wrong, or if they fail in their endeavours, we still have no choice but to adapt ourselves to deal with the problems that their policies create for us.

But the situation is very different in relation to Southern Africa and to the remaining Portuguese colonies in Africa. In Mozambique, Angola and Portuguese Guinea, the African peoples are being governed by an external power which categorically rejects the principle of self-determination. In Southern Rhodesia the colonial power claims to accept the principle of self-determination, but has utterly failed to assert its authority against a racist minority which denies this principle. In South Africa the apartheid policy is imposed on the Africans and other non-white peoples, and maintained by the most ruthless suppression. And the United Nations has failed to take any effective steps to dislodge this same tyranny from South-West Africa. In all these cases, outside forces are suppressing Africans, and Africans are being humiliated and persecuted simply for being what they are—black or coloured Africans.

In relation to all these areas of our continent, therefore, Africa as a whole recognizes a challenge from external forces and from a racism which denies our rights as human beings. We cannot be uninvolved. Just one African state does not have a recent experience of colonialism—and for many years that was independent in name only. We have all suffered from some degree of racial discrimination. If we accept the continuation of such conditions in Southern Africa, we are denying our own moral right to freedom and human equality, and are forced to justify our existence on the grounds of an economic and military strength which we do not, in fact, possess. We cannot adopt this attitude.

But in any case, whatever the emotions may be, the fact is that Tanzania's freedom is itself in jeopardy while colonialism and racism remain dominant on our borders. As long as we insist on making a reality of our freedom, and pursuing policies which uphold the dignity of African people, our existence is a threat to the colonialist and racist states of Southern Africa. They would inevitably take steps to reduce the effectiveness of our policies and to control our actions. For just as their policy of racism makes it daily more difficult for us to build a state on the basis of non-racism, so they cannot secure their slave systems while the rest of Africa uses its freedom for the benefit of its people. The principles of freedom and equality have no validity unless they are of universal validity; and the principle of racial supremacy is invalid unless it is universally valid. Conflict between these two conceptions of humanity is inevitable. Where they meet, the conflict will become an active one.

Tanzania's concern with the situation in Southern Africa is thus not something which is extraneous to our other policies. It is a matter affecting our security. It is central to everything we try to do. It is not that we are great altruists who love freedom so much that they will fight for it everywhere and anywhere. We know our limitations. We also know that people can only free themselves—no-one else can prevent them from trying to win their freedom, and no-one else can do it for them. But in the case of Southern Africa, we and the other free states are all involved. We are all Africans; we all need to work together for the real development of any of us; and a continuing freedom struggle in one part of the continent affects the security of all other parts. This involvement is acutely realized in Tanzania because we are a border state between free Africa and colonial Africa; but the same considerations apply to a greater or lesser extent to all free African states. Very little can be understood about Africa until this is understood.

Let me therefore try to sum up our position on this matter. The common objective of the African people is self-determination for the peoples of Southern Africa and the other Portuguese colonies, and an end to the official propagation and practice of racism in our continent. That is all. We are not anti-white terrorists wishing to impose a reverse racism; we wish to uphold human equality and to give human dignity and non-racism a chance to grow in our lands.

As far as the free states of Africa are concerned, what comes after freedom is an affair of the peoples of those territories. It is not for us to decide what sort of government they will have or what sort of system they will adopt. Tanzania must support the struggle for freedom in these areas regardless of the political philosophy of those who are conducting the struggle. If they are capitalists, we must support them; if they are liberals, we must support them; if they are communists, we must support them; if they are socialists, we must support them. We support them as nationalists. Our own commitment to socialism in Tanzania is irrelevant to the right of the people of Mozambique (and the other areas) to choose their own government and their own political system. The right of a people to freedom from alien domination comes before socialism. The right of a man to stand upright as a human being in his own country comes before questions of the kind of society he will create once he has that right. Freedom is the only thing that matters until it is won. The support which is given to the freedom struggles by Tanzania and by other African states is neither a disguised form of new imperialism nor an evangelical mission for socialism or capitalism. It is a recognition of the oneness of Africa.

BY PEACE OR VIOLENCE?

Yet there remains a big question. Is the freedom struggle to be waged by peaceful methods or by violence? Is Africa to support the freedom movement regardless of the methods used, or could we make our support conditional?

There are some people who appear to believe that there is virtue in violence and that only if a freedom struggle is conducted by war and bloodshed can it lead to real liberation. I am not one of these people; the Government of Tanzania does not accept this doctrine, and nor do any of the other free African Governments as far as I am aware. We know that war causes immense sufferings, that it is usually the most innocent who are the chief victims, and that the hatred and fear generated by war are dangerous to the very freedom and non-racism it is our purpose to support. We have a deep desire for a peaceful transfer of power to the people. We believe that if a door is shut, attempts should be made to open it; if it is ajar, it should be pushed until it is

open wide. In neither case should the door be blown up at the expense of those inside.

But if the door to freedom is locked and bolted, and the present guardians of the door have refused to turn the key or pull the bolts, the choice is very straightforward. Either you accept the lack of freedom or you break the door down.

That, unfortunately, is the present position in Southern Africa and, unless there is some new outside influence which forces a reversal of policy on those now in power, that is the choice now before us.

Portugal has proclaimed that its colonies in Africa are part of the metropolitan country and that self-determination for the peoples of these territories is therefore not a matter for discussion. Political organization is prohibited, all attempts at peaceful protest are suppressed, and change by negotiation is ruled out. In Rhodesia, the people's organizations have been banned and the leaders imprisoned. Even the British Government's absurd suggestion that the white minority should promise to bring discrimination to an end gradually has been answered by a clear statement of determination to maintain perpetual white supremacy. To the South African Government, discrimination on racial grounds is a basic article of faith which admits no argument.

In all these areas the demand for freedom has been rejected in principle. The door to progress is shut, bolted and barred.

In such a situation the only way the people can get freedom is by force. A peaceful end to oppression is impossible. The only choice before the people is organized or unorganized violence. But chaos will result, not freedom, from spontaneous uprisings when the frustrations get too great to be borne, or when some fresh turn of the screw goads the people to madness. Indeed, spontaneous uprisings in a modern and ruthless state are little more than mass suicide; they only achieve the release of death for many, and increased suffering for the others. When every avenue of peaceful change is blocked, then the only way forward to positive change is by channeling and directing the people's fury—that is, by organized violence, by a people's war against their government.

When this happens, Tanzania cannot deny support, for to do so would be to deny the validity of African freedom and African dignity. We are naturally and inevitably allies of the freedom fighters. We may decide, as we have decided, that no Tanzanian will take part in these wars; we may recognize the fact that we cannot arm the freedom fighters. But we cannot call for freedom in Southern Africa, and at the same time deny all assistance to those who are fighting for it, when we know, as well as they do, that every other means of achieving freedom has been excluded by those now in power.

THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE WEST

But it is not only African states which are inevitably involved in this conflict. All the traditional friends and allies of the powers concerned are also involved. Portugal is a member of N.A.T.O. To say the very least—much less than we believe to be the case!—the resulting military support allows Portugal to devote a greater proportion of her men and resources to the occupation of her African colonies than would otherwise be the case. Further, Portugal is a member of E.F.T.A.; it derives great benefit from selling to its Western allies goods which originate in the African colonies. Such economic links are another factor in the ability of the poorest state in Europe to spend something like 47 per cent of its Budget on "overseas defence"—which really means on the maintenance of colonialism in Africa.

About South Africa's position, I am sure it is unnecessary for me to say very much. It has great wealth and economic strength derived in part from past foreign investment. Its continuing economic development also

owes much to new investment and re-investment by Western firms, and its international trade links with the West are very important to both sides. Indeed, the size of the Western involvement in South Africa's economy can be gauged by the indignation with which African demands for an economic boycott are met.

The illegality of the Southern Rhodesian regime has led to an economic boycott being imposed on that country. Nonetheless, the refusal of the colonial power either to make the boycott a total and effective one, or to enforce its decisions by direct intervention, has a reason. It reflects a sense of involvement with that administration and the people it represents—in other words, the dominant minority.

But my real point is not the fact of the West's economic involvement with Southern Africa. My concern is with their ideological involvement. I am not accusing the Western powers of conscious racialism, but of a preoccupation with conflicts which are at present irrelevant to the situation in Africa.

N.A.T.O. is a Western military alliance against East European communism—perhaps against communism itself—and Portugal is a member of N.A.T.O. South Africa claims to be a bastion against communism in Africa. The regime in Rhodesia claims that it is defending its part of Africa against communist-inspired chaos. These states are all anxious that their struggle against the freedom movements should be interpreted in the West as part of a world-wide anti-communist struggle. The real danger which worries me is that the West will accept this interpretation, and that it will, in consequence, betray its own principles by supporting these Southern African regimes.

The principle of self-determination and of national freedom is part of the democratic ideal; it is enshrined in all the greatest philosophies and documents of the Western world. But will the West recognize that this is the question at issue in Southern Africa, or will it be confused by this talk of "Western civilization" fighting "Eastern communism"?

If the struggle in Southern Africa is seen as the freedom struggle which it in fact is, the policies of Western states—both governments and peoples—will be determined only by the degree of their willingness to sacrifice immediate economic interests to political principles. But if the West accepts the South African and Portuguese argument that they are fighting on behalf of the "free world" against communism, then I believe that in time this interpretation will become defensible—at least as regards their enemies. For if the West supports these racist and fascist states, the freedom struggle will in reality become a part of the world ideological conflict—as it is now wrongly alleged to be. Further, I believe that if this is allowed to happen, we are liable to finish up with an even more disastrous conflict—a conflict of the races. For Africa and the West will be on opposite sides of the barricades; and Africans will have the support of Asia and large parts of Latin America.

Let me explain my fears and what I believe can be done by countries of the Western bloc to avoid such catastrophes.

PRESSURE FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE

Africa is anxious for peace in Southern Africa. But the possibility of this depends upon the possibility of ending the present injustice without war. Neither free Africa nor the Western world has the right to ask the peoples of Southern Africa to accept indefinitely the present humiliation, oppression and foreign domination; and in any case they would not pay heed to any such demands. The only chance for peace in Southern Africa is if change can be secured without violence. If this is possible, no one will be happier than the people of Africa. But we

have tried peaceful methods and we have failed. The people of Southern Africa are therefore resorting to war, and the free African states are supporting them. The only chance for peace now is if the allies of the Southern African states are willing and able to exert the kind of pressure which brings change with the minimum of violence.

Do the Western powers have the ability to exert such pressure? I believe that they have a great deal of power if they are willing to use it for this purpose. Both South Africa and Portugal gain great benefit from their association with the Western nations; they will not wish to lose that benefit.

It is possible that South Africa would refuse to make any concessions to the democratic sensibilities of its allies, even at the cost of complete international isolation. I say this is possible because many people in South Africa believe in apartheid as a religion and will defend their faith until death. But there are other South Africans who rejoice in, and who support, the segregationist policies of that Government because of the material benefit and the position of privilege it gives them. I believe this is the majority. Such people give a support which is conditional to the extent that it is not based on fear; there is a limit to the degree of international isolation they would be willing to accept rather than accept an organized move towards individual human equality. At the very least, therefore, strong Western pressure on South Africa could introduce a new uncertainty and new insecurity among the dominant group. The police state machine would thus lose the virtually total white support which it at present enjoys. In that case, the violence may not be of such long duration or of such bitterness.

But what ever the situation in South Africa, it is quite certain that Portugal could not withstand real pressures for change exerted by its N.A.T.O. allies. A nation can withstand pressures from outside when it is united in hostility to that pressure. But a poor nation cannot maintain its domination over territories twenty times its own size, and over populations 50 per cent greater than its own unless it has the support of more powerful countries. In relation to the Portuguese colonies at least, members of the Western alliance do have the power to secure peace in Africa. They have the power to make a continuation of their support conditional upon Portugal's accepting the principle of self-determination.

Thus, in one case certainly, and in the other case possibly, it is the West which makes the choice between peace and war in Southern Africa. The question is not whether the Western powers are able to exert pressure on Portugal and on South Africa, but whether they are willing to do so. It is the implications of that question which I hope the people of this and other countries will carefully consider.

For I must stress that the choice before the free states of the world—which includes both Canada and Tanzania—is not between peaceful change and no change. The choice is between peaceful change and conflict. In the absence of peaceful change and real prospects of its continuing, the African people will fight for their rights. They will destroy stability rather than suffer under the stability of oppression. They have already begun to do so. We are not at the eleventh hour; we are past the twelfth. Already peace has to be re-established and confidence regained—both of which are harder things to do than to prevent war or to retain trust. So what is the alternative to a change in Southern Africa which is combined with stability?

THE IMPLICATIONS OF WAR

Portugal, South Africa and the regime in Southern Rhodesia are all heavily armed

with modern weapons and they have access to more weapons. They even manufacture some. If the freedom fighters are to succeed in war, they too must have arms. Not even the most skilled guerrilla movement can fight machine guns with bows and arrows, or dig elephant traps across surfaced roads. Africa cannot supply these arms; we do not make them, and we have no money to buy them.

But if the Western powers will not put pressure on their friends to secure peaceful change, is it likely that they will supply arms to those who in desperation have decided to get change by force? We all know the answer. The freedom movements will therefore get their arms from the communist powers. And these communist powers will be their exclusive suppliers.

In these circumstances it is no use anyone telling the freedom fighters—or telling the free states of Africa—about the evils of communism, or about the possibility that the supplying states may present a bill for their support. We all know of that possibility; we do not imagine that communism makes great powers less subject to the temptations of greatness. But we are much less concerned about possible future dangers—which may never develop—than we are with present facts. And those facts are that Africa is occupied by an alien power now; its people are suffering under minority domination now. We have to fight these things. So, we accept arms from communist states, and say "thank you" for them.

On the same basis, the nationalists of Southern Africa get their training where they can and from whom they can. Sometimes free African states can help in this; sometimes they cannot. And when they cannot, it is again communist countries which offer to help, and again we accept with gratitude.

We know our own motives in these actions. We are not communists; we are nationalists desiring freedom. We recognize the possibility that those who are helping us may have different motives. That is what we are told and we have no proof that it is not so. But we do have proof of our existing need and of practical offers to help.

So the freedom fighters use communist arms and are trained in communist countries because they have no choice. This is happening now and it will continue. And then South Africa and Portugal will proclaim to their allies this 'proof' that they are fighting communism. They will show captured communist weapons and display some hapless prisoner-of-war (whom they will call a criminal) in order to persuade those opposed to communism to support their war against the freedom fighters. They will also show evidence of cruelties, and tell tales of fear and suffering experienced by non-combatants on their side. And they will argue that this is the kind of people their opponents are—communists and racists. Some of this evidence will be forged, but some will be true. Wars are always ugly and brutal, and guerrilla warfare is no exception.

In the face of this kind of psychological pressure, I am afraid that Western states would strengthen their support for the Southern African regimes. They would argue that for their own protection it was necessary to prevent Africa from falling into the hands of communists. They will therefore strengthen their economic support, and then agree to sell arms—or to give them—to the regimes of Southern Africa. Even the democratic and liberal people of the Western states will lose sympathy for the freedom movements, because they will come to believe that these have been captured by the communists. And gradually this conflict will become the ideological conflict which at present it is not.

At that point, because Africa does not look at things through cold war spectacles,

the nature of the conflict may change again; it may become a confrontation between the poor, coloured world and the rich, white world. Only support for the freedom fighters from the Russian and East European communists would be breaking the colour pattern, and perhaps saving the world from this disaster. Indeed, it may be that the liberal humanitarians of Western Europe and North America may find themselves grateful to the white communists!

I am talking of what seems to me to be a terrifying series of events unless some effort is made to break the chain of logic in African and Western bloc relations. Of course, I have grossly simplified what would really happen; but we in Africa are not very sophisticated people, and indeed I do not believe the masses in any country are politically sophisticated. Therefore, I think that the pattern I have outlined is the way things might well look to us from our different sides. The people in the West would be seeing us as communists who wish them ill; we would be seeing them as supporters of racialism and of tyranny.

THE INEVITABLE CAN BE AVOIDED

These possibilities are real. If they develop, the effect on Africa could be terrible, and Africa's freedom struggle will bring great trouble to the world instead of releasing new energies for human growth—which is what we would like to think will happen. Yet knowing all that, we cannot draw back. For these are dangers and, however, inevitable they may appear in logic, they are possibilities only. Our oppression is real and present.

Yet I believe that the dangers I have outlined can still be avoided, or at least very greatly reduced, if the Western powers look at the Southern African question in its proper framework, and if they now take the necessary action to de-fuse the situation. I know that it is not easy for the Western states to put pressure on their allies; all developed states are reluctant to interfere in what they regard as the internal affairs of another developed state. I know too that international trade is of mutual benefit, and that—as far as the Western states are concerned—their partners' gain from this trade is incidental to their own. I know that the West has heavy investments in Southern Africa which they wish to protect. But I do not believe that these facts necessarily determine the issue, for I do not believe that the only thing which the West cares about is economics. I am neither a Marxist nor a Capitalist. I do not believe that every human value is, or need always be, sacrificed to economic interests. I believe that the basic philosophy of Western democracy has its own life and its own power, and that the people's concept of freedom can triumph over their materialism.

However, even if I did believe that economics was the only thing which mattered to the West, I would still ask myself whether short-term or long-term factors will determine the West's policies. For although South Africa may now be a bigger trading partner than all the rest of Africa put together—I do not know whether this is true for Canada—this will not always be the case. The population of South Africa is about 18 million; that of the rest of Africa is in the region of 250 million. However great the difference in wealth, these stark figures have their own logic—especially as the rest of us develop and become better markets because we are richer.

Further, the value of investments depends on their productivity. They are no use if the cost of protecting them is more than the return they give. And investments in areas of inevitable and foreseeable instability are surely of less value than investments where instability is a present but passing danger.

For Southern Africa is still fighting for the right to begin change. Except to the extent that the kind of change develops out of the nature of the struggle, the real problems of African development in these areas will remain to be settled when freedom is won.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, when you asked me to speak at this University, it may be that you were expecting me to speak about the internal affairs of Tanzania or about the relevance of our experiment in socialism for other countries—though you were too kind to express your wishes. But I have chosen to talk of change as an essential element in the stability which we need, and to emphasize this in relation to Southern Africa. I have done this for a very particular reason.

This is a Canadian University, and we in Tanzania have very great respect and admiration for the people of Canada. We believe that this country has both the opportunity and the willingness to try to build bridges in the world, and in particular to build a bridge across the chasm of colour. I therefore chose to discuss this question with you because I believe you will understand what I am trying to say, and will care about these matters.

I know, of course, that Canada has its own problems of cultural conflict, of peoples with different languages and different backgrounds living together. I know that within your own society you are now trying to work out new modes of co-operation, which allows a full expression of democracy without jeopardizing the special cultural interests of any minority. These are real problems for you; indeed your efforts in this matter are of world-wide interest. It would therefore not be surprising if such questions preoccupied the attention of the Canadian people. But the world is very small now. Canada's actions—or lack of them—in relation to Africa are also important to your future as well as to ours. For the questions are there; and the threat to peace is there. They will not go away because this large, wealthy and peace-loving state wishes to concentrate on its internal problems. You cannot escape giving an answer to the challenge of the freedom movements in Africa—even if it is only an answer by default.

Let me make it quite clear that I am not promising peace, stability, democracy, humanity or an absence of oppression in Africa, provided Canada (either alone or with its allies) recognizes the freedom struggle in Southern Africa for what it is, and adopts attitudes in conformity with its own principles. Africa has too many problems for that kind of optimism. When national freedom exists all over Africa, and when racial minorities cease to dominate any part of our continent, we will still have daunting difficulties to face and few resources with which to tackle them. We may still fail to make good use of our opportunities; we may be as slow to develop real individual freedom from both economic and political oppression as the worst states in the world. But we are determined to gain the chance to try to deal with these problems. And we can only give top priority to these questions of developing individual freedom and individual dignity when the whole of Africa is free.

The questions remain. Will Canada at least understand that freedom means as much to us in Africa as it does to any other people? And, if Canada cannot support our struggle, will it at least be able to refrain from giving comfort and help to those who would deny freedom and dignity to us? For the sake of Tanzania and Africa most of all, but also for the sake of future relations between men of different colours and different creeds, I hope that Canadians will be able to give attention to these problems. I hope that Universities like this one will help the people of this country to consider all the implications of their choice.

VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published Saturday, October 4, 1969, in the Washington Post contained some thought-provoking observations on violence on our television screens, and I would like to add a comment of my own by way of introduction. Because I share the widespread concern for the increase in crime, especially violent crime, I have sponsored legislation to reform the District's courts and its bail procedures and continue to urge speedy enactment of many of the administration's anticrime proposals. At the same time, we must be aware that swifter justice to criminal offenders will not cure the disposition to violent acts which too many people acquire at an early age. Violence does not always begin at home, but thanks to television, it can be learned there. A steady diet of television programs where sometimes even the good guys are hot-heads and bullies sets nothing but bad examples for our children.

Certainly censorship creates more problems than it solves. It would not dull the public taste for violence or the eagerness of the networks to cater to it. I wish, therefore, to commend those networks which are taking voluntary steps to reduce the level of hostilities in this year's programming, especially in programs viewed by children. It is now up to all of us as citizens and parents to let the networks know in no uncertain terms that we support these efforts.

The editorial is as follows:

VIOLENCE ON THE SCREEN

Both the blessing and the curse of television are readily apparent to anyone with young children. The temptation to gain a bit of quiet and to get some work done without interruption by letting the kids park themselves in front of the tube, particularly on Saturday mornings, is almost overwhelming. Yet, for those of us who worry about what our children are learning, every moment of that freedom has been plagued with a sense of unease about the fare that has spilled out of the television sets.

As a result, the report of the National Commission on Violence about television programming and the reaction of the networks to it support both our fears and our hopes. The report says that the "constant portrayal of violence" on television panders "to a public preoccupation with violence that television itself has helped to create." In simpler words, the commission suggests that our society has become interested in and perhaps tolerant of violence because its members have seen so much of it in the non-news programming of the last two decades. It may be, although the data are not yet conclusive, that part of the surge in crime can be attributed to the diet of television shows in which violence is an accepted method of reaching desired ends. A child brought up on programs in which the good guys win by beating up, shooting, or otherwise mutilating the bad guys may well come to believe that this is acceptable conduct. And it is the kind of conduct that has filled far too many so-called children's programs as well as the adult programs of the early evening that attract many children.

The networks have responded to this report not, as they have done sometimes in the past,

by denying the implications but by pointing to the changes made in programming in recent months. The amount of violence on television is down sharply this fall from what it was just two years ago and Saturday mornings, particularly, have been cleansed to a great extent of the shows that sent tremors up the back of every sensitive parent. It is much more comfortable for the parents, and probably much better for the future of the nation, to have that long morning full of friendly and humorous cartoon characters than of the titans who battled across the tube previously. At the same time, the first reports on the new fall "season" indicate that the amount of violence portrayed during the prime evening hours has also been reduced. All this is to the good and television deserves a thank-you for it. But there are still programs that ought to be cleaned up and perhaps the commission's comments will help accomplish this.

One recommendation of the commission deserves special notice. It is the backing the commission has given to efforts of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to obtain adequate financing from Congress. Public television can be the leader in developing both better fare and the appetite for it among both adults and children; surely the National Education Network's "Misterogers Neighborhood" is a model program for children both in its content and, if our experiences are indicators, in its audience-pulling power. NEP's new programs look promising, especially its ambitious mornings for children, and Congress ought to speed action on the corporation's request for interim and long-term financing so that it can expand this kind of experimental programming.

LIBERALS BECOME SILENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last July, I introduced House Resolution 497 to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete study of the demography of the United States with the view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States, and in the political subdivisions of each State.

On September 8, I called for cosponsors, especially from those who had earlier indicated their approval of such social weapons as forced busing to overcome racial imbalance.

If assignment of schoolchildren on racial percentages is to be a solution to the racial tension and forced busing is regarded as an acceptable expedient for eliminating imbalance, then those experts on solving the race problem in my State should, in the national interest, enthusiastically lead in any program to overcome national racial imbalance.

If it is morally right to forcibly transfer the children of my district from school to school—and distance should not be a factor in morality—then it must be just as moral to bus children, or for that matter, entire families from State to State to overcome racial imbalance nationwide. In fact, with this philosophy it would be immoral not to do so.

However, as anticipated, I have no offer to cosponsor or inquiries to support my bill from those socially aware and personally committed civil righters, who righteously profess indignation over racial imbalance in my district. They conveniently overlook their theme of a "fully integrated society" when it comes to their district or their State.

Examining the most recent census figures on racial imbalance in the United States, one can easily determine why support for my bill, House Resolution 497, is not forthcoming from those usually outspoken leaders in the field of civil rights.

I include an excerpt from the text of House Resolution 497 and the census figures as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE RESOLUTION 497

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the demography of the United States with the view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States and in the political subdivisions of each State.

Negro population by States, 1960

Rank and State:	
1 New York	1,417,511
2 Texas	1,187,125
3 Georgia	1,122,596
4 North Carolina	1,116,021
5 Louisiana	1,039,207
6 Illinois	1,037,470
7 Alabama	980,271
8 Mississippi	915,743
9 California	883,861
10 Florida	880,186
11 Pennsylvania	852,750
12 South Carolina	829,291
13 Virginia	816,258
14 Ohio	786,097
15 Michigan	717,581
16 Tennessee	586,876
17 Maryland	518,410
18 New Jersey	514,875
19 District of Columbia	411,737
20 Missouri	390,853
21 Arkansas	388,787
22 Indiana	269,275
23 Kentucky	215,949
24 Oklahoma	153,084
25 Massachusetts	111,842
26 Connecticut	107,449
27 Kansas	91,445
28 West Virginia	89,378
29 Wisconsin	74,546
30 Delaware	60,688
31 Washington	48,738
32 Arizona	43,403
33 Colorado	39,992
34 Nebraska	29,262
35 Iowa	25,354
36 Minnesota	22,263
37 Rhode Island	18,332
38 Oregon	18,133
39 New Mexico	17,063
40 Nevada	13,484
41 Alaska	6,771
42 Hawaii	4,943
43 Utah	4,148
44 Maine	3,318
45 Wyoming	2,183
46 New Hampshire	1,903
47 Idaho	1,502
48 Montana	1,467
49 South Dakota	1,114
50 North Dakota	777
51 Vermont	519

National total..... 18,871,831

Source: 1960 U.S. Census.

Percentage of Negro population by States, 1960

Rank and State:	
1 District of Columbia	53.9
2 Mississippi	42.0
3 South Carolina	34.8
4 Louisiana	31.9
5 Alabama	30.0
6 Georgia	28.5
7 North Carolina	24.5
8 Arkansas	21.8
9 Virginia	20.6
10 Florida	17.8
11 Maryland	16.7
12 Tennessee	16.5
13 Delaware	13.6
14 Texas	12.4
National average	10.5

15 Illinois	10.3
16 Michigan	9.2
17 Missouri	9.0
18 New Jersey	8.5
19 New York	8.4
20 Ohio	8.1
21 Pennsylvania	7.5
22 Kentucky	7.1
23 Oklahoma	6.6
24 Indiana	5.8
25 California	5.6
26 West Virginia	4.8
27 Nevada	4.7
28 Connecticut	4.2
29 Kansas	4.2
30 Arizona	3.3
31 Alaska	3.0
32 Colorado	2.3
33 Massachusetts	2.2
34 Nebraska	2.1
35 Rhode Island	2.1
36 Wisconsin	1.9
37 New Mexico	1.8
38 Washington	1.7
39 Oregon	1.0
40 Iowa	0.9
41 Hawaii	0.8
42 Minnesota	0.7
43 Wyoming	0.7
44 Utah	0.5
45 Maine	0.3
46 New Hampshire	0.3
47 Idaho	0.2
48 Montana	0.2
49 South Dakota	0.2
50 North Dakota	0.1
51 Vermont	0.1

Source: 1960 U.S. Census.

A REPLY TO ATTACK ON NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION—NSA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received through the mail some "stop NSA" literature being distributed by one of the Members of this House.

In an effort to make sure that all Members have at hand some of the answers to questions raised by the Member, I have asked the National Student Association to let me have some of their material which, with unanimous consent, appears in the RECORD below:

What is NSA's membership base?

NSA has, since its founding in 1947, been a confederation of student governments. Membership in NSA is and always has been restricted to student governments at ac-

credited two or four year institutions of higher learning. There is no individual or ad hoc group membership.

NSA membership—Is it declining?

A frequent charge of the Far Right has been that NSA membership has steadily declined since the CIA disclosures in March, 1967.

The truth is that NSA membership has steadily increased from roughly 280 in March 1967 to the present membership of 390.

Membership in NSA is affected through a campus democratic process, whether it be by action of the elected student legislature or by a referendum of the entire student body.

There is every indication that NSA membership will continue to increase, and there is no indication that it is decreasing.

What is NSA's tax status? What does it mean?

In August, 1968, NSA received official confirmation of a C-3 tax status which means that the Association is, by definition of the Internal Revenue Service, a tax free, non-legislative, non-profit organization. As such NSA cannot run legislative campaigns, nor endorse political candidates.

At the National Congress in August, 1968 (at Kansas State University), the assembled NSA delegates overwhelmingly adopted what was known as the "Dual Corporation Proposal." Following the model of the Urban Coalition, the NAACP, the AFL-CIO, and the Center for Community Change, NSA has been in the process of creating a legislative arm which would be able to involve itself in the political concerns of students. As in the case of the above mentioned organizations, the C-4 corporation would be governed by the same parties as the C-3 corporation. The activities of the "legislative arm" are specifically restricted by mandates of the National Congress. To repeat, *when this proposal is accepted by the IRS*, NSA legislative activities will be limited to five (5) specific areas, selected by the delegates to the national meeting, through democratic processes. Even under the "dual corporation" NSA would still be unable to endorse candidates for office.

What are the political activities of NSA?

NSA does not engage in legislative or partisan political activity, at the present, due to its tax status. (Note: See question on "Tax Status.")

What are NSA resolutions?

While (as the previous two answers indicate) NSA cannot involve itself in legislative activity, this does not mean that NSA cannot act as a forum for expression on the central concerns of students.

NSA conceives of students as "participants," and the member student governments have repeatedly decided that they do not desire to remain silent on such questions. As a matter of relevancy, representatives from student governments have felt a need to take stands on issues that concern them.

NSA resolutions are approved at the National Congress through an internal democratic procedure, utilizing the committee and petitioning processes. There is ample provision, within the Congress Rules, for minority statements.

The resolutions carried at the Congress, while becoming the official policy of N.S.A., only represent those in the room voting "yes," and are not interpreted to represent either member student governments, student bodies, the institutions that delegates attend, or the American student community as a whole.

Whatever representative quality an NSA resolution has, is restricted to those voting delegates who supported that piece of legislation. NSA resolutions are a viewpoint of those delegates, and are interpreted as such.

However, only a small part of NSA's 12 to 15 day Congress is spent in consideration of NSA policy and resolutions. In the past, a good deal of the time was spent in plenary

sessions, but this has been steadily decreasing, as illustrated by the following list of the number of resolutions considered (not approved) at the last four Congresses:

1965, University of Wisconsin.....	130
1966, University of Illinois.....	80
1967, University of Maryland.....	25
1968, Kansas State University.....	12

It should also be noted that many of the resolutions were for internal NSA student government programming, and only a few pertained to international and national policies.

The vast majority of time is spent in educational workshops, panels, small group discussions, symposia and so on.

At the conclusion of each Congress, NSA codifies and publishes the resolutions, which are then available to anyone upon request.

Is NSA representative? Does it claim to be?

It would be simply ludicrous for NSA to assert that it represented the American student community, or that it even represented the over 1.6 million students enrolled at NSA member schools.

NSA represents and services those students governments which decide to affiliate with NAS and to take advantage of the numerous programs of the Association.

At the XXI National Congress, in 1968, NSA made a survey of the "type" of delegate who attends NSA meetings. These are some of the results:

(A) 87% of those attending held some student government office.

(B) 72% declared themselves either Republican or Democrat, as far as party preference.

(C) 52% stated that their family income was between \$8,000 to \$15,000.

(D) 28% were members of Greek societies, and 30% came from campuses where none existed—only 9% stated they "strongly disapproved" of such societies.

(E) 81% stated that they attended religious services (35% once a week).

(F) 80% said they would not attend the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago.

(G) 76% said that their student government's affiliation with NSA was becoming stronger or remaining strong.

(H) 97% said the reason for their school's affiliation with NSA was because of either the services, educational reform or student rights programs.

(I) 72% said they were liberal politically, 6% said they were radicals, and 22% claimed to be conservative.

(Copies of this poll are available on request.)

This poll certainly disproves any assertion that NSA is a leftist-radical organization operating on the outer political fringe of society.

Who is Behind the STOP-NSA movement?

Operating under such innocuous titles as the "Committee for Responsible Student Government," and "Committee for an Open Campus," it is still not too difficult to determine, from the continual repetition of the same charges, in the same style, and even in the same words, that the major source of the literature is STOP-NSA.

Stop-NSA is an adjunct of the Young Americans for Freedom, a far-right student organization with only a sprinkling of campus support. In Congress, a former President of the YAF, Buz Lukens (R-Ohio), is the spokesman and leader of the anti-NSA sentiment. Congressman Lukens has been sending a fund raising letter for STOP-NSA in which he encloses an anti-NSA article written by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, a granddaughter of President Theodore Roosevelt. Miss Roosevelt appears periodically in several far right publications. In 1964, she was a faculty member at the Christian Crusade Anti-Communist Leadership School, and her speaking engagements have been made by the American Opinion Speakers Bureau of the John Birch Society.

It is important to consider anti-NSA material in its real political context.

What are NSA's connections with radical student groups?

NSA has no formal or informal affiliation or working relationship with SDS or any other radical political group.

YAF, in its anti-NSA materials, finds a good resource in utilizing far left literature which usually is not too complementary to NSA . . . therefore it is somewhat surprising that YAF can assert that NSA and SDS are working "hand-in-hand."

NSA, it has been said, is a "militant anti-Greek" organization, pledged to the destruction of sororities and fraternities. True?

Hardly.

NSA policy, since 1958, has officially favored "cooperation and understanding" with Greek societies. This stance has only been qualified by the position of NSA on discrimination and against restrictive clauses within fraternal charters. This statement is:

"No incoming group shall be allowed on campus which contains in its constitution and/or by-laws, discriminatory clauses with regard to race, color, religion, creed, political belief, or national origin. In the case of existing organizations which do discriminate, the institution and the student body should make every reasonable effort to obtain the elimination of such discriminatory practices as rapidly as possible." (1965)

NSA, for some time, both in its own practices and its recommendations, has, without qualification, opposed racist practices. In this light, NSA is not opposed to fraternal organizations as long as they do not practice racial or religious discrimination. Where Greek societies are free of such practices, NSA would be willing to work with them like any other group.

It has been said that NSA officers must keep the Association going to preserve their "lavish salaries." Is this true?

Ludicrous, pure and simple.

NSA officers (one President and two Vice Presidents) receive \$4,500 per year, and each has a travel budget of \$1,500. NSA officers rarely serve beyond their one year term and usually return to school.

NSA staff receive between \$4,500 and \$6,500, dependent on how long they have been with NSA and what their responsibilities are.

NSA honoraria for speaking engagements are, almost without exception, returned to the Association.

What is the draft status of NSA staff and officers?

At present, the draft status given a member of the NSA staff is entirely dependent upon his individual relationship with his local board. Now, as in the past (and presumably in the future), NSA officers and staff members have received 1-A classifications. The important point is that NSA has no external influences working on its behalf to insure any type of deferment.

How is NSA financed?

There are basically three sources of NSA income:

(1) *Dues from Member Schools.* These account for but a tiny fraction of income. With an annual budget of \$700,000, dues rarely run in excess of \$20,000 per year.

(2) *Services.* NSA services, which provide income to student governments, have not exceeded \$50,000 in the last three years. Currently, NSA is considering ways in which its services can be handled professionally, thereby greatly increasing income, for both NSA and student governments.

(3) *Grants.* The remainder of NSA's income comes from private foundations and government grants which are given the Association to carry out specific programs for students. Examples of past and present sources of grants are: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Economic Opportunity, National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Labor, Ford Foundation, Danforth Foundation, and Stern Family Fund.

The budget of NSA is adopted by the National Supervisory Board, and financial statements are made on a quarterly basis.

What is the structure of NSA? What kind of people are involved?

General and final authority for the direction and policy of the Association rests with the assembled delegates at the National Student congress.

At the Congress, each of the four (4) broad geographical areas (West, South, Midwest, and Northeast) elect members to the National Supervisory Board (NSB). The NSB, which is composed of ten (10) members who remain full-time students, meets no less than three (3) times a year to determine NSA policy within the limits of that set at the Congress. The NSB acts as a Board of Directors.

At the Congress, the delegates elect a President, an Executive Affairs Vice President, and a Campus Affairs Vice President to serve for a term of one year. The officers of NSA take a one year leave of absence from school to work full-time in the National Office. The officers, with the direction of the NSB and within the limits of Congress policy, direct, coordinate and supervise the activities of the Association and carry full responsibility for its actions. NSA officers and staff members are, for the most part, individuals who have held various positions in student government—many have been or are presently student body presidents.

The CIA: What are NSA's present international involvements?

After it was disclosed by *Ramparts* magazine in March, 1967, that NSA had received, over a period of years, large sums of money from the Central Intelligence Agency, the officers and staff of the Association began a very critical examination of international involvement.

Up until 1967, as appropriations and Congress resolutions suggests, NSA, as the American student organization, was "knee deep" in attending foreign conferences, in arranging international conferences here, in receiving representatives from foreign unions and so on. By the time the disclosures were made, NSA had severed all ties with the CIA, but was still continuing international programs, had an International Commission, and was a member of the International Student Conference (a pro-western, anti-communist federation).

In August, 1967, through a series of resolutions, the Congress formally admitted and then severed all ties with the CIA, withdrew from the ISC, and even changed the title of the international vice president, thus ending one of the most tragic chapters in the history of student organizations.

While there is an enormous amount of information available, on request, about the CIA-NSA relationship, the important present facts are as follows:

(1) NSA is not now, nor does it plan in the foreseeable future, any participation in the international area.

(2) NSA is neither a member of the International Student Conference or the International Union of Students, and it does not plan on affiliating.

(3) NSA has no connections with the Central Intelligence Agency or any other secret government agencies.

What is NSA's general philosophy?

Student governments basically have affiliated with the Association for four reasons:

(1) Student Governments feel a responsibility to develop basic services for student welfare.

(2) Student Governments within NSA have shared a fundamental belief in the basic rights of students.

(3) Student Governments within NSA share the belief that students have an important role to play in the decision making processes at the university.

(4) Student Governments feel a responsibility to involve themselves in the central political questions of the day.

NSA is committed to finding ways and formulating programs to meet those student needs which the member student governments feel.

OUTDATED MATERIAL

A word of caution: YAF has no great flare for accuracy or for timeliness. The great majority of right wing material against NSA was prepared in the early 1960's, so as a matter of factual accuracy, most of its material is out of date, irrelevant, and inaccurate.

In Congressman Buz Luken's statement in the *Congressional Record* (March 3, 1969), he lists a large group of NSA disaffiliates, which he states were taken from the NSA Codification of "January, 1961." It is therefore not surprising (with the passage of eight years) that the list is over 30% inaccurate.

CELLER RECALLS PRESIDENTS AND DAYS OF CURBSTONE CAMPAIGNING

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade now I have considered it to be a particular honor to serve on the Judiciary Committee under the wise chairmanship and guidance of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler). During his many years of distinguished service in this House, Mr. Celler has gained not only the respect and admiration of his colleagues, but also the esteem of a vast majority of the American people.

The most recent of his many triumphs and accomplishments was the overwhelming passage of the electoral reform bill calling for direct popular election of the President. His preeminent role in gaining the passage of this vital and much needed piece of legislation has been widely acknowledged and applauded throughout the country. One example of the public recognition of the signal service Mr. Celler has rendered over the years may be found in the following account which appeared recently in the *Christian Science Monitor* of October 4, 1969:

CELLER RECALLS PRESIDENTS—AND DAYS OF CURBSTONE CAMPAIGNING
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—"Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays!" cried Rep. Emanuel Celler (D) of New York.

The House tensed. Motion froze.

"The question is on the passage of the joint resolution," intoned the Speaker impersonally.

Suddenly alarm bells rang stridently all over the House, and in the three immense House office buildings—even in coat closets.

The yeas and nays were ordered. And the *Congressional Record* quietly added: "The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 70, not voting 21."

So Mr. Celler, who has sponsored three amendments to the United States Constitution, had successfully launched a fourth—to abolish the archaic electoral college.

"President Nixon's endorsement of it was like a cool wind in the heat of summer," Mr. Celler told a reporter in his office the other day.

WAVERING SENATORS

"I hope it will have a decisive effect on wavering senators."

Mr. Celler paused. Then the man who was considered a firebrand 47 years ago when he entered the House, but whose truculent bulldog face has long since mellowed into philosophical wrinkles, added:

"I hope the President will not only endorse it but will actually roll up his sleeves and do some fighting for it. And, if necessary, do some tickling of toes, and twisting of arms."

In 1968 Mr. Nixon said he wanted the presidential candidate with the most popular votes to win. As President he said he still favored direct popular election but feared it could not pass, so he was supporting the "district" plan—giving a candidate one electoral vote for each district, and two for each state.

When Mr. Celler won an overwhelming majority for the direct-election plan, Mr. Nixon telephoned his congratulations. But Mr. Celler hopes for a lot more than that, he explained wistfully as he rocked in his big swivel chair, with the autographed pictures behind him of all the presidents he has known. "Let's see, that's eight, no nine: Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and now Nixon."

TRUMAN FAVORED

Who was the one you enjoyed most? the visitor asked.

"Oh, Truman; he was simple and direct and straightforward. He was a man of the people. He will rank high in history, I think."

Who was the greatest?

A pause.

"Roosevelt was the greatest, I suppose. But he had his faults."

Mr. Celler has been chairman or ranking minority member of the powerful House Judiciary Committee since 1949. He was born in 1888 in a frame house on Sumner Avenue and Floyd Street in Brooklyn. Nobody else now in Congress has served so long.

He worked his way through Columbia, and Columbia Law School, and squeaked to election victory in 1922 in a hitherto Republican district by 3,111 votes. Now he normally wins his district by 3-to-1, or 5-to-1.

Those were the days! Mr. Celler's eyes light. It was curbstome campaigning, and you spoke from the tailgate of an open truck with a fire-and-drum corps playing and a burst of Roman candles and fireworks to gather the crowd which you then haranged.

Grandfatherly Mr. Celler salts his life with humor. There was this woman, he recalls, who listened to a rip-roaring speech in Brooklyn and gushingly asked him at the end if it wouldn't be printed. Mr. Celler wasn't so proud of the florid effusion but replied, deprecatingly:

"Yes, perhaps posthumously."

Quite pleased, the woman cooed that she "hoped this would be soon."

Mr. Celler can also be fierce, scornful, and curmudgeonly in debate, but he laces it more frequently now with humor. He stared once at a conservative questioner in the House and said, gently:

"We can give you the answer. But we cannot give you understanding."

And this same man who got House passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (first comprehensive act in 82 years), 1960 school and voting rights, 1964 public accommodations, and three subsequent civil-rights acts also unbends in the living room and, before unbelieving eyes of grandchildren, can turn a napkin into a rabbit that jumps.

FLATBUSH RECALLED

As an old Brooklyn boy himself, the reporter reminisced with Mr. Celler about the tree-lined Flatbush of former days, with ice wagons, and horse-drawn streetcars.

The congressman's office looks out on a park, with an angel-wing begonia on the sill and some original Celler sketches inconspicuously hung on one wall, drawn during speeches instead of doodling—David Ben-

Gurion, Adlai, Truman, Rayburn, Khrushchev.

"Herbert Hoover!" exclaimed Mr. Celler at one point, with a glance over his shoulder at the photograph behind him. "He lacked the gift of phrasemaking." He looked at the picture of the shy, uncomfortable-looking, high-collared president:

"Or something. . . . I was there when he dug the first earth for the great new Commerce Department Building. He was all for commerce, you know. He got a big spadeful of earth, and it had some worms in it. The only remark he mumbled on this historic moment was: 'Earthworms are very good for agriculture.'"

The walls of the room in the suite next to his office are lined with fountain pens under glass: each one a ceremonial presidential pen used to sign some bill that Mr. Celler had helped to pass. There are enough there to start a stationery shop, each with formal date, occasion, and presidential name attached. (Sometimes a president will use 30 pens for one "signature.")

As for those constitutional amendments he piloted, Mr. Celler recites them quickly—the 23rd (District of Columbia suffrage); 24th (antipoll tax); 25th (presidential disability).

Will there be a 26th? Mr. Celler sighs. He got the plan for direct majority vote brilliantly through the House with full Republican help.

What happens now in the Senate and the states, he says, will depend in part on presidential leadership.

PELLEY SUPPORTS MOVE AGAINST DDT

HON. THOMAS M. PELLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State director of agriculture will hold a hearing in Seattle next week on a petition of the Washington Environmental Council seeking a ban against DDT. Specifically, the petition calls for the cancellation of the registration for any use of all pesticides containing DDT.

This petition clearly points out that concentrations of DDT are found in many living organisms including man; and that the toxic effects of these concentrations in man still are largely unknown.

I have prepared a brief statement for inclusion in next week's hearing, and I insert these remarks at this point in the RECORD:

BAN AGAINST DDT

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS M. PELLEY, Representative, First District, Washington)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to submit a statement expressing in my views toward the further use of DDT in the State of Washington.

It is my opinion that the insecticide DDT is posing a complex dilemma. It has caused an undetermined amount of damage to the world's fish and wildlife resources, as well as causing serious and subtle changes in the environment. It is apparent that DDT is toxic to man and may persist for years with consequences unknown. Evidence shows that in the headlong rush to rely on expedient chemicals, many mistakes have been made and many safer alternatives have been passed up. There have been unintended damaging side effects and evidence suggests that

man may be seriously harming himself in the process.

Experiments indicate that DDT in very small concentrations can reduce growth and photosynthesis in certain marine plankton. Photosynthesis by marine plankton is estimated to account for more than half of the world's oxygen supply—some scientists theorize that we are already in an oxygen deficit situation. It has been said that marine organisms are extremely sensitive to persistent pesticides. As little as 0.6 parts per billion in the water will kill or immobilize a shrimp population in two days.

Oysters also have been harmfully affected. Nearly a million coho salmon were killed recently because of DDT, say Dr. Howard Johnson and Charles Pecor of Michigan State University who deduced that residues were accumulated in the egg yolk of adults and their fry were poisoned during final absorption of the yolk sac. In order to infect the salmon, the DDT had to travel hundreds of miles through air, water and soil and had to be consumed through the normal food chain of half a dozen organisms.

And, there has been a widespread loss of birds where elm trees are treated with DDT for Dutch elm disease. When leaves fall from a sprayed tree, they are eaten by worms. DDT does not harm the worms, but it accumulates in their tissues. When birds eat the worms they accumulate it in ever and finally lethal doses.

There have been innumerable cases in which frogs and snakes have been killed by pesticides and sometimes in massive numbers. Scientific studies also have linked pesticides with cancer, and there have been many deaths attributed to the misuse of pesticides in the home.

Mr. Chairman, the concern in America today over the misuse of pesticides is great indeed. Several States have restricted their use, and the State of Michigan's Department of Agriculture has issued two notices, one of them as late as June 30, 1969, cancelling the registration of DDT which makes the sale of the products illegal in Michigan. In addition, legislation is pending in 17 State Legislatures regarding the use of DDT.

These examples of the harm that DDT can cause are just several of the many that I have come across in my studies of pesticides. I firmly believe that the use should be restricted, and I strongly support the petition filed by the Washington Environmental Council.

And, again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to submit a statement expressing my strong and sincere feelings on this matter of the harmful effects of DDT on our environment.

THE REMEDY IS REAL GOLD, NOT "PAPER GOLD"

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the International Monetary Fund meeting in Washington last week has endorsed a new experiment to meet the world's monetary problems. The IMF approved activation of a plan authorizing special drawing rights for its members on a new pool of paper currency. This "paper gold" would join real gold and dollars as an addition to the world's monetary reserves.

The aim of SDR's is commendable. World monetary reserve assets are

shrinking. Dollars are not currently added to the pool. Until recently, at least, central bankers have refrained from buying new gold stocks under the so-called two-tiered gold price agreement.

But though the activation of SDR's represents an encouraging effort in international cooperation to expand the reserves, I have grave doubts that it offers more than a temporary palliative. Indeed, by giving false hope, it may prove to be a mistake and may further weaken the dollar.

The scale of the IMF's plan to create initially \$9.5 billion in paper currency over the next 3 years is not grand enough to bring real relief to the world's liquidity problem. SDR's appear to offer only a cheap, temporary solution to individual IMF members with chronic balance-of-payments problems. Europeans have registered concern that the United States might pursue such a course.

The failure of nations to cope with their international payments problems is the key to the weakness of the world's monetary system. No amount of SDR's can set this right.

My chief concern with SDR's, however, lies with their possible effect on the dollar. Milton Friedman, the eminent Chicago economist and monetary expert, has most clearly described the danger. Friedman argues that the two-tier gold system has in effect made SDR's obsolete before the system comes into being. SDR's might have been useful as a reserve asset in the days when central banks were free-wheeling in the world gold market. But now, with the supply of official gold virtually frozen, the central banks are holding tightly to their own gold stocks. SDR's then, Friedman believes, will not stimulate the circulation of gold reserves, but may be viewed by the banks as an asset to replace dollars. As the central banks accumulate SDR's they could dump dollars on the market, Friedman concludes, and the United States could face yet a deeper monetary crisis.

I agree with Friedman that reliance on SDR's is potentially dangerous to U.S. monetary stability. This, of course, is tantamount to saying that world stability is also threatened. The experiment in SDR's raises the same risk as we face in the use of untested drugs—the side effects may well do irreparable damage to the patient.

It seems to me that at this time the free world has no alternative but to rely on real, not paper gold. The United States could end the world's liquidity problems virtually overnight by raising the price of gold. By doubling this price to \$70 an ounce, the United States, for example, would almost double its own international monetary reserves, as would many of the other nations in the free world. This action could be coupled with other needed reforms.

The pressure on the United States to make all the major adjustments within the present international monetary framework would be turned off. The need to pursue riskier, more complicated solutions would be eliminated.

ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT SERIES PROVES CRISIS NATURE OF NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO REGULATE INLAND WATERWAY SAFETY

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in connection with the bill, H.R. 13304, to provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children, I traced the 12-year history of efforts to write into a law a program I first proposed in August 1957 to train teachers in the specialized skills of teaching all categories of exceptional children, including the gifted. The bill we passed yesterday completes that objective.

It is nearly 8 years since I first introduced legislation to require the licensing of key personnel and the inspection for safety of diesel-powered towboats and tugs in our inland waterways. We are finally on the verge of reaching agreement in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that some legislation in this field absolutely must be enacted in order to assure greater safety to those who work on the rivers and to the lives and properties of millions of Americans living or working alongside our major navigable rivers. It is tragic that we have taken so long to take even moderate legislative steps to solve this problem.

The first bill on the subject was introduced by me January 16, 1962, based on information developed by officials of Local 28, International Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL-CIO, of St. Louis, and by national officers of that organization. They had come to me in my capacity as a Representative from St. Louis serving on the Merchant Marine Committee to ask my help in solving the already serious safety problems on the inland rivers. But at that time, the Coast Guard was not aware that the problem was important enough or urgent enough to require any Federal legislation. So I asked the union to draft a bill which I could introduce for the purpose of obtaining hearings on specific proposals. That bill was H.R. 9700, of the 87th Congress, and, in introducing it, I said:

The bill which I am introducing by request as a means of bringing a long-standing problem before the Committee in a manner which will assure thorough hearings and consideration of the underlying issue, would extend to diesel-powered towboats the same requirements for inspection and certification now required in the case of steam-propelled towboats. Insofar as the inland waterways are concerned, I am informed that steam-powered towboats have virtually disappeared.

I am not personally conversant with the technical details of inspection and certification proceedings, but as one who was born and reared in one of America's great inland ports located on our greatest river, I am certainly aware of the importance of taking whatever steps are necessary to assure the safe use of our rivers by the mammoth trains of barges which carry tremendous amounts of industrial cargo.

In previous discussions of this problem with the Coast Guard, I was informed that accident statistics have not disclosed so far

any emergency situation as regards the operation of uninspected and uncertified towboats on the rivers. Nevertheless, as long as the danger of serious accidents exists, I believe we should take appropriate steps to extend the Coast Guard's inspection requirements, if that course of action is feasible and practicable. The purpose of my bill is to provide the vehicle by which the whole problem can be brought up for hearings in committee, with the expectation that if the supporters of this bill can establish the soundness of their position, we can then correct any deficiencies in the present law.

Other provisions of the legislation would require licensing of pilothouse employees on diesel-driven towboats just as they are now required to be licensed in steam-driven vessels of the same type.

COAST GUARD ASKS TIME TO CONDUCT OWN INQUIRY

After that bill was introduced in the first few weeks of 1962, the Coast Guard asked the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries not to schedule it for hearings until the agency itself could make a full inquiry into the need, if any, for the legislation. Such an inquiry was made, and the results compiled and disclosed nearly 2 full years later, in November 1963, when the Treasury Department, in a formal report to the House, stated not only that legislation was urgently needed, but that the bill I had introduced 2 years earlier did not go far enough in many particulars.

I thereupon introduced H.R. 9130 of the 88th Congress, on November 14, 1963—an administration bill which the then Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, said was needed to cope with "the ever increasing traffic in dangerous liquid cargoes and the fact that collision is a major source of marine casualties." In view of these facts, he added:

An obvious potential hazard is involved in permitting such cargoes to be towed by vessels which at present are neither subject to the requirements for safety inspection nor subject to the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

That was in 1963, Mr. Speaker. The situation since then has become alarmingly more serious. But legislation has not yet been enacted. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on my bill in 1965, with the Johnson administration strongly supporting it. But virtually every barge line and tug operating firm opposed it—not every one but virtually all of them. And the legislation died in committee.

H.R. 13987 PROVIDES PARTIAL SOLUTION

I have reintroduced this legislation, as H.R. 156, in every Congress since then. But while this bill, requiring inspection for safety of most of the cargo vessels working the rivers, as well as certification of key personnel, remains bitterly opposed by most of the operators, the glaring need for some solution to our dangerous conditions on the inland rivers has led to the introduction by Chairman EDWARD A. GARMATZ of the full committee, with cosponsorship by 21 other Members, including myself, of a new bill, H.R. 13987, requiring that a licensed pilot be on board every tugboat of more than 15 gross tons or more than 26 feet long, and that a licensed engineer be aboard all tugboats of 750 horsepower or more. This legislation would affect only about 1,800

of the 6,000 tugs now in operation. It is, as I said, only a partial solution—but is the first forward step since the 1965 hearings in coming to grips with the problem.

Hearings on this legislation are scheduled for tomorrow and Thursday in the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation. I am sure there will be strong opposition from many of the tug operators to even the modest requirements of this so-called compromise bill.

ALLAN HALE ARTICLES EXPLAIN WHY STRONG LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

The urgent need for strong legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been documented in an outstanding series of newspaper articles in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat by Allan Hale, a staff writer who has devoted months, and great effort, to this assignment. His series is a remarkable example of journalistic achievement in digging into a complex subject and bringing the facts to public view. Along with these articles, in chronological sequence, are companion articles or editorials dealing with the information developed by Mr. Hale, or based on developments here in Washington in connection with proposed legislation.

The newspaper articles referred to are as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 24-25, 1969]

A RIVER TRAGEDY POINTS UP A NEED

(By Allan Hale)

"It's not me I'm afraid of, or the river. It's the fact that the man I meet coming down may not know what he's doing."

Dave Carlton is a licensed Mississippi River pilot. The Marine Officers Association, of which he is a member, said that perhaps half of the pilots on the river are licensed.

"The public would really be surprised if they were informed," said another pilot. "There are no requirements at all. Anybody can be a pilot, no matter what kind of cargo he's got . . . you can take a taxi-cab driver, put him on the boat and tell him to be a pilot, and you're not breaking any law."

The men who move the big cargoes on the river, the long strings of barges with 20 to 40 thousand tons of cargo get a certain grim amusement out of the fact that the people of the river cities like St. Louis don't know what's floating past their front windows—or what might happen if something went wrong.

On May 12 a barge explosion which killed four persons at La Grange, Mo., underlined the reason for an increase of interest among the river cities in what's going on in front of them.

George Reeves, pilot of the barge that exploded at La Grange, is licensed as a "tankerman" but not as a pilot, an attorney for his employer said.

Reeves testified before a Marine Board of Investigation that the barge that exploded on May 12 was involved in an accident on May 9, when it hit a bridge pier after getting caught by a current.

The city of New Orleans got a demonstration in April when a towboat pushing three barges was involved in collision with a Chinese nationalist freighter one midnight, directly under the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge. The lead barge, loaded with 9,000 barrels of crude oil caught fire.

Flames soaring 100 feet into the air seared an 80-foot area of the bridge, buckled the steel rails of the sidewalk guards and damaged the understructure. Twenty-five Chinese crewmen aboard the freighter died.

It could happen any day, in any river city, say the towboat men.

"Now if this boat had also—I might mention that there were thousands of people gathered to watch this burning ship and barges—if this boat had also had a barge of chlorine in the tow, which you do sometimes have and it had exploded in downtown New Orleans, maybe 1,300 tons of it, it would have wiped out no telling how many," says Carlton. "This could happen at Alton, anyplace."

Carlton works out of St. Louis, lives at Cape Girardeau and mostly handles the two biggest towboats of the river, the 1,000-ton twins "America" and "United States," owned by Federal Barge Lines here.

It was a deputation of St. Louis towboat men which in 1962 went to U.S. Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, 3rd District. They were deeply concerned, she said. They said they were working under great hazards and with no safety regulations," she said.

The river men convinced her that there was a case for regulations requiring the licensing of pilots and the inspection of boats. The result was a two-month session of hearings before a subcommittee of the Congressional Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

There had been similar hearings on the same subject before. In 1935, when nothing was done. In 1951, when nothing was done. In 1965 the same thing happened.

The record of the hearings fills a book three-quarters of an inch thick. The book is so far the sole concrete result.

The regulations were blocked solid, Mrs. Sullivan explained, by the opposition of the majority of towboat operators. The men who work the boats came forward and spoke for a regulation. The towboat operators, with the exception of some of the largest and most reputable firms were against it.

The La Grange explosion, and the April disaster at New Orleans, coupled with an earlier one near New Orleans last year when 21 died in a towboat-freighter collision have convinced Mrs. Sullivan that the time has come to try again.

She has now asked the chairman of her committee to request those in favor of regulation and those again to sit down and reason out together what provisions of the bill they can and cannot live with. This will be no ordinary house hearing, she points out. "This is not the normal way legislation is written, but I think it's an effective way when it's stymied," she says.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 24-25, 1969]

BARGE INQUIRY ENDS: BLAST UNEXPLAINED

The Coast Guard board investigating the barge explosions at LaGrange, Mo., ended its inquiry Friday without determining what caused the blast that killed four and left two others missing earlier this month.

Capt. Robert Barber, head of the board of inquiry, said nothing was brought out that would point to the need for disciplinary action despite the occurrence of certain actions which "apparently were not in the best judgment."

He said the case would be forwarded to the Coast Guard commandant in Washington, D.C. for review and a final decision, which may take two or three months.

His announcement ended a two-day investigation of a series of explosions and fires on May 12 that gutted a towboat and two barges unloading gasoline at an oil refinery owned by the Triangle Refineries, Inc. Two members of the crew of the towboat Martin and two Triangle dock employees lost their lives in the holocaust.

Towboat pilot George T. Reeves testified Friday that the stove in his galley was turned on while the towboat was moored near the unloading gas barges and he did not feel this was safe.

In other testimony, a Martin crew member said he detected an odor of gas about 45 minutes before the explosion. He said he mentioned this to towboat Capt. W. R. Opitz, who told him it would be all right. Opitz died of injuries from the explosion.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 26, 1969]

INEPT RIVER PILOTS—INVITATION TO DISASTER (By Allan Hale)

On a fine day, it's a pretty sight to watch the towboats, painted in crude, bright colors, pushing their strings of barges up and down the river.

From the St. Louis levee, from the tall office buildings of downtown you can look and turn away with a renewed sense of America's industrial capacity, as demonstrated by those great, heavy-laden barges.

From the river overlooks dotted along the shore, from the gardens of homes that edge the water, the children wave at the pretty boat. Sometimes the man in the pilothouse waves back.

He knows something they don't. That a wrong touch on the steering levers, a sudden current or a wrong decision . . . and he could send a wave of burning gasoline and crude oil boiling into the city like a huge napalm bomb. Or flood the streets with chlorine gas.

He knows something else, also. That no regulations exist to require him or any other pilot he may meet on the river to pass an examination of competency.

There is an examination, set by the Coast Guard, and many men take it. Large barge lines like to use certificated men. Before taking the examination a man must produce letters of recommendation from employers he has worked for, usually as a mate.

For years now, and more particularly for the last five years, the licensed pilots and some of the larger companies have been trying to get legislation through Congress requiring examinations for towboat officers and inspection of boats.

Tows of barges on the Mississippi are growing larger all the time.

Such pilots work a 12 hour day, divided into two watches, six on, six off. They earn around \$15,000 a year and are entitled to a rest day for every day they work, which means a man may, if he wishes, work six months, rest six months.

Capt. Bill Jackson is a licensed pilot and a member of the executive board of the Marine Officers Association.

He explains: "Originally boats were placed under the marine inspection law by the steamboat inspection service of the Commerce Department. Now, slowly and methodically, steam has been replaced by diesel."

Few steamboats are left on the river today. The only commercial steamboat which now visits St. Louis is the excursion sternwheeler "Delta Queen."

When steam changed to diesel Capt. Jackson says, the regulations died with steam. Diesel boats are not required to have licensed officers or be subject to inspection while under construction or in use.

"The lobby of the diesel engine manufacturers, the industry, as represented by the American Waterway Operators—a powerful lobby in itself, which far supersedes anything we have to offer in the way of a lobbying group—have become so powerful that we can't even really be heard, so far as the need for inspection laws is concerned," Jackson says.

One of the arguments of the towboat operators against the regulation and licensing of officers is that the examinations set by the Coast Guard—the regulatory agency which administers the examinations—are unrealistic, involving river men in subjects like celestial navigation, which they will never need.

"There is a small degree of truth in this," Jackson admits.

"The Coast Guard are mainly salt water people and there is a certain degree of salt water interrogation in the examination for a pilot. It's not a thing that couldn't be overcome with compromise in a committee."

Compromise in a committee is the thing now being sought by U.S. Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, who, after being approached by a deputation of river men in 1962, introduced a bill which would have required the regulation of key personnel aboard towboats and inspection of the boats.

Hearings were held on it in 1965 and nothing happened. Small operators came forward and said it would ruin them, Mrs. Sullivan says.

One argument put forward by the operators is that they have pilots who are perfectly competent, but have no talent for taking formal examinations.

Asking about this at a recent meeting of the Marine Officers executive board, Jackson waved his hand around the table.

"Each and every man in this room has passed a Coast Guard license examination," he said. "We've all made it. There's quite a few people for whom it takes a little longer, but they have made it. It's simply a matter of studying and knowing your job."

Mrs. Sullivan, whose bill has made no progress, is now asking that both sides sit down round a table and discuss what sort of regulation they could or could not live with.

Meanwhile, night and day, the cargoes pass up and down the river. In many wheel-houses there hangs a thin, printed pamphlet, listing the dangerous cargoes which a pilot, experienced or inexperienced, licensed or not, may suddenly find included in his tow.

Where a page is marked with a skull and cross bones—and many are—it means that the cargo is deadly.

Nor does the pilot get any choice about what goes into the makeup of his tow. He is told by radio-telephone to pick up, at some designated point, barge XYZ-12.

The river men pay their toll in life. In two major accidents since March last year a total of 46 men have died. At La Grange, Mo., May 12 four died and two are missing in a tanker barge explosion.

Dave Carlton, another board member of the Marine Officers Association was talking to another pilot about it the other day. "What would people think if you allowed trucking companies to operate with men without a driver's license or any training whatsoever? Just put a man on a big diesel rig and send him out on the highway where you're driving up and down with your family?"

"Yeah," said the other pilot. "But you know? One day, one Saturday afternoon when the St. Louis downtown is crowded with shoppers, there's going to be a chlorine barge hit a pier of one of the bridges and rupture."

Carlton takes it up "If he hit the Eads Bridge on Saturday afternoon . . . pouf! Thirteen hundred tons of chlorine and here it all comes in a big green cloud. Remember the barge that sank at Natchez? They said if it ruptured and released that 1,100 tons of chlorine it would, with proper atmospheric conditions, have killed everything within 40 miles."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 29, 1969]

COAST GUARD TO BEGIN RIVER BARGE INSPECTION (By Allan Hale)

Starting at midnight Sunday, Coast Guard teams will begin boarding every tow of barges that moves on the Mississippi and

Ohio rivers asking for a list of all barges containing dangerous cargo.

The action is unprecedented and follows closely upon two river disasters within two months this year in which 31 are believed to have died. In each case a fuel-laden barge was involved.

The inquiry has been ordered by Rear Adm. Russell R. Waesche, commanding the 2nd Coast Guard District, which has its headquarters in St. Louis.

However, the survey had been under consideration for six months, explained Capt. R. F. Barber, Coast Guard chief of operations, here Wednesday.

The survey will be carried on 24 hours a day throughout the month of June, with teams stationed at two points on the Mississippi and one on the Ohio.

One team will be at Lock 26, Alton, one at Memphis, Tenn., and the other at Gallopis Lock, near Huntington, W. Va.

Towboat masters are required by law to be aware of any dangerous cargoes included in their tow, Capt. Barber said. The purpose of the survey is to take a sampling of exactly how much dangerous cargo is passing up and down the rivers.

"For years now, authoritative people have said it's growing, but nobody has any figures," Barber said. "No government agency has ever made an attempt to make a comprehensive picture of this."

"Some of the cargoes moving, such as liquid chlorine and anhydrous ammonia, which will combine readily with water are potentially extremely dangerous if the contents are released accidentally."

"Until now there has been no serious release of such dangerous cargoes on the western rivers. Unfortunately, the potential for disaster continues to grow. The Coast Guard feels it is absolutely necessary to determine what hazardous cargoes are being transported on the river."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 29, 1969]

DISASTER ON THE WAY TO HAPPEN

The federal government has strict laws protecting migratory game birds and other waterfowl that use the nation's rivers. Why, then, is not the same concern shown for people?

Globe-Democrat staff writer Allan Hale, in two articles on river pilots, has revealed gross dereliction which exists toward regulation of this exacting occupation.

The shocking truth is that there are no requirements at all, with the result that only about half of the pilots on the river are licensed.

Dave Carlton, licensed Mississippi river pilot and a board member of the Marine Officers Association, aptly compares the situation to allowing trucking companies to operate with men who have no driver's license or any training whatsoever.

It would be like putting a man with absolutely no experience on a big diesel rig and sending him out on a crowded highway.

As another licensed pilot puts it, "Anybody can be a pilot, no matter what kind of cargo he's got . . . you can take a taxicab driver, put him on a boat and tell him to be a pilot, and you're not breaking any law."

It's a potentially deadly situation—literally.

The slightest mistake by an inexperienced towboat pilot could cause barges to crash into a bridge, sending a wave of burning gasoline or crude oil into a city like a huge napalm bomb, or a lethal blanket of chlorine gas over a wide area.

Carlton and other licensed pilots say a disaster could happen on any day at any river city.

In the face of this grim possibility, the need for rigid regulations for river pilots is obvious.

Such legislation has been proposed by United States Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan of St. Louis, who in 1962 introduced a bill to require the regulation of key personnel aboard towboats and inspection of the boats.

Nearly seven years have passed and still Congress has taken no action on Mrs. Sullivan's bill.

How many more disasters such as the recent explosion at New Orleans—when three barges and a Nationalist China freighter collided, killing 25 Chinese crewmen—will occur before the nation's lawmakers decide it's time to give people the same protection as fowl?

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 29, 1969]

CITES NEED FOR FEDERAL REGULATION OF RIVER PILOTS

To the Editor:

The two articles on river pilots by Allan Hale were excellent. Having had to swim ashore from a sinking boat myself, when one of the most respected pilots in the profession was involved in an accident. I know that even the best trained men can have accidents due to the frequent changes in conditions found on the river.

Therefore, when you try to make a pilot of a man who can barely read or write, as was recently brought out in the investigation of an accident in which lives were lost below New Orleans, you are making matters worse.

If a man cannot read or write, how can he keep up with the various new navigation bulletins which are constantly published?

Because the Coast Guard inherited the exams from the old Bureau of Marine Inspection the exams for mates and masters may need updating, but the exam for pilots still requires them to draw a chart of the river showing the course of the channel, the bars, dikes, bridges, ferry crossings, etc. This along with his past experience is considered before granting a license.

The Waterway Journal recently carried an article urging the use of the Waterways to carry surplus poison gas when it is disposed of. Knowing the government's propensity for giving work to the lowest bidder, and since fly-by-night operators with untrained personnel would be able to underbid competent operators, I do not think that is anything to look forward to.

I certainly hope Congress will pass Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan's bill requiring the regulation of key personnel aboard towboats, as it is the only answer to the problem.

WALTER HASS,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 3, 1969]

CHECK OF TOW CARGOES IS BEGUN BY COAST GUARD

(By Allan Hale)

Coast Guard Lt. Gary Steiger, who rose early to spend a day by the river Monday, began by catching two big steel barges, one of which carried a corrosive and the other a potential explosive.

It isn't illegal to transport either on the river, but it is illegal for a towboat master not to know what's in his tow, listed in manifest or log.

Steiger, making his first boarding of the day from his station at Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Ill., wrote up a violation citation and described the incident as "fairly common."

"No manifest and nothing listed in the log," he said. "This is something you find. It's fairly common. Neither the captain nor anybody else knows what he has."

Wandering among the mixed tow Steiger found one barge marked "Caustic Soda." The other he had to list as some "petroleum product" because nobody knew what was in it.

Listing potentially dangerous cargoes passing through the lock is his main duty for

the next month, as the Coast Guard carries out the first attempt at a comprehensive survey of what proportion of the barges moving past river-side cities like St. Louis represent explosion, fire, gas or poisoning hazards to the people living there.

Steiger's team is one of three, all of which began work early Sunday and will work round the clock through June. Others are at Memphis, Tenn., and near Huntington, W. Va.

In uniform, hard hat and lifejacket, Steiger, 26, from Napa, Calif., moved up and down vertical ladders and across steel decks in a biting, gale-force wind. He was checking every loaded tow passing through the lock and trying to check every empty barge used for carrying a dangerous substance.

A Coast Guard book he carried lists 112 of these, most of them with names nobody but a chemist ever heard of, but which carry notations like "Highly toxic" or "Corrosive to living tissue" or "If released inform state water pollution or state health authorities."

By the time the information gathered by its observing teams is digested, the Coast Guard believes it will have an accurate sampling of what proportion of river cargoes on the Mississippi and Ohio is dangerous.

The commander of the 2nd Coast Guard District, here, Rear Admiral Russell R. Waesche, ordered the survey because although it has been said this proportion is continually growing, no adequate survey ever has been made.

Although the survey has been in preparation for six months, its beginning follows two disasters, one at New Orleans, the other at La Grange, Mo., in which 31 lives were lost. In each case a fuel barge was involved.

Monday checking a pair of tanker barges loaded with a total of 5,000 barrels of gasoline, Steiger found everything in perfect order, almost.

Each barge's certificate of inspection, mandatory for tanker barges, was in place in its little tube and up to date. Pump valves, banged with Steiger's fist, rattled, indicating they are free and working. Fire screens were intact. Usually the tanker men are careful.

Then, jumping across to the bow of the second barge, he found a portable gasoline pump lying on deck. "Highly spark producing," he murmured, and glanced toward the towboat wheelhouse.

To the captain, minutes later, he said, courteously, but firmly . . . "Must be removed as soon as possible. There are 15 or 20 theories about what happened at La Grange, of which that is one."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 5, 1969]

TOWBOAT OWNERS SUPPORT LICENSING OF RIVER PILOTS

The American Waterways Operators, an organization of towboat and barge owners, believes that tow boat pilots should be licensed. But it opposes the inspection and certification of tow boats, laying down of crewing standards and the licensing of crewmen other than pilots.

In a statement of The Globe-Democrat, the association's president, Braxton B. Carr, said:

"The reason for this opposition is quite simple. Based on the record of the cause of accidents, the proposed returns in safety of operations from implementation of the bill requiring inspection and certification, full crew licensing and manning scales would not be commensurate to any appreciable degree with the financial cost which would be imposed upon the industry, upon shippers using this mode of transportation, and finally upon the government itself for enforcement purposes."

The association says that in 1968, according to U.S. Coast Guard figures, 33.3 per cent of all accidents investigated—or one-third

of the total—were ascribed to "Fault on the part of unlicensed personnel."

The next highest percentage in the table of cause of accidents is 19.6—"Fault on the part of other vessel or other person."

"Fault on the part of licensed personnel" was ascribed in 12.2 per cent of accidents.

The next highest cause of accidents, in 8.6 per cent of cases, was failure of equipment.

Weather and currents accounted for 7.9 per cent of accidents and various other causes, including "calculated risk" for the remainder.

In 765 accidents, the association says, 10 lives were lost—6 in collisions, 1 in a foundering, 1 in a capsizing, and 2 in explosions and fires.

"Responsible men will, I believe, agree that this is not the record of a careless and irresponsible industry or of careless, callous, untrained, irresponsible men," Carr said.

"This is a part of the record of U.S. transportation which is characterized by the mobility of men, machines and goods. No one condones accidents. No one excuses them. No one plans operations without providing the best assurance against accidents that can be provided within the capabilities of humans and machines and within the limits of our competitive free enterprise system."

He went on to say that the association believes the safety record can be improved and its members desire to do so.

Carr says that since 1965 the association has "actively sought" the enactment of congressional legislation to license men in charge of navigating towboats, and supports the bill introduced by Rep. Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Maryland, who is chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

He says that industry representatives working in co-operation with the Coast Guard already have drafted regulations for the licensing of men in charge of navigation, ready for the enactment of legislation.

He added:

"The industry's desires and efforts to have Mr. Garmatz's proposal enacted into law has been frustrated primarily because of another piece of legislation dealing in part with the same subject.

"That legislation is incorporated in a bill introduced by St. Louis Representative Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.) which would give the Coast Guard authority to inspect and certificate all towing vessels of 15 gross tons or 26 feet or over in length during construction and periodically afterwards, set the number of men required to operate such individual vessels and license and certificate the crews of towing vessels."

Failure to resolve the points of view of advocates of both concepts has prevented the enactment of the Garmatz legislation, he says.

Commenting on Carr's statement Mrs. Sullivan said this week:

"I have refused to compromise on a bill that would simply license the pilot . . . I say in all seriousness that merely licensing the pilot is not an answer to the problem."

She said that although not "wedded" to any of the language in the bill, she would not compromise until there had been a "confrontation" with some of the main barge line operators, the Coast Guard and the men who crew the boats, before the members of the house committee. To pass the Garmatz bill for the licensing of pilots alone would mean that there would be no more chance of passing further legislation, she asserted.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 5, 1969]

HOUSE PANEL TO MEET ON TOWBOAT REGULATIONS

(By Allan Hale)

An unscheduled meeting of a group of members of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives committee concerned with towboat regulation has been called for Thursday in Washington.

Representatives of the U.S. Coast Guard also have been asked to attend.

The action follows closely upon two river disasters this year in which a total of 31 lives were lost, and a series of newspaper articles on a lack of regulations to govern towboat officers and towboats.

The meeting has been called by Rep. Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Maryland, who is chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. A subcommittee held a series of unproductive hearings on the subject in 1965.

Garmatz denied Wednesday that the calling of the meeting had been provoked by newspaper publicity, saying "I haven't had any pressure, but common sense will show you that something should be done."

The question was last discussed at a meeting between interests involved about a year ago, he said.

Representatives of the towboat owners and the men who crew the boats have not been invited to Thursday's meeting, Garmatz said, which will consist of "just three or four committee members and the Coast Guard."

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, who has since 1962 been a consistent advocate of the licensing of towboat key personnel and the laying down of standards for inspection and manning, will not be able to attend Thursday's meeting, although she was invited.

Her office in Washington said Wednesday that she is fully occupied this week with the business of a committee investigating the lending of money to people in ghetto areas.

She is chairman of this committee.

Mrs. Sullivan has recently urged the reassembly of the groups concerned—boat owners, boat workers and Coast Guard—around a table, to discuss what provisions of a towboat regulation bill the parties "could or could not live with."

At present towboat pilots are not required to be licensed.

Among the points at issue are the necessity for the inspection of boats, both under construction and in operation, and the laying down of crewing standards.

The most recent meeting between the parties a year ago, Garmatz said Wednesday, failed to produce any agreement.

Asked what he expected to come of Thursday's meeting, he replied: "I don't know. We will stay right on it."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 6, 1969]

TOWBOAT SAFETY LOGJAM BROKEN BY HOUSE PANEL

(By Allan Hale)

A Congressional logjam on towboat safety which has existed for four years, broke up Thursday in the course of a two-and-a-half hour committee session in Washington, D.C.

An agreement described by Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, as a "major breakthrough," authorized the U.S. Coast Guard to draft three new bills governing safety on the rivers.

All three are expected to be in the hands of the staff of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries by Monday morning, Mrs. Sullivan said Thursday.

The action, resulted from a suddenly-called meeting of the committee, following two river disasters this year and a series of Globe-Democrat articles pointing out the lack of regulations governing the licensing of towboat pilots and the inspection of towboats.

Mrs. Sullivan has since 1962 consistently attempted to have the licensing of key towboat officers, the inspection of boats and other aspects of towboat safety made subject to regulation.

Until Thursday's meeting, called by committee chairman Rep. Edward Garmatz, (Dem.), Maryland, there had been no progress since the calling of a series of hearings before a subcommittee in 1965.

At those hearings, and subsequently at several informal meetings between the interests involved, it was found impossible to reconcile the supporters of a bill introduced by Mrs. Sullivan and another by Garmatz.

The Garmatz bill concentrated on the licensing of pilots. Mrs. Sullivan's bill also required the licensing of other key towboat personnel and the inspection of boats.

The agreement reached at Thursday's meeting, Mrs. Sullivan said, will have the effect of withdrawing both bills.

Instead the Coast Guard will submit three bills to be considered by the committee as a package. The first will be a bill requiring the licensing of pilots and possibly some engineers. The other two will deal with the mandatory installation of ship-to-shore radio and the enforcement of "rules of the road," the compliance with river signs and regulations which is at present "haphazardly" observed, Mrs. Sullivan said.

The question of inspection, which throughout has been most bitterly opposed by towboat and barge owners, is shelved for the present, except, Mrs. Sullivan said, that the Coast Guard does not want to drop it altogether.

The principal reason the Coast Guard is ready to at least delay the introduction of inspection, she said, is that it would add a large item to their budget.

Thursday's meeting was attended by Garmatz, Mrs. Sullivan, Rep. William S. Mail-lard, of California, who is the senior Republican member of the House committee, and five Coast Guard officers, headed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. Willard J. Smith. Towboat owners and crew representatives were not invited.

Afterwards Mrs. Sullivan said "I think that the log jam has been broken and action will be seen now."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 13, 1969]

VETERAN SAILOR BLAMES LACK OF LICENSE LAW FOR DEADLY ENGINE ROOM RIVER GAME

(By Allan Hale)

"But what about old Sandy,

In the engine-room down below?"

—Traditional Scottish Seaman's Song.

Clarence McLaughlin is a ship's engineer, licensed to operate anything that floats. A deep sea man, he spent about half his working life in freighters, the rest on the inland waterways. He will tell you that he has been engineer aboard the biggest towboats on the Mississippi.

He is semi-retired now, but spends much of his time behind an office desk in the Cotton Belt Building, from where he runs the St. Louis office District 2 of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. This is a union, whose members are all marine engineers. For District Two, set in the heart of the St. Louis downtown, this means towboat engineers.

Attention lately has been concentrated on the lack of regulation and certification of towboat officers, more particularly the pilots. What about the man in the engine room, or the lack of a man in the engine room?

"First of all it's a dangerous game," says McLaughlin slowly. "The engine room game is one of the most dangerous there is. Very few people understand why it has been lax so far. Why that licensing law is so opposed."

He is referring to a series of proposals which would make the licensing of pilots and other key officers mandatory and lay down standards of inspection and crewing. The industry's organization, the American Waterways Operators, has said it will accept

the licensing of pilots only and oppose the other proposals.

Until this month, and following a Globe-Democrat investigative and editorial campaign, legislation had been logjammed in the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for four years, since a series of 1965 hearings in which Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, (Dem.), Mo., attempted to resolve opposition to her strong bill to regulate the industry.

"When I started in this business, which was before World War I," McLaughlin explains carefully, "Even up until the late 40s, 90 percent of our boats were steam-engined . . . traffic wasn't nearly as heavy then as it is now, but in the engine room—I don't care whether you were chief engineer or assistant engineer—you were coming down the river and you stayed at the throttles all the time."

"Then came the little towboats, grabbing one barge here and one barge there, half a dozen somewhere else and they cut us up piecemeal."

"But the reason they could get by with that was by reason of one thing and one thing only. There are absolutely no laws of protection, regardless of what you might say. I can be going down the river with 40,000 tons of freight and a 9,000 horsepower towboat, diesel engine, and I can take a farmer from Little Rock, Ark., anywhere, he might never have seen a towboat, but you can put him captain and you can put his yard boy in the engine room, and there's no law to prevent it. Now that's wrong."

"You run into somebody else, you drown a whole bunch of people. There's no law to prevent it. There's nothing you can do to that man, and that man goes back to the farm and you grab another and put him on there. That's wrong."

"Now I've got a license for anything that floats. I've got a chief engineer's license, there's no limit on my tonnage and no limit on my qualifications, and I've got the experience behind me. I've got to risk my license right now, and I've had my license since 1918. Everything that I've worked for all that time, and yet you can go down and run into one of the damned little towboats that run out in front of you, kill a bunch of men on my boat, kill a bunch of men on the little upstream boat there that's got one barge or a two of gasoline. He jumps in front of you and you have to cut off and hit a bridge pier . . . and there's nothing you can do. There's no law."

"Yet every man on the big towboats is accountable to the Coast Guard. There's no law to make him have a license, but he does have one and when an investigation comes, what happens? That man loses his license, and everybody that hasn't got one says 'Well, get yourself a job driving a freight truck.'"

McLaughlin pauses for breath and hooks a thumb into the heavy leather belt of his tan-colored outfit, the lightweight work shirt and pants of a ship's engineer, which he still wears at his desk job.

"There's no justice in that," he says vehemently.

In the engineer's day to day work, getting around the boat's engines without risking your life depends, at present, on the integrity of the boat-builder and of the companies, McLaughlin says, adding "There is no law to say you can't build it any which way and 90 per cent of them don't."

A handful of the larger companies, he says, do make provision for the safety of the man working among the spinning motors, he says.

"But the danger is still there because there's no law that makes those people crew those boats halfway decent. They cut the crews so short and there's no law of inspection."

There is an examination of competency which towboat engineers can take, but no precise figures exist to show what proportion of men on the rivers today have passed it.

The Marine Officers Association here estimates less than 50 per cent of towboat engineers are licensed, says member Bob Busse, who worked eight years as an engineer before losing an eye in a towboat accident.

A crucial step in crew reduction was taken, Busse says, when towboat owners began to employ monitoring devices over the engine room gauges.

It was then claimed by companies that a monitoring panel in the pilot house, with another in the chief engineer's cabin with a buzzer to awaken him if anything went wrong, Busse says, obviated the need for a man to be continually on duty in the engine room.

He dislikes the system and so does McLaughlin—emphatically.

"In the first place, a man has to sleep once in a while," said McLaughlin. I don't care how many gauges a chief engineer has got in his bedroom, once in a while he's got to go to sleep. Now what good are they, or all the alarms in the world?

"Now coming out of the Missouri River you'll be making 15 miles an hour lots of times. Much of the time you average 10. The tow is running anywhere up to 600 feet in length, besides the boat. It's impossible. When something happens it's happened, and you haven't got time to correct mistakes then."

"By the time that man rolls out of bed and gets down to the engine room he's consumed five minutes, at least . . . and possibly 10. He's not going down there barefooted."

"Quite frankly," he said, "I don't want to go up into an air conditioned room, tired and worn out after being in that hot engine room for six or eight hours and then expect a buzzer to wake me up and get me down in the engine room in time to put out a flash fire. Those things just don't happen!"

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 17, 1969]

MARITIME LABOR OFFICIALS PUSH FOR SAFETY LAWS

To the Editor:

Allan Hale's two articles last month on river hazards and The Globe-Democrat's editorial on the subject were very welcome news to those of us in maritime labor who've been urging enactment of safety legislation for the riverboat industry.

For several years we've been encouraging Rep. Leonor Sullivan of Missouri in her courageous fight to license and certificate the officers and crews of river craft and to obtain Coast Guard inspection of diesel vessels operating on the rivers.

Unskilled pilots are not the only problem—we also need qualified engineers, skilled crew members, and safe boats. A bad pilot can steer the boat wrong and collide with a bridge, but an engine breakdown, or an explosion in the engine room because of shoddy equipment can produce the same disastrous results.

The boats are getting more powerful, the tows are getting larger and the danger is increasing.

The Globe's articles are making a major contribution to river safety. We hope you'll continue them and that Congress will take heed.

CHARLES RICHARDSON,
Vice President, District 2, Marine
Engineers Beneficial Association.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 17, 1969]

VALLEY LINE HEAD SCORES LACK OF U.S. LAWS FOR TOWBOATS

(By Allan Hale)

"There are things going on, on these rivers today that shouldn't be allowed," says Wesley J. Barta, flatly.

"I can tell you of a company carrying the

most dangerous cargo which used to have an engineer sleep on a cot in the engine-room, on duty 24 hours a day. Inexperienced men in the pilot house. I believe it's doing the same thing today."

Barta is no disgruntled deckhand or hired union official. He is president on one of the six biggest towboating firms on the rivers of America, the Valley Line, with 800 hands on the payroll, 17 towboats of its own and a fleet of 500 barges.

Barta has for years supported rigorous standards of crewing, licensing and inspection which are opposed by probably every other towboat company in the nation.

He was the only towboat owner out of about 50 who testified at a Congressional hearing in 1965 to speak out in favor of federal laws for the towboat industry.

The argument has started again, following a series of Globe-Democrat articles and an editorial, and Barta has been asked by U.S. Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan if he would testify again. He says he will.

"I have felt this way for all of the 21 years I have been associated with the towboat industry," he says. Barta has been 34 years in shipping, starting on the Great Lakes.

He served a shipyard apprenticeship, later sailed as a licensed marine engineer, was six years a ship surveyor for the American Bureau of Shipping and joined the old Mississippi Valley Barge Line, now the St. Louis-based Valley Line, as superintendent of maintenance in 1947.

"This is a matter of public interest," he says. "Perhaps some of that comes from the fact that my background is that of an engineer and a shipbuilder. I haven't changed my views."

"I'm particularly interested in proper vessel construction and inspection," he goes on. "If you want to build any kind of a building there are building codes and regulations established for the general public safety. It is through a series of unfortunate circumstances that we don't have this."

He specifies two of these circumstances—the replacement of steamboats subject to strict regulation by diesel boats subject to no regulations; and the transfer of control over the inland waterways from the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Commerce Department to the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard, he says, and he doesn't blame them, had to familiarize itself with the business.

"It became obvious to many of us that we did need regulation," he says. "We recognized this in this company when we made the change from steam to diesel, and we've always built our vessels in accordance with American Bureau of Shipping Standards and the known rules of the Coast Guard."

"We have always maintained a policy of hiring licensed engineers and licensed pilots and masters."

To his knowledge, Barta estimates, the leading common carriers, perhaps six out of several hundred companies, make a policy of building their boats in accordance with Coast Guard regulations and American Bureau of Shipping regulations.

"So far as I know," he says, "only three of those adhere to the licensing principle."

"I made a conservative estimate, I thought, 10 years or so ago that reasonable rules for construction and operation were only being followed on about 15 per cent of the boats operating. I think that percentage has gone down since then."

Why are other companies against towboat regulation? "I can see some increased costs that come with it," Barta says. "But at the same time I see better operations and a better industry in which we have some hope of reducing insurance costs and many other costs of business so that the cost of doing business as a result of being embarrassed by the Coast Guard will probably be offset in some other areas."

To inspect a perfectly sound vessel, he admits, is time-consuming and costly. There would probably also be regulations imposed that are not completely acceptable to even the best companies.

"I recognize that, but the gain is having a much better industry, that's the way I look at it."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 25, 1969]

ONE IN FIVE BARGES HAS DANGEROUS CARGO, SURVEY INDICATES

(By Allan Hale)

Perhaps one in five of all the barges moved on the Mississippi and Ohio this month has been carrying a dangerous cargo, officially classified as being in some way potentially hazardous to life or health.

This is a rough estimate based on figures gathered during the first 23 days of a month-long survey being made by the U.S. Coast Guard.

The survey was ordered by the commander of the St. Louis-based 2nd Coast Guard District, Rear Adm. Russell R. Waesche, in an effort to determine what proportion of towboat cargo is dangerous, and whether, as has been alleged, that proportion is growing.

Final results of the survey will not be known until the figures are tabulated after the field work ends at midnight June 30.

Although the survey had been planned for six months, its start, in the early hours of June 1, coincided with a series of Globe-Democrat articles and an editorial on river transport dangers.

The U.S. House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has since resumed discussion of towboat regulations which had been logjammed for four years.

For the survey the Coast Guard established three boarding teams, two on the Mississippi and one on the Ohio.

A check made Tuesday with the three teams showed that, although there were slight variations at each station, officers' estimates, were, in each case roughly the same—about one fifth of the cargo on the river is potentially hazardous.

At one station, Memphis, Tenn., Lt. John Krumpelman said they had worked out exact figures for the first nine days of the survey.

"Over 9 days we worked out that 20 percent of the barges were tanker barges with hazardous cargo," he said. "Two out of every 10."

Hazardous cargo, according to Coast Guard classification, is petroleum distillates, various chemicals, any cargo which might burn, explode, release a dangerous gas or a poison.

Sometimes they come in bunches—he has noted as many as 21 hazardous cargo barges together—sometimes one or two scattered among a mixed tow among others carrying steel or grain.

He estimates around 160 barges pass the team's station each day and of these 35 will have dangerous loads.

At Lock and Dam 26, Alton, Lt. Gary Steiger, giving what he emphasized as "a very rough estimate" believes his team sees 20 dangerous cargoes a day. On a typical day the lock handles about 150 barges.

The third of the teams, at Gallipolis Lock, on the Ohio, boards around 25 dangerous cargo barges a day, estimates Lt. Cmdr. William Drew, and the lock handles around 120 barges daily.

Here, he says, the number of dangerous cargoes has been less than expected. They had expected around 30 daily.

There are at present no government regulations requiring a towboat pilot or any other towboat officer to pass an examination of competency and take out a license such as is required by a deep sea ship's officer.

Since 1962 Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, has been a consistent advocate of strong regulation for the indus-

try, including licensing, inspection of towboats and crewing standards.

[Editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 30, 1969]

RULES FOR RIVER SAFETY

A compelling reason why there should be regulations drawn up covering river towboats and their crews can be found in the preliminary findings of a survey being conducted by the U.S. Coast Guard.

Figures gathered in the first 23 days of the month-long study show that approximately one-fifth of all the barges moved on the Mississippi and Ohio rivers in June carried a dangerous cargo, officially classified as potentially hazardous to life or health.

The survey is an attempt to determine what proportion of towboat cargo is dangerous. Although final results will not be known until the statistics are tabulated after the field work ends June 30, the argument for better controls over towing operations seems documented.

It is alarming to think that with dangerous river cargo—such as petroleum distillates and various chemicals which might burn, explode or release a noxious gas—passing almost at the doorstep of private dwellings and industries, there are no government regulations requiring a towboat pilot or other officer to pass an examination of competency and take out a license. Nor are there adequate standards for the condition of the towboats themselves.

More adequate regulations for the industry are needed, similar perhaps to those long proposed by Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan of St. Louis, calling for licensing, the inspection of towboats and standards for crews.

Since the towboats ply federal waterways, it is logical that Washington supervise their operations. In this the Coast Guard could perform a valuable function by drawing up and administering rules for river safety.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 2, 1969]

TWO-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR FIRE ON TOWBOAT

LACON, ILL.—A flash fire Tuesday aboard the towboat City of Joliet caused damage estimated by firemen at \$200,000. All nine crew members escaped unhurt.

The fire, of unknown origin, started in the engine room as the boat was pushing 11 barges through the Illinois Waterway to Chicago.

The cargo was mixed. Two barges were loaded with chemicals but the fire was confined to the towboat owned by the American Commercial Barge Co. of Jeffersonville, Ind.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 16, 1969]

RIVER SAFETY BILL LEAKING; REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN HITS LOOPHOLES

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—A bill touted as improving safety on shipping on inland waterways sprang two big leaks Tuesday.

To their dismay, House committee members discovered that the measure requiring ship-to-ship radio-telephones would apply to only a small fraction of the vessels capable of smacking into each other.

One exemption would excuse vessels in the Mississippi River above Louisiana from complying.

Another exemption would limit the proposed law to tugs and towboats of 300 tons or more. Of 6,000 towing vessels in the nation, only 355 are large enough to be covered.

After sitting through two hours' testimony on the bill, Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, exploded in a denunciation of shipping operators, who she accused of blocking safety legislation "year after year."

"They don't want to be regulated," she said.

"Accidents continue to happen. Week after week there are fires on barges and tugs. Barges are coming loose, and barges are getting sunk."

"It's never anyone's fault," she added caustically.

The courtly southerner who was presiding in the House Merchant Marine Committee, Rep. Alton Lennon (Dem.), North Carolina, appealed to a representative of the American Waterways Operators, Inc., a trade association, to put aside "financial considerations" and "go as far as you humanly can" in strengthening the bill.

He said, "I would hate" to support a bill covering such a small percentage of the vessels "that could be involved in a tragic accident."

He pressed the witness, William C. McNeal of New Orleans, to say what would be "objectionable" in requiring all commercial vessels to be equipped with the radio-telephones, which would enable pilots to talk back and forth as they approached in tight passages.

McNeal, who was accompanied by Gerald V. Flynn, of St. Louis, president of Mid-Valley Towing Co., Inc., and two other AWO representatives, said he would have to consult with AWO directors before committing the association to a tighter bill.

McNeal gave AWO's official endorsement to the pending bill, which was introduced by the committee chairman, Rep. Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Maryland.

McNeal testified that "a majority" of the vessels on the Mississippi are already equipped with modern bridge-to-bridge two-way radio.

But he indicated concern among operators in various waters about the radio operating rules imposed by the Garmatz measure.

The exemptions in the bill were strongly opposed by a high-ranking official of the U.S. Coast Guard, which regulates maritime safety.

Rear Adm. Charles P. Murphy, chief of merchant marine safety, said the service considers the bill "an essential step in prevention of collisions" and believes that the coverage limitations "are not in the best interests of safety."

He told the committee that two recent collisions on the lower Mississippi, which killed 46 people, each involved a large cargo vessel and a tug of less than 300 tons pushing crude oil barges.

The freighter skippers had modern two-way radios for talking to each other. The tugs did not.

Murphy also reminded the committee that very-high-frequency radio-telephones have been available since World War II, when they were "invaluable" in assisting zig-zagging ships in convoy on the oceans.

"The size and speed of vessels are continually becoming greater, increasing the dangers of collisions," he said.

"Masters and pilots should be provided with all practicable means to help them maneuver their vessels safely by one another."

The admiral said that the exemptions originated several years ago in order to "obtain general agreement" on proposed legislation that time.

He said that recently, the Coast Guard solicited the opinions of 200 or 300 shipping interests on proposed legislation. The AWO witnesses denied their association had written the Garmatz bill.

The bill under discussion is one of three which make up a legislative "package" designed to bring the inland waterways under regulation. There are at this time no regulations requiring licensing of officers, inspection of towboats or crewing standards.

At the first day's hearing Monday, Mrs. Sullivan protested at the presentation of

just one of the three bills, which she said were to have been presented to the committee and the House as a package.

She withdrew her own strong bill which would have regulated the industry after a small meeting of members of the committee in June had agreed to a new package deal including a bill to be written by the Coast Guard which would require the licensing of pilots and perhaps some engineers.

Legislation in the committee had been log-jammed for four years. Meetings began again after a Globe-Democrat investigative and editorial campaign had pointed out the lack of regulation.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 18, 1969]

CONGRESS URGED TO ORDER RADIOS ON INLAND WATERWAY VESSELS

(By Edward W. O'Brien, chief of the Globe-Democrat Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Congress was urged strongly Thursday to pass a bill requiring two-way boat radios on inland waterways and to close wide holes in proposed legislation.

Representatives of maritime unions, two port cities, and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) testified that safety on rivers and harbors would be immensely strengthened if pilots could talk to each other by simple radio-telephones.

An influential member of the House Merchant Marine Committee, Rep. Alton Lennon (Dem.), North Carolina, said three days of hearings brought him to the same conclusion.

A law forcing vessel operators to install the radio equipment is "essential," he said, even if some shipping interests object because of the cost, or other reasons.

Lennon again pressed for changes in the pending bill so that the law, if enacted, will apply to a higher percentage of commercial power vessels on inland waterways.

But the committee chairman, Rep. Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Maryland, who introduced the bill with the broad exemptions on coverage, refrained from expressing any strong position like Lennon's.

At Thursday's hearing, Ernest A. Clothier, president of the American Pilots' Association, testified that bridge-to-bridge radio is now in use in many ocean ports, and "has contributed immensely to safety of navigation."

Clothier recommended wider coverage than proposed in the Garmatz bill, which would not apply to the Mississippi River above Louisiana, or to power vessels under 300 tons.

Another witness, Patrick J. King, representing the Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Union-AFL-CIO, said his organization "wholeheartedly and enthusiastically" endorses the radio bill.

A group speaking for pilots, ship operators, and port officials in Baltimore, said there is "an over-riding need" for mandatory two-way radio.

They said the bill should apply to all tugs and towboats of 26-foot length or more.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 22, 1969]

GETTING NOWHERE ON RIVER SAFETY

After three days of congressional hearings on improving safety in inland water shipping, only one thing is clear: A lot needs to be done.

This was brought out during the first day of the hearings on proposed legislation when Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan of St. Louis pointed out the bill under discussion by a House committee didn't go far enough toward regulating inland waterways.

She protested that stronger measures should have been presented to the committee and the House as a legislative package, including a wide range of changes needed to improve river safety.

The bill before the committee calls for

two-way boat radios, but is so loaded with exceptions that it leaks like a sieve. A law is needed requiring vessel operators to install radio equipment, but it should be a stronger one than that proposed by Rep. Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland. His bill would not apply to the Mississippi river above Louisiana, or to power boats under 300 tons.

An even more critical need is for the mandatory licensing of all towboat pilots and engineers, and requiring periodic inspections for all boats.

Such strong legislation had been proposed by Mrs. Sullivan but she withdrew it after agreeing to the package deal including a bill to be written by the Coast Guard on licensing regulations.

It's time the Coast Guard came out of dry dock and fulfilled its obligation to improve inland shipping safety.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 24, 1969]

CITY URGED: ENFORCE OWN RIVER RULES

(By Allan Hale)

In the absence of federal regulation the city of St. Louis should enforce its own controls over river traffic, it has been suggested by the Marine Officers Association in a draft ordinance submitted at the city's request.

It would give the city the right to inspect barges carrying dangerous cargo for safety and to insure they are not polluting the river, check fire and safety protection for personnel, inspect "all marine equipment moored within the harbor to determine the security of the moorings" and oversee loading and unloading operations.

Capt. Charles L. Jones, president of the association's Local 54, said Wednesday that the suggestions had been drafted at the request of the public safety department, members of the board of aldermen and street department.

The street department, which at present controls the riverfront, is consulting a number of interested parties, among them the Marine Officers—an association of towboat pilots—the U.S. Coast Guard and the city fire department, in order to prepare a new body of regulations for the riverfront, said Walter Abell, administrative assistant to the director, Wednesday.

New regulations have been under consideration since the June 28 storm in which the riverboat restaurant Becky Thatcher broke loose and drifted two miles downstream before colliding with a pier. There were no casualties and the 100 diners were rescued by a towboat.

The Marine Officers also have suggested that all towboats shifting barges in the harbor shall have a licensed pilot at the helm.

At present there is no federal law requiring a towboat pilot to pass an examination of competency and take out a license.

A Coast Guard survey made in June showed that close to a million tons of hazardous cargo—explosive, inflammable or poisonous—passes through the St. Louis harbor in a month.

The Marine Officers suggest that the city ordinance should require the master or operator of any towboat to report any damage which would release any pollutant into the water or air of the harbor and give the city power to order repairs to be made.

The requirement to report damage would apply to all tows passing the city. The other requirements apply only to cargo being loaded, handled or discharged here. Figures for 1967, the most recent available, show that the city stands first among the river ports on the Mississippi, handling more than 11 million tons of cargo a year. Only the deep-water access ports handle more.

The Marine Officers believe that a Supreme Court decision "Cooley vs. Wardens of the Port of Philadelphia" established a precedent for city control of river activities.

The draft ordinance, if adopted, would give the city powers similar to those embodied in federal legislation now stalemated in the U.S. House of Representatives Merchant Marine Committee.

The need for regulation of towboat traffic has been under discussion at intervals in the committee since 1935.

During three days of inconclusive hearings last week Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, accused the towboat interests of blocking safety legislation "year after year."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 26-27, 1969]

NOT A SINGLE FIREBOAT—THAT'S THE STORY OF ST. LOUIS, NO. 1 PORT ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER

(By Allan Hale)

In terms of the waterborne tonnage passing across its wharves, St. Louis stands number one on the Mississippi river. In terms of waterborne fire protection it stands nowhere.

More than 11 million tons of cargo comes and goes by water here each year. Three million tons more than the city's nearest inland competitor, Memphis, Tenn. Four million tons more than the combined total for Minneapolis-St. Paul. Only at each end of the waterway, where Chicago and New Orleans have access to deep water freight is that total exceeded.

St. Louis probably makes more use of its waterfront entertainment potential than any other river city. A determined effort has been made to re-focus the center of entertainment around the Gateway Arch.

Excursion boats, showboats, riverboat restaurants, exhibition and museum boats jostle for space in the shadow of the arch.

The muddy Mississippi, rolling steadily past the city at its inexorable 4 miles an hour, carries great tows of barges, loaded with highly explosive petroleum distillates and crude oil. No regulations exist to require towboat officers to pass an examination of competency, nor are their boats subject to inspection. The moored showboats rock in their wakes night and day.

Nor do the boats always stay moored. A month ago the riverboat restaurant Becky Thatcher broke loose in a violent storm and took 100 diners for a terrifying two-mile drift downriver before smacking into a chemical company wharf in a shower of sparks.

There was no official rescue service to save them. If the boat had caught fire, there was no official agency available to intervene in time to prevent the boat being burned to the waterline. The Coast Guard is not equipped for such emergencies and the city is not equipped for any river emergency. Period.

The city is broke. Fireboats cost money, anywhere from \$40,000 to \$300,000. Also, they have to be crewed. The number of men needed as a crew varies with the type of boat. A typical crew is seven, an officer and six men. To keep the boat standing by 24 hours a day requires three eight-hour watches, 21 men. Allowing for men on days off, or sick, say 25 men.

River fire-fighting is a highly specialized business. All these men will require special training. Where are they to come from and how are they to be financed? Also, they may stay on watch, doing nothing more visible than polishing the brasswork, for 365 days a year, waiting for something to happen. How do you justify that to the taxpayers?

The first question is who buys the boat? If the city can't, who would want to?

The city port commission, an advisory body of rivermen and associated interests which advises the Board of Public Service, points silently to a map of the St. Louis harbor, showing the industrial river frontage.

Over a distance of about 19 miles, between the Chain of Rocks Bridge and the Jefferson Barracks Bridge are clustered 55 industrial

enterprises with dock frontages, two military establishments and two waterworks.

About six months ago the Port Commission began considering a plan to pass the hat, arguing that self-interest combined with public spirit might encourage industry to fill it.

It was considered and shelved because, says Larry C. Unland, president of the Board of Public Service, the Fire Department, which had previously thought it possible to find crews from among its existing personnel, found itself faced with a demand for economies.

If you have no spare men, how do you find a fireboat crew? About a year and a half ago the city of Toledo, Ohio, bought its Fire Department a 34-foot jet-propelled fireboat at a cost of \$43,000 and Fire Chief Eulan Tucker found the crew to man it 24 hours a day without adding a single man to his department.

"We took 13 men from the nearest firehouse and put them through a course of training," he said. "We have more men in training now. Normally they work with their company and when the boat is needed they go and crew it."

"We've used it several times, also for rescue work and to combat oil spill. I'd like to have another, bigger one."

At each end of the great Mississippi waterway the fireboats cruise. The Chicago Fire Department has seven of them. New Orleans has three. St. Louis, number one inland port, has none.

Should it have? Should schools have fire escapes?

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 29, 1969]

INCOMPETENTS FEAR RADIO CHECK, RIVER PILOT SAYS

(By Allan Hale)

If radio talk between towboats was monitored in the same way that the Federal Aviation Agency records the conversation of airline captains, it would establish how many towboat pilots are incompetent.

This, veteran master pilot Walter I. Hass, charged Monday, is one reason why towboat owners are against the compulsory use of radio aboard all towboats, even though all but a handful of the boats already are radio-equipped.

"You could probably count them on the fingers of both hands, over the entire river system," he says.

Hass, a St. Louisan, has been a river man for 39 years and a master pilot for 30. He presently is captain of one of the biggest boats on the river.

Representatives of the American Waterways Operators Association, a trade organization, were urged at a Congressional committee hearing July 15 to "put aside financial consideration" and accept stronger legislation governing the use of radio.

A representative told the House Merchant Marine Committee that he would have to consult with AWO directors before committing the association to a tighter bill. A bill presently before the committee would bring under regulation only the 355 biggest towboats in the nation's 6,000.

Hass said Monday that if radio equipment was installed and operated according to federal regulations "It would give the federal agency a chance to then monitor these conversations and disprove some of the allegations of the operators that they are putting competent people on there. Because if you just listen to the radio their incompetence is obvious."

He cites instances: "I met up with a boat just above Yellow Bend, one night. (Yellow Bend is near Greenville, Miss.) I saw a searchlight, we had quite a large tow, so I called him and asked if he was going to wait for me below there." (At many points on the river, at certain water stages, two tows cannot pass without risking collision).

Hass says the oncoming pilot agreed and told him he would "Wait down by the elevator."

"Now at that time there was no elevator in Yellow Bend. So I said to him 'You're kind of lost, aren't you? There's no elevator down there.'"

"Well," he said, "Tell you what. You just tell me where to go and I'll go there and wait for you."

"That's the point. You see, when pilots talk to each other they use landmarks as reference points," Hass explains. "If you're a pilot you talk to him and tell him you're going to wait below the Yellow Bend light or above the dock and he'll know just exactly where you'll be. But when a man doesn't know his reference points, it's very difficult to tell him where to go."

There is at present no regulation requiring a pilot to take the Coast Guard examination which includes drawing a map of the river and its landmarks from memory.

U.S. Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis, has been trying to get this and other aspects of the industry regulated since 1962.

"I met another boat one night 'below Brown's Point,'" Hass goes on. "The river current runs pretty fast, so I was going to back up from point to point. As a result I wanted to come down around the buoys. He said 'I'm not on the buoys now,' so I said 'Just get over to the shore.' He said 'There's an eddy in there and I've got a long tow, 1,000 foot of tow and I can't get in that eddy.'"

"I said 'There's no eddy there, and so far as the length of the tow, I've got 1,200 feet here myself.' I finally had to put my foot down and make him get over to the shore, which he did."

"But these things are so unnecessary," Hass continues. "If you had trained people. The training does not involve a long period. The Coast Guard regulations are a matter of 10 trips. Only two or three need to be recent. But by having 10 trips the man does have some knowledge of the river and the condition of the river at various times."

There is at present no regulation requiring a pilot to take an examination of competency and qualify for a license. In June, Mrs. Sullivan withdrew her strong bill to license towboat officers and provide for crewing standards and inspection of boats, logjammed in committee for four years, and accepted a compromise package of three bills, to license pilots and some engineers, make use of bridge-to-bridge radio compulsory and codify rules of the road.

The waterways operators have said they will accept only pilot licensing and oppose everything else. The only action in the Merchant Marine Committee since the June compromise has been three days of inconclusive hearings on the radio bill.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, July 30, 1969]

A RIVER BARGE WILL SOON CARRY AS MUCH AS TRAIN, SAYS DRENNAN

(By Allan Hale)

A single river barge will soon be able to carry as much as an average freight train, forecast barge line president E. Thomas Drennan, Tuesday.

Speaking in a program on transportation, at Durango, Colo., he said that such barges would hold 1,500 to 1,800 tons of cargo and be made into tows of up to 60,000 tons.

He said the modern towboat can now transport 40,000 tons of cargo "The equivalent of four 10,000 ton trains, four Liberty ships or 27 average-size freight trains."

Drennan, president of the St. Louis-based Sioux City and New Orleans Barge Lines, predicted an increase in co-operation between barge lines and railroads.

This, he said, will be a major source of transport savings in the 1970s.

He also foresees door to door containerized

service, whereby cargo loaded into a container in Kansas can be railroaded to a barge, the barge towed to a port, floated aboard a barge-carrying ocean-going ferry and taken to Europe.

At the European end the barges will be floated out, tied into a string of river barges and forwarded to railroad and consumer.

"Relatively small boats with relatively small horsepower can push huge flotillas of barges over thousands of miles at startling low costs," Drennan said.

"If you are able to combine water transportation with economies which result from volume handling of products—bargeloads of 1,000 tons, trainloads of 10,000 tons joined to movement of 10 barges—the overall economies can be very substantial indeed."

"You can put money in your pocket by thinking not in terms of truck loads or car loads, but of unit trains of 7,500 to 10,000 tons, of 10-car cuts which can fill a barge."

"Combine the best efficiencies of these different modes and you might put \$1 or much more a ton in your pocket from transport savings alone, and also reach into new markets where your product attracts a higher price."

Drennan, whose company operates on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers was addressing the agricultural extension service conference at Fort Lewis College, Durango.

He told them that although efficient transport has always been one of the major keys to farm profits, this has never been more true than it is today.

"Freight transport accounts for 10 cents out of every dollar of production cost for the nation as a whole," he said. "For agricultural commodities, transport costs may take an even larger share of the total. For example, as a rule of thumb, perhaps 20 per cent of the price of grain at the ports is in transportation. So transport is far more important to the farmer and to agricultural business generally than is often realized."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 23, 1969]

AN SOS FOR FIREBOATS—SAFETY CHIEF WILLIAM TRANTINA SAYS GROWING NUMBER OF ENTERTAINMENT CRAFT ON RIVERFRONT ARE IN NEED OF PROTECTION

(By Allen Hale, Globe-Democrat staff writer)

St. Louis doesn't need a fireboat, says city Director of Public Safety William Trantina. In his opinion it needs three of them.

"One on the mid-north shore, one on the mid-south and one in the middle," he said. "To have only one would be as ridiculous as having one fire company and expecting it to answer all the calls in St. Louis."

Trantina believes he was the first city official to become concerned "several years ago" with the lack of fire protection on the river.

His concern was sparked primarily, he says, by the increase in entertainment activity on the riverfront. "The craft being brought up here, the old paddle-steamers, primarily as places of public assembly. Wherever you have a large concentration of people there is a problem of safety."

His anxiety is accentuated by the city's position as a port for the embarkation and discharge of cargo; and the amount of river traffic passing through.

"Barge loads are increasing every day," he says. "We have the movement of many dangerous materials. Tons and tons of explosive products of all types."

According to the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center, in 1967, the latest year for which figures are available, more than 11 million tons of cargo passed across the wharves here, to make St. Louis the number one inland port on the Mississippi.

A Coast Guard survey carried out in June showed that close to 1 million tons of cargo officially classified as "hazardous"—explosive, inflammable or poisonous—passes in front of the city every month.

The wakes of these boats has set up a rocking motion extending as far inland as City Hall.

There the port commission, a voluntary body of men with river interests, is engaged in studying a new code of regulation for the riverfront and river traffic.

One of their interests is fire protection. Trantina has already sketched out tentative plans for fire coverage.

First he rejects the idea of having a boat manned part-time, by a crew trained in river fire-fighting but doing regular land duty in a firehouse near the river.

"For one thing, what would happen if they were out on a call?" he inquires sensibly. "Nobody chooses the time when an accident happens."

His plan calls for 24-hour manning by three crews of 4 men, an officer and three privates. He visualizes the men and their quarters as entirely mobile.

The boat would float, secured and partially weather-protected in a roofed floating dock. From the boat a gangway would lead to the riverbank and two trailers, which can be moved to conform with the stages of the river. One would be a trailer firehouse for the men. The other an equipment store and workshop.

Trantina says he would prefer good-sized boats, costing around \$80,000 and equipped with powerful pumps and monitor fire-jets capable of throwing water or foam.

Crews would be trained in the techniques of scuba diving and rescue, as well as the highly specialized techniques of shipboard fire-fighting.

He sees riverfront fire protection as absolutely necessary, pointing to the breakaway of the riverboat restaurant Becky Thatcher on the night of June 28, when 100 diners were swept two miles down river, and eventually rescued by a towboat, as a near-miss with disaster.

"Even the people on the boat that night don't realize how lucky they were," he says. Moreover, he says, if proper fire protection is to be provided along the river, the money will have to be raised among the people to whom the river frontage is a means of livelihood, the users not just of the levee, but of the whole 19-mile complex of industry and barge-operating companies spread out along both sides of the river.

"We would expect the people who would benefit to pay, or to subsidize to some extent," he says.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 23-24, 1969]

FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLAR FIREBOAT URGED FOR ST. LOUIS

The St. Louis riverfront needs a \$50,000 fireboat, according to a list of top priorities listed in a six-month study of the city's fire protection.

The study, by Gage-Babcock and Associates, Mount Kisco, N.Y., was presented to the city Thursday.

It said "Fireboat service is needed to provide a good level of protection to river boats and waterfront property."

The city has no fireboat, although one was first requested by the fire department about 10 years ago.

The boat suggested in the study would have a crew of three and be capable of a speed of 25 knots, and have the capacity to fight oil or gasoline fires.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 23-24, 1969]

THIRTEEN RIVER ACCIDENTS—CLOSE BRUSHES WITH FIRE AND DEATH (By Allan Hale)

South St. Louis came close to being swept with a brush of fire Jan. 24 . . . and almost nobody knows about it. Cahokia lay under

the same threat. Few, if any, of the people who live there heard of it.

Clarksville, Mo., might have had a similarly unlucky day on June 13 . . . and if you were near the Chain of Rocks Canal on the afternoon of May 14, say in Granite City, that was the day you just escaped seeing flames in the sky.

In all these instances, people never knew. In each of these cases towboats laden with gasoline, thousands of gallons of gasoline, collided.

There have been 13 accidents in 30 months on one stretch of the Mississippi, some involving gasoline barges, some not. Any one of them could have blocked traffic on the river for hours, days or weeks.

The 13 were itemized in a warning given towboat operators in the course of a speech by an Army Corps of Engineers officer at Greenville, Miss., on July 25.

From the details given it appears that 11 of the 13 were legally reportable to the U.S. Coast Guard. A check of files shows only seven appear to have been reported.

In these seven cases, only three pilots are recorded as holding a license to pilot a towboat. There is no legal requirement for a man to take the entirely voluntary examination for a towboat pilot's license.

Nobody needs a license to operate a towboat. Nobody needs a license to be engineer on a towboat. Nobody has authority to supervise design of a towboat. Nobody has authority to inspect a towboat. Not the Federal government. Not the state government. Not the Coast Guard. Not the Interstate Commerce Commission. Nobody.

And on Jan. 24, in the dark cold hours of the early morning, an unlicensed pilot, with an uninspected boat which had an equipment failure, came close to starting a roaring fire rolling along the south St. Louis riverfront.

It was 1:40 a.m. when a southbound towboat, groping its way downriver among the floating ice, found its searchlight suddenly blacked out.

The pilot attempted, in the dark, to swing in reverse into the shelter of the Mobil Oil dock, on the Illinois side, at Cahokia a spot about level with the 3500 block of South Broadway in St. Louis.

There's a bad current there, and in the dark, a barge laden with gasoline smashed into a barge moored at the dock. More than 100,000 gallons of gasoline gushed out. At the same time a jagged steel segment of the shattered gasoline barge pierced the moored barge, loaded with petroleum distillate.

Then, for long minutes, nothing happened. The miracle had come to pass. There was no explosion and no fire. A call to the Coast Guard brought craft to flood the area with fire foam. Only then, slowly and gingerly, could the two enmeshed barges be backed apart, steel grating on steel that might at any moment produce a spark.

Had anything sparked off that 100,000 gallons of gas—and gas is slow to evaporate in 19-degree temperature, which it was that night—the effect would have been one which the St. Louis Fire Department doesn't even like to think about.

The collision happened at an oil company dock. Right across the river are three more oil company docks and a petroleum dock. The whole stretch on the St. Louis side is thick with industry.

On the Illinois side, barge fleets tie up along Arsenal Island, loaded with the hundreds of kinds of cargo the river carries, some of them explosive, some of them inflammable, some of them poisonous.

And behind this industrial frontage and intermingled with it are the little residential streets of the south side, Holly Hills and Montana and Gasconade and Piedmont and Chariton. Osceola, Oregon, Dakota, Elchenberger.

Floating gasoline burns rather than explodes, fire fighters know. Their vision of what could have happened is of a rolling fire, leaping from water to shore, to office buildings and construction shacks to storage tanks, an explosion, and more flames, leaping to picket fences.

This incident of Jan. 24 has been the most potentially hazardous so far this year, but it has not been the only one.

On May 14 a downbound tow with six barges of gasoline hit the wing wall at Lock 27, Granite City, cracking open the bow compartment of one of the lead barges.

Gasoline barges are compartmented and the bow compartment had been kept empty as a precaution against just such an accident.

However, the impact was enough to impale the barge on the wing wall of the lock with the concrete spur almost reaching the next, and laden, compartment.

It was found that the only way to free the barge was to swing it to and fro, steel grating against concrete. The fear of the men at the lock was that in the course of this spark-producing process the second compartment would burst. The maneuver was attempted only after the nose of the barge and the wing wall had been smothered in fire foam.

On June 13 a tow bound upriver, with two gasoline barges, hit and damaged the land-side leaf of the upper mitre gates at Lock 24, Clarksville, Mo. There was no spillage, but the whole gate could have been put out of action, stopping traffic past that point.

On July 2 a downbound tow hit the bridge at Cape Girardeau and spilled about 50 gallons of heptane, a petroleum product, into the river, a minor spillage compared with others.

It was the third time in 30 months that a bridge has been hit in that area. On April 17, 1967, a downbound tow hit the bridge at Chester, Ill. and spilled 5,600 gallons of gasoline.

On April 22, this year, a barge hit the bridge at Thebes, Ill., drifted downriver and sank. This was not a gasoline barge, but it was a hazard to navigation.

So the list lengthens. One expert informant who contributed information for this article commented: "It's anarchy. Nobody regulates them. They do as they damn please."

Of the 13 accidents which happened over a 300-mile stretch of river between Saverton, Mo., and Cairo, Ill., five involved possible danger from gasoline or a petroleum product. All, either by damaging structures or sinking could have stopped river traffic.

Two of the 13 are not considered reportable to the Coast Guard, which is supposed to receive reports of all serious accidents on the river, because action by other towboats or by men at the docks prevented the situation from developing.

These involved breakaway barges drifting into or toward a dam, and action was taken before there was lots of life, serious injury, grounding or damage totalling more than \$1,500. The occurrence of any of these things makes the accident reportable to the nearest Coast Guard marine inspection office.

Of the remaining 11, which appear officially reportable, in four cases no record can be found by the Coast Guard to show that they were ever reported.

Supporters of regulation of the towboating industry have long contended that official figures of accidents are misleading because many accidents are never reported.

The common feeling among the men who supplied material for this article is that there is bound to be a disaster some time. Their only hope is that it won't happen in this area.

At New Orleans in April a towboat collided with a Chinese Nationalist freighter. In the resultant fire 25 seamen died and flames soared 100 feet into the air, buckling steel

guard rails on the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge above.

It could happen any minute of any day here. It may be happening as you read this.

[Editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 26, 1969]

THREAT OF UNLICENSED TOWBOATS

It has now been revealed that an accident involving an unlicensed towboat operator earlier this year splashed 100,000 gallons of gasoline into the Mississippi near south St. Louis.

This was only one of 13 river accidents involving towboats in a 300-mile stretch from Saverton, Mo., to Cairo, Ill., in the past 30 months.

Only the rarest of luck prevented the riverfront from being turned into a roaring inferno as the towboat crashed into a gasoline barge as the Mobil Oil dock at Cahokia, opening a gash that loosed a torrent of gasoline on the river.

What would have happened if a fire had spread to the St. Louis side of the river where it could have fed on a long row of oil and fuel company docks and other industries lining the riverfront?

First of all, the city wouldn't have the single most important weapon to fight this roaring blaze—a fireboat. It would have to fight it as best it could from the shore because St. Louis is "economizing" by not having a fireboat.

This is astounding when one considers that nearly 1 million tons of explosive, inflammable or poisonous cargo pass in front of the city every month!

If such a fire had gutted industries along the riverfront, perhaps taking many lives as well, there would be an outcry: "Why was an unlicensed towboat operator plying the Mississippi? Who is responsible for this?"

The Globe-Democrat doesn't want to wait for a tragedy of this kind before getting regulations for towboat operations.

In a continuing series of articles by staff writer Allen Hale it has been pointed out that:

Anyone, and we mean anyone, can operate a towboat without a license.

Anything goes in the design and construction of towboats, since there are no inspections or regulations on design of any kind.

The waterways industry seems determined to do nothing to remedy the situation.

At any time, St. Louis could find its riverfront aflame, just as New Orleans did in April when three barges collided with a Nationalist Chinese freighter and 25 lives were lost.

Or it could be the scene of an explosion similar to the one which hit La Grange, Mo. in May and killed four persons.

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan originally submitted a bill that would have licensed towboat operators and called for inspection of these vessels.

She withdrew it when she was promised that a package of three bills would be offered to provide for licensing, inspection and two-way radio communication systems.

To date, however, the only bill offered was a watered-down two-way radio bill that would exempt all but the larger towboats.

It appears there has been another sellout to the water commerce industry.

Mrs. Sullivan should reintroduce her own bill, and demand provisions for licensing towboat engineers, specifying minimum crews, proper design and safety standards.

We would urge her to act with as much speed as possible. The city she saves could be her own.

[Editorial from the Globe Democrat, Sept. 20, 1969]

TOWBOATS' "UNSAFETY" RECORD

The National Transportation Safety Board has strongly reinforced what The Globe-Democrat has been saying through a series of articles and editorials—that a major hol-

ocaust is a real possibility if towboat operators are not licensed and if safety precautions aren't heeded.

Analysis of 12 major accident cases "showed the potential for a major catastrophic accident involving hazardous materials."

Casualties on towing vessels have increased 22 per cent in recent years. Fatalities are up 50 per cent in just two years. Groundings and collisions have increased by 20 per cent. Fires, foundering, capsizings and floodings accounted for 19 per cent of the casualties.

The study covering the fiscal years 1956-68 found a "significant proportion" of casualties involved personnel errors.

It further made a strong case for licensing pilots when it found that more than twice as many unlicensed towboat operators were involved in collisions as were licensed operators.

This report should clinch the case for a law to license towboats and require safety inspections of all such craft. Tow vessels also should be required to have two-way radio communications, minimum crews and meet other safety standards that now are often ignored.

Here in St. Louis we already are well aware of the potential for a disaster on the river. It was revealed only recently that an accident involving an unlicensed towboat operator spilled 100,000 gallons of gasoline into the Mississippi near south St. Louis. In the past 30 months there have been 13 river accidents involving towboats in a 300-mile stretch of the Mississippi from Saverton, Mo., to Cairo, Ill.

Congress has an obligation to act as quickly as possible to end the threat of an explosion or fire that could cause immense loss of life and property at any time or place along the thousands of miles of inland waterways.

It can do this by passing the licensing and safety standards act for towboats. The danger is too great to delay further.

[Editorial from the Globe Democrat, Sept. 24, 1969]

REALISTIC RIVER SAFETY BILL

A bill requiring towboat pilots and engineers to be examined and licensed, expected to go before the House Merchant Maritime Committee within the next few days, is a long overdue step in the right direction toward regulating the nation's inland waterways industry.

Sponsored by Representatives Leonor K. Sullivan of St. Louis and Edward A. Garmatz of Baltimore, the bill would put an end to the current dangerous practice which allows virtually anyone—experienced or not—to operate a towboat.

This is a sensible piece of legislation which needs to be adopted. A continuing Globe-Democrat investigative and editorial campaign has pointed to the hazardous-accident potential under the lack of regulation of the towboating industry.

The proposal is not as tough as it should be. It represents a compromise between Mrs. Sullivan's strong bill for regulation of the waterways, introduced in 1962, and a pilot licensing bill backed by Garmatz. Also needed are crewing standards, which the new bill does not require.

But the plan is a realistic one in that it is probably the best that could be hoped to win acceptance. If it's approved by Congress—as it should be—it opens the door for more comprehensive regulations to increase safety on inland waterways.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 24, 1969]

HOUSE GROUP TO WEIGH RIVER PILOT LICENSING BILL

(By Allan Hale)

A bill requiring towboat pilots and engineers to be examined and licensed is ex-

pected to go before the House Merchant Marine Committee in Washington within a few days, according to Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), St. Louis.

The bill stands in her name and that of Congressman Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Baltimore, and represents a compromise between her strong bill for regulation of the inland waterways industry, introduced in 1962, and a pilot licensing bill by Garmatz.

Dangerous accidents and lack of regulation of the towboating industry have recently been the subject of a continuing Globe-Democrat investigative and editorial campaign.

In a memorandum accompanying the draft bill, Garmatz urges its adoption, saying "For several years, it has been apparent that action must be taken to increase safety on our inland waterways. At present, no licenses are required for any operators of towboats in that area and there have been an increasing number of casualties."

Mrs. Sullivan's original bill would have required the licensing under Coast Guard supervision of all key towboat officers, including pilots and engineers, the laying-down of crewing standards, the construction of boats to approved design and their inspection while in operation.

The Garmatz bill would have required only the licensing of pilots.

The compromise bill will require the licensing of pilots in all boats of more than 15 gross tons, which means effectively all the 6,000 boats in the industry.

It also will require all boats of 750 horsepower or more to have a licensed engineer. The adoption of the horsepower of engines as a standard controlling whether or not the boat must have a certificated engineer can be regarded as a gain for the proponents of licensing of engine-room officers.

The horsepower standard will bring considerably more engineers under licensing control than the standard set in an earlier draft of the same bill, which would have required licensed engineers only aboard boats of 100 tons or more.

The bill leaves open the door to further regulation of the industry, by requiring the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a study of the "need for, if any, inspection of towing vessels" and "any other matter which he deems necessary to provide for safety on the navigable waters of the United States."

The Transportation Secretary is required to submit an interim report six months after the passing of the bill into law and a final report at the end of two years.

In his memorandum accompanying the circulated draft bill, Garmatz says, "This bill is the result of considerable study both by Mrs. Sullivan and me with respect to the causes of casualties, and we have come to the conclusion that by far the major number of casualties has been the result of inefficiencies in the pilot-house."

A report issued last month by the National Transportation Safety Board said there has been a 20 per cent increase in towboat accidents in the last four years.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 26, 1969]

TWENTY-TWO IN HOUSE PUSH TOWBOAT BILL— PROVIDES FOR LICENSING, INSPECTIONS (From the Globe-Democrat Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Following up swiftly a federal finding that more than twice as many unlicensed towboat operators were involved in collisions as were licensed operators, 22 members of the House of Representatives have just introduced a bill to step up licensing requirements.

The measure would require a licensed pilot on every tugboat of more than 15 gross tons or more than 26 feet long. It would prohibit a pilot's working more than 12 hours in every 24, except in emergencies.

In addition, all tugboats of 750 horsepower or more would be required to carry a licensed engineer. This would affect about 1,700 of the 6,000-odd tugs now in operation.

(At present there is no law requiring any towboat officer to take an examination of competency and hold a license. This and other dangerous circumstances on the inland waterways have been the subject of a continuing Globe-Democrat investigative and editorial series.)

The bill also directs the Secretary of Transportation to carry out an intensive study of the need for requiring inspection of all towing vessels on inland waterways. This would affect virtually all such craft. Last year, for example, 6,101 tugs were not inspected, only 68 were inspected by the Coast Guard.

The secretary would be required to file interim reports on the survey every six months, including statistics on accidents during each period. His final report is due Jan. 1, 1972.

The bill was co-sponsored by Rep. Edward A. Garmatz (Dem.), Maryland, and Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan (Dem.), Missouri, chairman and next ranking majority member, respectively, of the House Merchant Marine Committee.

The committee will hold hearings on the bill Oct. 7, 8 and 9, Mrs. Sullivan said. A committee source indicated it was expected to move ahead rapidly.

The bill as drafted represents a compromise, it was reported, as Garmatz originally had not supported licensing of engineers.

The need for licensing was pointed up by the National Transportation Safety Board recently in an analysis of Coast Guard figures on tugboat accidents.

"Unlicensed towing vessel operators," the board said, "were involved in twice as many collisions as were licensed operators."

The board said the figures "revealed the need for more competent operators, knowledgeable in the rules of the road."

The Coast Guard had reported in detail on 108 major accidents. In one, for example, a towboat pushing a barge hit a major highway bridge, knocking out a section of the span.

"The operator of the towboat was unlicensed, and had only four months' experience," the Coast Guard said.

In another case, two tows collided on a straight stretch, both with unlicensed pilots, because each failed to take proper precautions. A third accident saw two vessels with unlicensed operators collide because they failed to stay on their own sides of the channel.

In a fourth instance, an unlicensed pilot tried to rush his towboat across the bow of an oncoming tow. His towboat was capsized and one of two men in the crew drowned.

REPRESENTATIVE BYRNE ADDRESSES PULASKI DAY OBSERVANCE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, those who were privileged to attend the 1969 Pulaski Day observance in Philadelphia's Independence Square on Sunday, October 5, were fortunate to hear a stirring address by our esteemed and honorable colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative JAMES BYRNE.

Sponsored by the Polish American Congress for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, the ceremony honored Marine Maj. Robert J. Modrzejewski, a recent

recipient of the Medal of Honor for heroism in Vietnam. As Congressman BYRNE points out in his speech, Major Modrzejewski embodies those same qualities of respect for freedom and human dignity which inspired Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

In many ways Congressman BYRNE's remarks lend meaning and significance to an important reality in our American tradition—the fact that we all come from different national heritages but are joined together in the common cause of our love for America. It is for that reason that I am pleased and honored to place it in the RECORD at this point and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE BYRNE

Mayor Tate, Reverend clergy, honorable government officials—city, state and Federal—Major Modrzejewski, President Czaplicki, General Chairman Wyszynski, Grand Marshall Walczak, ladies and gentlemen:

We gather here today, at this historic shrine of liberty and independence, to honor two heroic sons of Poland—one who died 190 years ago this month in the gallant struggle to create this nation; and one, who we are thankful is among us today, who is continuing the fight for freedom.

Actually, we are honoring more than just two men; we are honoring them as representatives of an American community renowned for its contributions in all fields of endeavor.

Casimir Pulaski was born a Pole and died an American. Our guest of honor today, Marine Major Robert J. Modrzejewski, was born an American, but he, too, stands up proudly and declares: "I am a Pole."

This is entirely proper, for this is the American way. We are proud, indeed, of being Americans, but we look back with fondness, respect and nostalgia to the land that gave us birth—or from which came our parents or grandparents.

Casimir Pulaski had a dream. If not for that dream, he might never have come to our shores. And without the heroism of Pulaski, there is a serious question of whether the Stars and Stripes would be flying here today—or at least whether those eight long years of our struggle for independence would not have been many more.

Casimir Pulaski could have been one of the viewers instead of one of the doers. After all, he was a nobleman, with wealth and position. He did not have to put his life and position on the block.

But he had a dream, and within himself that inner voice kept repeating and repeating, ever in stronger tones, "Someday, Poland will be free!"

Pulaski did not live to see that dream become a reality. He died on his adopted shore, many thousands of miles from his native and beloved land, so that America could be free.

But Pulaski's dream did not die. It remains in the hearts and on the lips of free men everywhere even unto this day: "Someday, Poland will be free."

May it be in our lifetime, or at least in the lifetime of our children!

As commander of the Polish Patriotic Forces, Pulaski and his comrades fought hard and well, but they faced unsurmountable opposition. Poland was not freed; and Casimir Pulaski was forced to flee for his life.

There were not many avenues open to him; there were few lands which would welcome a revolutionist—despite the legitimate cause for which he fought.

But the American colonies, where the thoughts, if not the words, that declared that all men are created equal permeated the populace, offered him refuge.

He more than amply repaid the debt he owed America with his bravery, ability and his life.

It was at the Battle of Brandywine, on September 11, 1777, that the military genius of Casimir Pulaski was truly realized. The British had landed a huge army on the Chesapeake and were marching on Philadelphia, the capital of the fledgling nation.

Near Chadds Ford, in Delaware County, at the banks of Brandywine Creek, an American Force, under the command of General George Washington, the Marquis de Lafayette and Count Casimir Pulaski took a stand to stop this superior force and save their capital.

I guess under present day terminology, Brandywine would be called a lost battle, for Philadelphia was not saved. It fell to the British and their Hessian mercenaries two weeks later and the Continental Congress fled to York.

But, in reality, and in the end, Brandywine was an American victory because the British were forced to go around the American army, leaving them the rich farms to feed them for the winter and the many forges to produce their cannon and rifle barrels.

Before the Continental Congress left in the face of the advancing British, in these very buildings, the Congress promoted Casimir Pulaski to brigadier general and named him the chief of all cavalry forces of the Continental Army.

Subsequently, Pulaski added more luster to his name at the Battle of Germantown and the battles of the winter of 1777-1778.

Following that bitter experience, he formed a corps known as the Pulaski Legion, with which he defended Charleston, South Carolina, in May, 1779. A few months later, fighting the Battle of Savannah, he was mortally wounded and taken out to the U.S.S. *Wasp* in the harbor.

There, on October 11, 1779, he died and was buried at sea. We have no gravestone at which to lay floral tributes. But we have a place for him in our hearts.

Our other honored son of Poland, Major Modrzejewski, was born July 3, 1934, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and, by coincidence, attended Pulaski High School there.

Upon graduation from the University of Wisconsin, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, and he has been a Marine for more than 12 years now.

He, too, won military recognition thousands of miles from his native land, and for this his nation honored him with its highest decoration for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor; and for this we pay him homage today as the symbol of the young men of our nation.

It was March of last year President Lyndon B. Johnson placed around the neck of this young man a symbol honored by fighting men more than a general's stars.

He received this medal, and may I quote from his citation, "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as commanding officer, Company K, Third Battalion, Fourth Marines, Third Marine Division, in the Republic of Vietnam from 15 to 18 July, 1966."

If I may, I would like to read the entire citation. I think you ought to know the type of man you are honoring here today.

"On 15 July, during Operation Hastings, Company K was landed at an enemy infested jungle area to establish a blocking position at a major enemy trail network.

"Shortly after landing, the company encountered a reinforced enemy platoon in a well organized, defensive position. Major (then Captain) Modrzejewski led his men in a successful seizure of the enemy redoubt, which contained large quantities of ammunition and supplies.

"That evening, a numerically superior enemy force counterattacked in an effort to

retake the vital supply area, thus setting the pattern of activity for the next two and one-half days.

"In the first series of attacks, the enemy assaulted repeatedly in overwhelming numbers but each time was repulsed by the gallant Marines.

"The second night, the enemy struck in battalion strength and Major Modrzejewski was wounded in this intensive action which was fought in close quarters.

"Although exposed to enemy fire, and despite his painful wounds, he crawled 200 meters to provide critically needed ammunition to an exposed element of his command and was constantly present wherever the fighting was heaviest.

"Despite numerous casualties, a dwindling supply of ammunition and the knowledge that they were surrounded, he skillfully directed artillery fire to within a few meters of his position and courageously inspired the efforts of his company in repelling the aggressive enemy attack.

"On 18 July, Company K was attacked by a regimental size enemy force. Although his unit was vastly outnumbered and weakened by the previous fighting, Major Modrzejewski reorganized his men and calmly moved among them to encourage and direct their efforts to heroic limits as they fought to overcome the vicious enemy onslaught.

"Again he called in air and artillery strikes at close range with devastating effect on the enemy, which together with the bold and determined fighting of the men of Company K, repulsed the fanatical attack of the larger North Vietnamese force.

"His unparalleled personal heroism and indomitable leadership inspired his men to a significant victory over the enemy force and reflected great credit upon himself, the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the end of the citation of this young man who we honor here today. Actually, it is we who are honored, Major Modrzejewski, by your presence among us today.

Would that it were within my power to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to each of the young men of Company K, those who survived and those who gave their lives in their nation's service.

But it is not.

Therefore, Major Modrzejewski, as a representative of your grateful nation, may I salute you for your individual accomplishments, as a representative of all our brave young men, and as a worthy son of a proud and noble people.

Thank you.

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker. There are ramifications to the October 15 moratorium which should be considered by all genuinely concerned about peace in Vietnam and the future role of the United States in international affairs. David Broder, in his column appearing in today's Washington Post, exposes some of the very far-reaching dangers which could result from this exercise in "breaking the President."

As Mr. Broder points out, American men are being withdrawn from Vietnam

and the level of hostilities appears to be deescalating. Steps are being taken to turn the fighting over to the Vietnamese if peace is not negotiated.

The country will be in very great danger if the demonstrations against the war weakens the authority of the President or his ability to lead the Nation. While the right of reasonable dissent should not be restricted, there is an admitted interest among some agitators in the breakdown of the constitutional governmental system in this country. Participants in the Vietnam moratorium would do well to consider the possible outcome of their actions.

I submit the Broder column for printing in the RECORD at this point:

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job:

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed

messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as it being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a President?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

AGE—AN ASSET

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alameda Times Star, published by Abe Kofman, carried an editorial the other day, "Age—An Asset" which I commend to my colleagues in the House.

It pertains to the employment of men over 40. In this day and age when the emphasis is on youth, the agitators on the campuses, throughout the country, and also some of them in this very House, forget the truth that age will some day catch up with them.

In Shakespeare's great tragedy, "Hamlet" there is a graveyard scene in which Hamlet is handed the skull of he who

was once a great jester. In closing his soliloquy, as he tosses it back into the grave, he says, "Get thee to my lady's chamber and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come."

The editorial appears below:

AGE—AN ASSET

Special emphasis is being placed on the value of workers who have passed age 40—at least some quarters are trying to prevail upon corporations to not rule out those in the plus-40 age bracket.

Governor Ronald Reagan points out that "scientific and statistical evidence" relegates to the category of the old wives' tale the idea that persons past 40 are somehow less knowledgeable and less efficient than those under 40.

There is need for such statements and such efforts to bring pressure on industry to revise the restrictive employment policies as related to age which have become accepted practice in too many places.

A talk show last week brought into graphic focus this very problem. Station KGO broadcast the conversation of a man who described himself as 43, an electronics engineer with a master's degree who has consistently kept abreast of state-of-the-art.

Although he did not identify the corporation by name, it was a big one on the San Francisco Peninsula. The axe had struck him, he said—he was terminated. And some 5,000 persons are in the same category, he charged. All are due for the pink slip, in line with that corporation's policy of weeding out persons over 40.

Under the free enterprise system, a policy such as this is considered the inviolate right of management. Government can suggest, perhaps even cajole, but it can exert little effective control over preventing such a harsh, impersonal policy from being implemented.

The personal damage done to individuals who fall under the age gullotine is unmeasurable. It is an ego-shattering experience, and can change the whole direction of not only one individual's career, but of his entire family.

And there is no question but what such a policy is shortsighted and destructive of the asserted goals of management—"team effort, efficient, quality production."

Most people grow in their work situations. They're better men at 40 than they were at 30, and they're better at 60 than they were at 50. Experience can be acquired only by doing.

Disregarding the cruel, immoral aspects of an age-restricted employment policy, it cannot be demonstrated that firing people at age 40 is good for the output of any organization.

A small step has been taken by Congress in making it unlawful to discriminate because of age. But proof is next to impossible to obtain. And since the average age continues to drop, those in power positions in industry probably will go right on being arbitrary, arrogant, brutal.

Maybe an "over-40 picket line" might be considered. Would that be too far-fetched? Not if you're a victim!

DR. GEORGE MUELLER, PLANNER-TECHNICIAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 23, 1969, the New York Times carried an article on Dr.

George Mueller, Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Having been associated with Dr. Mueller quite closely since he took over this post, I can frankly say that he is one of the most dedicated and sincere employees our country has. His vast knowledge and experience, I believe, was the major contributing factor to the success of our Apollo program and the ultimate moon landing. I have nothing but respect and admiration for George Mueller, a dedicated and loyal American. The Times article follows:

PLANNER-TECHNICIAN—GEORGE EDWIN MUELLER

(By Richard Witkin)

Some of the top officials directing day-to-day preparations for Apollo lunar flights became seriously worried 18 months ago about the dizzying complex of computer programs for the rockets, the spacecraft and the ground-support network. They feared the computer programs might not mesh as precisely as they had to if the voyage to the moon was to succeed. Following conventional wisdom, the officials decided they needed a preference for the job was anything but conventional. He was Dr. George Edwin Mueller, their boss.

As associate administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in charge of all manned space projects, Dr. Mueller might have been expected to be too busy with his vast administrative and planning duties to be able to take on the extra assignment, however important. He found the time.

"The computer programing was the biggest job of its kind anybody had ever attempted," Lieut. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, director of Project Apollo, said yesterday. "Some would disagree, but I believe the special effort George directed produced a lot of positive results."

It was no surprise to those who had followed his career that Dr. Mueller (he pronounces it Miller) could turn so readily from broad policy matters to the most intricate technical questions.

Intense, often called brilliant, he has been a professor of electrical engineering at Ohio State and later held a top position with a company that helped the Air Force pull together the many complex parts of its missile program.

Recruited for NASA, he brought to Washington a passion for work—16 to 18 hours a day. He became intimate with almost every piece of Apollo hardware and training equipment, staying out of the training centrifuge only because the doctors thought the gravity forces might be too much.

During the Apollo 8 mission he was home with flu. But he was constantly on the phone with the Mission Control Center and between calls he built himself a color TV set.

Important as his role has been, he has not been highly publicized. "In Washington," he once said, "if you stick your head above the waterline, you get it shot off. So when I took this job I made up my mind that, to get it done, I'd remain submerged."

In his NASA post, Dr. Mueller has been looking far ahead of Project Apollo, lest the valuable assets put together to produce the miracle of a lunar landing might be dissipated if the country did not set itself some new goals.

Pressing that point yesterday, he told a news conference in Houston:

"It seems quite clear that the planets of the solar system are well within our ability to explore, both manned and unmanned, at the present time."

But some of his highly-placed associates say there is a blemish in the picture of the successful spaceman. As one of them put it, "he has leadership problems."

Slight in stature, indirect in his personal approaches, he is not generally considered the model of an inspirational leader. His critics suggest he is distrustful of others and therefore unable to command their respect. Others say he is so single-minded about his assignment that, despite a casual informal manner he often rides subordinates too hard.

One of his stout defenders is Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, retired, who ran the Air Force missile program.

"I always had the sure confidence that he could understand technical details and at the same time glue a management together," General Schriever said yesterday. "No one can snow him."

Dr. Mueller was born in St. Louis exactly 51 years before the launching of the Apollo 11 spacecraft at Cape Kennedy on July 16.

He and his wife, the former Maude E. Rosenbaum of St. Louis, live in an attractive townhouse in the Georgetown section of Washington with one of their two daughters. The other is married to a Norwegian who is studying here for the ministry.

OPERATION INTERCEPT

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted the text of a statement on drugs issued by Gov. Ronald Reagan commending the administration's "Operation Intercept." Today I include in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times from a Beverly Hills doctor which raises serious questions concerning administration motives and judgment in implementing this border crackdown. The good doctor, to put it mildly, expresses his views quite adamantly. Since I believe that honest debate on the different approaches to the problem will result ultimately in the adoption of the best method of handling it, I am submitting the letter for your perusal.

Dr. Rickles, among other things, speaks to the underlying causes of drug use by young persons. He feels that the continuation of the war in Vietnam and the catastrophic conditions in the ghettos create a need to escape among our disenchanted youth. Ending the tragedy that is the Vietnam war and erasing the poverty, malnutrition, and hopelessness that exists in the ghetto areas, he surmises, will help to alleviate the narcotics problem. In this respect, we are in agreement. The pruning of a diseased tree will do no lasting good if the diseased core is not removed.

The letter follows:

MOTIVES QUESTIONED: CRACKDOWN ON MARIJUANA

You gave considerable publicity (Sept. 14) to a massive crackdown on the illicit traffic in marijuana. I am not objecting to this plan by the government. But I seriously question the motives behind and the reasoning espoused by the Justice Department.

I quote directly from your article. "The Nixon Administration hopes to turn young persons away from marijuana by choking off supplies and pushing the price beyond their reach. This, Dep.-Atty. Gen. Richard G. Kleindienst said, would send the price of marijuana skyrocketing, so that unlike

today, it will be beyond the reach of our young people who are using it so commonly."

His reasoning was that, "It's not an addictive drug like heroin." Asked whether the task force had considered legalizing marijuana, Kleindienst replied quickly and crisply: "No, we believe it should be a crime . . . it has adverse effects on our citizens, based on the literature I have read."

What literature? As a doctor of medicine, I have read the literature too, but all the literature not just that which is adverse. By far, the preponderance of authentic writings state just the opposite. But that isn't the issue. Alcohol isn't an addictive either. A similarly aroused government created the Volstead act in 1918 to prohibit the sale of alcohol. And with what dire results. We created a nation of law breakers and encouraged and abetted gangsterism which still plagues us and according to the FBI, is the greatest menace to our country today. And so once again we play into the hands of organized crime.

How stupid and arrogant can the establishment be? Hasn't the rebellion of youth reached their closed minds? People will not be forced to stop drinking alcohol, nor will the youth be forced to stop smoking pot. We have by conservative figures at least 10,000,000 alcoholics in the United States today. And from government figures at least 30,000 users of grass. What does the government want to do increase that figure to 50,000,000?

Is our government truly so blind and stubborn that it must continue the same strong-arm tactics to force obedience to established though questionable laws? Can't they see that maybe, just a possible maybe, that it is their approach and attitude that could be wrong?

Why won't they learn from bitter experience? Why won't they listen to informed behavioral scientists as to the harm of rigid controls where human emotions are concerned? Why won't they find out why our children have flocked to marijuana, to the land of lotus eaters as a surcease from the pain and anxiety of bitter disillusionment?

The government or no other agency can stop anyone from taking pills or alcohol by prohibition. But they can cut down on the intake by eradicating the causes and the motivation.

Two persistent overwhelming factors contribute today to the meteoric increase in drug consumption. One is the catastrophic condition in our ghettos, with poverty and inequities primarily involved with minorities. The second is the stupid continuation of a colossal blunder in Vietnam. Concentrate our man power to the eradication of these two evils and there will be an immediate let down in the need to escape on the part of our disenchanted youth.

Continue the blind enforcement of rigid controls and we will all end up lotus eaters!

OCTOBER 15 MOBILIZATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Reds are reported to be feverishly mobilizing to meet an October 15 deadline.

Is the October 15 mobilization just another Communist gimmick? Can it be that the crumbling and corrupt Red dictatorship is merely using the Russian

Bear as a catalyst to renew the national spirit of the Chinese people?

Or, are the Chinese Communists actually mobilizing against a threatened military attack which they feel the Russians could claim was an anticipatory retaliation in view of the Red Chinese nuclear threat.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings:

[From Parade magazine, Oct. 5, 1969]

REPORT FROM RED CHINA

One of the best yardsticks of how things are going in Red China is the number of illegal Chinese refugees making their way into Hong Kong.

The Chinese refugees swim rivers, cut through or scale barbed-wire fences, hide in junks, undergo unimaginable hardships to flee their homeland.

Last year 2000 of them made it to Hong Kong. This year the number approaches 8000. which means that conditions must be bad indeed in China.

According to Chinese escapees, who are generally allowed to remain in Hong Kong, the monthly food ration per person in Kwantung Province is now down to ten ounces of meat and four ounces of oil. Rice, the daily staple, is down to 30 pounds per month. The yearly clothes allowance is five yards of cloth. Matches are limited to two small boxes per month.

Worse yet, Mao has issued the nationwide call: "Prepare for war." Fear is rampant and the stockpiling of reserves is feverish to meet an Oct. 15th deadline, which is about when the Chinese expect the Soviet Union to attack them in the start of a full-scale war.

The trains from Canton, which arrive at the station in front of the Peninsular Hotel in Hong Kong, carry passengers who report widespread student unrest and juvenile delinquency in China. Worst offenders, they say, are the former Red Guards, who seemingly prefer perpetual rebellion to hard work, either in or out of school. Others report that Mao has instituted a crash program to move the Chinese nuclear installations from Sinkiang Province on the Soviet border to safer, more secret underground locations farther to the south.

As usual, the truth of what is really going on in Red China is extremely difficult, almost impossible to come by.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 5, 1969]

RUSSIA SET TO ATTACK CHINA?

(By Victor Zorza)

LONDON.—The pace of the Chinese nuclear program is quickening again, after the disruptions due to the "Cultural Revolution," and this cannot fail to cause concern to Russia.

Last week China tested what it described as "a new hydrogen bomb." The week before, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission picked up seismic signals from China equivalent to an underground nuclear test in the low to intermediate range.

No previous Chinese tests were held in such quick succession and both tests were held in the Lop Nor area of Sinkiang Province, which has long housed some of the most important Chinese nuclear installations.

Intelligence reaching the Indian government recently suggested that China was moving its nuclear installations from Lop Nor, near the Soviet border, to Tibet, where they would be less vulnerable to Soviet attack. But the latest tests suggest that an important part of the Chinese installations still remains in the Lop Nor area.

MAY STILL HAVE TIME

If, therefore, the Russians are to try to destroy the installations, they may still have time to do so—though not much. The longer

they wait, the more difficult the task would become.

Moreover, the longer they wait, the more likely the Chinese are to assemble an arsenal of nuclear weapons which, however small, could threaten to destroy some of the large Russian cities in the Far East, such as Vladivostok and Khabarovsk which are virtually just over the border.

The most primitive means of delivery, such as the old Soviet bombers still in service with the Chinese air force, could accomplish the job—and the Russians know it. It will be some time before China has the rockets which could pose a similar threat to the United States.

A Moscow paper recently acknowledged—quoting U.S. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird—that China will not be in a position to threaten the United States with nuclear weapons within the next few years, and it therefore went on to suggest that "Peking's nuclear ambitions are connected with plans to spread the Chinese revolution to neighboring countries."

Other signs in the Soviet press have suggested for some time the existence of two factions in the Soviet leadership, with some urging the elimination of the Chinese nuclear threat while there is still time, while others advocate moderation.

Striking confirmation of this has appeared in an article by a Russian journalist, Victor Louis, written for publication in the West.

In a dispatch sent from Moscow to the London Evening News, Louis said that "some circles," which he did not identify, were asking why the Brezhnev doctrine—under which Russia invaded Czechoslovakia—"should not be extended to China."

China was indeed much larger than Czechoslovakia and might offer active resistance, but according to the "Marxist theoreticians" who were his sources, this was "no reason for not applying the doctrine."

His "well-informed sources" in Moscow were "surprised at Western excitement over the Soviet plan to launch an air attack on Lop Nor," Louis wrote. "Whether or not the Soviet Union will dare to attack Lop Nor, China's nuclear center, is a question of strategy and so the world would only learn about it afterwards."

A DIFFERENT APPROACH

Just like the invasion of Czechoslovakia? Not quite.

This time the Kremlin is actually saying, almost in so many words, that it is considering an attack on the Chinese nuclear installations.

In the case of Czechoslovakia, the Russians made no direct threats in public, and the threats they made privately to Alexander Dubcek were so indirect that even he was disinclined to believe that they meant business. This time, the Kremlin is evidently trying to make sure that its warning is recognized and is heeded.

But why choose Louis to say it? Because if the Kremlin were to say it directly, in Pravda or in a diplomatic communication to China, it would lay itself open to the charge that it is warmongering, and that it is using the threat of aggression as an instrument of policy.

Moreover, the aim is not only to convince the Chinese that the Kremlin means business this time, and that they will be punished with the utmost severity unless their border "provocations" cease.

The aim is also to spread the word around, to get the diplomatic and military experts in the world's capitals used to the idea that a Soviet strike against Lop Nor is a distinct possibility, so that it should not be too great a surprise if and when it comes.

Louis' story has had precisely that effect.

Louis himself has been described in the Western press as "a Soviet citizen believed to have close connections with the Soviet secret

police." He has carried out in the past "special tasks" in the field of foreign propaganda, "apparently at the bequest of the Soviet KGB, or secret police, or the Soviet foreign office, or both."

As far back as August 1967, the New York Times reported that "Western intelligence services have long suspected Mr. Louis as an agent of a KGB department used by the Soviet government to pipe expedient information toward the West."

In the Italian Corriere Della Sera, the paper's former Moscow correspondent, who had known Louis for a number of years, described his "privileged position" in the Soviet capital in an article entitled "Half Journalist, Half KGB Spy."

INDIGNANT AT QUESTION

This spate of articles two years ago was provoked by Louis' intervention in the Svetlana Stalin affair, when he brought to London a copy of her memoirs in order to arrange their publication before her own publishers had done so, and thus deprive her book of the impact it was expected to produce throughout the world.

The London Observer said that he had often been asked "why his activities often seem to fit in with the purposes of the Russian government." His reply, the paper said, was indignant. "Everyone expects that I should be a Soviet agent. Why cannot they believe that I am a professional journalist?"

It is a matter of public interest of the greatest importance that when Victor Louis writes, as he does in the Lop Nor dispatch, of "well-informed sources in Moscow," these should be recognized for what they are.

When he says, further, that still unreported developments on the Sino-Soviet frontier are "causing the military considerable concern"—and suggests that anti-Mao forces in China "could produce a leader who would ask other Socialist countries for fraternal help"—he is virtually writing a scenario for a Soviet invasion of Sinkiang.

Has the Kremlin given the order to the military to go ahead? My considered reply is that it has, that Louis would not have been allowed—or told—to send out his article if this decision had not been made.

It was about a month before the invasion of Czechoslovakia that analytical evidence made it possible to conclude that the hawks in the Kremlin had prevailed over the doves, and that an invasion was to be expected. The same sort of evidence now suggests that a similar decision has been reached with regard to China.

The evidence is not "hard," any more than the earlier evidence was, because it is the nature of this type of analysis that it must be tentative. Moreover, any orders given to the military may be countermanded before they have been carried out, and the Kremlin "doves" will no doubt continue trying until the very last moment to restrain the "hawks."

But the failure of Premier Alexei Kosygin's mission to Peking suggests that the hawks have a better chance of carrying their plans through to a conclusion than the doves have of restraining them.

True, there has been no further news of frontier skirmishing, but there have been similar periods of silence in the past, which were later shown to have concealed serious clashes on the border.

It is still possible that the Chinese will accept the proposal for talks at deputy minister level, which Kosygin put to Peking, and that this may put off the day of reckoning. But there probably will be those in Moscow who would regard this as a delaying tactic, and would argue that any delay now is going to cost more Soviet lives later.

Could Cite Czech Invasion

Soviet inspired rumors last month that Mao was dead or dying may be belied by his

reappearance in Peking, but they also suggest that the Kremlin is reckoning with the possibility of his sudden disappearance from the scene.

The Kremlin's old dilemma is becoming more acute. What would serve its interests best? Immediate intervention might prevent the consolidation of power by the Maoist faction, which has pledged undying hatred of the Soviet Union. If Russia stands back to allow Mao successors to fight it out, there is always the chance—as the Kremlin hawks would argue—that the anti-Soviet faction would win and would go on to pose a much greater threat to the Soviet Union in the future.

This is precisely how they argued before the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and they won the day then. They can now claim that the consequences of that invasion were not as disastrous as the doves feared they might be, and that this justifies the application of the Brezhnev doctrine to China—which is what Louis' Moscow "sources" advocate in so many words.

Last month U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers said the Soviet Union had "moved a lot of equipment towards the border." It has moved more than equipment—it has moved men and weapons, and both are in a state of battle readiness.

It may be that the military movements are intended to warn the Chinese, and that this is also the purpose of Louis' dispatch. But there is a point at which a warning becomes a threat, and the threat becomes the first in a chain of actions that is more likely than not to culminate in hostilities. This point has now been reached.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 7, 1969]

PEKING MEETING WOULD TAKE UP BORDER DISPUTE

HONG KONG.—Communist China asked the Soviet Union today to help defuse their potentially explosive border dispute, Peking Radio reported.

The Red Chinese proposed a military pull-back in key disputed areas and agreed to resumption of formal border talks in Peking by vice foreign ministers of the two countries, Peking said. Time of the talks was not stated.

These positive public gestures are viewed by observers here as part of a broad effort to exert all possible leverage, political and psychological, on Peking to induce the Chinese leaders to negotiate a solution of the Sino-Soviet conflict and avert further dangerous incidents.

The Russians appear convinced that this is the time when such a hard-sell campaign may prove effective for they believe that China is wracked by dissension and turmoil at many levels from the top down.

Even while refraining from direct criticism of China, the Soviet press has quoted foreign reports of internal disturbances and mass repression there.

The Chinese statement said the border dispute was the most serious issue in the long quarrel between the two Communist giants.

The statement indicated that the increasing tension along their 5,000-mile border had made war a very real threat.

The Chinese also raised the specter of nuclear war, implying that the Soviet Union was threatening preventive strikes against strategic Chinese areas.

The statement said Chou and Kosygin met on Sept. 11 in Peking and had an exchange of views on the boundary question and the relations between the two countries.

The Chinese statement said Soviet assertions that China was threatening war, particularly a nuclear war, were "nonsense" and "ridiculous." But it also warned Russia that

China "does not fear any war, even nuclear war."

WOULD FIGHT AGGRESSION

Referring to reports Russia might be considering a preventive strike, Peking said:

"If the handful of warmongers want to do the most ridiculous thing in the world and launch an attack against the strategically important places in China, this is a war, it is an invasion."

"The 700 million people of China will rise up and fight. We will use revolutionary war to destroy aggression."

Yet a curious parallel presents itself between the present Sino-Soviet confrontation and Soviet dealings with the Alexander Dubcek regime in Czechoslovakia in the months prior to the invasion by the Warsaw Pact powers.

Quite likely this similarity occurred to the Chinese leaders when Kosygin requested the Peking meeting with Chou to present the Soviet position.

For it was Kosygin who journeyed to Prague before the invasion to persuade the Czech leaders to accept Moscow's views and demands.

It would be rash to assume by stretching this reasoning that an invasion of China is imminent. But even while speaking softly on behalf of the negotiated solution and improved relations, the Russians continue to hold a big stick in abeyance.

At the present stage, this is a part of their political and psychological effort. But should that effort fail and violence break out again, the possibility of the kind of preemptive strike envisaged by the writer Victor Louis is not to be excluded.

This was originally hinted in Pravda's Aug. 28 editorial headlined "Peking's Adventurist Course," wherein the Communist party paper bluntly accused the Chinese of preparing all-out war against the Soviet Union.

A SOUTH AFRICAN VIEW OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Mr. Colin Eglin, national executive chairman of the Progressive Party of South Africa, and a former Member of Parliament, has prepared a most thoughtful report on his recent visit to this country. During his brief stay here, Mr. Eglin met with various congressional and national leaders for an informal exchange of views on contemporary problems in the United States and the Republic of South Africa. In his report, Mr. Eglin shows particularly keen insight in analyzing current tensions and violence in this country. He describes our racial conflict as being of a temporary nature which will eventually lead to a greater awareness by this country of its social responsibilities.

It is no secret that in South Africa the leadership of the ruling National Party has sought to draw comfort from our own racial difficulties. In doing so, they are mistakenly seeking vindication of their own racial separation policies. Mr. Eglin's report puts this situation in its proper perspective, particularly for South Africans who may have a simplistic view of race relations elsewhere and

who may too easily draw the wrong conclusions. It would be useful for Americans to see their own society succinctly analyzed by a perceptive, intelligent foreign observer.

The report follows:

REPORT FROM U.S.A.—JULY 1969: FRUSTRATION, CLOSE TO THE POINT OF ANGER

(By Mr. Colin Eglin)

We arrived in Boston in time to watch—on colour T.V.—space capsule "Charlie Brown" streaking across the sky and splashing down with uncanny accuracy to make its mid-Pacific rendezvous with the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Princeton. Three astronauts had completed a seven day reconnaissance journey to the moon.

I was at once aware of the personal drive, the technological skill, the industrial power which have become the hallmarks of the American society. Indeed one cannot visit the United States without being impressed, to the point of almost being overwhelmed, by the magnitude of American achievements.

Many of these stand out visibly before even the most casual of visitors—towering buildings, vast urban renewal schemes, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, a sophisticated network of communications, universities, art galleries, cultural centres. One senses the throbbing power of the gigantic economic machine. And when one looks further there is the achievement in the field of research, the humanities, education, community projects, yes and even in the field of civil rights and intergroup relationships.

But what was equally interesting and impressive to me, a visitor from South Africa, was to watch the American people engaged in a critical examination of themselves and their society. No slavish acceptance of existing norms, no meek acquiescence with the ideology of a central authority, no 'closing the ranks' on criticism from outside or action against non-conformist critics from within. To many Americans the debate with its thrust and counter thrust, its issues, its confrontations might seem interminable—but to me at least it was a refreshing contrast to the present South African scene.

I left the United States not only impressed and refreshed, I left it perplexed and disturbed, for, in spite of the unity generated by the momentum of the mighty economic machine, powerful, centrifugal forces are developing in the United States society. These forces are delicately poised between two contrasting courses of action—they could prove to be constructive, invigorating, adding a new sense of purpose to the American society and its institutions. But equally they could erupt, erupt with violence, destroying much that is worthwhile, leaving scars on the American people and putting back the clock of progress both in the United States and around the world.

I am not suggesting that the American nation is or should be ashamed or afraid of these forces. They are the inevitable products of the technological age, of the big cities, of a shrinking continent in a shrinking world.

In looking closer at the origins of the forces I could not help being struck by the changes in the mood of the United States during my visits there over the past decade.

The apparent purposefulness and thrust of the nation as it swung in behind President Kennedy at the end of 1960.

Five years later, growing disillusionment and mounting disenchantment. For then, in spite of a massive legislative programme initiated by President Johnson—the civil rights bill, the medicare, poverty programs etc.—the gaps between promise and performance were starting to grow. And by then the Vietnam war was escalating.

And now in 1969 America is in a mood of frustration—frustration close to the point of anger.

Students, young people, frustrated with an establishment that has not lived up to its professed standards, which has so often forfeited its claims to credibility. Black Americans frustrated with a society that has given to them as American citizens equality in law, but denied to so many of them equality in practice. Non-students, non-Black Americans frustrated at students for flouting authority and defying convention, at Black Americans for their "impatient demands in the face of all that has been done for them in the past 15 years."

Student unrest, Black power, White backlash acting and reacting one upon the other. Acting and reacting in a society living at a dizzy pace. A society constantly confronted by new social problems constantly required to make adjustments following in the wake of technological achievement and above all acting and reacting all under the shadow of the Vietnam war. The war which by now no-one wants. A war which now has no glories, no heroes, no victories. A war steadily eating away at the human and material resources of the nation, sapping its moral fiber, leaving its nerve ends raw and exposed.

The United States death toll in Vietnam, now at 35,000, exceeds the death toll in both the Korean War and the Great War. Exceeded only by United States deaths in the last world war it makes the Vietnam war in terms of casualties "The United States' second most costly war".

And in the centre of this awesome arena stands newly elected President Nixon. Defeat and victory have taught him to recognise and to understand the temper and the mood of his fellow Americans. He knows that he was elected to office on a tide of frustration. He knows too that unless it is turned that same tide on which he rose to be president will dash him on to the rocks of defeat.

And so President Nixon appears to have set as his first objective to get the American 'pot off the boil'. His first five months in office have been sedate and relatively uncontentious. No dramatic changes in policy or personnel, no promises, no legislation, no confrontations. Of course there is as yet no peace in Vietnam and here is one area in which no initiative could prove disastrous for, as days turn to months "Johnson's" war could well become "Nixon's" war. Nixon's recent meeting with South Vietnam's President Thieu, his subsequent statement and his decision to withdraw the first 25,000 United States troops indicates that he can no longer delay taking some meaningful action. Americans will hope that he can pull them out of the morass of Vietnam. The ending of United States involvement in the Vietnam war is a prerequisite to the easing of tensions at home.

President Nixon's ability to lead the nation to the solution of its pressing domestic problems, his ability to move the forces in the United States society towards constructive effort and away from eruption, hinge more than anything else on his ability to end the Vietnam conflict.

STUDENT UNREST

During the past year there has been a massive stirring among the students at America's 2,500 universities. At some this stirring has gone no further than discussion and debate on the character, quality and purpose of the universities and the American society. At others it has led to requests, demands, demonstrations, confrontations: at some it has erupted into violence.

Some people have attributed the cause of this wave of student unrest to "a small group of agitators". It cannot be denied that there are anarchistic elements within the student body. It is true that the militant S.D.S. (Students for a Democratic Society) appears bent on breaking down rather than on building up. But to see the events only as

the result of the actions of a few militants would be quite wrong.

Although only 2 percent of universities have been the scene of unrest and disturbances, polls indicate that the majority of students around the country agree with the goals, if not the methods, of those who have staged campus demonstrations.

The student unrest cannot be dismissed lightly. It is fundamental in nature and serious in content. It has already had a profound effect on American universities, their staff, their curriculae and their administration. It is receiving the thoughtful attention of authorities at city, state and federal level.

Wherein lie its origins? What are its goals? "It is rooted in the complete disillusionment of the younger generation with an establishment that has not lived up to its professed standards and has so often forfeited its claims to credibility," was the opinion of a young clergyman attached to a mixed urban congregation.

"It starts with cynicism, cynicism because of the gap between promises and performances of those who wield power. Cynicism heightened by the war in Vietnam and the injustices and inequalities still to be found on the domestic scene," said an executive member of an organization dealing with projects for young Americans.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence headed by Milton S. Eisenhower recently expressed itself in this way:

"Although much of this discontent often focuses on grievances within the campus environment, it is rooted in dissatisfactions with the larger society that the campus can do little about.

"Students are unwilling to accept the gaps between professed ideals and actual performance. They see afresh the injustices that remain unremedied.

"Students see a nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so.

"They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. They see a world of nations—states with the technical brilliance to harness the ultimate energy but without the common sense to agree on methods of preventing mutual destruction.

"At a time when students are eager to attack these and other key problems, they face the prospect of being compelled to fight in a war most of them believe is unjustified. This traumatic experience has precipitated an unprecedented mass tension and frustration.

"Students attribute the shortcomings they see to the smugness of their elders and the weaknesses of social institutions."

The findings of the Eisenhower Commission support the view that, while the student unrest is rooted largely in dissatisfaction and disillusionment, its driving force is a spirit of idealism and a desire to improve and reform.

"Most students, despite their view of society's failures, accept as valid the basic structure of our democratic system; their main desire is to improve its ability to live up to its stated values.

"With the fresh energy and idealism of the young they are impatient with the progress that has been made but seems to them to be indefensibly slow."

It is apparent that the social awareness of American students is at a new high level. The demonstrations have mainly occurred, not at universities serving the poorer sections of the country, but at those established institutions serving primarily students from the privileged section of the community.

A recent poll showed that 51 percent of all students interviewed had done social work and that 65 percent of those students who took part in demonstrations had done such

work. Of interest too is that, asked what occupation they expected to be in at 40 years of age, no less than 29 percent responded that they would be teachers.

The question might well be asked "If student dissatisfaction is with the establishment and with the society, why attack the universities?" The fact is that students see the universities as they exist today as part of the establishment and therefore in need of reform as much as numerous other institutions.

But more than this "they see the university, guardian of man's knowledge and source of his new ideas, as an engine for powering the reform of the larger society, and as the first institution they are in a position to reform." Under searching student examination many universities, some among the most prominent in the United States, have been found to be inadequate in one way or another. Too often they have reflected the attitudes and norms of the establishment, too often they have been insensitive to the needs of a changing society, too seldom have they been "engines for powering reform."

Under pressure from students, faculty and administration have in the main shown considerable restraint and understanding. There has been a willingness to admit the need for reform and to meet student representations. Significant changes have been made in curricula, administrative procedures, admission rules, staff performance, students have been given a greater say in decision making, universities have been made more socially aware. Under pressure from students investments in South African stocks have been sold and federal grants with military implications have been turned down.

Said a senior Professor to me "I can't say that confrontations with students are always pleasant affairs but on the whole I think that our universities are better institutions as the result of the student unrest."

In the United States one always has the uncomfortable feeling that violence is just around the corner. Provided violence on the campuses can be curtailed and provided student unrest does not provoke counter violence, the United States will emerge from the era of the student revolt more aware of its social responsibilities and better equipped to grapple with them.

BLACK POWER

Black Power. Black is beautiful. Black studies. Black dormitories. Black states. Black Panthers. Black Americans. These are household phrases in America today. A sophisticated network of mass communications has brought "black" into every American home. It has made non-black Americans aware as never before of their black compatriots who form 11 percent of the nation. It has also made black Americans aware of themselves as a power in the land.

Black power. It is not a party, it is a phenomenon. It is not an organization—it is a force.

But to what extent is Black power the counterpart of White *baasskap* in South Africa? Is it *apartheid*, black *apartheid*? Is it ideological as White exclusivism in South Africa is ideological? Or is it a tactical ploy?

"You would be wrong if you were to think of Black Americans as a monolithic group." These were the opening words of Mr. James Farmer, himself a Black American, a former leader of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) and at present Assistant Secretary of Health Education and Welfare in the Nixon administration.

Certainly if political leaders and forms of political expression are a guide Mr. Farmer is correct; black Americans do not form a monolithic group. Black Panthers talk of revolution, Black Muslims of separation, Black militants on the campuses of black dormitories, black universities, black studies, and black areas in cities erupt and burn. On the other hand black citizens join the Demo-

cratic and Republican Parties, others become councillors, mayors, congressmen and senators through the ordinary processes of ballot box democracy. A black judge sits on the bench in the Supreme Court. Mr. Farmer himself holds a key post in the federal administration.

Those who believe in violence and revolution are relatively few in number. Many more would not be shocked by violence for in one way or another they have lived with or close to it for much of their lives. But most Black Americans want to become full citizens, full in the meaningful sense of the word, they believe they have to marshal their forces, their talents, their votes, their energies in order to assert themselves.

But why not as ordinary Americans—why as Black Americans? Why Black Power? Why "Black is beautiful"?

Again and again Mr. Farmer and others with whom I discussed this question explained. Firstly, in spite of the progress, especially over the past two decades, in spite of Bills and judgments which declare them equal in law, Black Americans are not full, equal citizens in the real sense of those words. Years, often generations, of living in underprivileged conditions have left many of them in a position where they cannot use the opportunities which equality in law would appear to have given them. And even when there are no such obstacles Black Americans find that while legal barriers have been removed racial barriers have remained. They have become convinced that the remaining obstacles can only be removed if they assert themselves at all levels in the society and government. Black power represents the harnessing of this collective effort.

But there is a second reason given for this apparent reversion to Black exclusiveness. Black Americans don't feel that they are full Americans. They sense that they are 'out' while others are 'in'. America is emotionally a White society to which they do not fully belong.

"Why," said a Black American to me, "my child in his readers at school always sees American children depicted as White, in the films ordinary Americans are always White—Black Americans only appear in character roles."

They believe that they will never be part of the mainstream as long as that mainstream is emotionally 'White'; the mainstream will have to cease to be exclusive; some of their 'blackness' will have to rub off on it. But again this will only happen through the efforts of Black Americans and it will never happen if they are ashamed of their blackness. It certainly cannot happen if they 'try for White'. And so 'black is beautiful'—away with the idea that black is the colour of the outcast or the inferior.

Other immigrant communities brought with them a culture, a history, a tradition, often a language and a religion. They tended to congregate in areas and this gave them a sense of security and a measure of political power. And in due course they were absorbed into the mainstream of American society—a process made easier by the fact that they were White and so was the society.

But the Negro, the Black American was different. He had been pried loose from his African heritage, his communal links were broken, in slavery he was not able to set down any new roots; he was without any political power. And what was more, 'absorption' was to be ever so much more difficult because he was visibly different from the established American society.

Today it is Black studies, Black art, Black history, a search in Africa for a heritage from which their forebears were forcibly removed. These things are to provide the cultural base, with Black power to provide the political base. Then like other immigrant communities black Americans will feel secure and strong enough to move out as equals into a wider society. Then they will

be in a position to assert themselves, to change the exclusive character of the American society. And when that society has blackness as one of its facets 'Black Americans will be able to be just "Americans"'. Racist? Ideological?

No, said the people with whom I discussed these matters. Of course there is the dangerous extremist element who would like to subvert black power for their own revolutionary purposes. The Black American is not anti-white, but he does want an America of which he can be a part. "Anti racist racialism", said Mr. Farmer.

REACTION

Action generally provokes reaction. Forces of change are often partly counter-productive. And in this the American society is no exception. Indeed, just as the United States constitutional system operates through an involved system of checks and balances, so 200,000,000 Americans belong to a society which is constantly adjusting the balance in an effort to resolve the forces developing within the society.

And so the United States society is reacting to both student unrest and black power.

In the main, leadership in government and at the Universities have reacted with considerable understanding. There has been no outright condemnation even when the pressures to reform have resulted in outbreaks of violence. Violence and law breaking have been condemned but when doing so great care has been taken not to allow the condemnation of violence to cloud the issues at stake or to allow this to be interpreted as ignoring or rejecting the need to reform. A broad strata of thinking Americans recognizes violence and unrest as symptoms of shortcomings within their society.

But it would be idle to deny the growth of a considerable force at grass roots level which is unsympathetic if not hostile to both student and black demands.

To date violence has not resulted in counter violence on any equivalent scale. But the danger is always there—the danger not only that citizens will respond with unlawful violence but that under pressure of reaction the laws will be changed to give the authorities and the police the opportunity to react with violence within the law.

Either of these forms of violent reaction could start a chain reaction of violence that could disrupt the nation. Responsible authorities from President Nixon down appreciate the dangers inherent in the present situation. This is why, while talking in terms of firmness, they are urging restraint and a need for understanding of the underlying problems.

In spite of these restraining and calming words from above the force of grass roots reaction is very real. With greater frequency one hears calls for "tough measures." Local election results recently have shown a considerable swing away from the tolerant point of view.

In Los Angeles retiring Mayor Sam Yorty, one of the least illustrious people to occupy the Mayoral chair, came in towards the end of his election campaign with a part racist, part tough law-and-order appeal. In an 80 percent white electorate this was enough to have him selected over moderate Negro Councillor Bradley. This, despite the fact that Bradley had strong backing from Party leadership and that opinion polls showed him to be way ahead a couple of weeks before the election. In the mayoral election in the midwestern city of Minneapolis ex-policeman Stenvig, also fighting under a tough law-and-order banner, recently beat his more liberal opponent by a two to one majority.

Will the potentially dangerous forces in American society be resolved? I believe that they will, although not necessarily without some further eruptions of violence.

Student revolt and the reaction to it could be de-escalated and even abated by making reforms which do not appear to require fundamental adjustments by the society as a whole.

The resolution of the forces of black power and the reaction to it is more difficult. For this involves a fundamental emotional change on the part of millions of white Americans to their society, a change away from the concept of a white America in which there are also 20 million Negroes to the concept of an American society that is neither white nor black but a synthesis of the two.

In the short term the forces of reaction may retard this process of change. But the very dynamic of American society, I hesitate to call it the American machine, makes the changes, seen in any historical perspective, quite irresistible.

How are the forces which are developing and the events which have occurred likely to affect South Africa and American-South African relationships?

In the long term I believe that America will emerge from this period even more aware than before of its social responsibilities. It will have a more integrated society—integrated not only legally and economically, but integrated emotionally as well. And, to an increasing extent, at all levels within this new society, black Americans will be playing their part as ordinary Americans. *Apartheid*, race discrimination, *baasskap* will seem more and more archaic and less and less defensible. If, by that time, white South Africans have abandoned present policies based on race discrimination, either in favour of non-discrimination in a single South Africa or non-discrimination in a South Africa fragmented with the consent of all South Africans, we could enjoy warm and co-operative relationships with the United States. But, if we do not, we can anticipate an era of mounting hostility between the United States and ourselves.

What of the short term, say the next few years?

I see no significant change from the present position—cordial government to government relations limited by the United States' public condemnation of *Apartheid* and its international commitments through its membership of the United Nations.

With pressing problems at home and the all pervading problem of the Vietnam war Americans have little interest in South Africa. There is certainly no general desire for United States involvement in South African affairs.

In some ways events have worked in favour of the South African Government.

To an extent, but this should not be overrated, the reaction to violence and to black power has taken the sharp edge off some of the criticism of South African policies. Events in the United States and around Africa have led to an appreciation of the very real problems in plural societies. There is a wide acceptance of the fact that embargoes and boycotts have not proved to be effective instruments of reform.

On the other hand the American nation as a whole remains firmly committed to non-discrimination. In spite of its stability and its strategic location South Africa, because of its policy, remains an embarrassment to the United States in the arena of world politics.

America would dearly like to see South Africa reform her race policies. But at the same time she is coming to realize that there is little or nothing she can do that will be effective in forcing this reform from outside. Measures could be taken which would be punitive, but they would be unlikely to persuade white South Africans to change their policies. Indeed, there is the growing

realization that punitive measures can prove to be counterproductive.

This presents a dilemma for Americans in positions of power. On the one hand a tough line towards South Africa could well consolidate whites around the present regime; on the other hand should the United States appear to be more passive towards South African policies this would all too readily be interpreted, domestically and internationally, as United States indifference to or even support for Nationalist Government policies.

In all the circumstances it is likely that the demands within America for action relating to South Africa will be intensified. These demands will be strengthened as student unrest leads to a new wave of 'social awareness' and as black Americans in increasing numbers take their places in the power structure of the American society.

Already students are demanding that university managements sell stocks held in South African companies; 140 black American leaders have called for the cancellation of the South African Airways' flights into New York; there is a congressional move not to renew South Africa's sugar export quota to the United States.

The Nixon Administration is clearly not seeking a confrontation with South Africa. It is not persuaded that embargoes and boycotts will be effective. And yet in response to pressures at home and in the interest of the United States abroad it might have to consider action and attitudes which will be demonstrative of the United States' abhorrence of apartheid.

NET PRESENTS AN EXCELLENT DOCUMENTARY "IN SEARCH OF REMBRANDT"

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, a recent documentary on the famous masterpieces by Rembrandt was expertly presented through the joint cooperation of the National Gallery of Art and National Educational Television. Following the commentary an article appeared in the New York Times, on October 2, by Jack Gould who very skillfully described the production.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate at this time to insert in the RECORD the above-mentioned article for my colleagues to see before debate begins tomorrow on the educational television and radio amendments:

TV REVIEW

(By Jack Gould)

A superlative documentary, "In Search of Rembrandt," that beautifully and imaginatively used the television medium to explain to a general audience the genius and complexity of the artist, was presented last night by National Educational Television. The program was seen locally on Channel 13.

The occasion was the 300th anniversary of the death of Rembrandt, but R. F. Siemanowski, who wrote, directed and produced the documentary, lifted the hour from the level of the all-too-familiar televised tribute or tour. He achieved what could be described as an exquisite primer in art appreciation.

His program incorporated a fund of information, yet in one sentence he described the difficulties of trying to reduce Rembrandt to words: "Why try to describe a sunrise?"

After the desultory opening of the commercial TV season, the N.E.T. production raises a viewer's spirits. There are people concerned about good television. Mrs. Cordella S. May, art patron and philanthropist of Pittsburgh, made the generous grant that allowed camera crews to go abroad to do the film. The National Gallery in Washington, where the film will be available for further showings, fully cooperated, and N.E.T. had the benefit of the advisory expertise of Dr. Seymour Slive, professor of fine arts at Harvard University and a Rembrandt scholar.

James Mason served as an effective narrator, and "In Search of Rembrandt" was a full reflection of its title. With inspired brevity, Mr. Siemanowski left to the program's very end a rundown of the vital statistics about Rembrandt. He let the artist's own words detail different chapters in his creativity, aided by some of the most polished and sophisticated commentary heard on TV in a long time.

In the unfolding of "In Search of Rembrandt," the viewer was accorded lingering and unhurried glances at many of Rembrandt's notable works, everything from his portrait of Tulp, the anatomist, to his unforgettable understanding of the "Good Samaritan" and his famed "Night Watch."

But surely a catalogue of Rembrandt is not required. The importance of the hour was the viewer's own discovery of so many unforgettable faces, particularly his depiction of Jewish residents of Amsterdam with such total dignity and honor.

And as the set-owner watched Mr. Mason drop in just the right number of Mr. Siemanowski's words, calling attention to Rembrandt's use of subtle shadings of light and his willingness to spend more than 10 years perfecting what is so widely known as "the hundred guilder print," all that his masterpiece brought when personal fortune first fell his way.

"In Search of Rembrandt" is really what public TV is all about and the nation is indebted to Mrs. May for quietly and modestly showing how the best in our society can harness its energies to fruitful ends in the electronic age. Mr. Siemanowski's only problem now is to resist commercial temptation, and it is N.E.T., not the big boys of commercial video, that has registered the first cultural bang in September.

If Congress does not get on with the job of making sufficient funds available for public television, the only possible excuse is that it has not been looking.

N.E.T., with its delicate but never disagreeable observation of how contemporary artists try to treat some of the same themes that attracted Rembrandt, put in a word for both all that has endured for 300 years and the efforts of those who are now trying in their own modern way.

Mrs. May is an activist angel representing the finest in TV; financial support and taste, a rare combination.

THE UNITED STATES AND DEMOCRACY IN KOREA

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, three often-repeated canards of the so-called new left are these:

First, the United States, while professing to espouse the cause of democracy and constitutional government throughout the world, has done little or nothing to further that cause.

Second, the United States inevitably supports coercive and unpopular regimes against the legitimate grievances and revolutionary activities of their citizens.

Third, the United States readily acquiesces in the overthrow of legitimate, democratic governments by military groups.

The falsity of each of those statements is demonstrated in a recent article by Dr. John Kie-Chang Oh, entitled "Role of the United States in South Korea's Democratization." Published in the summer, 1969, issue of *Pacific Affairs*, the article documents the important assistance given by the United States in helping the Koreans toward maintaining and preserving constitutional democracy in South Korea.

I believe Dr. Oh, an associate professor of political science at Marquette University, has presented a strong case for believing that the United States even apart from defending the South against the Communist North, has had a beneficent effect on the development of a free and democratic society in Korea.

For that reason, I am inserting the article, together with a biography of Dr. Oh, into the *RECORD* at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN SOUTH KOREA'S DEMOCRATIZATION

(By John Kie-chiang Oh)

Although the role of the United States in Japan's democratization has been extensively studied, its similar role in Korea has seldom been examined. It is probable that other American involvements in Korean affairs—as in the Korean War, the maintenance of military security, economic rehabilitation, or the *Pueblo* incident—have demanded a higher priority of attention. These involvements alone, however, do not constitute the total, or the more lasting, picture of the U.S. role in Korea. There has been a less visible but possibly more significant side of the role. This article attempts to illuminate some aspects of the U.S. role in establishing and, to a limited degree, maintaining the basic political orientation of South Korea for the first twenty years since the establishment in 1948 of the Republic of Korea.

The overall American influence in the Korean democratization would be undeniable to anyone who asks what would have happened if South Korea had been occupied by a different power after the Second World War. The situation in North Korea suggests the most obvious answer. Further, it is undeniable that the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP), and the United States Army military government in Korea that functioned under the general supervision of SCAP, were pursuing a deliberate policy of democratizing such occupied countries as Japan and Korea. Parts of the document on the United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan¹ and numerous pronouncements including those by the Assistant Secretary of State for Occupied Areas (who was specifically charged with coordinating all policy matters for occupied areas), leave little doubt as to the U.S. policy orientation. According to one pronouncement, the basic objection of American policy with respect to occupied areas, including Japan and Korea, was "to create conditions under which political and economic democracy can flourish. . . . Formulation of the political pattern upon which the foundation may be laid for developing occupied countries on democratic principle is privilege and responsibility of the first order."²

The most obvious problem of the political independence of Korea was disposed of by August 1948 with the establishment of the Independent Republic of (South) Korea. Indeed, the occasion of national independence under the supervision of the United Nations and the United States provided a golden opportunity to the new Korean elite that emerged during the American occupation to launch a modern, democratic political system.

The 1948 Constitution of the Republic of Korea declared that the Koreans were engaged in the "re-establishment" of a "democratic" state and were determined "to establish a democratic system of government." The "General Provisions" in chapter I declared that "the sovereignty of the Republic of Korea shall reside in the people" from whom all state authority emanates. Article 5 stated that in all fields of political, economic, social, and cultural life, the Republic of Korea "shall be responsible for respecting and guaranteeing the liberty, equality, and initiative of each individual and for protecting and adjusting these for the purposes of promoting the general welfare." The various rights of citizens of the Republic were carefully spelled out and guaranteed in chapter II. These were astoundingly radical departures from the political theories, systems, and practices with which generations of Koreans had been familiar.³

The Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, General Douglas MacArthur, stated in his speech at the inauguration that the birth of the Republic meant "liberty reborn," and added that "nothing shall prevent" the Korean people from being "free men of a free nation."⁴ It is undeniable that American influence was the most significant force in triggering the chain reaction that led to the far-reaching democratization of Korean legal-institutional complexes.

Soon after the establishment of this Republic, President Truman made a rare declaration of the United States "foreign policy aims" in Korea in his message to Congress of June 7, 1949, on economic assistance to Korea:

"Korea has become a testing ground in which the validity and practical value of the ideas and principles of democracy which the Republic is putting into practice are being matched against the practices of communism which have been imposed upon the people of North Korea . . . the Korean Republic, by demonstrating the success and tenacity of democracy in resisting communism, will stand as a beacon to the people of northern Asia in resisting the control of the communist forces which have overrun them."⁵

The President of the United States in an official communication had thus characterized the Republic of Korea as a testing ground of democracy that should stand as a beacon to all peoples of Asia. Having flatly stated that the ideals and principles of democracy were being put into practice in the Republic, President Truman declared in effect that helping the Republic survive and develop as a showcase of the success and tenacity of democracy was a foreign policy aim of the United States.

The democratic suprastructures so launched, however, lacked congruity with the then existing socio-economic foundations or substructures that were just emerging from debilitating colonial domination, which in turn succeeded a feudalistic-monarchical rule at the turn of the twentieth century. The governmental systems were not founded on the existing political realities of South Korea; in fact, there existed a huge gap between the idealistic aspirations and functional capabilities of the system. In a very real sense, this gap was to become one of the villains in the operation of the system, tend-

ing to divide the Koreans from Americans and, indeed, leading to sharp disagreements.

Autocratic tendencies within South Korea became evident almost immediately after the establishment of the Rhee administration, in which the awesome personalism of Rhee triumphed over democratic institutionalism. The Yosu-Sunch'on mutiny, touched off on October 19, 1948, barely two months after the inauguration of the Republic, was the starting point of this tendency. Furthermore, the Yosu-Sunch'on rebellion gave a great impetus to the open suppression of civil liberties in South Korea, so that the political environment became increasingly suspicious, intolerant, and oppressive. It was in this atmosphere that President Rhee proposed in a message to the Assembly on March 31, 1949, that the National Assembly elections that had been scheduled for May 1950 should be postponed indefinitely.

The official United States reaction to this irregular and apparently undemocratic move was predictably stern. In an *aide-memoire* to the Korean Ambassador to Washington, Secretary of State Dean Acheson voiced the American government's "concern" over the reported intention of President Rhee: "the United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the Republic. Free, popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the Republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions."⁶ Acheson also threatened to review the entire Korean aid program unless vigorous anti-inflationary measures were forthcoming. With the existence of the Republic thus threatened, President Rhee declared that elections would be held on schedule and that taxes would be raised as an anti-inflationary measure.

When the Communist North Korean armies suddenly invaded the Republic on June 25, 1950, it was not surprising that President Rhee should appeal for urgent United States assistance for the defense of what President Truman called the "bulwark of democracy in the east."⁷ None would claim that the United States fought in the Korean War solely for the defense of democracy in Korea. It remains a fact, however, that the United States resolutely participated in the bitter war and suffered 157,530 casualties, including 33,625 battle deaths. This was indeed the single most significant and costly role that the United States played in Korea.

By the time the Korean War ended, however, many of the democratic rights of the Korean people had been given crippling blows. The Rhee administration had won its fight against the National Assembly in July 1952, when the first of a series of constitutional amendments which Rhee desired in order to strengthen his regime was passed by a lopsided vote of 163 to 0. The war and emergency powers of the president were utilized to the fullest extent to bolster the political position of Rhee and his followers. Meanwhile the United States was preoccupied with the expedients and daily challenges of war.

Even after the war was over, the continued existence of the Communist regime in North Korea provided Rhee and his apologists with an excuse to usurp the powers of the legislature. In this sense, communism not only constituted a visible, external, physical threat to "democracy" in South Korea but also accelerated the formation of an extreme rightist autocracy in a country that was supposedly "democratic." This process culminated in the National Security Law promulgated on December 26, 1958.⁸ The Rhee administration claimed that the law was aimed at domestic Communists, but the possibilities of applying it against political opponents were unlimited.⁹

Predictability, Rhee's opposition was almost completely cowed in the 1960 elections

Footnotes at end of article.

which were rigged on a massive scale under the personal direction of the Home Minister.¹⁰ The crude and often violent manipulation of elections now meant that the people were denied the last legal, if only intermittent channel of expressing their political views. Accumulated resentments of the people exploded in Masan, where police stations, the Liberal party building, and other public buildings were destroyed. The Masan incident set off violent chain reactions in virtually all urban centers throughout South Korea. Hundreds of thousands of college and high school students literally threw themselves against the police, and they were soon joined by cheering crowds.¹¹ This was the "Righteous Uprising of April 19," or the "Student Uprising," or the "Student Revolution."¹² President Rhee announced that these riots were the work of Communist agents, declared martial law, and made it retroactive to the moment when the police guarding his mansion fired against students. Heavily armed soldiers were moved to Seoul.

The President had just taken these defensive measures when he found his position challenged from an unexpected source. In the afternoon of April 19, the United States Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, called in the Korean Ambassador, You Chan Yang (Yang Yu-chan), for a meeting. On the very same day, possibly even before a coded message from the Korean Embassy in Washington reached President Rhee, the Director of the Office of News of the State Department read a statement to correspondents: "Ambassador Yang was informed that this Government believes that the demonstrations in Korea are a reflection of public dissatisfaction over the conduct of the recent elections and repressive measures unsuited to a free democracy."¹³ This was a forceful refutation of the statement made only three days earlier by President Rhee and echoed by Ambassador Yang himself, that the turbulence in Korea was the "work of communist agents." The State Department spokesman continued: "The Secretary suggested that the Korean government should, in its own best interest in order to restore public confidence, take necessary and effective action aimed at protecting democratic rights of freedom of speech, of assembly and of the press, as well as preserving the secrecy of the ballot and preventing unfair discrimination against political opponents of a party in power."¹⁴ At a crucial moment of the "Student Revolution" the United States government had once again, as it did through Secretary Dean Acheson in 1950, intervened publicly and loudly in the domestic situation in defense of the "democratic rights" of the Korean people. Secretary Herter justified this intervention on the basis that the United States "has, in the eyes of the world, always been closely associated with Korea as a friend, supporter and ally."

The United States government evidently chose to become "a friend, supporter and ally" of the Korean people demonstrating against the Rhee administration. The impact of this move by the U.S. government was immediate. As the American Ambassador to Korea, Walter P. McCaughy, drove toward the presidential mansion on the night of April 19, the milling crowds cleared a path for his limousine and he was enthusiastically cheered by Koreans on the streets of Seoul.

The American government was evidently determined to go further than issuing a sharp note. The United Nations Command, under General Carter M. Magruder of the United States Army, had tactical control of the Korean Army. The UN command allowed the Martial Law Command of the Korean Army the use of tanks—but without live ammunition.¹⁵ Thus, the United States played a decisive role in furthering the cause of anti-administration demonstrators.

By now the hated police force that had been blindly loyal to Rhee had been demoralized; the Army under the Martial Law Commander, Lieutenant General Song Yoch'an, showed no intention of shooting at demonstrating students. In fact, the Army seemed to maintain "neutrality" between the Rhee administration and the demonstrators.¹⁶ While the very life of the Rhee administration trembled in the balance, the brutal coercive powers of the regime evaporated. The seemingly impregnable, twelve-year-old regime was toppled when Rhee resigned a week after the uprising of April 19.

The Constitution of the Second Republic, which was established in the wake of the Student Uprising, was a product of full-scale amendments to the fundamental law of the First Republic of President Rhee. These amendments were adopted on June 15, 1960, by an Assembly vote of 208 to 3. They were designed to give substance to the constitutional guarantee of the rights of citizens in chapter II: abandoning the presidential system in favor of a cabinet system of government, and establishing the Central Election Management Commission and Constitutional Court to give political parties constitutional recognition, and a guarantee of freedom of action.¹⁷

As the government of the Second Republic under the presidency of Yun Po-sŏn and premiership of Chang Myŏn was formed, the July 29, 1960, elections were officially observed by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and also by observation teams of the United States Embassy (reportedly eight). These teams toured the provinces and found no evidence of official interference, coercion, or other attempts by the government to influence the vote. American Ambassador Walter P. McCaughy noted that the elections had "strengthened democracy" in Korea.¹⁸ It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Second Republic was the brief heyday of democracy in Korea. Freedoms of the press, speech, and assembly were conspicuously enjoyed by more Koreans than ever before, or since.

But with the government paralyzed by the split of the Democrats and the New Democrats in the Assembly, freedoms now effectively guaranteed by the amended Constitution tended to be abused to the point of directly menacing the very existence of the republic. There were vague rumors of another political crisis,¹⁹ but South Korea remained generally calm on the surface until May 16, 1961, less than nine months after the formation of the first Chang cabinet, when some elements of the Army swiftly executed a *coup d'état*.

Though the United Nations Command headed by General Magruder had, according to the 1950 Taejŏn Agreement, the operational control over the South Korean military forces, the American General was apparently caught by surprise when the coup came. The General and the American *Chargé d'Affaires*, Marshall Green, learned in the predawn hours of the military takeover from the Korean Army Chief of Staff, General Chang To-yŏng. But the picture was far from clear to them.²⁰ Nevertheless, the American military commander and the ranking U.S. diplomatic representative quickly reached an important decision to initiate a move aimed at restoring the *status quo ante* in South Korea. They agreed to issue separate statements immediately, before the 10:30 a.m. deadline of afternoon dailies in Seoul, although no advice had yet been received from Washington.

Magruder's statement read:

"General Magruder, in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command, calls upon all military personnel in his command to support the duly recognized Government of the Republic of Korea headed by Prime Minister Chang Myŏn.

"General Magruder expects that the chiefs of Korean Armed Forces will use their authority and influence to see that control is immediately returned back to governmental authorities and that order is restored in the armed forces."

Green stated:

"The Position taken by the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command in supporting the freely elected and constitutionally established Government of the Republic of Korea is one in which I fully concur.

"I wish to make it emphatically clear that the United States supports the constitutional Government of the Republic of Korea as elected by the people of the Republic last July and as constituted by election last August of the Prime Minister."

Thus the two top ranking Americans urgently chose to make it crystal clear that the U.S. representatives on the spot irrevocably supported the democratic government headed by Premier Chang. The tone of the statements reflected both their conviction that the "freely elected" Chang government had to be restored and their expectation that the bulk of the Korean armed forces would remain loyal to the "constitutionally established" government and actively subjugated the revolutionary troops. The American military commander, with the full and public support of the chief American diplomat on the spot, was in fact urging that the Korean armed forces follow his command, both politically and militarily. Both the full authority and the prestige of the United States were emphatically invoked. These statements by the American officials were the only voices that could be heard defending a "freely elected" or democratic government in South Korea on the morrow of the military coup.

These statements were rushed to Seoul newspapers by messengers, and another set was sent to the American-controlled Voice of the United Nations Command. Though the Voice once began broadcasting the statements, Korean newspapers were already under strict censorship by the coup forces. Stories on the statement were literally "blacked out," and the impact on Koreans was largely lost.

President Yun, having heard the Voice broadcast of the Magruder-Green statement, urgently summoned the two Americans to the presidential mansion. The Americans lost no time in demanding presidential sanction to launch a counter-revolution. Magruder wished to order the mobilization of 40,000 men—many times the strength of the revolutionaries holding the Seoul area at the time, he said—to encircle the capital and force the revolutionaries to return to their posts. The American general asked Yun, as the chief of state and commander-in-chief of the Korean armed forces, to agree to this plan. Magruder now estimated—shortly after 11 AM—the revolutionary strength in the Seoul area at 3500 men, almost precisely correct.²¹

Green then emphasized that the coup was unconstitutional and declared flatly that the United States could not support it. If this coup succeeded, the American Minister told the Korean President, there would be second and third coups, all of which would thwart the development of democracy in Korea. The American Minister fully backed the American commander's request for the President's approval of counter-revolutionary actions. Korea stood at the brink of civil war. On President Yun depended whether or not the Korean armed forces would be split into two warring camps.

Yun resolved that South Korea could hardly afford such a peril, particularly in view of the ever-present menace from the Communist army poised in North Korea.

Footnotes at end of article.

Yun's answer to Magruder and Green was No. The President of the Second Republic, who was merely a ceremonial head of state, also observed that a military revolution, though not desirable, was perhaps inevitable, since the Chang Myon government had lost the people's confidence. Nevertheless, General Magruder subsequently called an emergency staff meeting at his headquarters and decided that the coup forces had to be crushed since "the coup did not reflect the will of the Korean people."²³

General Magruder decided that units of the Korean First Army and of the U.S. armored division had to be immediately mobilized and so instructed Lieutenant-General Yi Han-ilm and General John L. Ryan, commander of the First U.S. Corps. General Magruder subsequently visited General Yi at the latter's headquarters for a strategy session. However, the Korean First Army had already been paralyzed for any counter-revolutionary moves because of effective infiltration of both the general and special staffs by determined pro-revolutionary officers. It was becoming increasingly clear to General Yi that any order to march against the revolutionary forces in Seoul would be violently rejected by numerous officers and men of his field army. General Yi probably saw the handwriting on the wall—he could not become a heroic defender of democracy and constitutionally-established government alongside the Americans.²⁴ Some three hours after the visit by General Magruder to the First Army headquarters, a public statement in the name of General Yi was issued simultaneously by General Yi's headquarters and the military junta in Seoul stating that General Yi supported the revolution "together with all of the officers and men under his command."²⁵

This clinched the success of the military take over. With the May 17 announcement, anti-coup strength among Korean military forces dissipated. If any forces were to crush the revolutionary movement, they now had to be American troops only. Such an action was probably unthinkable to the United States. For nearly two days after the coup, U.S. State and Defense departments refused to comment on the Korean development on the ground that it was in a "fluid" condition. As hopes of reversing the military coup collapsed, State Department officials were reported to be "concentrating on trying to salvage some vestige of democratic rule in Korea."²⁶ Under-Secretary of State Chester Bowles was now reported to have said that the coup leaders were mainly interested in cleaning up corruption and not setting up a permanent military dictatorship. Obviously, Washington was attempting to adjust to the *fait accompli* in Korea. On the morning of May 18 Premier Chang, after two days of hiding, contacted General Chang Toyong through his American consultant, Donald Whittaker. Escorted by Chang and Whittaker, pale-faced Premier Chang was driven to the Capitol to preside over the last cabinet meeting of the nine-month-old Democratic administration. When the final cabinet session of May 18 was over, the Second Republic of Korea was formally declared dead.

Throughout these developments, some members of the Military Revolutionary Committee had felt nagging apprehensions about the attitude of Washington toward a military regime in South Korea. After all, South Korea had been heavily dependent on United States assistance, both economic and military. Washington did not dissociate itself from the Magruder-Green statements of May 16 which urged the revival of the Democratic administration. In an extraordinary move, Lieutenant-General Chang Toyong, now chairman of the Military Revolutionary Committee, on May 18 sent a special

message to President John F. Kennedy expressing the Committee's desire to maintain "the most friendly ties" with the United States. The uncouth message stated, in part:

"On behalf of the Military Revolutionary Committee I wish to express my sincere respect and gratitude to the Government and people of your country for the assistance and contribution made toward the progress and prosperity of the Republic of Korea. It is the aim of the Republic of Korea to uphold democracy, based on liberty, equality and good neighborliness."

"Although the April revolution of 1960 carried out by students was successful with the overwhelming support of the Korean people and international sympathy, after one year since the assumption of power by the Democratic Party the people still find themselves in the condition of starvation and despair, and the Government continues to follow the ill practices and corruption of the past. This situation has resulted in endangering our capacity to combat effectively the Communist threats."

"Unable to let the situation deteriorate any further, at dawn on May 16, 1961, the military acted to overthrow the Government and took complete control of the executive, legislative and judiciary powers of government. Thus, we embarked upon the sacred revolutionary task of overthrowing the corrupt and inefficient regime and of saving the people and the country."²⁷

This message, which read more like a hastily written and translated plea or apology, then summed up the first five of the six revolutionary pledges which had been announced on the morning of the coup. It continued:

"Finally, at any time upon completion of our mission we will hand over the control of the Government to clean and conscientious civilians and to [sic] return to our proper duties of the military."

"Please rest assured, Excellency, of the integrity of the Committee, and we sincerely hope that the most friendly ties existing between our two countries will continue to be strengthened."

The official State Department spokesman, Lincoln White, broke the silence on the day after the dispatch of the unprecedented message and read a statement "understood to have been cleared by President Kennedy."²⁸ The terse statement, the first one to be formally issued by the Department of State on the fourth day after the coup, read:

"It has been our purpose in Korea to help the Korean people achieve, through democratic processes, stability, order, constitutional government and the rule of law as the essential basis for sound economic growth and improvement in the welfare of the people as well as for the defense of the country against any possible communist threat."

"This continues to be our purpose."

"We are encouraged by the strong intent of the military leaders in Korea to return the government to civilian hands."²⁹

A formal response of a sort to General Chang's message to President Kennedy was made more than a week later, not in the name of the President but by Minister Green, addressed to the Korean Foreign Minister under the military junta, Kim Hong-il, a retired general, but not to General Chang. Minister Green acknowledged the May 18 message to President Kennedy and stated that his government "noted with approval the pledges set forth in General Chang's message." The American Minister then singled out a pledge, as did the State Department spokesman, that the United States government "notes with satisfaction the expression of intention to return the Government to civilian control."³⁰ Green then reminded General Kim that the United States had endeavored to assist the government and people of Korea in their efforts to "main-

tain freedom through democratic progress." The message concluded: "My Government trusts that the traditional friendly relations between our two countries will continue and that we shall together continue our cooperation in promoting the well-being and strength of Korea. . . ."³¹

The democratic trimmings of the Second Republic had been almost completely eliminated by this time, and the political dynamics of post-coup Korea were most dramatically reflected in the awesome centralization of power in the military Supreme Council for National Reconstruction. The basic rights of the citizens, so painstakingly guaranteed in numerous provisions of the Constitution, were now contracted drastically "to such extent as is not inconsistent with the fulfillment of the tasks of the Revolution," according to Article 3. The General Provisions of the law, however, declared: "The Supreme Council for National Reconstruction shall be established as an extraordinary measure intended for the reconstruction of the Republic of Korea as a genuine democratic republic. . . ." (italics added).

Under the aegis of the military revolutionary leaders, the Constitution that had been revised twice during each of the two preceding regimes was rewritten extensively for the fifth time in about fourteen years of its existence.³² The amended Constitution was promulgated by General Park on December 26, 1962. Despite the sweeping series of amendments, however, the Constitution retained in the very first article, ringing proclamations that "the Republic of Korea shall be a democratic republic" and that "the sovereignty of the Republic of Korea shall reside in the people and all state authority shall emanate from the people." Foremost among the main features of the new constitution was the restoration of a presidential system.

In fact, the position of the president became far stronger under the new constitution than under that of the First Republic. This presidential system left little room for the executive-legislative tensions and conflicts that had paralyzed functional capabilities of the government, particularly during the Second Republic. A compact, streamlined, unicameral legislature was consciously made amenable to presidential policies, through his broad emergency and veto powers. The judicial structure was equally subject to presidential hegemony, partly through his influence on the Judicial Recommendation Council. The orientation of the government was now one of centralization at the expense of institutional differentiation and autonomy.

The military leaders pledged that they would restore the government to "honest and conscientious civilians" and they would return to their "proper military duties." On August 2, 1961, General Park announced that the turnover of the government to "civilian control" was planned for the summer of 1963. The text of the brief August 2 statement contained three resounding phrases asserting that the revolutionary government was endeavoring to establish "the foundation for new democratic institutions," to create "a true democratic political order," and to establish "a firm foundation for democratic prosperity of the nation."³³ On March 16, 1963, however, General Park made the startling announcement that the military junta had decided to extend military rule for four years. He then proposed a plebiscite in which the people would be given a chance to vote either "Yes" or "No." It was soon reported that General Park had sent a letter to President Kennedy explaining his proposal for the four-year extension of military rule. After an ominous silence for several days, the official State Department spokesman, Lincoln White, stated on March 25:

Footnotes at end of article.

"We believe that prolongation of military rule (in Korea) could constitute a threat to stable and effective government, and we understand that this whole matter is being reconsidered by the Korean government. . . . We hope that junta and the major political groups in Korea can work out together a procedure for transmission to civilian government that will be acceptable to the nation as a whole."²²

White added that he was certain that President Kennedy was aware of the U.S. policy behind the State Department's statement. At the same time the United States flatly turned down the military junta's request for an additional \$25 million in economic aid, "to underscore its determination to bring constitutional government to Korea." Washington observers noted that the White statement was made at the time to "correct any misapprehensions that the United States was in favor of continued rule by strong-man General Park Chung-hee and his military junta."²³ The U.S. Embassy in Seoul immediately echoed the Washington statement, and American Ambassador Samuel D. Berger on April 2 delivered a reply from President Kennedy to General Park's letter.

The General actually reversed his position and once again pledged, on July 27, that the transfer of government to civilians would be made within the year. This announcement marked the resumption of flurries of activities among civilian politicians. General Park resigned from active military service on August 30 and on the same day joined the Democratic Republican party. On the very next day, he accepted the presidential nomination of the party, a move that had been carefully prepared for under the direction of Kim Chong'il. The presidential elections were to be held on October 15, just a month and a half later. The military junta forces were ready for the elections with both a presidential candidate whose image had been sharply and freshly etched on the minds of the electorate and a political party which throbbed with youthful energy. The opposition groups were divided, quarrelsome, and meagerly funded. It was believed that the United States government had already given its official blessings to the elections so long as they were "free and fair" and had indicated its willingness to honor the result of such elections.

Park was the winner in the presidential elections of October 15, 1963, though his winning margin over Yun Po-sŏn was slim indeed—156,026 votes, or a mere 1.42 per cent. Park again defeated the same opponent in the May 3, 1967, presidential elections, but this time with a margin of 1,162,125 votes. This difference was of landslide proportions when compared with the 1963 margin. It has been generally accepted that these presidential elections were conducted fairly, though there were numerous irregularities in the June 8, 1967, National Assembly elections.²⁴

To conclude, it is evident that the initial impulses for Korean democratization were generated by the United States, and thus she played a significantly creative role in the development of Korean polity. What was noteworthy was that the ruling elite that emerged in South Korea after three years of American military occupation eagerly embraced Western democracy and launched democratic legal-institutional complexes. The birth of the "democratic" republic was apparently a product of a joint cooperative venture of the new South Korean elite and its American mentor.

Because of the incongruity between the idealistic aspirations and the functional capabilities of the constitutional system in the Korean environment, and also because of the constant and real Communist menace from the North, there occurred numerous instances of violently spasmodic political readjustments in South Korea. These tended to narrow the gap between the supra- and

infra-structures, and to liquidate the crises of authority, particularly during the Second Republic, and the consequent immobility of the system. When these upheavals threatened to undermine and destroy the essentially democratic orientation of the Korean polity, however, the United States government exercised its considerably military-economic influence in Korea to steer the nation onto a basically democratic path. The cost of such influence has been considerable also, but the price so paid by the United States, particularly during the Korean War, probably made the American influence explicable, if not always wholeheartedly and immediately acceptable to the Koreans.

No assertion is made here that the United States has interfered frequently and tyrannically in essentially domestic affairs of Korea. Nor is it asserted that the South Koreans always slavishly followed the advice or bent to the pressures of the United States. There were often realistic dialogues and interactions between the Americans and South Koreans. For instance, President Yun refused to launch the counter-coup which the Americans advocated in 1961. The United States exercised its influence quietly and judiciously as a protector of a democratic system in Korea. Had it not been for this influence and interaction, the South Korean policy today would be quite different from what it is.

While this American role has been played out, a significant development has been taking place among Koreans themselves. The democratic orientation that has been more or less maintained for two decades now, and certain practices and processes such as the general elections in which Koreans participated some thirteen times in one form or another, have created certain lasting impacts on the political culture of the Korean nation. Also, the educational system that has taught democratic principles, theories, and values to a new generation of young Koreans, may have left indelible imprints on the minds of those students who have experienced and possibly contemplated the results of the Student Uprising that toppled what appeared to be a formidable regime. The Korean masses, too, have begun to show a considerable degree of political sophistication. Whenever elections were relatively fair and free, the anonymous and seemingly acquiescent Korean people exercised keen collective judgment that stunned many politicians or caused them to renew their confidence in the people.

The future of what is left of democracy in Korea will ultimately depend on these developments among the Korean people themselves, and American influence and "interference" may have purchased some valuable time for the Korean people to develop in the generally democratic path. Whether or not this development has gone far enough to sustain and periodically rejuvenate a democratic orientation in the future, remains an unanswered question at present.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Specifically, part I (b), Part III, and Part IV, 2 of the documents of August 29, 1945.

² "American Policy in Occupied Areas," *Department of State Bulletin*, XV (August 18, 1946), p. 291.

³ John Kle-Chiang Oh, *Korea: Democracy on Trial* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968), chap. I.

⁴ Donald G. Tewksbury (ed.), *Source Materials on Korean Politics and Ideologies* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1950), pp. 90-2.

⁵ U.S. Congress, Senate, *The United States and the Korean Problem: Documents 1943-1953*, 83rd Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 29-32.

⁶ Tewksbury, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

⁷ Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs* (2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), p. 336.

⁸ For the original text, see Republic of Korea, *Kwanpo* (Official Gazette), No. 2206.

⁹ For statements of the opposition leaders, Cho Pyŏng-ok and Chang Myŏn, on the question, see *Kyŏngnyang Shinmun* (Seoul, Korea), December 26, 1958. Also, Cho Pyŏng-ok, *Minjujuuiwa na* [Democracy and I] (Seoul: Yongsin munhwasa, 1959), p. 267.

¹⁰ Hanguk hyŏngmyŏng chaep'ansa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, *Hanguk hyŏngmyŏng chaep'ansa* [The History of Revolutionary Trials in Korea] (Seoul: Hanguk hyŏngmyŏng chaep'ansa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, 1962), p. 106.

¹¹ According to an official report, there were eighteen universities, thirty-six four-year colleges, and five junior colleges in South Korea, enrolling a total of 85,920 university and college students as of April 1959, a year before the massive demonstrations (Korean Research and Information Office, *Korea Report: Report from the Cabinet Ministers of the Republic of Korea* [Washington, D.C., 1959], VI, pp. 104-106). An estimated total of middle and high school students in 1706 schools was 800,000 in 1960. Potentially, therefore, a million youths could protest against the Rhee regime.

¹² See among others, Cho Tŏk-sŏng (ed.), *Sawŏi hyŏngmyŏng* [April Revolution] (Seoul: Ch'angwŏnsa, 1960), *passim*; Min Yong-bin (ed.), *Sawŏi yŏngungdul* [April Heroes] (Seoul: Ilisinsa, 1960), *passim*.

¹³ U.S. Department of State, Historical Office, *American Foreign Policy: Current Documents 1960* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 680.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Yi Ki-ha, *Hanguk chŏngdang paltalsa* [A History of the Development of Korean Political Parties] (Seoul: Uihoe chŏngch'isa, 1961), pp. 439-40.

¹⁶ Sin Sang-ch'o, "Yi Sŭng-man p'okchŏng-gŭi chŏngyŏn" [End of the Tyranny by Syngman Rhee] *Sasangge Monthly*, VIII, No. 6 (June, 1960), p. 84.

¹⁷ Han Tae-yŏn, "Chel konghwaguk hŏnbŏpŭi kyŏngnyang" [The Tendency of the Constitution of the Second Republic], *ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁸ Ambassador Walter P. McCaughy's replies on August 3, 1960, to a written questionnaire submitted by the Associated Press.

¹⁹ *Kyŏngnyang Shinmun*, Feb. 23, 25, 1961.

²⁰ Chang telephoned Magruder to inform him of the coup activities. When Magruder asked Chang about the "real character" of the turbulence, Chang replied: "I don't know whether it's a mutiny or revolution" (Walter Briggs, "The Military Revolution in Korea: On Its Leader and Achievements," *Korean Quarterly*, V, No. 2 [Summer, 1963], p. 29).

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

²² Hanguk kunsu hyŏngmyŏngsa p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe, *Hanguk kunsu hyŏngmyŏngsa* [The History of the Korean Military Revolution] (Seoul: Tonga sŏjŏk hoesa, 1963), I-B, pp. 4-5.

²³ Yi Han-lim was a graduate of the Military Academy of Manchukuo under the Japanese domination, as was General Chung Hee Park (Pak Chŏng-hi). Yi also attended the U.S. Army Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia.

²⁴ *Korean Times*, May 18, 1961.

²⁵ United Press International, Washington, D.C., May 17, 1961.

²⁶ U.S. Department of State, Historical Office, *American Foreign Policy: Current Documents 1961* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 974. (Hereafter referred to as *Current Documents 1961*. Italics added.)

²⁷ United Press International, Washington, May 19, 1961.

²⁸ *Ibid.* (Italics added.)

²⁹ *Current Documents 1961*, p. 975.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Oh, "The Political Role of the Korean Military: The Making of the Third Republic," *Studies on Asia 1967* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. 71-86.

³² *Current Documents* 1961, p. 977.

³³ United Press International, Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.

³⁴ *Ibid.* March 25, 1963.

³⁵ Pujong sönkörü ttainda" [Contesting the Rigged Elections] *Shindonga*, No. 35 (July, 1967), pp. 96-107, and related topics on the same theme, pp. 72-132. The *New York Times* editorialized on July 13, 1967, that while Park's own election was "sufficiently honest," the June 8 elections were: "so crooked that Washington has not yet got over a sense of embarrassment." The *Washington Post* condemned on June 20, 1967, "government harassment of the opposition" during the elections and declared that Park government "is essentially a military regime backed by the United States."

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. OH

Dr. John Kie-chiang Oh is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Marquette University. He is the author of a book entitled *Korea: Democracy on Trial* published in 1968 by the Cornell University Press and of many scholarly articles on Asian and international politics. For instance, articles by Professor Oh and about his works appear in the current issues of the two most noted scholarly journals concerning Asia, the *Journal of Asian Studies* and *Pacific Affairs*. He is currently working on another book-length study of contemporary Japanese politics, and for this project he has traveled three times to the Far East in the past two years. He has regularly presented papers to the national and regional meetings of the Association for Asian Studies. He is again scheduled to present a paper to the upcoming Midwest Conference on Asian Affairs. He will also be the chairman of a panel on Japan.

Professor Oh was a member of the Republic of (South) Korea delegation to the United Nations Command Delegation to the Panmunjom armistice negotiations that terminated the Korean War. He was subsequently a member of the Korean Mission to the United Nations, New York.

He received his undergraduate training at the Seoul National University and Marquette University. He did his graduate work at Columbia University and Georgetown University, and received his Ph. D. from the latter institution.

POST OFFICE EXCEEDING AUTHORITY GRANTED IN PUBLIC LAW 90-590

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which will rectify a serious error in Public Law 90-590, which dealt with, among other things, the use of the mail for fraudulent purposes.

Apparently, since the passage of this legislation the Post Office has taken upon itself the authority to act as censor in all types of areas. I do not believe this was the intent of the Congress when the legislation was passed.

An area that has been particularly hard hit, and unfairly, is health publications. The National Health Federation in its June publication reports that at least six books have been banned from the mails, and at least three others are threatened. Three cases are currently before the courts.

In an exchange of letters with the Post Office Department on this question, it is clear that standards for censorship have not been set up, decisions are being made without justification, and a lot of honest citizens are finding themselves shabbily discriminated against by the Government.

I sincerely hope this matter will be expeditiously taken up by the committee. When freedom of expression is challenged and the justification offered is the authority granted by legislation passed by Congress—then Congress has the clear obligation to remedy the situation.

MOUNTAIN STATE FOREST FESTIVAL PROCLAIMS GRANDEUR OF WEST VIRGINIA AUTUMN—WILLIAM L. LINDHOLM DELIVERS THOUGHTFUL ADDRESS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, early October is the time when the mountains and forests of West Virginia are at the peak of their display of autumn color. Each year at this time the people of West Virginia observe the bounty of the State's woodlands, not only for the beauty but also for the important role they perform in its economy.

This tribute is appropriately held in my hometown of Elkins, situated high in the mountains of West Virginia surrounded by our awe-inspiring forests.

This year's Mountain State Forest Festival, the 33d, was held last week with activities running from October 1 through October 5. It was my pleasure to join with the 40,000 to 50,000 visitors to Elkins for the festival.

The principal event on Thursday, October 2, was the annual distinguished guests dinner. More than 500 people from all parts of West Virginia attended. They heard an address by William L. Lindholm, president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. Mr. Lindholm presented a very thoughtful discussion of the positive aspects of the United States at a time when, I believe, we need to realize that there is another side to our national life in addition to the problems about which we hear so much.

On Friday, Miss Charlotte Buzzard of Moundsville, W. Va., the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh A. Buzzard, was crowned Queen Sylvia XXXIII to reign over the Forest Festival. The Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor of West Virginia, presided over the coronation ceremony. This young woman, a splendid representative of the youth of West Virginia, carried out her duties at the festival with the dignity and grace that has typified other wearers of the crown over the years.

Other public officials participating in festival activities included Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS and the Honorable John D. Rockefeller IV, Secretary of State of West Virginia, Lysander Dudley,

Commissioner of Commerce for our State, T. R. Samsell, director of the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, State Senator Carl Gainer, and Elkins' Mayor Ralph Shepler.

On Friday night the firemen's parade provided displays by volunteer and professional firemen from many communities.

The festival's largest event was the Grand Feature Parade on Saturday, a 2-mile-long spectacular exhibition of pageantry. The parade consisted of 30 floats and 59 bands from five States to make it among the outstanding in festival history. Most of the bands were high school musical groups, and I was again reminded that such worthwhile events cannot take place without their participation and contribution of talent. I was gratified that more than 3,000 young musicians participated in the Mountain State Forest Festival.

Mr. President, the success of such a gala celebration as the Forest Festival can only be achieved through the diligence and dedication of many people. With the leadership provided by individuals such as W. Grady Whitman, president of the Forest Festival Association, and William J. Loy, director-general of the festival, those responsible have again made it a memorable occasion.

The address delivered by Mr. Lindholm at the distinguished guests dinner has a message for all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CASE FOR AMERICA

(By William L. Lindholm)

Not long ago I read an article that said, "If you are wondering whether there is anything right about America, look beyond the troubled cities. Look to the towns and countryside. There you will find the stability that has long sustained the nation."

Elkins and the festival you celebrate this week are perfect examples of the truth of that statement and give it substance. It is reassuring to me to be in a town where order, stability and progress march so well together. And I tell you that in all sincerity. In fact, Elkins illustrates the theme of my talk so well that I could almost just state my thesis and then point to this town and others like it across the country as prime evidence and say, that is what I mean. Because tonight I want to talk to you about this country we love so deeply and about the sources of her strength.

My theme is simply this: that it is not in our vast geographical resources, nor in our military armament, nor in our great wealth that our real strength is to be found, but in the spirit of the American people. Tonight I say to you, let us renew that spirit and our faith in ourselves and in our country.

Just now I think we stand greatly in need of faith in ourselves. Reports of our ills and failures and shortcomings over the past few years have hit us hard and have caused a good many people to wonder whether there is anything about us that is good and worth keeping.

Almost every day we have been reminded of our woes as magazines, newspapers, and the airwaves have chanted the catechism of failure. According to these reports we are a nation in which millions wallow in poverty and millions are functional illiterates. Ac-

cording to them there has been little or no racial progress. We are a nation of haters. Unemployment is rampant and getting worse. We are choking on polluted air and gagging on polluted water in our decaying cities. We ignore hunger in the midst of plenty. We have student anarchy, a rising wave of crime, dissent over Vietnam while at the same time we are charged with suppressing dissent. Of Americans themselves, we hear that we don't care for one another, that it's every man for himself, that we are miserable, tense and worried, and sit shamefacedly in collective guilt.

Before I go any further, let me say clearly that I cannot refute some of these charges. I cannot say they are false because regrettably many have some basis in fact. Neither do I agree with some who say that the news media have been malicious and conspiratorial in their reporting of our problems. It's the job of the news media to report the news as they find it, and I think for the most part they have done that. I do think that more weight has been given to editorial comment than is justified. And I think that more attention, too repetitive attention, has been given to the dark side of the news than is perhaps necessary.

But rather than talk about who or what is to blame, I want to talk about effects—the effects upon us of continually being told how bad we are without also being told that we have some good things going for us.

I think we have become victims of a strange boomeranging kind of psychological warfare we have waged upon ourselves without knowing it.

In the specialized world of psychological warfare, there are said to be two kinds of power tools.

One is offensive, designed to reduce the enemy's belief in his own cause, to make him mistrust his leaders and his colleagues, to raise serious doubts as to the justice of his system, to make him lose faith in stated objectives of his society.

A second kind is designed to close ranks behind one's cause, to reaffirm one's own ideals and purposes, and to bring moral courage and dedication to things one genuinely holds to be essential to his way of life.

Our incessant attention to our problems and weaknesses has had the demoralizing, debilitating effect upon us of the first kind of psychological tool. We have had all too little of the kind that unites us, encourages us and gives us hope that we can ever overcome our difficulties.

And the effects upon us are as devastating as a broadside from a cannon. We are a people with faith in one another, and when we lose that faith, we become weak, however heavily we may be armed.

The dangers of always hearing how bad we are, are first, that we might believe it; that we might become what our critics say we are. And second, that we might dissipate our energy in frenzied activity trying to answer all the alarms at once without doing anything really productive.

I remember a story that illustrates that point quite well. It's said to have actually happened. It's about a high school football player in his first varsity game. He was a pretty good player and his coach told him he was going to let him make the opening kickoff. The young man got a real good case of the jitters and became very nervous and tense about it because he wanted to perform well and live up to his coach's expectations of him. When he walked out on the field, the referee sensed his tension so he talked to him and gave him some advice. He said, "Now, all you have to do is just keep your eyes on the ball, and when you hear my whistle, run up there and kick that ball as far as you can." Well, he followed that advice to the letter. He heard a whistle, ran forward, kicked the ball and watched it sail off on the longest kick he had ever made. Then he ran after it as hard as he could,

saw everyone in the stands rise to their feet, and he suddenly realized he was the only person moving. About that time he heard his coach yelling for him to stop. The whistle he had heard was the band director's whistle to begin the national anthem.

The point I'm making is that when we get so "psyched-up" about our problems, we can waste a lot of energy just worrying about them or running around in circles, without ever really accomplishing anything productive.

I think it's a mistake to allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with our problems and failures that we forget our strengths and successes.

As the German poet Goethe noted, "If one treats a person as if he were what he ought to be and could be, he will become what he ought to be and could be."

I believe that. And I believe it applies to nations as well as individuals. So now in the remaining minutes I would like to speak of our strengths as individuals and as a nation, as a way of reminding ourselves of what we are and what we can become.

First, I want to consider the strengths of the individual. Development of this point is admittedly simplistic. Yet it is a firm belief of mine that within every human being there are powerful, yet untapped resources of utterly amazing strengths. They remain unused mostly, until some unique circumstance which demands heroic action brings them out.

For example, a few years ago newspapers carried an account of a mother who lifted a small foreign car off her son on whom it had fallen. While she held up the car, the son scrambled to safety. She performed this amazing physical feat even though she stood less than five feet tall and weighed less than 100 pounds.

Not long afterwards, another story told about a man who saved his son under similar circumstances. The son had his car—a normal-sized American car—jacked up with the rear wheels removed. The jack slipped and the car fell on the boy. The father grabbed the rear of the car and lifted it so his son could slide out.

I have seen great feats of dedication to service and duty occur within my own business on innumerable occasions.

And there are sources of moral as well as physical strength within us. Each of us knows that down deep within us there is a tremendous capacity—an urge—for good. And again, it is often the unusual circumstances that call it out in us in most spectacular form. For example, we are seldom so friendly to one another or so willing to help one another as when we are fighting together against a common threat. After Hurricane Camille left the Gulf Coast area and parts of Virginia and West Virginia devastated, there was an immediate outpouring of clothing, food, money and honest sympathy from all over this country. People were so generous as a matter of fact, that disaster officials had to ask that we stop sending goods because they just couldn't handle it all.

The strength of this country lies in the physical, moral and spiritual strength of her people—people who have a sense of what is right and what is wrong. It is that spirit that is so evident here in Elkins. And the strengths we possess individually we possess collectively as a nation. The strengths of kindness, the boundless capacity for working together, our social, political and technological skills—all these strengths have led us to do the world's work with a minimum of supervision and leadership. And these are strengths that lurk in the commonest American.

Eric Hoffer, the widely-quoted longshoreman-philosopher, spoke of those traits in a book called "The Temper of Our Times." And he told a story that illustrates the point so well, I want to pass it along to you.

He says that once during the Depression, a construction company that had to build a road in the San Bernardino mountains in California sent two trucks down to Los Angeles to hire workers. Anyone who could climb onto the trucks was hired on the spot.

When they had two truckloads full they drove off and dumped those men on the side of a hill up there in the mountains, where they found bundles of supplies and equipment. The company had only one man on the spot. So the men began to sort themselves out. There were so many carpenters, so many electricians, so many mechanics, cooks and so on. They put up tents, fixed latrines, built a cook shack, and went on to build the road. Hoffer says that "If we had to write a constitution we probably would have had someone who knew all the whereases and wherefores." He says, "We were a shovelful of slime scooped off the pavement of skid row, yet we could have built America on the side of a hill in the San Bernardino mountains." That's what I mean about our strengths.

And what have our strengths and abilities led us to do? To create the healthiest, wealthiest, most generous nation in the history of the world.

A few statistics will give you some idea of just how successful we are. These figures were reported by U.S. News & World Report and they're a real eye-opener.

Just listen to this:

With 7% of the world's land area and 6% of the world's population, we account for one-third of the world's production of goods and services.

Our farmlands produce 13% of the world's wheat, 46% of its corn and 21% of its meat—enough to feed 200 million Americans and much of the world besides.

Our factories produce a flow of goods almost equal in size to the combined output of the Soviet Union and Western Europe.

Fifty-three percent of all the cars in use throughout the world are found on American streets and highways.

Per capita disposable income in America (1967 figures) comes to more than \$2,700—45% more than in Canada and the United Kingdom and 70% more than in France.

No other country can even come close to matching a record like that. We're immensely successful and there's no reason to be ashamed of it.

That's the record of the free enterprise system. From time to time we hear about the great advances Communist countries have been making in recent years, and we sometimes get the idea that they're about to overtake us. But don't you believe it. As a matter of fact, if we wanted to match the Soviet Union in just about any area, we would have to decrease our production.

We would have to destroy about two-thirds of our railway mileage.

Destroy about 60 percent of our houses.

Destroy 60 percent of our steel mills.

Destroy nine out of every ten telephones. Move about 60 million people back to the farms.

Reduce our overall standard of living a full 60 percent.

There's just no contest.

We are the strongest nation the world has ever seen, and we have shared our wealth as no nation has ever done.

Since the end of World War II, we have supported the hopes, the welfare, and, by and large, the unity of the whole non-communist world.

Contrary to what some of our critics say, we are not imperialists. We are not sick. We are not on the downhill. The problems we face are problems of success, and of all the ills we could suffer, success is by far the best.

Now let's look specifically at some of the problems we face. First, the problems of poverty, unemployment and lack of racial prog-

ress. We must admit that those do exist in America today. But we do not have to accept the reports that imply that little or nothing is being done about them. The fact is that we have made enormous progress in these areas.

According to the U.S. Census, from 1948 to 1963 the percentage of non-white males in the \$6,000-\$10,000 salary bracket went up by almost twenty-five times. As you can well imagine, a move from a family income of, say, \$5,000 a year to \$10,000 a year is more significant in human terms than a jump from \$10,000 to \$20,000. It is precisely in this area that extraordinarily large numbers of Negroes have been making their great leap forward. Altogether, more than 14 million Americans have left poverty behind in the past seven years.

We are making progress. The reason for this is that a larger number of people today are getting jobs—and a lot of them who are, are people who have never been able to get jobs or hold on to them before. According to the Department of Labor, unemployment has been declining twice as fast in poor neighborhoods as in the nation as a whole. In one year there has been a 20% drop.

I know this is a sore point with West Virginia. You got tagged in the late 1950's with being a state with a high unemployment rate.

Some people have a hard time realizing nothing's static, that situations change. The rate of unemployment has changed very much for the better in West Virginia and I think you can be very proud of that change. In 1959, the unemployment rate was 14.5%; in 1964, it was 8.8%; in 1968 it was 6.4%; and for the first seven months of 1969 it has been at the very low figure of 5.4%, the lowest in decades. And that indeed is progress.

More people are earning better salaries and wages, because they are working at more and better jobs, and because they are getting a better education.

As a matter of fact, Americans today are the best educated people the world has known. More Americans have completed high school than any other people. No other nation comes close to matching the 6.5 million students enrolled in our colleges and universities. More than that, a young person in the United States, no matter what his color, is more likely to go on to college than is a citizen of any country except France. Education, in fact, is now our biggest industry and, says U.S. News & World Report, it involves even more people than does national defense.

Well, what else? We hear that we have become unfeeling, uncaring about other people. I'll answer that by pointing to the fact that last year alone we Americans contributed more than 14 billion dollars to charitable causes. Some people might think that came mostly from foundations and big business. But it didn't. Three-fourths of that 14 billion came from private individuals like you and me, digging deep down into our pockets to help our fellow man. In addition to giving money, more than 50 million Americans donate their time to charity.

Equally available evidence tends to discount another widely heralded "weakness" of America—that its people are ridden by frustrations, are despairing of their lot in life and are just plain miserable.

According to one study I ran across, however, the average housewife (if there is such a person) has been married to the same man for 22 years; she's not strong on clubs; she thinks she's happier than her mother was; drinks little or not at all; is wrapped up in her home and family.

And on another related subject, a Gallup Poll taken last year found that 45 percent of all Americans attend church often, and 70% thought religion very important. More than that, in spite of the "God is Dead" theology that has become somewhat popular

recently, the poll found that 97% of adult Americans still believe He's alive.

There is indeed a great absence of misery in this country today—absence of misery in that number of children who don't die in infancy; in the tens of millions of once certain illiterates who instead can read and write; in the millions of Negroes now in the ranks of the middle class, and in the considerable number who are moving up. There is an absence of misery in the millions of men who will retire healthy and compensated at 65 or 62; in the hundreds of thousands of farmers who own their own farms and do not have to share-crop; and in the hundreds of thousands of women who will never again have to work in sweatshops. These non-miserable millions, and millions more like them, populate this land we love and call America—a country that in 50 years has ended two world wars and started none, fought and is fighting to prevent communist take-over in two other wars, a country that has beat off a savage depression, played the major role in rebuilding a shattered world, and almost as an afterthought, created the most healthy, wealthy and learned a nation the world has ever seen at any time or at any place.

And as Eric Hoffer has pointed out, all these good things have happened in the "only nation founded by the ordinary people, by the masses. All other societies have been shaped by exclusive kings, nobles or priests."

These are the good things about America. There are many more that I would like to remind you of, but I don't have time.

I want to say just one thing more and then I'm going to stop. And that is this: that of all the good things about America, the best of all is her people. If we lose faith in ourselves, we will become what our critics say we are.

Tonight, I've attempted to show you that we have amazing resources of strengths as individuals and as a nation. There is much to be proud of. Some feel there is much to be ashamed of. We have problems, of course, some very serious ones, and we have a lot more to do. But my plea is that we on one side and those on the other not bicker and harangue or curse one another as we decide how best to heal our wounds and cure our ills. We can love this country without hating others. And we can continue the debate on how we can become what we've yet to be. But while the debate continues, so must the country.

So what we must ask of each other is that, through it all, we cherish this country, that we have a feeling of pride and confidence in her—an enduring feeling, not a fleeting one.

For all time, our task is to keep America signing. And Elkins—and towns like it all across the country—I am sure, will provide the strongest chorus.

LET'S FIND OUT

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which was published in three newspapers in my district known as the Tidewater Weeklies. This editorial, I think, is especially timely as a small group of our Members attempt to second guess the President. I hope their statements do not handicap his efforts to bring about peace in Southeast Asia or embarrass our negotiators at the peace table. The editorial is set forth in full below:

[From the Montross (Va.) Westmoreland News, Oct. 1, 1969]

LET'S FIND OUT

With nearly everybody picking on the military, President Nixon has set up a blue-ribbon panel to make a 12-month study of the Defense Department's management, research, procurement and decision-making machinery.

In charge, he wisely placed a top grade businessman who cannot remotely be considered a part of the defense supply industry—Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. The need for a new fact-finding panel was in fact foreseen by the Administration at the time it took office and was recommended by Defense Secretary Laird some weeks ago.

At the same time, the President tightened the procedures under which the Budget Bureau examines our Vietnam and other military spending. Whereas defense budgets under the Johnson Administration went directly to the President with the Budget Bureau role limited to the right to appeal, they now will go, like all others, to the Bureau for final approval. The Defense Department, in turn, has the right to appeal to the President.

The new Administration does not accept as gospel all the shrill cries of those critics who see a conspiracy between the military and manufacturers behind every procurement contract. It wants the facts—and invites the public in to help find them.

It is worth noting that the new Fitzhugh Panel should not be confused with the blue-ribbon Hollifield Procurement Commission now being proposed in the Congress, with bi-partisan support. This Commission aims to reform all types of government purchasing—civilian as well as military—and does not duplicate the Nixon-Fitzhugh Panel. Both of these investigations make more sense than some of the emotional talk we endure today, and both deserve public support.

KAREN SEPPA—4-H REPORTER TO THE NATION FOR 1969

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting with an attractive and outstanding young lady from my congressional district who is one of 11 "4-H Reporters to the Nation for 1969."

Miss Karen Seppa of Petaluma, Calif., is the epitome of American youth, and certainly restores one's faith in the future of our Nation and the world.

So that my colleagues may know of the accomplishments of this outstanding example of American youth, I am including a copy of Karen's biography so that all of the Members may know of her outstanding record, not only in 4-H work, but also in the community at large. To say that I am proud of her, would be an understatement of fact.

As a former 4-H Club member, myself, I am very familiar with the principles and programs the organization espouses. America desperately needs to expand the 4-H concept and youth programs. Also, all America should adopt their motto, "To Make the Best Better."

I include Karen's biography in the RECORD, so that history and this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will permanently recognize and record her accomplishments:

KAREN SEPPA

Karen might be twins for all she's done in 4-H in nine years. A California "All-Star," she won a trip to National 4-H Congress in food preservation. But she also has a long list of citizenship and other activities. Her parents are Mr. and Mrs. Emil Seppa, both former 4-H'ers and now leaders; her two brothers were 4-H'ers and her sister is now. A Finnish visitor at the Seppa's wrote and published a long illustrated feature about Karen and her family in a Finland paper.

Since 1961, in plant and animal science projects, she has raised 4 steers, 9 lambs, and set out 1300 plants in plant propagation and home grounds beautification. She helps with the family garden and orchard, and preserves fresh fruits and vegetables from them.

She has canned, dried, frozen, and otherwise "put up" a 100 to 650 containers a year for seven years; has prepared about 650 dishes and dozens of meals, always thinking of good nutrition and balanced diets. She learned a little foreign cookery from an "IFYE" brother from India, and taught him food preservation. She has made nearly 40 garments and moderated 4-H dress revues. In junior leadership four years, she had led 122 younger members in citizenship and food preservation. She and her 4-H juniors canned 174 quarts of tomatoes in three years for the County Rescue Mission.

She has further helped "the less fortunate" by collecting clothing for some Alaskan Indians, a Turkish orphanage, Russian River flood victims, and others; has made useful articles and gifts for the sick and elderly in rest homes, and for patients in a local hospital; encouraged "letters to servicemen" and food treats for returning wounded from Vietnam; worked in March of Dimes, UNICEF's "Trick or Treat," and Easter Seal campaigns; and gathered coupons for a Braille reader for the blind.

She's helped clean up country roadsides, planted wild flowers, aided in anti-litter efforts, beautified local landmarks, attended the Mayor's Beautification Conference, and served on her town's first committee for a Congress for Community Progress; stressed fire safety education, promoted car safety checks, made anti-smoking health displays—one with a goofy manikin "Hopeless Harry" she helped create; has given resuscitation demonstrations with her "Bill Blow" manikin to 4-H'ers and non-4-H'ers; taught "Flag Facts and Etiquette," urged owning and displaying flags, appreciating our American heritage, and "getting out the vote;" served on the County 4-H Citizenship Committee, and been 4-H broadcaster and District Fair interviewer on KTOB.

Outside 4-H, she belongs to the Petaluma Youth Action Council, has attended the Governor's Traffic Safety Conference, been active in a "Model United Nations," been Senior High president, in the College Executive Cabinet; church youth president, pianist, choir singer. Her hobbies—tennis, snow skiing. Her career aim—teaching.

Karen is one of 11 4-H Reporters-to-the-Nation for 1969, representing the Nation's 3 1/4 million members in all 50 States. Each Reporter serves singly and with others to tell the 4-H story to national organizations; leaders in government, business, industry, agriculture, education, and to the general public through mass media.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the atten-

tion of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the September 13, 1969, issue of the Sheboygan Press. The Postmaster General has, like the rest of us, one thing to gain from reform of our present postal system and that is improved postal service. As the Press appropriately states:

Mr. Blount's refreshing candor in criticizing the system which put him in charge of the Post Office should not be lost in Congress when the postal reform bill is taken up.

The text of the editorial follows:

WORTH TRYING SOMETHING

Postmaster General Winston M. Blount presented a strong case for postal reform Monday when he addressed some 2,000 business executives attending the national postal forum held annually at Washington to discuss mail problems and ways to improve postal service. He said no organization could operate smoothly and efficiently "under such a revolving door management."

He said: "I am the sixth postmaster general in this decade, and each officeholder has some new policies and politics. No organization could be expected to operate smoothly and efficiently under such a revolving door management."

"Piecemeal changes to the present system will not do the job," he warned in an appeal for support of the administration's bill to establish a government-owned and operated postal corporation. "A basic change of direction is necessary."

Mr. Blount's refreshing candor in criticizing the system which put him in charge of the Post Office should not be lost in Congress when the postal reform bill is taken up.

STUDENTS LEAGUE AGAINST
NARCOTIC TEMPTATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a project currently in operation by the Missouri Jaycees. The project, Students League Against Narcotic Temptation—SLANT—is aimed at educating young people with the facts of drug use and abuse. Following is a statement by the Missouri Jaycees on the project and its growth:

STUDENTS LEAGUE AGAINST NARCOTIC
TEMPTATION

FLORISSANT, MO.

One of the three greatest problems facing our country today is the alarming increase in drug abuse among young people. It presents a serious challenge to society. As Jaycees we are faced with an urgent responsibility in combatting the menace of drug and narcotic addiction through programs of preventive education. It is of critical importance that maximum effort be given to this first line of defense.

The aim of SLANT is to have "Youth bring the message to Youth". To make the students ambassadors to their fellow students.

There have been narcotics programs presented to students in the past. They have showed movies and gave information about the penalties for use or possession of narcotics and how a police record would affect their quest for future employment. We don't feel that these programs were actually getting to the students. The SLANT program will, "Tell them like it is." We want to give

the students the right information on the use of drugs. The effects that it will have on their bodies. How it causes kidney, liver, heart and brain damage, and even death.

The idea for SLANT came from a narcotics conference sponsored by the National District Attorneys Association held in Chicago last summer and attended by Bob Lowry, Chief of Detectives of the Florissant, Missouri Police Department, a past president of the Florissant Valley Jaycees and a member of the Board of Directors of the Florissant Valley Jaycees. The Florissant Valley Jaycees conducted a SLANT Program in two Florissant area High Schools and presently have 500 SLANT members in the two schools.

In June of 1969 at the Executive Committee Meeting, held in Columbia, Missouri the SLANT Program was presented to the Executive Committee of the Missouri Jaycees and was accepted as a state program.

At the time of this writing 33 local chapters in the state of Missouri are planning on conducting a SLANT Program in their local area High Schools. We have also had indications from chapters in Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, South Dakota, Iowa and Wisconsin that they are also planning on conducting SLANT Programs in co-operation with the Missouri Jaycees.

We can't impress upon you enough just how important we feel the SLANT program is. We feel that it is so important each chapter in the State of Missouri should be conducting a SLANT program in their local schools.

TONY BROCKMEYER,
SLANT Chairman.

BIRDS ALERTED FOR WAR

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, last week we were told that the fat and unnecessary spending had been cut out of the military procurement authorization bill.

I was greatly disillusioned, disappointed, downhearted, and disturbed to read that \$600,000 is to be spent by the Defense Department with the psychology department of the University of Mississippi for a program which is based on the supposition that birds will eventually replace humans for activities that are dangerous, difficult, expensive, or boring.

The insanity of such a program is obvious.

Unless such foolish programs as this are cut from the military budget, I expect to vote against the appropriation.

I urge the Military Services Subcommittee on Appropriations to cut the many forms of waste from this program. The citizens of our country are greatly worried at the manner in which the taxpayers' money is being spent on these wasteful, absurd projects, and I include the article from today's Washington Post, "Birds Alerted for War," by Thomas O'Toole, to be printed in the RECORD:

BIRDS ALERTED FOR WAR—FLYING OFF TO
COMBAT?

(By Thomas O'Toole)

Would you believe that war is for the birds?

So much so that hawks and doves might fight side by side or that parrots, ducks,

chickens, pigeons and even mynah birds could be drafted to help defend the flag in some future war?

Whatever you might think of the scheme, the Pentagon is all for it. Consider the description of the \$600,000 contract the Defense Department has with the Psychology Department of the University of Mississippi:

"This program is based," the contract reads, "on the supposition that birds will eventually replace humans for activities that are dangerous, difficult, expensive or boring."

Among the activities the Pentagon has in mind are "aerial photography, gunnery, steering of missiles, detection of mines and search and destroy operations."

Just how the Pentagon plans to get birds to do all these things is anybody's guess, but it does mean to try.

"Much of the research will relate to complex forms of stimulus control," the contract with the University of Mississippi reads, "for example, visual search, auditory pattern recognition, pursuit and tracking, controlled locomotion and operation of manipulanda while flying."

"This is not a development contract," explains a Pentagon spokesman. "What we're trying to do here is to see if birds can be trained to do certain things."

The Pentagon admits it won't be able to use all birds in its research but it would like to train most species of wild birds for combat flying. "Especially crows, ravens, jays, hawks and vultures," the contract goes on, including "doves, parrots, mynahs, chickens and pigeons."

The use of warbirds is not a new one, though its past is hardly glorious.

The most serious attempt to use bird-like creatures was in a program called X-Ray, in which bats carrying incendiaries were to be flown into Tokyo during World War II. The idea was to get the bats to roost in the eaves of Tokyo's wooden buildings, where the bombs would go off when the bats flipped upside down to sleep.

"The trouble with that one," said one scientist who worked on Project X-Ray, "was that it almost burned down an Air Force base in New Mexico." X-ray never made it to Japan.

The latest scheme for warbirds came to roost when the Pentagon circulated a letter advertising for ornithologists to work on it. "I read it, I re-read it, and I read it again," one scientist said, "and I still couldn't believe it. It's insane."

Critics notwithstanding, the Pentagon is going ahead with its bird scheme.

"This program is just getting started," it says. "Hopefully, it will go on for 10 or 20 years."

The project is supported by a three-year "Project Themis" contract, at \$200,000 a year. Project Themis is a program aimed at beefing up basic research in universities that have not had strong science programs.

LESOTHO INDEPENDENCE DAY, OCTOBER 4, 1966

HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Lesotho attained its independence and full sovereignty 3 years ago when the British Government agreed to terminate its protectorate.

Lesotho is a landlocked high plateau country in South-East Africa, completely surrounded by the Republic of South Africa. Its area is about 12,000

square miles and its population is just under 1 million. Its sturdy and fighting tribes were formerly ruled by a powerful tribal chief, and fought fiercely for their way of life. In mid-19th century, the country was taken over by the British and annexed to the Cape Colony, much against the wishes of the people. In 1884, indirect British rule was restored, and gradually local government administration was instituted. By the end of the last war the people had developed their own tribal-national identity and worked for their independence. Subsequent to a period of preindependence status, the Lesotho people attained their goal on October 4, 1966, proclaiming their leader as their monarch, their chief of state.

The Kingdom of Lesotho is somewhat better off than some other new African states in that its population is fairly homogeneous, they are well trained to submit to the Central Government, thus causing no tribal feuds in Lesotho. They all speak one language—Sesotho—and the Government officials are also well versed in English. It is an agricultural country, and its economy is largely based on livestock production and farming. All land is held in trust for the nation by the Government, but its good and equitable distribution and effective use is also assured by the Government. Its industrious and hard-working people are making progress under the Government's paternalistic and well-conceived soil erosion program. On the third anniversary of their independence day we wish peace and prosperity to the people of the Kingdom of Lesotho.

CIGARETTES AS FIRE HAZARDS

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to require cigarette manufacturers to print on their packs, in addition to the present "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health," or any stronger statement which may be subsequently determined by this Congress, a warning pointing to the extreme fire hazard that cigarette smoking has created in our Nation.

The additional warning reads:

The smoking of cigarettes is a dangerous fire hazard which results in hundreds of deaths and many million dollars in damage each year. You are urged never to smoke in bed or when in a drowsy condition and to be absolutely certain that each cigarette before it is disposed of—is completely extinguished.

My bill also calls for a penalty of a \$100,000 fine for manufacturers who are convicted of violations.

My intention in making this proposal, Mr. Speaker, is not to denigrate the extremely serious and lethal health hazards which cigarette smoking represents.

This very fact was emphasized and reiterated just last month when the U.S. Public Health Service presented its 1969 supplement to its 1967 review of the

health consequences of cigarette smoking.

The USPHS presents still more evidence that cigarette smoking is harmful to the heart, lungs, mouth, and even the unborn babies of smoking mothers.

The health hazards of smoking cannot be emphasized too strongly. But at the same time, we seem to be ignoring another consequence of cigarette smoking, which albeit not of the magnitude of death through illness created by this habit, is yet substantial enough to warrant our attention.

And this is the fire hazard of smoking cigarettes. Let me give you some idea of the magnitude.

My city of Philadelphia, which enjoys the best fire record of any major city in the Nation, had 6,665 fires in the calendar year of 1968. Of this total, 4,524 of these blazes were in single or multiple dwellings, and 1,046 were industrial fires.

A full 36.6 percent of all the fires were attributed directly or indirectly to smoking of cigarettes.

During that year, 77 persons lost their lives in these blazes—75 of them in residential fires and two in industrial conflagrations. Of these 77 deaths, a full 32—almost half—were as a result of fires directly or indirectly caused by smoking cigarettes.

These are not my opinions. These are the hard facts established by the fire marshal of Philadelphia in his investigations of each and every fire.

I do not have the current figures nationally because of weaknesses of reporting systems. However, if we realize that the population of the city of Philadelphia represents almost exactly 1 percent of the total population of the United States, and even taking into account Philadelphia's fine fire record, we need only multiply the Philadelphia statistics by 100 and come up with a tragic and pitiful national disgrace.

I can give no guarantees, Mr. Speaker, that my bill will put an end to fires and blazing deaths caused by cigarettes. This would be unrealistic, wishful thinking.

But if just one person who read the warning took heed from smoking in bed, or completely extinguished a potential lethal weapon, if just one fire were averted and just one life saved; then I believe passage of this bill will have been justified.

I deeply regret that the cigarette companies themselves, with the billions of dollars they derive in profits and the millions spent annually in advertising, have thus far never seen fit to spend a single dime to remind people of this extreme fire hazard and threat of life and property which cigarette smoking represents.

MORATORIUM DAY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, October 15, 1969, has been designated "Moratorium Day," as a

means of forcing the President to unilaterally withdraw all our forces from Vietnam. The leaders will admit, when asked, that this action is designed to do just that.

However, Mr. Speaker, the universities and colleges in this Nation are not being told this.

The University of New Mexico Board of Regents for example were told that this was a day to be set aside where both sides of the issue could be discussed. With this understanding, the board of regents endorsed Moratorium Day.

Mr. Speaker, I only point this out so that when a large participation is noted on October 15, that it is understood that it will not be a representation of a large feeling for unilateral withdrawal, but that it will simply indicate that the universities are interested in their students discussing both sides of this question.

LEGISLATION DEALING WITH OBSCENE MATERIALS MAILED TO MINORS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe all the Members should be aware of some very pertinent testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary this morning. My dear friend and fellow Alabamian, the Honorable JACK EDWARDS, clearly pointed out the need for a tightening of legislation dealing with the mailing of obscene materials into homes with minors. The text of his remarks are as follows:

Today almost any youngster can walk into a store in his town and purchase a book or magazine or pamphlet or picture that is aimed at appealing to his prurient interests. He can see any number of movies of a pornographic nature often times in spite of self-imposed restrictions by the movie houses and the industry. But in these areas parents can exercise parental control over what the child may be exposed to.

However, the villainous purveyors of smut are no longer waiting for their victims to come to them. They have now taken to the mails and through many devious means are mailing pornographic materials to homes where children reside. Unknowingly children will open these mails and be exposed to materials which they are not psychologically and emotionally prepared to understand.

There is little legislation on the books that will stop the use of the mails for this purpose. It is for this reason that I have introduced H.R. 5190. This will give the Postmaster General the legislative muscle needed to dry up the ever-growing flow of smut to homes with children.

Our present Postmaster General Winton M. Blount, a fellow Alabamian, has been making every effort to hamper the use of the mails by these fly-by-night business concerns who deal in smut. Last week his Department revoked the post office box privileges of eight dealers in sexually oriented materials.

This is the first significant action by a Postmaster General in a long time to stop the mailing of pornography. But the use of administrative authority by the Postmaster

General is a weak tool. The bill being considered here today will strengthen that tool and add measurably to his Department's powers to control these harmful mailings of smut.

I believe a review of some of the measures on the books at the moment will give you an indication of the vital need for this legislation.

A few years ago in Congress, we passed a law to provide that persons receiving this material could return it to the Post Office with orders that no more mailings from that particular source be sent to the home. This was a step in the right direction, but not enough. I am sure you will agree with me that this suffers on two accounts. First, it does nothing to prevent the initial mailings. The damage to a child's psyche or moral fiber may already have been done. Second, it is a long and complicated process to stop the materials, starting with the necessity of the postal patron to fill out forms to prevent further mailings. Even this is ineffective since companies that deal in pornographic materials change names and status frequently.

In 1967 I proposed a bill setting up a commission to study the problem and make recommendations. Legislation very closely following the proposal I made was approved in October of that year. Now is the time to take a definite step to curtail all mailings of pornographic materials to minors or homes wherein minors reside.

There is a great urgency in this matter as the amount of unsolicited pornography mailed into the homes is growing by leaps and bounds. As an indication of the rising incidence of pornographic material being mailed, the Post Office Department provided me with information indicating that under the pandering law that went into effect in April 1968, 334,928 persons have requested that these mailings be stopped during the first 16 months. The Post Office was able to issue 257,133 orders to that effect based on the complaints. And these are only the complaints. How many people received the pornographic mailings and simply discarded them? How many were unaware that there was something they could do about these mailings?

Let me quote some other statistics that show the astronomical rise in the peddling of smut. In the fiscal year of 1967, 140,000 complaints were received by the Post Office Department from patrons who had been mailed pornographic materials. In fiscal 1968 that number rose to 167,000. And in the fiscal year just concluded that number has jumped to over 234,000 complaints.

We must act now to stop this threat to the very roots of the moral fiber of the nation—the developing child. We must attack the source—those vile, perverted individuals who prey on the innocence of our little children. We must take a real step forward in eliminating such vice from the mails. I believe this bill is such a step. It attacks the violator directly by making the act of mailing unsolicited pornography a crime. I strongly urge you to report this bill out of committee and submit it to a vote of the House.

POLICEMEN AND THE FLAG

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of the United States has the American Flag been so dishonored as it has been in the past decade.

Hippies, yuppies, and others of their ilk find it expedient for their purposes to desecrate the flag. They defile it in ways which make an American's blood seethe in anger. They spit on it. They burn it. They tear it and wear it. They get a twisted pleasure from pulling the flag down from its standards and running up one belonging to a nation responsible for the deaths of 40,000 Americans.

These are the same people who heap abuse upon law enforcement officers at every opportunity. They scream insults and obscenities. Their actions would not be tolerated by any man. Yet police officers must endure the degradations or be accused of brutality.

How ironical it is that police officers, targets of the most despicable acts, should be the ones to take the boldest steps to restore the flag to the level of esteem it so richly deserves.

Police officers in the cities of Duquesne and Clairton in my 20th Congressional District, have elected to make a shoulder patch of the flag as part of their uniform. They wear it with pride. An attack upon an officer thus becomes an attack upon the flag itself, upon every American who takes pride in it, and upon the United States of America.

Other police departments in the Nation have followed the example set by the Duquesne and Clairton officers. These two organizations and Duquesne Police Capt. Debs Melegari, who inaugurated the idea in the district, have received the salutes of staff writers for the Pennsylvania division of the American Federation of Police and by Earle Wittpenn, managing editor of the New Daily Messenger in Homestead, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I share the pride of many Americans in the initiative taken by these officers. I commend the Pennsylvania division of the Federation of Police and Mr. Wittpenn for lauding them in public print.

I insert their writings in the RECORD and I call the attention of my colleagues to them:

POLICEMEN AND THE FLAG

"Old Glory," the "Stars and Stripes," the "Star-Spangled Banner"—our flag! Any American citizen, when he sees the flag, sees the nation itself, sees the country and our government, our ideals, our traditions and our history.

In peace and war, the Flag is always taken for granted. It is a symbol of our strength and of the blood shed in our nation's development.

You can link names like Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Betsy Ross and Francis Scott Key, but don't ever forget the names of those who died for the Flag. They represent every nation in the world—the Smiths and Messners, the Beesons and McKeevers, the Patellis and Alahouzos, the Urbanskis and Hrivnaks, the Tognarinas and Saccos, the Mendelwitzes and Ginsbergs—they as much as threaded the needle for Betsy Ross to sew the stars on the Flag.

The Flag has been planted firmly on the pinnacle of the American faith and has found itself in many foreign lands as an inspiration to millions. Now it has a place on the moon, as a symbol of the heritage of all free men.

The Flag has found itself a place also on the uniform of the policeman as a reminder to the citizens that the police officer is a

guardian and that, when he is attacked, the American people and their Flag are attacked.

The writers salute the Duquesne Police Department, along with Captain Debs Melegari, for the inauguration of this project that has been copied by police departments all over the nation. The policeman wears the shoulder patch with pride to be an American and to stand behind the Flag.

IT'S OUR FLAG—DUQUESNE PRIDE EVIDENT

Enthusiasm for the American flag, once a paramount trait among freedom-loving peoples, is being rejuvenated across the nation and this is good.

For too many years of late, respect for the flag has diminished and the strength of the nation has been jeopardized. This was not the case in years previous when people believed in and respected the flag.

Domestic strife has tainted the image of the flag because of the public's apathetic attitude.

But those who believe in it are once more leading the way and it's proving contagious.

Just recently the Duquesne Police Department, first in the valley, attached to its uniform a flag shoulder patch. This proves their pride and respect for our national standard.

Other departments in the nation are cognizant of what's happening in Pennsylvania and are following the example. This can only mean a rebirth of the spirit that has helped to make America the great nation it is.

In still many other areas, but not yet here in the Steel Valley, official council, or elective bodies have begun the practice of opening meetings with the Pledge of Allegiance. This, too, is good for democracy and sets an excellent example for the young people of the nation whose minds have not been fully inculcated with the idea of patriotism.

Parents, too, are displaying more enthusiasm for the flag. The evidence is particularly strong during national holidays when home owners display the standard to commemorate whatever the holiday might be.

Communities, like Homestead and Clairton, have also stressed the importance of the flag. The impressive display of the standard along the business areas of these two communities is without equal in any other city across the land.

So, Mr. and Mrs. America, we are finally recognizing the need for more emphasis on patriotism. Perhaps now we can settle down to deal with some of the internal problems which created a deterioration of our patriotic feelings.

Perhaps now we can, with a measure of reason, discuss and overcome the problem of racial strife, college turmoil and any other problem before us.

These problems are serious and require constant attention and effective solution. But this can be done without diminishing our belief in the principles on which the nation was founded.

The Duquesne police, like many other people across the land, have set an excellent example. Let it spread wide and far as quickly as possible so that we and our neighbors in other parts of the world will readily recognize that we are still the strongest and most patriotic people in the universe.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the News Gazette, the Sterling, Ill., Gazette, the Chicago Daily News, and the Elgin, Ill., Courier-News, in the State of Illinois. The editorials follow:

[From the News Gazette, Aug. 1, 1969]

LARGER TRUCKS ALLOWED? NO

A proposal now pending in Congress would allow operation of larger and heavier trucks on the Interstate highway system.

We are opposed to the bill and believe a majority of citizens will be, if the facts are known and digested.

Already, the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs have voiced strong opposition to the proposed legislation.

The present "big truck" bill is almost identical to the measure proposed in Congress last week which brought an avalanche of critical public opinion and much editorial criticism in the nation's press. Many leaders in the motor safety and highway uses field, concur with the view expressed by Gerald W. Cavanagh, Chicago Motor Club president, that passage of this bill "would result in premature damage to pavement and bridges and would constitute a major hazard to others using the traffic lanes."

The current bill calls for raising the weight limit for single axles to 20,000 pounds (up from 18,000) and for tandem axles to 34,000 pounds (up from 32,000) and for permitting truck lengths up to 70 feet and widths up to 102 inches.

The measure is called a permissive bill, as it would simply permit the states to authorize larger truck sizes on interstate highways within their borders. But in the past, most states have been quick to go along with the trucking interests. They have strong lobbies in the state capitals. And inasmuch as trucks have to get off the big interstate highways to make pickups and deliveries, they presumably would be permitted on smaller roads as well.

The measure is defended by trucking interests as a way of enabling construction of "safer trucks" and as an overdue "unfreezing" of truck size limits set by the 1956 highway act. For truckers, bigger vehicles mean bigger loads and more profits.

In opposing the measure, Cavanagh declared that the men "who have been charged with the responsibility of constructing and maintaining our highways at both the state and the federal level have made it known that the increases in axle loadings permitted by the legislation will not only reduce the life of pavements in use, but will also necessitate the expenditure of billions of dollars for reconstruction of older pavements, and additional costs in highways yet to be constructed."

While basic research into the accident hazards posed by larger, wider trucks is lacking, we believe most operators of passenger vehicles don't want to see any larger trucks and semi-trailers plying the highways than are now in legal use.

We agree with the AAA officials that before any such bigger truck legislation is even considered in Congress, some basic research should be done first on this question. The lives and property of more than 100 million drivers are involved in such a decision. As one official commented, "we cannot ask them to be guinea pigs by increasing the sizes and weights and then researching the effects."

From several standpoints, including safety of passenger vehicles and motorists, avoidance of further traffic congestion and more difficult driving conditions, and the probable greater wear-and-tear on the highways and expressways if larger trucks should be allowed, we think adoption of the current proposal should be speedily killed in Congress.

For those who so agree, a letter to a congressman or senator expressing your view, probably would be helpful.

[From the Sterling (Ill.) Gazette,
July 23, 1969]

BID FOR BIGGER TRUCKS

The trucking industry, engaged in a determined campaign for the last year or so to persuade the government to give even larger

trucks the run of the nation's road, has lately come up with a new argument to bolster its case.

Industry spokesmen asserted in congressional hearings that the size and weight hikes desired would actually contribute to highway safety. Their reasoning is that by abandoning the present weight limit—73,280 pounds—for trucks on the interstate system and adopting instead an axle-spacing formula, weight distribution would be improved. Trucks might be heavier—up to 92,500 pounds—and wider, but also better-balanced, and therefore less of a hazard to truckers, passenger car drivers, bridges and the roadways themselves.

There is no question that trucking is a vital element in the transport system of a consumption-happy society or that there are valid arguments for bringing existing regulations into line with changing needs of the industry and public improved technology and highway facilities.

But this is one that is likely to be difficult to sell to drivers who have had white-knuckled experienced maneuvering around and among present width and weight trucks, or struggled to keep a car on the road in the gale-force winds frequently created in passing or being passed by trucks.

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Courier-News,
Aug. 6, 1969]

TRUCKS, BUSES BIG ENOUGH

Public opinion last year set up a roadblock against a Senate-passed bill permitting states to increase the weight and width of buses and trucks operating on the interstate highway system.

Now the bill has turned up again in the House public works subcommittee on roads, and trucking and bus interests are attempting to get a favorable recommendation.

The Senate-approved bill would allow states to increase the maximum weight of single-axle trucks from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds; of tandem-axle trucks from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds; and to replace the existing gross weight limit of 73,280 pounds with a sliding scale formula based on the distance between the front and rear axles and the number of axles on the vehicle. The maximum width would be increased from 92 to 102 inches.

The American Automobile Association has charged that the 1968 legislation would open the door to triple-trailer trucks on the interstate system. Motorists who find it difficult to pass the mammoth trucks on highways today would be up in arms if triple-trailer trucks were permitted.

Even a six-inch increase in the width of trucks would increase the safety hazards. The problem exists mainly on highways and streets removed from the interstate system. Drivers of many of the huge trucks already find it difficult to make turns at right-angle intersections.

Even though the federal legislation permits states to raise limits, the bill should be blocked in the House. Residents of Illinois and other states are all too familiar with the success of the trucking lobby in heading off increases in license fees and in diesel fuel taxes and getting its way on other legislation.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 9, 1969]

TRUCKS ARE BIG ENOUGH

The highway-busters are at it again, trying to persuade Congress to ease the rules limiting the weight, length and width of trucks on interstate roads. They got such a bill through the Senate last year, but luckily it died in the House. Now the measure is up for hearings before a House subcommittee and the truck and bus lobby is mounting a powerful pressure campaign in its behalf.

The proposed new limits exceed in most respects those permitted on Illinois highways. The bill, applicable at first only to in-

terstate routes, would sanction trucks 70 feet long, compared with the general 55-foot limit in Illinois. Truck width, now limited by federal and Illinois law to eight feet, would be broadened by six inches. The gross load limit of 73,280 pounds, now in effect on most state and federal highways, would be increased through a new formula based on length and number of axles.

If such behemoths were restricted to the new interstate freeways, which are usually built to withstand more abuse than the average state highway, a plausible case might be made for relaxing the rules. But as a practical matter the trucks must get off the freeways at various points to deliver their cargo. This means going over state and local roads and bridges that cannot take the pounding administered by the mastodons.

Truck lobbyists would be rushing to state capitals to persuade the legislatures to change state regulations to conform with federal standards. Civics books to the contrary, most Illinoisans know that our own Legislature in Springfield is particularly susceptible to the blandishments of the truckers. It would be only a matter of time before state officials caved in and gave the truckers what they want. Building state, county and local roads to handle the behemoths would result in an enormous increase in Illinois highway costs.

When Gov. Ogilvie proposed a substantial boost in diesel fuel taxes and truck licensing fees, pointing out that the fees hadn't been hiked in 18 years, the truckers insisted it was a specious argument and persuaded the Legislature to pare the governor's request. In Washington, the truckers are arguing that the best case for easing truck-size limits is that they haven't been changed in 13 years. Who's being specious now? Certainly not Gov. Ogilvie, who was quite right in saying that truckers have not borne their fair share of increased Illinois highway costs since 1951.

Congressmen should bear in mind what the trucking bill would cost their constituents back home, and defeat it. The sharp recent increase in Illinois road taxes should make this state's delegation in the House especially sensitive to the bill's local ramifications.

THE MARIHUANA PROBLEM

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the use of marihuana has expanded to frightening proportions in the United States. The number of people who have experimented with marihuana is estimated at 12 million, and that number is expected to increase. It is alarming to note that many college students have experimented with marihuana. If marihuana has some harmful effect on its users, we must discover it immediately.

I am, therefore, cosponsoring a measure, that will be dropped in the hopper shortly, to provide for the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Marihuana. This Commission would be composed of professionals who would consider the legal, social, and medical ramifications of marihuana smoking. The Commission's work should be concluded in 1 year, and would submit to the public its conclusions and recommendations. This would be a firm basis for comprehending and dealing with the problem, which is growing rapidly. We cannot permit such

a large number of our people, many of them young, to use a drug we know little about.

There are many questions about marihuana use that are presently unanswered. Our statistics about the number of users are not verifiable. Moreover, the pharmacology of marihuana is almost completely unknown. The immediate and long-term effects marihuana has on its users is anybody's guess. Its relationship to aggressive behavior and crime is a cipher, its relationship to the use of other drugs has never been answered.

It is high time that we educated ourselves about these important questions. I believe that an authoritative study that provided these facts would enable us to deal with the problem effectively. The problem is weighty. We must seek the answer.

TIMBER PRODUCTION AND THE NATIONAL HOUSING GOAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent months have focused attention on the glaring disparity between promise and performance in meeting national housing needs. Over the last few months it has become clear that there has been little effort to correlate Federal programs with the lofty 10-year national housing goals. In no area has this lack of coordination been more apparent than the timber sales program, which is administered by the Department of Agriculture. For nearly three-quarters of a century that Department has been responsible for disposing of all the timber made available from our national forests. This represents approximately one-third of the total annual timber output. At the present time, over 95 percent of all sales of timber from national forests are made at auctions conducted by the Department of Agriculture as long as the total amount of timber put up for sale exceeds \$2,000 in value, the sale is made at an auction.

The only test of a potential buyer's qualifications to bid at the auctions conducted by the Department of Agriculture is his ability to pay. Therefore, there is no assurance that the timber sold will be available to meet domestic housing needs. In point of fact, a large share of the logs are bought by foreign firms.

The basic premise of this bill is that our scarce timber resources should be carefully husbanded and, when used, should be utilized in that manner which best serves the interests of the American public. That interest has been emphatically enumerated in the statement of our Nation's housing goals. I think it is appropriate to note that the principle embodied in this proposal is particularly pertinent to the production of our national forests. These forests are, literally, the property of the people. Many of the forests have—since the founding of the States of our Nation—known no owner save the Government. The wisdom of our early leaders in preserving

these lands for public purposes is evident in many ways. It would be made more clearly manifest were we to enact the bill I propose and, thereby, insure that the public forests are used to serve the public welfare.

I would hope that this legislation would be viewed as a measure to advance the achievement of a priority national public policy goal, the national housing goal of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. This goal was mandated by the Congress and deserves to be implemented through the adoption of effective programs.

I am introducing a second bill today. It will complement the first by providing a badly needed supply of manpower to assist in making the management of our national forest resources more efficient. As the situation now stands our federally owned forests which represent over half of our total timber acreage produce scarcely one-third of our total timber production. Hopefully, the manpower that will be made available through the Youth Conservation Corps will enable us to greatly increase the output of the federally owned and managed timber lands.

In addition the bill will provide a means for young people to pool and motivate talent that can immeasurably increase the managerial skill needed to make our national forests more productive.

Finally, the corps will further the cause of conservation of our natural resources. It will provide needed additional personnel for our national conservation areas, such as national parks and wildlife sanctuaries. It will provide young Americans with a better understanding of the important role conservation of natural resources can play in American life, and of the role they as individuals can play in furthering this conservation effort.

By working on new methods of increasing the yield of our national forest timberlands; by working on land and water reclamation projects and by communicating their ideas and enthusiasm to all types of conservation projects, young Americans if given the opportunity through the Youth Conservation Corps can make a vital and lasting contribution in an area of national significance.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH RESNICK

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to the memory of former colleague Joe Resnick, of New York, whose sudden and untimely passing leaves us all deeply saddened.

Joe Resnick came to the 89th Congress in 1965 and left in 1968. In the 4 years that he served here, he made his presence felt throughout this Chamber through the force of his intellect, the power and warmth of his personality,

and his determination to serve his people to the best of his ability.

In his first term in Congress, Joe Resnick played a vital role in passing the historic legislation that makes the 89th Congress a high-water mark in American history.

All of us are richer for having known and worked with him. Though he served only two terms in Congress, his example of a dedicated, hard-working Congressman will be remembered long after all of us are gone.

Mrs. Boggs and I have lost a friend. Together, we express our deep sense of loss to Mrs. Resnick and their four children.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) in expressing my shock and my sorrow at the untimely death of our former colleague here in the House, the late Honorable Joseph Y. Resnick.

Joe Resnick was a fine legislator. He was fearless in dealing with causes which he felt were right. For example, when he could not get official action in areas he felt needed attention, he did not hesitate to launch his own unofficial hearings to air the controversy.

His tenure in Congress was too short. He made a strong bid for a seat in the U.S. Senate last year, but lost out in a bitter three-way race.

Joe Resnick earned high respect among his colleagues, especially those who entered Congress with him in 1965. He was as industrious as a legislator as he was in his business life where he built a prosperous electronic business in cooperation with two brothers.

He was with us in Congress—and in life—too short a time. Our Nation needs Joe Resnicks. We all miss him.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks I am including the text of the obituary on Mr. Resnick which appeared in a Washington newspaper:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 7, 1969]

EX-REP. RESNICK DIES; ELECTRONICS EXPERT

Former Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, 44, of Ellenville, N.Y., who made a fortune in the electronics field, died yesterday of a heart attack while in Las Vegas on a business trip.

Mr. Resnick, elected to the House in 1964 was the first Democrat in recent history to win a congressional seat from his central Hudson Valley district.

He dropped out of the House a year ago to run for the U.S. Senate, but lost his party's nomination to Paul O'Dwyer, a Vietnam dove, in a bitter three-way race that also included Eugene H. Nickerson, the Nassau County executive.

A strong supporter of the Johnson administration's Vietnam policy, Mr. Resnick earned the reputation of a "hawk" in the senate race.

DEVELOPED BUSINESS

Mr. Resnick and his brothers Harry and Louis started Channel Master Corp. in 1947

to manufacture a pre-assembled television antenna. The business developed from a \$7,000 operation in an Ellenville barn to a corporation with 1,000 employees and sales of \$45 million a year.

Mr. Resnick held several patents for electronic devices, including the one for the first preassembled television antenna, which he conceived while installing unwieldy antennas on roofs during cold weather.

The Channel Master Corp. now makes transistor radios and televisions sets, and is engaged in plastic research.

Mr. Resnick was born in Ellenville, the son of a poor Russian immigrant. Before being elected to the House, the only political experience he had was a successful race for the Ellenville school board.

He won reelection to the House in 1966, and during his second term took up the cause of Lt. Cmdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter who was removed as commander of the U.S. destroyer Vance on charge of irregularities.

Mr. Resnick held three days of unofficial hearings and called for the resignation of Paul R. Ignatius as Secretary of the Navy.

ATTACKED FARM BUREAU

His best known campaign in Congress was against the American Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. Resnick repeatedly attacked the organization's tax exempt status, noting the Farm Bureau was in several profit-making ventures, including the sale of insurance policies.

Congressional investigations of the Farm Bureau were promised by several of Mr. Resnick's colleagues, but no major action was ever taken.

Mr. Resnick defeated incumbent Rep. J. Earnest Wharton, a Republican during the 1964 Johnson landslide. In 1966 he defeated Hamilton Fish Jr. Fish won Mr. Resnick's seat in 1968.

Mr. Resnick is survived by his wife, Ruth, and four children Jeffery, Todd, David and Debbie, his two brothers, all of Ellenville, and two sisters.

Services will be tomorrow in Ellenville, with burial in Ezrath Israel Cemetery in Wawarsing, N.Y.

THOMAS P. REILLY: DEDICATED LAW ENFORCER

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I was recently notified by the executive secretary for the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police of the tragic events which occurred on the evening of September 8, 1969, resulting in the deaths of a police patrolman—that same evening—and of the newly elected association president, Chief Thomas P. Reilly, on September 13.

Reading this report brought to mind the great many similar statements I read during my more than 20 years as a law-enforcement officer. In each case then—as in the present case—a great sadness rests within me. At this point in the RECORD I would like to commend this report to the attention of my colleagues:

On Monday evening, September 8, 1969 at approximately 9:30 in the evening a report was received by Onelida Police Department describing the car and a description of the driver of the car who had just held up a gas station in Canastota with the use of a fire arm. The Village of Canastota, City of Sherrill, and the City of Onelida are on a radio net together and in a few moments Sherrill

Patrolman, Robert Mumford radioed that he had a suspect in custody. The suspect was stopped about one thousand feet from President Reilly's home, and he immediately went to the aid of his patrolman. At the same time, two patrol cars from the City of Onelida and a patrol car from the Village of Canastota with the complainant in the car proceeded to the site in Sherrill where the suspect was being detained. I also drove towards Sherrill in an effort to give any assistance to President Reilly that I could. President Reilly and I were in radio contact and he advised me not to take unnecessary chances, that the suspect had identified himself with his registration, operator's license and credit cards, and that he was very cooperative and was under control. Suddenly, President Reilly radioed back that he and Patrolman Mumford had been shot and the suspect was heading East. The suspect, according to President Reilly, was standing with his back towards President Reilly, facing Patrolman Mumford and was about three feet distant from President Reilly when he suddenly whirled with a gun in his hand and told the president to put his hands up. President Reilly reached for the suspect and the suspect shot him in the chest and in the same instance grabbed Reilly's gun from his holster emptying the gun as he whirled and fired three shots from a .38 revolver at Patrolman Mumford, one bullet entering Mumford's body just below the heart and spun around the rib cage destroying his pancreas, his liver, his lung and cutting the large intestine. President Reilly tried to crawl towards his car to summon radio help and was shot twice while he was on the ground. On bullet entering his left arm causing a compound fracture of the bone near the shoulder and the second bullet entering the right abdomen which cut an eight inch gash in the large bowel and cut the colon.

Patrolman Mumford died later that night and at this writing, President Reilly is still considered to be in critical condition. His condition is neither improved nor deteriorated since he was wounded. The Doctor tells us that each day increases his chances of recovery. I was allowed to see him last night for two minutes.

When I arrived at the scene of the shooting, and I believe I was the first one there, Chief Reilly's concern was not for himself, but for the quick medical aid for his Patrolman and to make sure that I had the description, name, registration and credit card of his assailant. President Reilly lived up to every tradition of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police and that of a good police officer and did it without regard for himself or any fear. May God let him live so that he can lead us for the remainder of the year as our President and remain with us for many years.

September 14, 1969—It is with deep regret that I announce the death of President Thomas P. Reilly. He suffered a cardiac arrest on September 13, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his family for the great loss they have suffered.

POP FESTIVALS—NOT THE HARMLESS DIVERSIONS CLAIMED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, we may all recall the news accounts in mid-August of the Woodstock Music and Art Fair, characterized as a gathering of "beautiful" people whose peaceful conduct was

only surpassed by the utopian aura surrounding the entire collection of some 400,000 adherents to the cult of ignorant bliss. Of course, in this light, any incidents of unlawful conduct were muted, because in such a paradise, law represents nothing more than the provocation of violence.

At the risk of offending the sensitivities of some who have hailed these festivals of recent months as islands of paradise, I call the attention of my colleagues to the police reports of the Atlantic City Pop Festival, preceding the Woodstock Festival by 2 weeks. Among a crowd, estimated to number about 160,000, the record shows that within a 3-day period there were 229 general police investigations, 32 arrests for narcotics, lewdness and disorderly conduct, six arrests for drinking while driving, 34 traffic complaints, 19 motor vehicle accidents of which one was fatal, and nearly \$45,000 in stolen property. In addition, 247 persons were treated at local hospitals, 53 for use of narcotics and other drugs.

In the August 1969 issue of the Triangle, the official publication of the New Jersey State Police, the prevention of a major disorder was attributed to the visible presence of an adequate number of law enforcement officers. Some may dispute this, but recent history is permeated with strong evidence that, unfettered by any semblance of order, people will destroy not only themselves, but anything within their reach. I submit the observation that within this decade, defiance of the law and the permissiveness of public authorities in tolerating lawlessness in the first instance are perhaps our major social problem, the effects of which hinder the achievement of every other social objective, however meritorious. I am sure it disturbs our constituencies to think that mass gatherings, in some instances, have been given virtual immunity from the law while this same law punishes those who exceed its limitations in individual actions.

I include the full text of the Triangle's account of the Atlantic City Pop Festival, not the harmless type of diversion which many have claimed:

The hirsute, the hip, the hangers-on and the ardent devotees of rock music by the thousands made the trip to Atlantic City on Friday August 1, for a deafening three days at the Atlantic City Pop Festival and a tribal gathering of the New Generation.

Early arrivals began camping out on grounds, on and adjacent to the (Atlantic City Race Track), in established campgrounds and private lots that had been turned into campgrounds by the owners.

A 211-man State Police detail, under the direct supervision of Captain John Carpani, was used for policing the perimeter of the Atlantic City Race Course. Security at the track was provided by 100 guards hired for the duration of the festival by the promoters.

A large contingent of Division manpower was visible throughout the three days and presumed responsible for preventing any civil disturbance such as rock throwing, gate crashing, personal injury, and destruction of property which marred the recent gatherings in Newport, Denver and Los Angeles.

Even without the violence, there was no preventing the major traffic problem, filth and debris that usually accompanies this form of invasion. Anyone who might think

that pop festivals are harmless diversions should be reminded of the following police activities: 229 general police investigations; 32 arrests for narcotics, lewdness and disorderly conduct; 6 arrests for drinking driving; 34 traffic complaints; 19 motor vehicle accidents (one fatal); 139 motor vehicle summonses; 186 dismounted posts; and nearly \$45,000 in stolen property reported (\$3,758 was recovered).

During the three days, 247 persons were treated at local hospitals for illness or injury—53 for the use of narcotics and other drugs.

At the conclusion of the festival, there was 114,100 paid attendance reported. However, it was estimated that 160,000 persons were in and around the track during the three day period.

WILLY BRANDT: NEW LEADER FOR GERMANY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week there was an unfounded attack on the new head of government of West Germany, Willy Brandt, appearing in these pages.

I think a much more balanced view is included in Time magazine for October 10, 1969. With unanimous consent I enter it at this point in the RECORD:

WEST GERMANY: OUTCASTS AT THE HELM

Bismarck barred them from political life, and Kaiser Wilhelm scourged them as an unpatriotic rabble. Konrad Adenauer, who presided over the rebirth of West Germany, dismissed them as unfit to govern, and for years millions of his countrymen agreed. Last week, in the wake of one of the closest elections in the 20-year history of the Federal Republic, the Social Democrats, long the outcasts of German politics, prepared to take power. Unless the coalition carefully pasted together with the Free Democrats suddenly comes unstuck, Willy Brandt will be sworn in as the Chancellor of West Germany on Oct. 21, thus becoming the first Socialist to lead a German government since 1930.

This was an election that could easily have earned Germany new notoriety in the international community. The right-wing National Democrats of Adolph ("Bubi") von Thadden might have won 5% of the national vote and thereby earned the right to sit in the Bundestag (parliament); in that case, fears of renaissance Nazism would have chilled much of the world. As it turned out, the National Democrats were able to draw only 4.3%. Far from becoming a black mark against West Germany's name, the election turned into what could well prove a historic turning point.

It was Brandt's own daring as much as the actual election results that brought the Socialists to the brink of power. Neither of the two major parties won an outright majority. The long dominant Christian Democrats, who had promised "no experiments," remained the largest party, with 15.2 million votes or 46.1% of the total—a 1.5% decline from the last election in 1965. The Socialists, who pledged to "Build the Modern Germany," won 14 million votes, increasing their 1965 percentage by 3.4% and capturing 42.7% of the electorate. Ironically, the party that ended up holding the balance of power was the one that had lost the most: the Free Democrats, an unlikely assortment of conservative and far-left liberals, had lost

19 of their 49 seats in the Bundestag, and their share of the total vote dropped from 9.5% in 1965 to a mere 5.8%—just above the 5% required for representation in the Bundestag. After three days of intense negotiations, the Free Democrats, who are led by Walter Scheel, threw their slight but decisive weight behind Brandt. At week's end the one-time outcast of West German politics informed President Gustav Heinemann that he was prepared to form a government in coalition with the Free Democrats and rule the Federal Republic.

CONSIDERED TO THE PAST

It was an auspicious moment for a party that not too long ago seemed irretrievably locked into the role of the opposition, unable to break its blue-collar mold and incapable of attracting much more than one-third of the voters. Throughout the country there was a deep and exciting awareness that a watershed had been reached. After 20 years of uninterrupted rule Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger's Christian Democrats prepared to take their places on the opposition benches. Said the conservative *Bayern Kurier*: "The political generation of postwar times finally belongs to the past."

Not unlike the Democrats and Republicans, Germany's two major parties share many fundamental beliefs, including a firm commitment to NATO and a desire for British entry into the Common Market. But in style as well as substance, there are important differences. While the Christian Democrats are older and more cautious, the Social Democrats emphasize youth and a flair for innovation. While the Germany of Adenauer, Ludwig Erhard and Kiesinger was a reliable if overly dependent partner of the West, Brandt's Socialists are certain to be more assertive and fluid, especially in foreign relations.

In an effort to ease the tensions that have contorted Central Europe since the end of World War II they are committed to launch bold new initiatives toward the Soviet Union and its East European allies. At home, the Socialists promised to bring an innovative approach to problems of university reform, youthful unrest and individual rights. Among their first acts is likely to be an upward revaluation of the muscular German mark, probably fixing its price around the 26.5¢ level to which it has floated since it was cut loose from its old 25¢ price the day after the election (see BUSINESS). Also expected swiftly is ratification of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty—a move that could persuade several smaller, weaker countries to sign the document.

A change of power was bound to be beneficial for West Germans. Twenty years in office is a long time for any party, especially in Germany, with its authoritarian heritage. Furthermore, West Germany has lacked an effective political opposition since the Socialists joined Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger's Grand Coalition three years ago.

There were also risks. Willy Brandt's partnership with the Free Democrats might prove precarious from a practical standpoint because the Free Democrats are a schizophrenic party. It was formed in 1948, composed largely of business and professional men who found the C.D.U. too "black" or Catholic and the S.P.D. too "red" or socialist. At first the F.D.P. was dominated by a rightwing of naysayers—businessmen who thought there was too much welfare spending. Protestants wary of the C.D.U.'s heavy Catholic influence, nationalists who felt Bonn was too pro-American. Scheel belonged to the Free Democrats' younger left wing, and when he took over 21 months ago, he set about transforming party policy from right of the C.D.U. to left of the S.P.D. on a number of important issues. Since there are still conservatives in his party that resent the leftward move, the party could conceivably break apart under the strain of government and leave Brandt

stranded without a majority in the Bundestag.

There is some question whether Brandt will make a good Chancellor. Reserved and thin-skinned, Brandt may find the perpetual pummeling that high office brings unbearable. Furthermore, his own past—his illegitimate birth, his "defection" from Nazi Germany and acceptance of Norwegian citizenship—turns many Germans from him. Those very credentials, however, enable him to speak far more candidly about Germany's past than Kiesinger, who had been a Nazi official. As mayor of West Berlin and later as Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister in the Grand Coalition, Brandt performed admirably. In Berlin, he coolly faced down the Soviets during the 1959 crisis, when Nikita Khrushchev threatened the city's links to the West. As Bonn's foreign policy expert since 1966, he began an *Ostpolitik* diplomacy, seeking new amity with the East that his government is certain to emphasize with new vigor.

LITTLE COALITION

Seldom has such a momentous political change been caused by such a small shift in the vote. As the first returns trickled in, computers forecast that the Christian Democrats would make a strong showing. The outcome seemed so certain that in the early evening President Nixon sent a congratulatory message via the Washington-Bonn "hot-line" teletype to Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger.

Later, as the trend changed by mere fractions of points, the C.D.U.'s lead dwindled until it was left with 242 seats, seven short of a majority in the 496-seat Bundestag. Together, the Socialists with 224 seats and the Free Democrats with 30 held a margin of twelve seats over the C.D.U. Earlier, Brandt had declared that he would need a majority of 13 to 30 seats to put together a coalition with the Free Democrats. The moment he caught a whiff of power, however, he lowered his sights. Surrounded by a dozen close colleagues in Bonn's drab Socialist headquarters, which are aptly called "the Barracks," Brandt announced just before midnight: "I'll do it, even if we have only a majority of two." With that, he telephoned the Free Democrats' Walter Scheel to ask if he were interested in trying to form a coalition.

Brandt offered Scheel the foreign ministry, plus two middle-level posts (interior and agriculture) in the 15-member Cabinet. Belatedly, the C.D.U. weighed in with an even more generous offer, including both the foreign and finance ministries. Said one Free Democrat: "The C.D.U. is willing to give us everything but the chancellorship." Too late. In a party caucus, the Socialists unanimously voted for the "Little Coalition" with the Free Democrats. With three members abstaining, the Free Democrats also endorsed the union. According to the present schedule, President Heinemann will nominate Brandt as Chancellor on Oct. 19, the Bundestag will vote on the proposal two days later, and if he wins the election, Brandt will be formally installed the same day.

Manfully, the Christian Democrats insisted that it might not be so bad, after all, to play the role of the opposition against a shaky coalition. As the largest party, the Christian Democrats will have a tight grip on the many key committees; they also will be able to delay and block legislation in the Bundesrat (upper house), where they still command a 21-to-20 majority.

WORTH THE RISK

After an initial period of indecision, Kiesinger decided that he would direct the opposition in the Bundestag himself. But the C.D.U. leaders were also confronted with some fundamental decisions about the party's direction. There will be a chorus of voices, probably led by Bavarian Party Chief Franz-Josef Strauss, favoring a move toward the right to attract those who may desert the defeated National Democrats.

There are certain to be strong tugs in the other direction as well to keep the party in the middle of Germany's political spectrum. The Christian Democrats will not only have to resolve those conflicting pressures but also to produce new faces and more attractive ideas. A promise to preserve the status quo is no longer an appealing platform.

For Brandt, the swift move to snatch the chancellorship from the C.D.U. is obviously the gamble of his career. In the unlikely event that the Free Democrats do not hold to their bargain, his action in hastily forming a government will appear overreager and precipitous. Once in power, he will still face severe problems of operating with a narrow majority. There is also the possibility that the Christian Democrats may try to induce defections among the Free Democrats who belong to the conservative wing of the party. Brandt is betting that the Socialists will do so well in office that even if the Free Democrats should defect after a year or so, he could call new elections and win a substantial margin of seats. In any event, to Brandt it is worth the gamble if it means the Socialists can once again hold the power that has so often eluded them.

German socialism is rooted in the French Revolution, the dialectics of Hegel and the philosophy of Karl Marx, who as a German exile in London took a special interest in the activities of his brethren in the homeland. The party itself was not formally founded, however, until 1869, when the German Workers Party was born in Eisenach.

Power did not come easily to the Socialists. Though they are Germany's oldest political party, until now they have been in power for only two brief periods during the 100 years of their existence. As advocates of internationalism, democracy, a distinct separation between church and state and improved social conditions, the Socialists naturally aroused deep suspicions in the monarchical, clerical, nationalistic Germany of the 19th century. "For me, every Social Democrat is an enemy of the Realm and of the Fatherland," declared Kaiser Wilhelm II. "That party, which dares to attack the foundations of the state, which revolts against religion and does not even stop at the person of the Almighty Rule, must be crushed."

Instead, the Socialists helped crush the Kaiser by leading the revolution that broke out in the closing days of World War I. When the Weimar Republic was established in 1919, the first government was led by the Socialists, who ruled for two years. It was a dubious honor. Socialist Foreign Minister Hermann Müller was obliged to sign the harsh Versailles Treaty, putting the onus of Germany's defeat on the party that many nationalists already blamed for stabbing the country in the back by calling for the overthrow of the monarchy while the war was still going on. In 1928, another Socialist-led government took power. But Germany, beset by inflation and plagued by increasing political violence, proved ungovernable. After the Socialists resigned over cuts in unemployment insurance in 1930, the Weimar Republic fell increasingly under the power of the Socialists' enemies—the brown-shirted Nazis of Adolf Hitler.

STREET FIGHTER

The rivalry between the Nazis and Socialists spilled over into bloody street battles that erupted all over Germany. In the Baltic seaport of Lübeck, the Nazis met a tough opponent in a husky, square-jawed youth named Herbert Karl Frahm, a member of the Socialist youth club. The son of an unmarried shopgirl whose lover had deserted her before the child's birth, Herbert Karl and his mother lived as boarders in the home of a chauffeur whose own wife had little patience with the child. Perhaps to compensate for his unhappy circumstances, the boy excelled at school, winning a schol-

arship to the Lübeck gymnasium, and developed an abiding interest in politics. Because of his lower-class origins, his inclination was instinctively socialist. "Social responsibility and a sense of justice are probably rooted more deeply when they are based on personal experience," he once said. He soon attracted the attention of one of Germany's most influential Socialists, Julius Leber, who represented Lübeck in the Reichstag. Leber encouraged the gifted youngster to write articles for the local party newspaper, which he did under the pen name Willy Brandt. As Brandt later wrote: "I had grown up without a father; there was an emptiness in my life. Leber filled it."

In 1933, only a few days after Hitler had seized power, Julius Leber was beaten by Nazi storm troopers and put under arrest. His young protégé helped organize a protest rally. Then, in danger of arrest by the newly formed Gestapo (secret police), the 19-year-old youngster hopped aboard a fishing boat in Lübeck and made his way to Norway. When the Germans invaded Norway in 1940, Brandt put on a Norwegian soldier's uniform in an attempt to evade detection by the Gestapo, who would have arrested him for his resistance connections. The ruse worked, and after a four-week internment as a prisoner of war, Brandt was released as harmless. He quickly made his way by auto and foot across Norway to neutral Sweden, where he later was joined by his Norwegian wife, Karlota. While in Stockholm, Brandt learned that Julius Leber had been executed as one of the conspirators in the plot to kill Hitler and end the war.

THE OTHER GERMANS

After Germany's defeat, Brandt, who by then had become a Norwegian citizen, returned to his shattered former homeland to cover the war-crime trials at Nürnberg for Scandinavian papers. While reporting on the trials, Brandt wrote a thoughtful book entitled *Criminals and Other Germans*, in which he pointed out that while the guilty Nazis should be punished, there also were decent Germans who could be counted on to build a democratic nation.

In late 1946, Brandt arrived in Berlin as a Norwegian major assigned to liaison work with the Four Power Control Commission that was run by Britain, France, the Soviet Union and the U.S. As a member of the occupying force, Brandt enjoyed privileges and comforts of the victors, but he felt a growing obligation toward Germany.

A major influence on him was Ernst Reuter, a Socialist professor who had returned from exile in Turkey. Reuter was leading the struggle in Berlin against Russian attempts to force the Socialists to join the Communists in a single party. At the end of 1947, Brandt became a German citizen again, explaining to his Scandinavian friends: "It is better to be the only democrat in Germany than one of many in Norway or another country where everyone understands democracy."

As the rivalry between the U.S. and Russia deepened, Berlin, 110 miles behind the Iron Curtain, became the principal tension point. As an aide to Reuter, who had been elected mayor, Brandt was in the front trench of the Cold War. In 1949, after the Allied airlift and the resistance of West Berliners had forced the Soviets to lift their 332-day blockade of the city, Brandt became West Berlin's representative to Bonn, where a new West German government was being formed. Though the Socialists felt they deserved to lead the new Germany, they won only 29.2% of the vote in the first national election. As a result, the newly formed Christian Democratic Union, led by Konrad Adenauer, came to power with the margin of a single vote in the Bundestag.

Adenauer's Christian Democrats steered West Germany into a close alliance with the West and presided over the great economic boom—the *Wirtschaftswunder*—that brought

unparalleled prosperity to the country. The Socialists meanwhile remained locked in the "30% ghetto," unable to broaden their support beyond workers and left-wing intellectuals. The Socialists' leader, Dr. Kurt Schumacher, was strangely out of tune with the political realities of West Germany. He favored neutrality at a time when West Germans wanted the Western Allies to protect them from the Russians; he called for a tightly controlled economy at a time when Germany was just emerging from the tightly centralized direction of the Nazi period. At a time of great social flux, Schumacher retained the party's unfortunate old image of proletarians who were not *salonfähig*—fit to be brought into the parlor.

DUMPING MARK

Willy Brandt also felt locked into a more personal ghetto. Though the Socialists ruled West Berlin, the fact that he was not a native Berliner handicapped his rise within the party. As he turned 40, Brandt was an extremely frustrated man. Then, in the course of one night in 1956, Brandt became the hero of West Berlin. The occasion was a protest rally in West Berlin against the Soviet suppression of Hungary. A crowd of nearly 100,000 West Berliners was headed toward the Soviet sector of Berlin at Brandenburg Gate, crying "Russians, get out!" Brandt commandeered a sound truck and managed to divert most of the marchers to the memorial for the victims of Communist tyranny, far back from the sector borders. But even as Brandt addressed the crowd, word came that a small breakaway group had pushed through police lines near the gate and was advancing toward the East German guards. Rushing to the scene, Brandt averted a certain blood bath by persuading the column to turn back. His plucky courage impressed even the self-assured Berliners, to whom he suddenly became "*unser Willy*"—our Willy. The following year Brandt was elected governing mayor of West Berlin.

Brandt's victory coincided with a changing mood within the Socialist Party in West Germany. Restless Socialists, less interested in rigid dogmas than a chance to get into the parlor, demanded a change. Under the guidance of Herbert Wehner, an irascible former Communist who is the party's chief strategist, the Socialists at a crucial meeting at Bad Godesberg in 1959 dumped their Marxist ballast and sought to transform themselves from a party of the workers into one of the people. Instead of the old dogma about class warfare and the rule of the proletariat, the Socialists endorsed a mixed economy, the profit motive, parliamentary democracy and a close military alliance with the West. They even settled their old feud with the church. "Socialism," proclaimed the Bad Godesberg platform, "is not a substitute for religion."

Brandt became the standard-bearer for the revitalized party. In the 1961 elections, he waged a U.S.-style campaign, stomping the country and pumping hands, that raised the S.P.D. share of the vote to 36.2%. In 1965, the Socialists' showing rose to 39.3%, but the C.D.U. remained in power under Ludwig Erhard as Chancellor. It was Brandt's second straight defeat, and once again his party had failed to break through the 40% barrier. Discouraged, Brandt went into a personal decline, marked by long periods of introspection. Observers revived his old nickname, "*Weinbrand Willy*," because of his liking for brandy. During this period he collected a series of essays under the title *Draussen* (Outside). He had no idea how close he was to the inside.

In late 1966, in a protest against tax hikes, the Free Democrats suddenly resigned as partners in Erhard's coalition Cabinet. For five weeks, West Germany drifted without an effective government, while Socialist

Strategist Wehner pondered a dilemma: Should the S.P.D., out of power for 36 years, seek a coalition with the unpredictable Free Democrats and risk making a mess of things? Or should it bide its time and join a C.D.U.-led Grand Coalition to show voters that they were capable of governing the country? Wehner chose the second course, and the experiment turned out to be a success.

In the Grand Coalition, the nine Socialist Ministers (out of 19) were the stars of the government. Socialist Economics Minister Karl Schiller guided West Germany out of its economic slump; Transportation Minister Georg Leber (no relation to Julius) began unclogging Western Germany's *Autobahnen* by forcing freight off the roads and back onto the deficit-ridden rails. Foreign Minister Brandt conducted an imaginative eastward-looking policy. Meanwhile the Free Democrats were moving away from conservative policies and closer to those of the Socialists. Last March, Socialist and Free Democrat members of the Bundestag joined forces to elect Gustav Heinemann as the first Socialist head of state in the 20-year history of the Federal Republic. It was a harbinger of things to come.

The Free Democrats' Scheel began to consider the possibility of a more lasting alliance with the Socialists. Engaging and affable ("I'm a court jester, just a king's fool"), Scheel is nonetheless considered to be a skillful politician, who, as Foreign Minister, will bring a light and sensitive touch to German diplomacy.

METAPHYSICAL "LEDERHOSEN"

Last week's pattern of voting buttressed the Socialists' optimism. In a country whose population is steadily growing younger, increasingly affluent and more urbanized, they outdrew the Christian Democrats handily among first-time voters, well-paid workers and city dwellers. They made inroads into the Catholic vote and the female vote, two blocs usually overwhelmingly loyal to the C.D.U. In the Bonn area, the Socialists scored an 8.6% increase, a testimonial that the government employees like to work for them.

Much of the credit for the electoral gains belongs to the team around Brandt. In pre-election polls, Brandt trailed both Kiesinger and his own Economics Minister Karl Schiller, who emerged as West Germany's popular politician. But Socialist publicists wisely played up the theme, "we have the right men."

A striking feature of Brandt's team is its relative youth in a land where "*Opa*"—grandpa—was long presumed to know best. Ever since the trauma of the Nazi atrocities and World War II, Germans have shouldered a heavy burden of guilt—their "cartel of anxiety," as they refer to it. But today, two-thirds of the men and half of the women among West Germany's 61 million people are under 40 and had little or nothing to do with the war. If many of them are "Hitler's children," born during his rule, the Führer would surely disown them. They are painfully aware of their country's Nazi past; two years ago, a public opinion poll showed that 60% of those between the ages of 16 and 29 would rather live in another country.

A similar poll conducted today might show that many more would be willing to stay at home and work at changing the country. To be sure, there are free love communes in West Berlin, pot-smokers and hippies in most large cities, but the mood of the young is, by and large, activist. Significantly, Nobel prize-winning Novelist Hermann Hesse no longer exerts a strong pull on young West Germans. To them, Hesse's romantic mystique of the outsider and his preoccupation with passive Oriental philosophies has about it what British Critic D. J. Enright calls "the smell of metaphysical *Lederhosen*." Hesse's appeal is largely to those racked by

uncertainty and disillusion, which explains his vogue on U.S. campuses, and, in the early postwar period, among Germany's youth.

Opinion surveys show that the majority of students are willing to accept the existence of East Germany as a separate state and to write off the territory beyond the Oder-Neisse line. German students have a deep revulsion to anything that reminds them of Hitler—and that sometimes includes their own parents. At the same time, students who only a few years ago looked to the U.S. as a model are now somewhat disenchanted, largely because of the Viet Nam war and U.S. racial disturbances. German students are also strongly antimilitaristic, a fact that will probably prompt the Socialists to cut the tour of duty for draftees from 18 months to 15; at present, 200,000 German youths between 19 and 24 are conscripted each year.

Old habits do not vanish overnight, however, and discipline is still next to godliness in the eyes of many Germans. According to one well-known barb, Germans obey the law because it's against the law not to do so. Yet there are signs that even in Germany, discipline is giving way to what Sociologist Ralf Dahrendorf, who also happens to be the Free Democrats' leading thinker, calls "the individual search for happiness by people freed of the fetters of tradition and thrown into the affluent society." Writes Dahrendorf in *Society and Democracy in Germany*:

"Discipline, orderliness, subservience, cleanliness, industriousness, precision, and all the other virtues ascribed by many to the Germans as an echo of past splendor have already given way to a much less rigid set of values, among which economic success, a high income, the holiday trip, and the new car play a much larger part than the virtues of the past. Younger people especially display little of the much praised and much scorned respect for authority, and less of the disciplined virtues that for their fathers were allegedly sacred. A world of highly individual values has emerged, which puts the experienced happiness of the individual in first place and increasingly lets the so-called whole slip from sight."

THE NEWEST WAVE

At the same time, more and more Germans seem willing to take an active role in shaping their surroundings. Emulating the questioning, self-critical approach of youth, Germans are beginning to examine their institutions and seek to run them. Parents, once the silent partners of the German Parent-Teacher Associations, demand a voice in how the schools are run. Churchgoers want a say in the allocation of the vast West German church tax resources and even in the selection of priests and higher church officials. Journalists seek the right to participate in the shaping of editorial policy. Germany finally seems to be developing what Novelist Günter Grass calls "voter initiative," a long step toward developing a true participatory democracy.

Recently the Germans have also begun to take a much more objective view of themselves. In the 1950s, according to opinion surveys, only 32% of them felt that their country alone was responsible for the war; now fully 62% believe that the blame was Germany's, a view more in line with the opinion of the rest of the world. In the 1950s, a majority of Germans felt that their image abroad was bad because foreigners were envious of Germany; now they concede that it might be because Germans have some negative characteristics and still have an abominable past to live down.

Even more striking perhaps than the restless mood of youth and the gradual erosion of traditional authority is that enduring

wonder, the German economy, which continues to pour forth much of the world's most sought after goods. There are more jobs than workers to fill them. Unemployment in West Germany is a scant one-half of 1% in a labor force of 26.3 million, and 1,400,000 foreign workers, mostly from the Mediterranean countries, have been imported.

As befits Teutonic efficiency, West Germans enjoy the world's most perfect color TV, and some the most incisive documentaries shown anywhere. In the past few years, however, the German literary scene has become less lively. Günter Grass's latest book, *Örtlich Betäubt* (roughly translated as *Locally Anesthetized*) is only a faint echo of *Tin Drum*; Uwe Johnson and Helmut Kirst have not published for several years. It may be that the wartime themes, the grist for German novels for the past 25 years, are beginning to pale. The best-received plays come from Vienna's experimental theaters. But the Stuttgart Ballet may be the world's most exciting dance group, and the German classical theater and opera remain first-rate.

In each successive phase in Germany's postwar development, the country has been seized by a different craze. First the hungry Germans gorged themselves in the *Fresswelle* (eating wave), then took to wheels in the *Vespa-welle* (motor scooter wave) that was followed by the *Autowelle* (auto buying). Next came the *Wohnungswelle* (home buying) and *Reisewelle* (traveling). Now Germans are inundated by the *Sexwelle*.

Naked girls adorn just about every magazine cover. Under the guise of adult sex education, film makers are cranking out movies with such titles as *Your Wife, the Unknown Creature*, in which live models demonstrate an astonishing variety of positions for intercourse, while a narrator (naturally a *Herr Doktor*) supplies clinical comments. Beate Uhse's sex boutiques in eleven cities offer all manner of sexual paraphernalia. Complains one Austrian, who deplors the Germanic lack of spontaneity: "There is a certain plodding quality in the German approach to sex. Boom. Boom. Boom. Now we have discovered sex and we will conquer it." Some Germans claim to see in the *Sexwelle* a new desire for Germany to place individual happiness ahead of duty to state or community.

PRIORITIES AND POLICIES

In this atmosphere, Brandt will seek to prove—even more conclusively than it was proved in the Grand Coalition—that his Socialists are eminently *regierungsfähig*, or able to govern.

And what of Brandt's own ability? He hardly fits the old stereotype of the super-efficient German. Though he usually struggles into his office by 9:00 a.m., he hates to get up and must be handled gingerly until he has had coffee and the first of the 40 or so *Attache* cigarillos he smokes each day. "The man is useless until noon," says one of his aides. A night creature, Brandt grows more animated as the hour grows later.

During the campaign, his early-afternoon speeches were wooden and broken; by 4 p.m., they were more coherent but still lacked vibrance; by 8, he was witty and forceful, holding the audience in his spell while tossing off withering asides to hostile hecklers. After that, while throwing back glasses of Benedictine and brandy, he often talked with local politicians and swapped political jokes with newsmen until 3 a.m. One of Brandt's favorites: After the Soviet-Czechoslovak summit confrontation at Cierna last summer, Soviet Party Boss Leonid Brezhnev turns to Premier Aleksei Kosygin and asks: "Did you see that beautiful watch Svoboda was wearing?" "No," replies Kosygin. "Let me see it."

Brandt has been attacked by conservatives

for the permissive attitude he and his second wife Rut show toward their two hippie sons. Peter, 21, was arrested last year for participation in a riot, sentenced to a \$50 fine and a four-week suspended jail term. Lars, 18, whose blond hair almost reaches his shoulders, said last week that even though he considers himself a member of A.P.O. (the far-left Anti-Parliamentary Opposition), he favored his father's coalition. But he expressed serious reservations about having to move from the Brandt home in Venusberg to Bonn's Palais Schaumburg, the residence of German Chancellors.

Vater Brandt has no such reservations. Once in the Palais, he can be expected to deal immediately with mark revaluation and the signing of the nuclear non-proliferation pact (which Klesinger resisted on the ground that it could leave Germany at a disadvantage in peaceful nuclear research). Brandt's main task will be to look eastward. He and Scheel are agreed on an approach to East Germany, which the Christian Democrats preferred to pretend did not exist. In hopes of easing the economic lot of the people in the East, Brandt aims to stop short of full diplomatic recognition but to seek closer travel and communications links and trade opportunities with the East Germans.

Brandt also harbors grander schemes for Europe that would break down the barriers between the East and West blocs. While some critics feel he is overly optimistic, he wants to accept the Soviet proposal for a European security conference, provided the U.S. would be invited to attend. He would be prepared to renounce Germany's claim to its lost territories that comprise some 40,000 square miles in Poland, in order to wind up the business left over from World War II.

SOVIET CONSIDERATIONS

The question is, would the other side cooperate? The Soviets were rooting for a Brandt victory as the lesser of two evils in the election, and *Izvestia* called him "more realistic on certain foreign policy questions." Perhaps they might sign a mutually attractive trade deal or grant Lufthansa landing rights in Russia. But so far, it seems unlikely that the collective leadership of Brezhnev and Kosygin would agree to any far-reaching accommodation with West Germany. One reason the Soviets moved against Czechoslovakia was that Brandt had opened negotiations in Prague that might have led to diplomatic relation and Germany investments in Czechoslovak industry. Soviet diplomats subsequently warned Brandt's aides that they do not want the Germans poking around in Eastern Europe. Still, Brandt is not likely to give up easily. For years the Soviets have unfairly castigated West Germany as a haven of unrepentant Nazis. It is a charge Brandt and the West Germany that helped bring him to power are both singularly well qualified to refute.

Brandt's administration means, in fact, a new era in which the power in West Germany has largely passed to the untainted Germans—those who were too young to be accomplices in Hitler's crimes. When Brandt cries, "Twenty years is enough!", it is not so much a plea for absolution as a reminder that a new generation is arriving and should not be condemned in advance.

The Germany of this new generation will be somewhat different and perhaps a bit difficult for its old allies. Yet it may well be a Germany that is far more attractive than any of the earlier generations were able to make. In one of Helmut Kirst's novels about World War II, a German soldier in Russia expresses the hope that maybe some day there may even be a Germany that is fun to live in. With luck, Brandt's Germany could be that place.

HARD TO BELIEVE—BUT TRUE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in this day of great national concern for the elimination of job discrimination against blacks, it is unbelievable, but true, that a black mayor would refuse to rectify blatant discrimination against black employees in an office under his control.

Even more reprehensible is the fact that Mayor Walter Washington of the District of Columbia, in his defense of racial discrimination, would resort to the antiquated clichés of bigots and racists.

In attempting to "whitewash" the case against a black employee, Mayor Washington may have served notice of his successful completion of the course in "white brainwashing" to which he has subjected himself in recent months. Apparently, he passed with honors.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Afro-American of September 27, 1969:

MAYOR'S DISAPPOINTING STAND ON DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT

The disappointment and outrage of several parties over the mayor's ruling in the case involving a housing inspector's complaint of discrimination is justified.

Mayor Walter E. Washington dismissed as baseless the charge of Joseph Watkins that he had been denied promotion because of prejudice in the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The mayor's action was taken despite findings to the contrary by two reputable bodies, one of which was appointed by the mayor. Both the D.C. Human Relations Commission, then under the directorship of Mrs. Ruth Bates Harris and a three-member ad hoc committee established by Mayor Washington determined after hearings that the evidence "amply supports the charge of discrimination in promotion to vacancies as they occurred in the Housing Division since the inception of that division."

The mayor's refusal to confirm the findings of the investigators is all the more surprising in that he admits that the record statistically supports a past pattern of discrimination existed within the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

After making this concession, Mayor Washington makes the contradictory statement that it does not follow that there was any discrimination against Watkins or other non-whites in the department.

How can patterns of discrimination exist unless exclusion has been practiced against individuals in promotions and hiring? And wasn't Mr. Watkins one of these individuals?

The mayor asserts that conditions which may have impaired equal opportunity in the Dept. of Licenses and Inspections have been eliminated (this is another admission of past discrimination) with the departure of "responsible parties" and the agency is moving aggressively to insure equal employment and opportunity under the present director of the Department, Julian Dugas.

We understand the mayor's pride in singling out the progress made in the department under the leadership of Mr. Dugas, who is one of the mayor's appointees. But we do not think that the mayor should use any

present day record of achievement to defend past inequities or even to suggest any new appointments or promotions counterbalance and offset what has been denied others.

The mayor's own committee, in a 3,600 page document reported these denials (AFRO, Sept. 20, 1969):

(1) Watkins, with an associate degree in sciences and advanced training with 14 years' experience in the Department received no promotion. At the time of the hearing (before the ad hoc committee), he was GS-8 by virtue of job upgradings. In the meanwhile, one Hobart Seese, a high school graduate, a retired military man, was promoted over Watkins and four other black employees with higher educational qualifications in September, 1967.

(2) As of July 16, 1967, there were 66 white employees in the Housing Division of L and I in grades GS-7 and above and 20 non-white employees in the Housing Division in grades GS-7 and above.

As for education, 69 percent of the white employees in GS-7 or above had only high school or less while 69.2 percent of non-white employees had some college or better education.

The record is studded with examples of individuals by name who were bypassed for promotion while whites advanced. The American Civil Liberties Union Fund, which provided legal services for Watkins, pointed out that evidence at the hearing showed that with a single exception of one black, every white employee who started service with Watkins has attained a GS-11 or better.

Thus, it is abundantly clear that black employees at the Department of Licenses and Inspections have been the victims of past discrimination. It has been just as obvious that the mayor, through his aides, has tried to rectify the situation but it seems to us, that one of the first steps in instituting justice is to see to it that those who have been the past victims of inequity be provided relief.

We are at loss to understand the mayor's attitude unless this statement issued by him provides a clue:

"I do not see in the record any basis for compensation to individuals because of alleged past discrimination. Furthermore, I have been advised that the District Government has no legal authority to make such payments."

Perhaps it was from fear that monetary judgment for the black employees would be sought (and maybe won from the District Government) for past Department wrongs that the mayor overrode the conclusions of the exhaustive hearings. We hope this consideration had no bearing on his ruling for what can be forgiven on principle will not be tolerated for expedience.

A TRIBUTE TO ANDREW G. LOHMAN

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in rural America we still occasionally find instances where one man, by his foresight, character, and leadership, molds the economic prosperity of an entire community. Such a man is Andrew G. Lohman, of Hamilton, Mich., who retired on September 30 after 48 years as manager of the Hamilton Farm Bureau Cooperative. When he took over as manager, the cooperative was considered a

failure with assets placed at a minus \$3,000. At his retirement, the Hamilton Farm Bureau Cooperative is the best known and one of the most prosperous farmer cooperatives in Michigan. Its sales volume is now \$7 million a year, and that on only \$13,820 of actual cash invested by stockholders. All of the business growth, except for this amount, has been financed out of reinvested profits.

The Hamilton community is an unincorporated village southeast of Holland, Mich. It is basically a community of thrifty farmers of Dutch descent. Back in 1921, when Andy Lohman became manager of the then struggling cooperative, diversified livestock and crop farming were the mainstay of the economy. Within 5 years, however, Lohman saw the opportunities in egg production, and he led the community into that specialized type of agriculture. Hamilton became known for egg production, and the cooperative became the economic center of the community. It remains the economic center today.

Through the years it has been frequently said that the cooperative is Hamilton and Andy Lohman is the cooperative. True leader that he is, Lohman modestly states that the success of the cooperative has not been accomplished by one individual. This is far from the facts, he says, because no single individual could have accomplished what has been done. Many individuals, he points out, played a big part in the development and success of the Hamilton Farm Bureau. The community accepts that remonstrance from him, but, in spite of it, they know that, without him, Hamilton would not be the prosperous farmers' village it is today.

While the fame of the Hamilton Farm Bureau Cooperative and much of its financial success rests in the egg business, Mr. Lohman believed in the importance of offering a wide variety of services to farmers. The development of a large dressed-poultry business was an obvious line of endeavor. Since feed is the most important item in the cost of producing eggs, and also a factor in quality, Mr. Lohman gave constant attention to poultry feeds. New and improved feed mills have been regularly installed. A poultry farm was organized as a separate corporation to run tests on feeds, to try out and demonstrate new ideas, to provide chicks from high-laying strains to the poultrymen of the area, and to operate on a profitable basis. Through the years, the Hamilton Farm Bureau has worked closely with the agricultural services of Michigan State University. The cooperative also operates enterprises in lumber and building materials, hardware and appliances, petroleum products, and a garage, which are used largely to service poultry enterprises in the community.

A man with an eighth-grade education plus a course at a business college, Andrew Lohman was endowed with a natural ability to learn quickly through observation and experience. He had good business judgment and the courage to undertake new ventures which appeared likely to succeed. Like many successful

men of his generation he can claim the distinction of a self-made man. But while many have been motivated to accumulate personal fortunes, Andy Lohman has dedicated his career to the success of a community through the vehicle of a cooperative. It is truly said of him that Andy has done for his community what others have done for themselves.

MEXICAN AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Mexican American Casualties in Vietnam," written by Dr. Ralph Guzman, Ph. D., professor of political science at Merrill College, of the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Dr. Guzman's study indicates that casualties among persons of Mexican American descent so far during the Vietnam war have been more than 50 percent greater than the ratio this minority group bears to our overall population.

These somber statistics prove once again, as similar experience in World War II and the Korean conflict showed, that the Spanish-surnamed community in the United States has traditionally shouldered its share, and more, of the burden of military service in America.

In commenting on the sizable military contribution of the Mexican American soldier, and his impressive record of heroism in time of war, Dr. Guzman notes that:

There is a concomitant number of casualties attending this Mexican American patriotic investment.

The article follows:

MEXICAN AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM (By Ralph Guzman)

Mexican American military personnel have a higher death rate in Vietnam than all other servicemen. Analysis of casualty reports for two periods of time: one between January, 1961 and February, 1967 and the other between December, 1967 and March, 1969, reveals that a disproportionate number of young men with distinctive Spanish names do not return from the Southeast Asia theatre of war. Investigation also reveals that a substantial number of them are involved in high-risk branches of the service such as the U.S. Marine Corps.

In the southwest, where the majority of the people of Mexican American descent reside, Spanish named casualties remain consistently high in both periods. During the first period (January, 1961 to February, 1967) casualties with home addresses in the states of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas, totalled 1,631 deaths from all causes. Of these, 19.4 percent had distinctive Spanish names (see Table 1). In the second period (December, 1967 to March, 1969) there were 6,385 deaths. Casualties with distinctive Spanish names represented 19.0 percent of the total.

Casualty figures for each period are high when compared with the total Spanish surnamed population living in the southwestern

United States. According to the 1960 report of the U.S. Bureau of the Census 11.8 percent of the total southwestern population had distinctive Spanish surnames and were, therefore, presumably Mexican American. The figures remain high when the comparison is based only on males of military age, meaning individuals between age 17 and 36 years. Mexican Americans are estimated to represent 13.8 percent of this age group.

While these figures are estimates, they are sufficient to indicate orders of magnitude. If one were to project birthrate, immigration, natural death and other factors, the statistical relationship would not be substantially different. It is probable that Spanish surnamed individuals would be slightly more numerous. It is significant that the percentages of Spanish named casualties for each period remains nearly constant at 19.0 percent.

War deaths by branch of service indicate that a great number of Mexican Americans choose high-risk duty. For example, during the first period, 23.3 percent of all southwest Marine Corps casualties had distinctive Spanish surnames. The Army, also supplies an important number of ground troops, 19.4 percent of the casualties reported between January, 1961 and February, 1967, had Spanish surnames and were presumably of Mexican parentage. In the later period, between December, 1967 and March, 1969, Spanish surnames represented 17.5 percent of all southwestern Army casualties.

When these figures are analyzed by state, California shows both the greatest number of total deaths from all causes and the greatest number of Mexican American casualties. During the first period 821 servicemen from California were killed. Of these, 15.0 percent had Spanish surnames, which is well above the 10.0 percent estimate of Spanish surnames in the total population of the state. During the second period 3,543 servicemen from California were reported as casualties in Vietnam, 14.8 percent had Spanish surnames. The State of Texas ranks second in total deaths and

in Mexican American casualties. During the first period 554 Texans died in the war. Of these, 22.4 percent were presumably Mexican American. In the more recent period, between December, 1967 and March, 1969, there were 1,921 deaths with home addresses in Texas. Casualties from Texas with Spanish surnames represented 25.2 percent of the total. In both California and Texas, Mexican American deaths are consistently high and disproportionate to the size of this minority group.

An adequate interpretation of the data is impossible without more information from official sources. For example, there is a gap between February, 1967 and December, 1967. Data were not available when this report was written. In a different sense, Spanish-surnamed servicemen may be over-represented in the Vietnam reports because they are over-represented among those who are drafted for military service and those who volunteer.

Historically, Mexican Americans have been a suspect, "foreign," minority. Like the Japanese Americans during World War II they have been under great pressure to prove loyalty to the United States. However, there are other reasons why Mexican Americans join the military. The reasons are several. One is the desire for status that the military life offers. Another is economic. Mexican Americans, particularly those from extremely poor families, help their families with their

service allotments. Still others wish to prove their Americanism. Organizations like the American G.I. Forum, composed of ex-GI's of Mexican American identity, have long proclaimed the sizable military contributions of the Mexican American soldier. According to the American G.I. Forum and other Mexican American groups, members of this minority have an impressive record of heroism in time of war. There is a concomitant number of casualties attending this Mexican American patriotic investment.

Only a relatively small number of Mexican Americans have been able to circumvent obligatory military service by attending college. Student deferments for residents of our southwestern barrios are scarce. The reason, of course, is the under-representation of Mexican Americans in institutions of higher learning. At the University of California, Mexican American students number less than one percent (1%) of the total student population of 97,000.

There are other factors that motivate Mexican Americans to join the Armed Forces, some may be rooted in the inherited culture of these people while others may be more deeply imbedded in poverty and social disillusion. Whatever the real explanation, we do know with a high degree of certainty that Mexican Americans are over-represented in the casualty reports from Vietnam and under-represented in the graduating classes of our institutions of higher learning.

TABLE 1.—VIETNAM CASUALTIES FROM ALL CAUSES IN THE 5 SOUTHWESTERN STATES, BY BRANCH OF SERVICE, BETWEEN JANUARY 1961 AND FEBRUARY 1967

	All causes			Combat			Noncombat		
	Spanish surname			Spanish surname			Spanish surname		
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
Total.....	1,631	316	19.4	1,335	274	20.5	296	42	14.2
Army.....	927	180	19.4	765	155	20.3	162	25	15.4
Air Force.....	88	8	9.1	55	5	9.1	33	3	9.1
Marine Corps.....	520	121	23.3	459	109	23.7	61	12	19.7
Navy.....	96	7	7.3	56	5	8.9	40	2	5.0

TABLE 2.—VIETNAM CASUALTIES FROM ALL CAUSES IN EACH OF THE 5 SOUTHWESTERN STATES BETWEEN JANUARY 1961 AND FEBRUARY 1967

	All causes			Combat			Noncombat		
	Spanish surname			Spanish surname			Spanish surname		
	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent	Total	Number	Percent
Arizona:									
Total.....	83	14	16.9	68	11	16.2	15	3	20.0
Army.....	50	8	16.0	41	7	17.1	9	1	11.1
Air Force.....	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps.....	26	5	19.2	22	4	18.2	4	1	25.0
Navy.....	3	1	33.3	1	0	0	2	1	50.0
California:									
Total.....	821	123	15.0	685	108	15.8	136	15	11.0
Army.....	454	75	16.5	383	65	17.0	71	10	14.1
Air Force.....	39	2	5.1	29	2	6.9	10	0	0
Marine Corps.....	270	45	16.7	235	40	17.0	35	5	14.3
Navy.....	58	1	1.7	38	1	2.6	20	0	0
Colorado:									
Total.....	108	26	24.1	85	22	25.9	23	4	17.4
Army.....	55	16	29.1	45	15	33.3	10	1	10.0
Air Force.....	6	1	16.7	2	0	0	4	1	25.0
Marine Corps.....	37	9	24.2	33	7	21.2	4	2	50.0
Navy.....	10	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0
New Mexico:									
Total.....	65	29	44.6	54	25	46.3	11	4	36.4
Army.....	35	12	34.3	28	10	35.7	7	2	28.6
Air Force.....	2	1	50.0	1	0	0	1	1	100.0
Marine Corps.....	25	13	52.0	23	13	56.5	2	0	0
Navy.....	3	3	100.0	2	2	100.0	1	1	100.0
Texas:									
Total.....	554	124	22.4	443	108	24.4	111	16	14.4
Army.....	333	69	20.7	268	58	21.6	65	11	16.9
Air Force.....	37	4	10.8	19	3	15.8	18	1	5.6
Marine Corps.....	162	49	30.2	146	45	30.8	16	4	25.0
Navy.....	22	2	63.6	10	2	20.0	12	0	0

¹ Includes 1 member of the Coast Guard.

TABLE 3.—VIETNAM CASUALTIES FROM ALL CAUSES IN THE FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES BY BRANCH OF SERVICE, BETWEEN DECEMBER 1967 AND MARCH 1969

Branch of service	Total number of casualties	Distinctive Spanish surnamed casualties	SSN percent of total	Non-Spanish surnamed casualties	Non-SSN percent of total	Percent total
Army.....	4,056	753	17.5	3,303	82.5	100.0
Air Force.....	116	9	7.8	107	92.2	100.0
Marine Corps.....	1,977	465	23.5	1,512	76.5	100.0
Navy.....	236	25	10.6	211	89.4	100.0
Total.....	6,385	1,252	19.0	5,133	81.0	100.0

TABLE 4.—VIETNAM CASUALTIES FROM ALL CAUSES IN EACH OF THE 5 SOUTHWESTERN STATES, BETWEEN DECEMBER 1967 AND MARCH 1969

State	Total number of casualties	Distinctive Spanish surnamed casualties	SSN percent of total	Non-Spanish surnamed casualties	Non-SSN percent of total	Percent total
Arizona.....	354	86	24.3	268	75.7	100.0
California.....	3,543	525	14.8	3,018	85.2	100.0
Colorado.....	336	66	19.1	270	80.9	100.0
New Mexico.....	231	91	39.4	140	60.6	100.0
Texas.....	1,921	484	25.2	1,437	74.8	100.0
Total.....	6,385	1,252	19.6	5,133	80.4	100.0

A CONSTITUENT'S POINT OF VIEW

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, together with a recent statement by Monsignor Flemming, president of Seton Hall University, arrived from my constituent, Mrs. E. V. Connell. Because of her request, and the commonsense and forthright views that point up some of the most vexing issues of our day, I would like to share her letter and President Flemming's statement with all the Members of the House:

NEWARK, N.J.,

October 6, 1969.

DEAR MR. RODINO: First of all let me congratulate you on your interest in and quick action on the "Green Beret" case. This most unfortunate "inter-agency" fight at the expense of our Country was unbelievable—even to the laymen. Certainly no one in his right mind *wants* war, but our boys who are there must be backed up all the way and God knows we don't want those who have sacrificed their lives (like my own nephew) to have died in vain because of politics at home!

My second point is the enclosed copy of Monsignor Flemming's much discussed message to the Student Body at Seton Hall. The papers as usual give a few quotes. However, I believe this message is one of the best I've read in this permissive age we're living in. I am sure all America would be interested in reading such a message from a man with such moral fortitude and stamina. Accordingly, it would seem to me to be an excellent item to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Would you be so kind as to take such action?

Again thanking you for your interest, I am
Sincerely yours,

AGNES O. S. CONNELL.

MONSIGNOR FLEMMING'S MESSAGE GIVEN TO STUDENT BODY AT SETON HALL

We begin the school year today as a faculty and student body praying the Mass to God the Holy Spirit, that we might gain one great grace: wisdom to see the road ahead this year in the light of the needs of time and eternity. I sometimes think that we are so close to what is happening here at Seton Hall we may fail to grasp the real vision of what we are striving to accomplish, even to appreciate what we are praying for today.

The ever burning question is still pressing for an answer. What are we primarily striving to do and how are we doing it? Or—to rephrase the question—why have a great Catholic university, or any Catholic university at all? The answer it would seem should necessarily show that a Catholic university has a role as a university, and precisely as a Catholic university, fulfilled by no other. Only then would this institution fulfill its mission with unsparing devotion. Only then would it be proud of its place in the world.

We have reached, I believe, a certain critical moment in the history of Seton Hall, for it is the moment that reveals to us the need to be more clear and more articulate in our understanding and our basic philosophy of Christian education. In a word, our future does not involve Seton Hall's becoming some sort of nebulously religious-oriented school, but to be and to become a real genuine Catholic university.

Those who would refashion our society, the church, and specifically, Seton Hall into something of their own image, no matter how

sincere and well-intentioned they may be, must be confronted with the fact that there are real basic principles which we cannot and will not compromise 'till hell freezes over.

Last May the International Association of Catholic Universities met in Europe and reaffirmed to all the world that the objective of a Catholic university is to assure a Christian presence in the university world while confronting the great problems of contemporary society. Seton Hall fulfills her role as a Catholic university: (1) If she is a Christian inspiration to you and to the community. (2) If she continually reflects in the light of Christian faith upon the growing treasure of human knowledge. (3) If she is faithful to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church. (4) If she commits herself as an institution to the service of Christian thought and education.

If you and I would walk down the long rows of crosses in the cemeteries of this state, we could ponder and reflect upon a silent brigade of priests and laymen these one hundred and thirteen years who have given their lives that Seton Hall might be just such a Catholic university.

It was a Protestant educator who reminded us recently that ours is the richest and most constant spiritual and intellectual tradition in the world. Because of that tradition it is the destiny of the Catholic university to bear witness to the incarnation of the Son of God. The Destiny of Seton Hall in itself is its own justification. It must stand forever as a sign—a sign that the Son of God really entered our human history and that in so doing, He sanctified all truth.

If Seton Hall is to fulfill its mission, you and I must learn that no one is unimportant because all of us have the same basic dignity as members of Christ. All truth, all grace, all dignity from Pope to peasant is from Christ. And because we are His life, faculty and students alike, we must reorder, revivify, redeem the world by our lives, we must take our intimate part in the prayer life of the Church that we may all grow inwardly and to the full maturity of the Life of Christ.

In this Christian context you are not exclusively all head, all heart, all piety, or all muscle. The world already has enough half formed men. You and I must grow organically, i.e. in knowledge and virtue. This is the beginning of wisdom. This alone can make each of us more fully man.

If within these walls we are to grow together, faculty—all faculty, students and administrators on all levels, God forbid that anyone or any thing would try to divide us. Though faculty and students share the responsibilities of the educative process, they are not equal partners since students, by definition, are here to study and to learn under the directions of the faculty. I believe firmly in community government in so far as this means everyone's voice should be effectively heard in accord with his competence.

I should like to speak briefly about student life in the context of a Christian community. Over the past five years we have endeavored to revise and restructure student life so as to provide an atmosphere that will encourage a growth of personal responsibility. Rules are necessary in any social group, but they must always exist within the framework of personal responsibility. They are directed at preserving good order that a serious pursuit of learning demands. They are directed to the common good.

We hope that Seton Hall will be with us as a unique institution of education for the thousand tomorrows. Discipline will be part of the education here during those tomorrows. So will values and standards. Just a few years ago many pages of rules were reduced to a half page of a few essential rules. If anyone sincerely believes he cannot become educated at Seton Hall without drunken orgies, or partying through the wee hours of

the morning, or if he feels that his personal freedom is impossibly restricted, then I believe the only honest reaction is to get free of Seton Hall—not to expect this institution to lose its unique character and become just another school. Seton Hall has changed greatly and will change more, for better, one hopes. But set principles must guide the change, permanent values must remain.

We prayed in the Mass today "come Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of the faithful." The joy of being a student is to have one's heart filled, to find out what one should be. It is to answer that vocation with a great respect for the gift of intelligence and with a passionate dedication to the truth wherever one finds it and no matter how much it costs.

To many, the greatest problem facing Seton Hall this year, and I do not mean to underestimate it, is crowded physical space. How can we fit so many into our dining facilities, gymnasium, playing field? Yet there is an opposite problem of even greater long range impact in our lives. It is not whether we are going to be too crowded physically, but whether we are going to be too confined intellectually and spiritually. Are we going to reach out for the unexplored realm of the Spirit, or merely moan the physical confines of our academic planet. Hence I ask you: can our organizations, societies, fraternities and sororities develop enough interest in truth of the Spirit to ask: what it means to be a student in this Catholic university. Can our student leaders conceive of constructive projects with great minds and great hearts, or will they settle for something which caters to their own whims and fancies? Is our student body interested enough in truth to go out into the community that surrounds us, into their hearts and their minds as well as in their automobiles? Are they concerned enough to bring back to this campus not only the middle class morality they find so easy to copy, but also the inarticulate aspirations for holiness that whisper there? I wonder if the student community has the vision to ask the administration for something more than bigger and better weekends and bigger and better parties. I wonder if they have the courage to ask for something more than a good time. I wonder if we can create together through understanding and love a Christian community living in the Spirit. Then you will not have missed the reason for Seton Hall and you will have shared with us the ideals and principles for which we are giving our lives.

WHO IS TAMPERING WITH THE SOUL OF AMERICA?

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa, Okla. Tribune, and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, recently appeared on television station WVEC-TV in Virginia.

Mr. Jones spoke on the subject, "Who Is Tampering With the Soul of America?" His observations were so timely, and well stated, that I thought his remarks should be shared with others.

The speech follows:

WHO IS TAMPERING WITH THE SOUL OF AMERICA?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

This, ladies and gentlemen, is to be a jeremiad.

I am about to inflict upon you an unrelieved, copper-bottomed, six-ply all-wool

howl of calamity about the present moral climate of America. And before you tag me for being a fogey, let's turn around.

The pathway of history is littered with the bones of dead civilizations and fallen empires. Most of them had rotted out before the barbarians battered down the gates. They had rotted out with corruption and dishonesty and the search for kicks. And in most cases the arts and sciences which they had developed went into a long eclipse before they were replaced by superior arts and sciences.

Nearly 1,000 years elapsed between the fall of Western Rome and the rise of the Renaissance, and in between we had the Dark Ages in which nearly all of Man's institutions were inferior to those which had gone before.

I don't want my children's children to pass into the limbo of social chaos, because in chaos liberties die and the man on horseback with a whip is the bringer of the new order.

It is too bad that morals are popularly regarded as the preserve of the professional moralist. Because professional moralists are often unpleasant and unreasonable people. We have the image of the thundering preacher threatening all backsliders with hellfire and damnation, of the dour man in the funeral costume, so beloved by prohibition-era cartoonists, who is opposed to anything that's fun.

There is a difference between a moral precept and a taboo. A taboo is a capricious rule that may be utterly devoid of common sense. Puritans could not wear silver buckles. The Alaskan Indian could not eat the flesh of the animal sacred to his totem. These are taboos.

A moral principle should be a very different thing. Consider the Ten Commandments. Long before Moses came down from Mount Sinai men had observed the devastating effects of chronic murder and theft. They had observed cruelties brought about by false-witness, and social turbulence produced by stealing or trading wives. These things were frowned on in an effort to make the society work. And Moses brought down a codification of these frowns.

Well, how are we doing?

In reply to the admonition "Thou shalt not kill" we hear sniper fire in our cities excused as an expression of despair.

Overwhelmed by the rising tide of petty theft San Francisco has decided police are wasting too much time taking culprits to the police station. So it is issuing citations like traffic tickets, asking the thief to please step over and see the judge.

In opposition to the Biblical injunction—"Honor thy father and thy mother"—we hear the zipper slogan "Don't trust anybody over 30." And the way some mothers and fathers have bugged out on the ancient task of directing their children into the paths of rectitude and righteousness, there is a good question about how much honor is due them.

I believe we should look upon morals as a pragmatic search for ways in which human beings can live together successfully. And successfully means this: communities in which people respect each other's dignity, in which people take pride not merely in being self-supporting but in pulling up the brothers and sisters who haven't made the grade, in which tolerance for honest differences is balanced by a healthy intolerance of those who would prey upon the innocent and blight the community with debauchery and turbulence and fear.

The excuse for morality is good living. Any revised moral theories that deliver an unworkable society do not deliver good living. If being "mod" means promoting a system of human relationships in which the honest and the diligent must carry on their backs the swingers and the kick-seekers then "mod" can't work because the "squares" hold the

ultimate power in this world. But for them, nobody eats, and the patience of the "squares" may not be limitless.

What we are suffering from in the United States is a gradual erosion of integrity. And integrity is merely the effort to apply some objective standards to desirable human performance.

As an example of this loss, let's look at modern art. The ancient and Renaissance sculptors and painters subjected themselves to rigid objective disciplines. Michaelangelo risked prison to dissect cadavers so that he might understand the placement of every muscle.

Today it is hard for any similarly-disposed artist to gain a prize. The blue ribbons go to the splatters and the finger-painters. People who can't draw an apple hang garlands around the necks of people who can't draw an apple.

Talent is for squares. Whatever you can recognize is no good. If you have the spark of a Titian or a Rembrandt you can stay at the foot of the class, because you'd spoil the game. And our museums, are filled with splashes, cubes and blots being stared at by confused citizens who haven't the guts to admit they're confused.

But fakery in art is a light cross we bear. Much more serious is the collapse of moral standards and the blunting of our capacity for righteous indignation.

Our Puritan ancestors were preoccupied with sin. They were hag-ridden and guilt-ridden and theirs was a repressed and neurotic society. But they had horsepower.

They wrested livings from the rocky land, built our earliest colleges, started our literature, caused our industrial revolution, and found time in between to fight the Indians, the French and the British, to bawl for abolition, women suffrage and prison reform and to experiment with graham crackers and bloomers. They were tremendous people.

And for all their exaggerated attention to sin, their philosophy rested on a great granite rock. Man was the master of his soul. You didn't have to be bad. You could and should be better. And if you wanted to escape the eternal fires, you'd damned well better be.

In recent years all this has changed in America. We have decided that sin is largely imaginary.

There has arisen the environmentalist school of sociology. If the surroundings of an individual are poor, then it is Society's fault, and Society cannot blame the individual for what he does. We hear the cry arise that the persons responsible for the rocketing crime rates in our inner cities, the illegitimacy and rising tide of dope addiction, cannot be charged with what they do because Society has failed to provide them with excellent surroundings.

The environmentalist theory has now become a rigid dogma among many of our best-intentioned people. It is an article of faith in many universities. You cannot be a lover of humanity unless you embrace it.

It is, oddly enough, a new theory. Always before Americans had assumed that you didn't have to be poor and dirty. Lincoln came from a plain but clean cabin. Al Smith was raised in a scrubbed Brooklyn tenement. He was sent off to school, ragged but eager, not to pull a switchblade on the teacher, but to learn.

The plain fact is, of course, that people make rats. The most expensive public housing can become overrun with vermin if the halls are used as latrines and garbage thrown down the elevator shafts.

It may be more fun to send dead rats to City Hall, but it is more practical to put the lids on the trash cans.

It has been truly charged that the inhabitants of inner cities are often deprived of modern stores and inexpensive merchandise. But shopping losses are added to the

prices that honest customers must pay. When what is stolen exceeds three per cent of volume, self-service stores begin to close. The merchant who has suffered his 20th hold-up tends to grow discouraged.

It is bad, indeed, to raise children under chaotic conditions where disorder rules the streets, where prostitutes and pushers abound, where radio and TV sets blare all night, where errant fathers flit from household to household. But sometime soon we're going to have to revive the now unfashionable idea of individual responsibility.

When enough individuals grew tired of riot and disorder in the gold camps of the Old West they took collective action and the situation dramatically improved. They didn't sit around bawling for more appropriations. There weren't any appropriations to bawl for.

The doctrine of an individual's responsibility to himself and his neighbors is not one of cruelty, but of kindness. It is the tolerance of irresponsibility that is cruel, because as long as it prevails tigers prowl the streets and no outpouring of federal funds will cut away the jungle.

The pernicious idea that the individual cannot be charged with his performance failure has made a mockery of public education in New York City. There all pupils have been promoted each year, whether they have learned anything or not. New York City is producing high school graduates who can hardly read.

What kind of kindness is this? How would you feel if you hadn't understood anything on the blackboard for years? Wouldn't you want to burn the place down?

By pretending that bad work is just as good as good work we destroy what motivation there is in the weakly-motivated, and we guarantee them disappointment when they discover that the world thinks there's a great deal of difference.

No one wants to cross a bridge built by an engineer who could never read a slide rule. No one wants to go to a brain surgeon who has given his diploma out of pity.

Many American universities are now faced with demands that they admit, in the name of social justice, students who couldn't pass the entrance requirements. What kind of social justice is this?

Colleges that succumb to this pressure must either water down their standards of teaching, and thus cheat the students who have properly prepared themselves and who have only a few precious years to absorb what the university can give them, or they must doom to bewilderment and frustration unprepared students who have labored under the impression that mere contact with halls of ivy will give them wisdom.

Wherever integrity bites the dust, confusion will take over. The basic honesty of college administrations—their ability to level with the student body—will be on trial this year as never before. Last year some of the faculties of our most celebrated institutions didn't do too well as they bowed before storm troopers carrying guns and set up courses of study based more on myth than fact.

We Americans must now consider whether we can drown our children in sex and pornography and see them grow to adulthood without any detectable damage to their characters.

I would question our current experiments in "anything goes," not necessarily because they violate most of the religious and ethical prohibitions of western civilization, but because I think they will be destructive of the experimenters.

Many gentle and intelligent people just don't know what's going on. They express horror at the thought of censorship in any form, but they keep away from the cesspools that are bubbling out of the ground.

I think they ought to have the courage to do some sniffing.

A couple of years ago I was dismayed by a book called "Candy." Since then, the paperback shelves in drugstores and supermarkets have sagged under the literary opuses that make "Candy" read like "Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm."

It will be hard to top the best-seller, "Portnoy's Complaint," but let us not underestimate the imaginations of certain human minds, particularly when there's a buck around.

Last year a U.S. District Attorney in Iowa sent me three books on which he had obtained pornography convictions. I haven't the guts to give you a reasonably-accurate synopsis, but "Three Way Apartment," "Call Her Lesbian," and "Two Women in Love" produced a photo-finish between filth and bad writing.

Still, as the D. A. had feared, the three-judge U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis overturned all the convictions.

The august judges bought the argument by the defense that, and I quote, "the frank and sordid discussion of sexual perversion is itself the social importance to be weighed."

"Three Way," a particularly gamey tale aimed at the fo'c'sle of a minesweeper, received the blessing of one judge who wrote as follows:

"The mere suggestion of 'wife-swapping' is offensive to me. However, my personal offense is not the test. There is a possible 'moral' to the story, perhaps even a psychological lesson that may be of value to marriage counselors."

Oh, come on! If "Three Way" passes the judicial test of social value then it would be impossible to imagine any scatology that would fail.

What we seem to be hung up on in America is a fear of making a value judgment. We seem paralyzed at the thought that we might be accused of dogmatism and prudishness. Yet there is no effrontery to common sense equal to the smut peddler's pretense that the pursuit of the dirty dollar is a crusade for liberation of the human mind.

Value judgments are always subject to error. There will always be honest arguments whether the line was drawn a millimeter to high or too low. But the fact that there is a thin dividing line between a ball and a strike, a tiny point of distinction between an apparently idiotic pass and a grounded football doesn't mean that we must fire all umpires or referees.

As to the condition of American movies, we have finally reached the ultimate in the dirty western. We not only have what columnist Jim Fiebig calls the bare-bottom syndrome, but the portrayal of homosexuals and lesbians, and broad hints of specific perversions leapfrog each other in what the movie blubs describe as "new horizons of honesty and boldness."

Honesty and boldness, maybe, but perhaps the true Hollywood motive was best expressed in the titles of two recent excursions into sadism—"For a Fistful of Dollars" and "For a Few Dollars More."

I liked what Broadway producer Dave Merrick said when he was asked if he had seen the copulatory film, "I am Curious—Yellow." He said he was more yellow than curious.

And the stage has finally succeeded in selling the Port Said peep-show at \$10 a seat. We used to have costume plays. Now we have no-costume plays. It was, perhaps, unconsciously significant that one of the latest naked capers, "O Calcutta," is named after one of the most hopeless cities in the world.

It is argued that pornography is healthy. Look magazine recently ran an article lauding the Danish experiment in removing all restrictions. Look ecstatically quoted a number of Danish professors to the effect that this freedom will sublimate the dark frustrations of the deviates and everyone will have a more healthy attitude.

I'm willing to be convinced. I'm willing to

acknowledge that all moral laws since the beginning of the human social system have been wrong if it can be proven that ogling the worst makes everybody better.

Anyway, we should soon know. If drowning our children in sex from the ring-around-the-rosy age onward is going to make more stable family relationships the statistics should begin to prove it. If free love brings happiness the psychiatrist benches should begin emptying and divorces should diminish. If incipient sex criminals are cured by slaver over X movies the incidence of rape and mutilation should reflect it.

Unfortunately, up to this moment the statistics have all been going the other way. If the swingers are delirious with happiness they don't show it. If unwanted pregnancies have brought joy to teenagers I haven't heard of it.

In the past 12 months compared to the previous 12 months forcible rapes in America rose 17 per cent. Where is this promised sublimation?

While we have moved into this eclipse of taste and behavior we have also seen a questioning of ancient loyalties and disciplines. Homes were important things because both parents and children found in them mutual responsibility and protection. And a man was supposed to be proud of his ability to plow a straight furrow or shoe a fractious horse or lift the heaviest bale. It has been said with some sarcasm that we were a work-oriented society—and so have been.

These values are now doubted. Not long ago at Monterey, California I sat in the shadow of the lighthouse while a shaggy haired gentleman in beard and beads lectured to me about the right of man to do his thing, regardless of whether it had any apparent value. And all the time he munched on a poor-boy sandwich produced by squares in Kansas or Iowa who had risen before dawn and labored in the fields and hog lots. Maybe making sandwiches for hippies was "their thing."

We have always had bums. But this is the first time bums as a class have become philosophers. Yet there is an interesting thing about this philosophy. There is no mortification of the flesh in it. It is an easy philosophy. You get a chick, a sack of pot and a cuddly pad. It is easier to go to Canada than to go to work. It is fun to demonstrate for peace and paint daisies on a Volkswagen in hopes that the atom bomb will go away. The messy business of answering bugle calls in the rain on the Rhine is for the pterodactyls.

The question before the house is Who is Tampering with the Soul of America? For nations do have souls. They have collective personalities. They differ in their ability to perform, their ability to react intelligently to crises, the level of honesty which the people expect of their servants, and the level of their pride in themselves and their traditions. What is happening to our morale as a people?

J. Edgar Hoover recently wrote: "We are giving too much attention to various dissident elements which have a lot of noisy energy but little purpose. Many of them are complaining about conditions which they helped create. Now, they want our whole society to plead guilty to mass inaptness. This is ridiculous."

Many crimes, of course, have been committed in the name of patriotism. But great nations that cease to believe in themselves are not long for greatness. The mystique of nationhood, the sense of belonging to a tradition bigger than oneself and deserving of loyalty if not of sacrifice is important in the development of a human character.

Here is America that has poured more than a third of a trillion dollars worth of its labor into an effort to feed the world's hungry, to educate the world's ignorant, to deliver machines to those who never knew anything but tools, and to protect weak states against their predatory neighbors.

Sometimes we were clumsy. Sometimes our unprecedented excursions into international philanthropy backfired. But no nation in human history ever tried so hard to be a good neighbor. No nation ever shed so much blood in wars from which it could not profit.

We have the most successful economic system the world has ever seen, if you can measure such a system by its ability to put creature comforts into the hands of the most people. And our technological genius is unsurpassed—behold! two men on the moon.

Yet we are, as Lyndon Johnson sadly remarked, deep in the business of "poor-mouthing" America.

In a recent commencement address Dr. Daniel Boorstin of the Smithsonian Institution said that apology has become the American posture.

"The liberal virtue of self-criticism," said Doctor Boorstin, "has become the national vice of self-hate. We seem to see everything about ourselves except what is good, everything about our past except what we have achieved. Grovelling has become that national disease."

How right Dan Boorstin is! And much of the responsibility must go to our mass media. It is one thing to accurately chronicle the voice of dissent. It is quite another to play down the positive and accentuate the negative.

Never before in America has treason enjoyed such a wonderful press. Never before have the irresponsible damners of the American dream been followed by so many reporters with open notebooks and poised pencils.

Let a patriotic parade be held with 50,000 marchers and half million appreciative spectators, and let 100 placard waving revolutionaries try to block the march. The cameras of all television networks will rush to the spot to give the impression that the American people greeted with violence and disgust the display of the flag.

There are some interesting features to much of this so-called dissent. Many of the same voices that are denouncing the draft as unconstitutional not only had no word of criticism for it when Russia was sorely beset by Hitler, but they were bawling for an early second front.

Add up the program of the so-called Students for a Democratic Society. End military research by the universities. Dismantle the so-called military-industrial complex. Don't deploy any defensive missiles. Knock out R.O.T.C. Fold up NATO.

Is it rude to ask which powers in the world would profit from the SDS program? The tanks that crunched into Czechoslovakia are by no means out of gas.

It is also interesting how selective the militant left is about free speech. They have a long list of revolutionaries who, they insist, must be brought to every campus to strip the scales from the student's eyes about the evils of the Establishment. Yet we have seen high government officials repeatedly shouted down in the college halls by activists who have taken over the first six rows. This is a peculiar kind of freedom.

It occurs to me that it is time the vast majority of decent, hard-working American citizens got off the floor. It is time they quit being cowed by the yammering of characters who would destroy our institutions by riot and fire, but who seem to have nothing to offer in their place but the dictatorship of the self-annointed.

There is nothing at all unthinkable about removing federal subsidies from students who would wreck universities as teaching institutions and turn them into cadres for revolution.

There is nothing cruel and unusual about prying off the federal payroll those ostensible uplift workers who spend their time gathering guns and promoting race warfare.

Let the people who want to set American against American and rip to tatters the fabric

of our country at least knock off their demands on the federal treasury.

This is a great country.

Its population, drawn from all the races and traditions of humankind, is history's most successful amalgam of human beings.

It retains position No. 1 in the popularity poll among all persons who would leave their country for another.

The contrast between its way of life and the life offered in the communist states grows more embarrassing to the dialecticians every year. After half a century communism has been unable to deliver on its promises of material blessings, and it has not dared to offer any measurable amount of freedom.

That's why the winds of cynicism and disillusion are rising behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains, and why the Red leaders view with new urgency the job of pulling America down.

And America can be pulled down.

Without moral disciplines a nation is fat for the kill. There is no protection in flower children. There is no national inspiration in the wacky dreams of chemical hallucination. Nothing is defended by people high on marihuana. There is no social uplift in the easy business of demand, unless demand for opportunity is accompanied by a determination to learn the hard way and to work with reliability and devotion.

There is no future to the philosophy that says: "Because we are not satisfied with the social order we will burn it down. And don't ask us now about alternatives. After the destruction is over we will think of something."

The strength of America is in its "Squares." The squares answer the alarm clocks. They go forth each day in the cold and the heat to the mill and the barn, the shop and the office.

They drive the cabs and peddle the steel and pull the carrots and fix the carburetors. Usually they give up more in taxes than they consume of government services, and thus they provide the surplus that underwrites education and makes charity possible.

The squares provide the integrity without which prosperity would wither. They are responsible for that level of honesty that makes possible the convenience of a credit card civilization, for there is no trust in a nation of thieves and grifters.

The squares acknowledge their kids. They bring the paychecks home. They try to provide guidance to the young superior to that offered by the leering billboards of the glittering movie palace; by the filthy lyrics of the far-out rock combos.

The squares have the old-fashioned idea that there is something more to education than setting the dean on fire, something more to life than self-indulgence, something more to literature than restroom graffiti, and something more to love than erotic exercise.

The squares have been confused too long by the purveyors of ugliness and degradation, by the screeching voices of disruption and hate, by the admirers of our enemies and the sneerers at our traditions.

Since the welkin has been ringing with the complaints and curses of the oddballs, the drop-outs, and the fellow-travelers, maybe it should be the privilege of America's squares to speak their pieces now and raise a little hell.

GOODLING'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS MERIT COLLEAGUES' PRAISE

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvanians are proud that a member of CXV—1845—Part 21

our delegation, GEORGE A. GOODLING, recently received the Distinguished Alumnus Award of the Pennsylvania State University.

As secretary of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, I have been asked to extend the congratulation of the entire delegation to the gentleman from the 19th District, and call the award to the attention of the Members of Congress.

The principal purpose of the Distinguished Alumnus Award of the Pennsylvania State University is to recognize and salute the achievements of outstanding alumni—a purpose perhaps best expressed by the inscription on the reverse side of the medallion symbolic of this honor:

Presented to George A. Goodling whose personal life, professional achievements, and community service exemplify the objectives of The Pennsylvania State University.

Our colleague has had a long career in public service. He served seven terms in the Pennsylvania Legislature and is now in his fourth term in the Congress.

In honoring him, Pennsylvania State University cited his exceptional record as a conservationist and his contributions in the field of agriculture, and noted his years of community leadership in his native York County in education and other public services. This is best summed up by the citation itself:

To George A. Goodling, for a career of legislative service to state and nation; for nearly half a century of successful agricultural pursuits; for an exceptional record as a conservationist; and for community leadership in education and other public services.

In his native-State of Pennsylvania and in the Congress of the United States Representative GEORGE A. GOODLING has enjoyed a distinguished legislative career. Beginning in 1942, he was elected to serve 7 terms in the Pennsylvania Legislature, where, in addition to his chairmanship of House committees, he was chairman of Joint State Government subcommittees. Now a member of the Agriculture and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees of the 91st Congress, Representative GOODLING also held seats in the 87th, 88th, and 90th Congresses. His roots are deep in his York County birthplace, which he represents along with Adams and Cumberland Counties in the 19th District. This south central Pennsylvania district has a population of some 425,000.

Representative GOODLING attended York County schools, the York Collegiate Institute, and Bellefonte Academy before enrolling at Penn State. His fellow students recall his considerable musical ability, he not only performed with the band but sang in the choir and the Glee Club. After obtaining a bachelor of science degree in horticulture in 1921, the future Congressman taught vocational agriculture for 2 years, he then became the owner and operator of a fruit farm which he still maintains. His interest in education led him to become a school director, a post he held for 28 years, serving as president of the board, treasurer, and a member of the building committee. In addition, he was one of the organizers of the Loganville

Fire Co., and has been its secretary for 32 years.

An ardent conservationist, Representative GOODLING succeeded against precedent—since he was a freshman Congressman and a member of the minority Republican Party—when a bill he introduced to protect the golden eagle was enacted into law. The population of the golden eagle, which is valuable to agriculture in the control of rodents, had declined at an alarming rate. The new law, Public Law 87-884, also provides a shield for the bald eagle, the U.S. national symbol, which was often killed by persons mistaking it for the golden eagle.

During the last 2 sessions of Congress, Representative GOODLING has introduced resolutions ranging from creating a select committee on ethics and standards for House Members to permitting non-denominational and voluntary prayer participation in the public schools and other public institutions. He has also sponsored resolutions to broaden present Federal control over oil pollution in coastal waters, a Human Investment Act to extend a tax incentive to employers providing training to upgrade workers' skills, and a resolution to reassert U.S. rights and privileges in the Panama Canal Zone.

A former member of the Civil War Centennial Commission and the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Representative GOODLING served as a past president and is currently executive secretary of the Pennsylvania State Horticulture Association. His other memberships include the Agriculture Extension Association, Grange, Pennsylvania Farmer's Association, and Izaak Walton League.

We of the delegation are pleased that this honor has come to one of our numbers, and we salute him.

USE OF THE FEDERAL LABORATORIES

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, my Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development has been studying for sometime the use of the Federal laboratories. We know that agency missions change from time to time and that the expertise in one laboratory may be useful in a developing program of another agency. However, the transfer of responsibilities and funds is a difficult bureaucratic problem. We will continue to urge a greater flexibility for the use of these scientific resources which must be considered as national resources rather than those of a particular agency.

An interesting example of the problem is covered in the remarks of AEC Commissioner James T. Ramey at a conference September 5. I insert an excerpt from the paper in the RECORD at this point:

THE NEXT 5 YEARS IN NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

(Remarks by James T. Ramey, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Before the Briefing Conference on Nuclear Power)

INTRODUCTION

It is a particular privilege for me to address this luncheon gathering of distinguished lawyers, engineers, scientists, and management leaders in the nuclear industry.

As a matter of fact, I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the next five years in the atomic energy program. As you may recall, President Johnson somewhat unexpectedly reappointed me to a new five-year term which began this past July. The unexpected nature of the reappointment related to the fact that my term had one year to run, which caused one member of the Joint Committee to inquire at my confirmation hearing as to whether the move was Churchillian, Machiavellian or Johnsonian!!

In any event, this circumstance caused me to do some thinking about the next five years, and I even brought my music, in the form of some notes on the next half decade, projects may call for marshaling of resources of several states or even of several countries. They will involve coordination of large-scale agriculture, industry and the creation of major population centers. Perhaps management lessons for such projects could be derived from the experience of regional organizations in the Tennessee Valley, in the Northwest, and certain international consortia.

THE AEC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

Not all important AEC development programs involve multi-million or billion dollar funding problems. Even so, some, such as the development of the artificial heart and the liquid centrifuge, have the potential for major impact on our lives. These programs are encountering management problems that are just as real and difficult to solve as their more opulent brethren that I have been discussing.

The artificial heart

Another low-budget developmental program with tremendous potential—but with many management and funding problems—is the effort to develop a nuclear-powered artificial heart. The primary role of the AEC is the development of the tiny and dependable radioisotopic heat source that will be essential to the practical application of such a device. Obviously, there are some rather substantial technical problems, but our preliminary development work has been encouraging.

We have estimated it would cost only a few million dollars to develop and test a workable prototype isotopic engine which would be a major step toward an artificial heart, but we have not been able to get the necessary funds or authority to proceed. The Bureau of the Budget has, in their bureaucratic wisdom, made us a sort of subcontractor to the National Institutes of Health. This is contrary to all of our successful experience in developing prototype devices under our own authority and funding. Furthermore, NIH does not have funds for developing a nuclear-powered device, and while interested in our development, has other interests and priorities as well.

So there obviously is a management problem here with the usual manifestations of bureaucratic delay. But this problem should be solved, because the artificial heart could help some of the 100,000 Americans who need help each year and for whom transplants or preventative measures are not feasible.

As I have suggested to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, if this project is going to move ahead we will need to set up some sort of a joint effort with the NIH to coordinate the various activities. And, I believe the AEC must be able to exercise its

authority to develop the isotopic heat source-engine to the prototype and demonstration stage.

The liquid centrifuge

The development of the liquid centrifuge is, literally, an example of "spin-off" in the atomic energy program. The liquid centrifuge was developed at Oak Ridge National Laboratory as an outgrowth of its isotope separation program. It is an improved instrument for biological research and has isolated and purified influenza viruses for use as vaccines from large quantities of material. It has also isolated cancer viruses. It will undoubtedly have other uses.

How does one bring about the transfer from the laboratory to early and widespread use by the drug industry of a machine such as the vaccine centrifuge? Such machines are within the capability of small business to manufacture, but how do you get industry to participate with the necessary investment to prove out this technology and bring about its large-scale use? It is not always clear why such problems loom so large to industry when the machine offers the potential for producing a greatly improved vaccine product with no side effects. I have heard some cynics wonder if the drug industry doesn't have a greater interest in selling palliatives than in developing and adopting preventatives.

This represents again the problem of demonstrating a technology. Unfortunately, in some of these areas of atomic energy, such as the isotope program, we never seem to be able to get a demonstration program adequately funded and our relationships with user agencies and industry sufficiently coordinated. Therefore, we have a greater time lag in moving these technological advances into the mainstream of U.S. industry than in the field of atomic electric power.

MIRV AND THE DANGERS TO PEACE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the time approaches for the commencement of strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union, I think it would be useful to refresh our memories on the concern which has been expressed in this Congress over the development of multiple independently guided reentry vehicles, popularly known as MIRV. I think it is significant to note that over 40 Senators and over 100 Representatives have sponsored a resolution urging the administration to propose to the Soviet Union a mutual moratorium on the flight testing of multiple-warhead missiles.

There is a great deal of agreement in both the political community and in scientific and academic circles over the dangerous implications posed by MIRV. It is generally felt that this new member of the weapons family is not only unnecessary, but that it is a provocative weapon that would spell a new escalation in the arms race and would make virtually impossible a meaningful arms agreement once it is deployed.

For this reason, Congressman COHELAN and I have introduced our resolution aimed at heading off MIRV while it is still in the testing stage and before it has passed the point of no return. We are hopeful that the administration will

sense the urgency of a MIRV moratorium now and will make it the first item of business when the SALT talks with the Soviets begin.

During the time the Congress was in recess, a letter appeared in the Washington Post from Mr. Adrian Fisher, formerly the Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In this letter, Mr. Fisher presents an excellent rebuttal to the arguments of MIRV proponents and spells out the need for a mutual moratorium on the flight testing of MIRV's. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. The letter follows:

MIRV AND THE DANGERS TO PEACE

(By Adrian Fisher)

The article on MIRV's—multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles—in your Aug. 19 edition describes a statement by G. Warren Nutter, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, considering the foreign policy and strategic issues raised by MIRV. In this statement, which was concurred in by Dr. John S. Foster Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the position was taken that the passage by Congress of a resolution calling for a cessation of MIRV testing by the United States, if reciprocated by the USSR, would adversely affect the U.S. negotiating position in the strategic arms limitation talks which we all hope will soon be taking place.

This statement shows a complete insensitivity on the part of its authors to the dangers to peace involved in the development and deployment of these hydra-headed weapons. It shows a surprising disregard for the consequences of an escalation of the arms race by a development which would increase by many times the number of nuclear warheads in the missiles which we and the Soviets have aimed at each other and by the steps which both sides might take to counter MIRV deployment by the other. It overlooks the dangers to peace in the deployment of a weapon which—certainly in the Soviet case and quite possibly in ours—seems more suitable for a first nuclear strike than for retaliation, and which would therefore increase the temptation to launch such a strike in times of crisis.

In stating that the passage by Congress of a resolution calling for a cessation of MIRV testing would adversely affect the U.S. negotiating position in the forthcoming talks, the authors of this statement attempt to shrug off the fact that what is under consideration is a cessation of MIRV testing which would remain in effect only if it were observed by both sides. They attempt to do so with the statement that, "The appropriate trade-off for the U.S. MIRV is not a Soviet MRV or MIRV, as a mutual moratorium implies." They go on to argue that a limitation of U.S. MIRV's must be counter-balanced by limitation on Soviet ABM capabilities which the MIRV system was originally designed to penetrate.

In their statement, as distinct from their testimony, they make no mention of two facts: (1) the original basis for the decision to go forward with MIRV's was based on a belief that the Soviet so-called "Tallinn" system—involving a very large number of defensive missiles—was an ABM system; and (2) the intelligence community no longer believes this to be the case, a fact which they admitted on cross-examination before the Subcommittee. It is generally agreed that the real Soviet ABM capability is limited to the 64 "Galosh" missiles deployed around Moscow. No one, so far as I know, has attempted to justify the deployment of MIRV's as necessary to counter these 64 Galosh missiles.

In opposing congressional steps looking toward a mutual cessation of MIRV tests by

the United States and the USSR, these two officials appear to be embarked on a course of conduct which would render meaningless the assurance contained in the letter of July 9 from President Nixon to Senator Brooke, reported in your Aug. 19 article. According to your article, President Nixon advised Senator Brooke that the United States would be prepared to consider the possibility of a ban on MIRV tests in discussions with the Soviet Union. Your article pointed out that this statement did not involve any commitment on the ultimate resolution of the MIRV issue, but it is fair to conclude that this statement would not have been made unless the President felt that a verified mutual restriction on MIRV's was at least a possibility at the present time.

This is the case at the present time because neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. has developed a MIRV system with sufficient confidence in its effectiveness to justify deployment, and an understanding under which both sides refrained from further MIRV testing could be verified by national means now available to us. But this situation will not last very long. The series of MIRV tests begun by the U.S. in September 1968 is scheduled to end in June of 1970. Dr. Foster testified we are between one-third and half-way through. The Soviets have also begun a series of tests which, in the opinion of Dr. Foster, looks toward the development of a MIRV, although one substantially less flexible than that of the U.S. Dr. Foster has also testified that it is generally agreed that the Soviets have not completed their tests to the point of developing a satisfactory system, but it is of course not possible to know their future plans.

We therefore still have a chance to deal with the MIRV problem, but if either the United States or the Soviet Union continues to press its tests series to a point where MIRV's are ready for deployment, the possibility of dealing with MIRV's will no longer exist. A limitation on MIRV testing, after we had completed our own tests series, but before the Soviets had completed theirs, would be non-negotiable with the Soviet Union. Such a limitation would not be acceptable to the United States if the situation were reversed. A limitation on MIRV deployment without any form of inspection would not be acceptable to the United States. A verified limitation on MIRV deployment, once they were developed and tested, would have to involve the disassembly and inspection of nose cones in the missiles actually deployed in silos and submarines. This would not be acceptable to either the U.S. or the USSR. Therefore, unless some form of mutual restriction on MIRV testing is worked out promptly, the possibility of dealing with the MIRV problem—the possibility referred to in President Nixon's letter to Senator Brooke—will disappear.

The late George Santayana defined fanaticism as redoubling one's efforts after losing sight of one's aim. The present drive to complete the MIRV program, when the purpose for which it was started no longer exists and when the danger that it will frustrate the strategic arms limitation talks is greatly increased, seems to fit that definition.

THE 58TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Friday is the birthday of one of America's staunchest allies in the Far East: It is the 58th anniversary of the uprising against the

Manchu dynasty and the beginning of a republican form of government in China. From the turmoil and tragedy of her early decades, China now stands as a strong symbol of Asian anticommunism as well as a shining example of successful development by a dedicated and talented people.

Once a recipient of substantial American aid, China has grown so prosperous that not only is she able to stand alone, but she also gives technical assistance to numerous other countries.

A three-stage land reform program broke the subsistence cycle of traditional agriculture, doubling farm production and yielding enough food to feed her people.

Such a firm agricultural base and a stable government provided hospitable climate for industry, and industrial growth has regularly exceeded 10 percent annually over the past decade. Foreign investment and trade have been welcomed, opening many new jobs and encouraging the growth of a sophisticated system of harbors and communications. China's citizens have the second highest per capita income in all of Asia, and it is still growing.

Nor has China neglected her international commitments while concentrating on domestic growth. The government has been usually successful in balancing the demands of development against the needs of a constantly modernizing military force, maintaining a large and well-trained army capable of rallying over million men for emergency military service.

China also encourages continuation of classical Chinese scholarship, thus preserving the traditions of China.

We often hear of poverty and economic needs of Asian nations. We are concerned today with the instability of governments and popular unrest. Yet, President Chiang Kai-shek has ruled China peacefully, while building the nation into a showcase of prosperity for the world. Mr. Speaker, I salute the Republic of China on its national day and wish its citizens continued progress and prosperity.

FORMER JOHNSON AIDE DEBUNKS SOME MYTHS ABOUT COMMUNISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under the junior Senator from Arkansas prepares for another performance that will have the result of encouraging Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and other world trouble spots, a column by Dumitru Danielopol is extremely timely. Mr. Danielopol, the distinguished international columnist of the Copley Press, writing in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News September 12, comments on a recent statement by Prof. John R. Roche. A good deal of the commentary pertains to the junior Senator from Arkansas and he will no doubt

perform in typical fashion when he convenes his committee for the next series of television shows. The article follows:

FORMER JOHNSON AIDE DEBUNKS SOME MYTHS ABOUT COMMUNISM (By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"From the viewpoint of American policymakers what difference does it make whether communism is monolithic or polycentric?" asks Prof. John P. Roche.

The former national chairman of the ultra liberal Americans for Democratic Action and one time special assistant to President Johnson, has been debunking some myths about communism that have been so popular among liberal thinkers.

It is a dangerous fallacy to conclude that polycentric communism is less pernicious than a monolithic system, he said.

Ho Chi Minh supposed to be a polycentrist, did not hesitate to flaunt both Moscow—by ignoring the 1962 agreements to neutralize Laos, and Peking by barring Mao's little red book from mass circulation. Nor did his polycentrism make the war in Vietnam less bloody.

"Communist imperialism is no less imperialistic by being polycentric," says Roche.

"The meaningful criterion . . . for distinguishing among Communist states is whether they are internationally quiescent . . . or imperialist as is true of Hanoi, Peking and . . . Moscow."

This is not the first time that the Brandeis professor of politics has been at loggerheads with some of his unrealistic, day-dreaming fellow liberals.

In his parting speech in April 1965 as chairman of ADA, Roche lambasted the organization for its anti-Vietnam war attitude and accused it of "part-time pacifism and liberal isolationism."

"I am convinced," he said, "that the absence of liberal realism in the analysis of international relations has a dangerous effect on national opinion."

"I recall distinguished liberal and socialist spokesmen informing us that Hitler was just a rational spokesman for German national interests and an understandable consequence of the 'evils of Versailles.'"

In a recent article Roche bitterly attacked the "liberal canonization" of Sen. J. W. Fulbright, D-Ark., because their views on Vietnam happen to coincide with those of the senator.

"It's a classic example of what happens to liberal judgment when one issue . . . is allowed to overpower all others."

Roche upbraided the Arkansas senator for what he called his unfair handling of AFL-CIO President George Meany at a recent Senate hearing.

"The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee charged flatly that Meany had been 'paid off' by President Johnson . . . for labor support for the war in Vietnam," he said. "Fulbright's behavior deserves the condemnation of all those who value fair play."

Roche is just what the liberal community needs. His credentials are impeccable and his vision is remarkable. Let's hope his colleagues pay heed to his words.

GREEN BERET RECEIVED SOLDIER'S MEDAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, CWO Edward M. Boyle of Dundalk, was one of the Green

Berets charged by the Army with murdering a South Vietnamese double agent. Though charges against him were dropped, he suffered a great deal of anguish and embarrassment as a result of this case. I find it both tragic and ironic that the Army could have charged this man with murder when only 8 months before, it awarded him the Soldier's Medal for saving the lives of many Vietnamese citizens. I should like to share this citation with my colleagues at this time.

JANUARY 16, 1969.

AWARD OF THE SOLDIER'S MEDAL

1. TC 320. The following award is announced

Boyle, Edward M., [REDACTED] SSAN [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Chief Warrant Officer W2 United States Army, 5th Battalion (Provisional), 525th Military Intelligence Group, APO 96307.

Awarded: Soldier's Medal.

Date action: 7 September 1968.

Theater: Republic of Vietnam.

Reason: For heroism not involving actual conflict with an armed enemy in the Republic of Vietnam: Chief Warrant Officer Boyle distinguished himself by valorous actions on 7 September 1968 in the Dakao District of Saigon. While driving on Le Van Duyet Street, Mister Boyle saw a fire burning out of control in a residential area. Leaving his vehicle, he raced into the buildings and began helping the occupants escape the inferno. After making sure that the nearby homes had been evacuated, he formed a bucket brigade and fought the blaze with every available water container. When fire fighting equipment arrived Mister Boyle led a team of firemen to the source of the conflagration, saving several dwellings from being consumed. Once the water supply was exhausted, he climbed to the burning rooftops and used a fire extinguisher until he was driven away by intense heat and flames. Returning to the street, he reunited members of the families who had been separated in the confusion. Chief Warrant Officer Boyle's heroic actions were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Authority: By direction of the President under the provisions of the Act of Congress, approved 2 July 1926.

LEO B. JONES,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff.

CONGRESSMAN MIKVA WORKS TO PRESERVE OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Representative ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat of Illinois, and I coauthored a bill to ban the use of the pesticide DDT except under certain emergency conditions. Twenty-eight of our colleagues in the House have joined in cosponsoring this legislation. The work that Representative MIKVA has been doing on this bill is outstanding. I am pleased to submit an editorial from the September 27 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times that outlines the role that Representative MIKVA has played in this area. I commend the following editorial to my colleagues in the hope they will lend their support to this important bill:

DDT AT THE SOUTH POLE

The Department of Agriculture is finally taking action on the problem of DDT. It has ruled that DDT and two other "persistent" or "hard" pesticides (chemicals that retain their toxicity for years after use) that are now used in federal-state insect control programs will no longer be used. Other, less persistently toxic pesticides, will be substituted.

This is a move in the right direction. The evidence against DDT and other hard pesticides has been piling up. In areas where the hard pesticides are used the very ground is poisoned for years. The life cycles of birds and other wildlife are endangered. Drainage from the ground areas where the hard pesticides are used goes into streams, rivers and lakes and contaminates the fish.

DDT is found everywhere in the world. Concentrations of DDT have been found in penguins and seals in the Antarctic and in reindeer in Alaska—far from the areas where the pesticides were used to kill insects.

Rep. Abner J. Mikva (D-Ill.) has sponsored a bill to ban all use of DDT after June 30, 1970. Mikva says that the DDT situation has become so serious that DDT concentrations in mother's milk have been found to be more than twice as great as the concentrated permitted by the federal government in cow's milk to be sold for public consumption.

There is no arguing the fact that DDT and other hard pesticides contaminate everything they touch and the contamination remains for years. The federal government's action in suspending the use of DDT and two other hard pesticides is welcome but it does not go far enough. The same pesticides will continue to be used in insect control at civilian and military airfields by the federal government.

Mikva has 28 co-sponsors for his bill to ban DDT. No other Illinois member of the Congress is listed as a cosponsor of the bill. We hope that all will join Mikva in his effort. And we suggest that Mikva amend or rewrite his bill to ban the use of all the hard pesticides, not just DDT.

TESTIMONY ON TAX REFORM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week I submitted testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on the subject of tax reform. I advised the committee that the areas of: oil depletion, capital gains, State and local bond interest, and farm losses, generally encompass the major disagreements I have to the Tax Reform Act of 1969, as presently written.

During the coming days, I plan to insert in the RECORD various portions of the testimony I gave to the Senate Finance Committee. I do so because the debate on tax reform issues is a continuing one in the State of Texas and throughout the Nation. I hope my remarks will contribute to the general understanding of the complex issues involved in the subject of tax reform.

My insert today is confined to that portion of my testimony relating to the revision of the tax treatment of oil and gas.

The item follows:

OIL DEPLETION

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the oil depletion allowance must be retained at its full 27½ percent, because maintaining a healthy

and active oil and gas industry is vital to the continued well being of the nation.

Our economy is heavily dependent on the production of oil and gas. Together, they provide nearly three-fourths of all the energy consumed in the United States. The Department of the Interior has aptly summarized the national dependence on oil and gas as follows:

The importance of petroleum to the national life of the United States at this particular moment in history is abundantly in evidence. It supplies nearly three-fourths of all energy consumed. Virtually all movement of goods and people depend upon it. The Armed Forces would be immobilized without it. Countless industrial processes employ it exclusively, and nine-tenths of all space-heating is provided by it. And quite apart from its use as a fuel, petroleum forms the base for 88 percent of all organic chemicals manufactured in the United States.

Petroleum is truly the life blood of the Nation.

Throughout our history, the petroleum industry has met our national consumer and defense needs for oil and gas. I need not remind the Committee of the major crises our nation has met by virtue of the fact we had a healthy and active petroleum industry. The list is long, and our memories poignant.

At the core of the vitality of our oil and gas industry is the depletion allowance. More than any other single factor, the oil depletion allowance has provided the means by which oil producers could keep abreast of ever-growing consumer and national defense demands.

The reason why the depletion allowance is of such critical import to the petroleum industry lies in the very nature of the business. Extracting oil and gas from the land is a risky proposition in terms of financial success. Only one out of nine drillings produce some oil, while merely one well in forty-five is even profitable. Moreover recent industry experience shows that, on the average, only about one out of 50 exploratory wells will find oil and gas in significant quantities; that is, the equivalent of at least one million barrels of oil. These risks are just as real today as they were 10, 20, or 50 years ago. In spite of all our scientific progress and technological advancements, there is still only one way to establish the presence of oil and gas in the ground; and that, is to drill a hole.

Searching for oil and gas is an expensive business. Capital for the search is provided by a mix of federal and private funds. Industry-wide averages show that for every dollar the industry recovers through depletion, it must spend another four dollars from other sources to capitalize the hunt for and development of new reserves.

If the reduction in the oil depletion allowance made by the House is allowed to stand, several undesirable effects will follow. The incentive for the oil producer to assume the risks associated with the oil business will be reduced especially for the small independent producers who produce a significant percentage of our oil and gas. With reduced incentive, fewer oil operators will take the risk of drilling wells. With the lower level of federal recovery money flowing in, fewer investors will finance oil ventures. The inevitable result will be that our production of oil and gas will decline, with the decline stemming from the independent producers segment of the industry which would either be forced out of business by the decline in revenue, or absorbed by the major oil companies.

The decline in the production of oil and gas will have a two-fold effect on our economy: the price of gasoline and petroleum products will be increased to the ultimate consumer, and our oil reserves will be lowered to such a point that the United States will be forced to rely more on foreign oil. As we all are well aware, the political situation

in the oil-rich Middle East is too uncertain and too volatile for the United States to rely on the area as a prime source of supply.

We all remember the crises we faced only a few years ago when our supply of foreign oil was cut off by the Mideast war.

A reduction in the depletion allowance will also overburden the petroleum industry; which is, contrary to popular opinion, carrying its fair share of the federal tax burden. In fact, the petroleum industry bears an overall direct tax burden exceeding that borne by other industries, even though its federal income tax bill is reduced by the depletion allowance. The reason for this is that the lower income taxes are offset by the heavier burden of other direct taxes such as severance and property taxes. As a result, in 1966 the total taxes paid by the petroleum industry, exclusive of motor fuel and excise taxes, were equivalent to 6.0 percent of revenues. This is contrasted with the fact that mining and manufacturing corporations paid direct taxes equal to 5.8 percent of revenues in the same year, and all business corporations paid taxes equal to 4.8 percent of revenues.

The income structure of the petroleum industry reveals a similar disparity. Last year, 99 petroleum producing and refining companies earned 12.9 percent return on net assets compared with an average return of 13.1 percent for all manufacturing companies. This does not represent an unusual year; the rate of return on net assets for the petroleum industry has been lower than the average for all manufacturing companies in eight of the last ten years.

In conclusion, I re-emphasize the importance to the consumer, the petroleum industry, and the nation, that the 27½ percent depletion allowance has. It *should not* and *must not* be reduced.

EDWARD PINKOWSKI, EMINENT HISTORIAN, IS PICKED FOR PHILADELPHIA COMMISSION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, people in the American-Polish communities throughout the Nation are looking with pride at the high honor which has come to an eminent historian, Edward Pinkowski.

He has been chosen by Mayor James Tate of Philadelphia, to be a member of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. He is the first commissioner of Polish extraction to be named since the commission was established.

Mr. Speaker, the honor for Mr. Pinkowski has been a lead story in American-Polish publications and I include with my remarks the text of the story which appeared in both the Am-Pol Eagle, in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., and in the Polish American Journal, which is published in Scranton, Pa., dated September 25 and September 27, respectively:

ON HISTORICAL COMMISSION: PINKOWSKI ONE OF MAJOR HISTORICAL RESEARCHERS

PHILADELPHIA.—Edward Pinkowski, one of the major historical researchers in the country, has been appointed to the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

His appointment was made by James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia, who said Pinkowski was highly recommended to car-

ry on the work of the Historical Commission "in the preservation and classification of Philadelphia's historic buildings."

Pinkowski is the first commissioner of Polish origin to serve on the Philadelphia Historical Commission since it was established by City Council in 1955.

Although born 53 years ago in Holyoke, Massachusetts, Pinkowski has spent the greater part of his life in Pennsylvania, first in Mount Carmel, a coal mining town in which his grandfather had settled in the 1890's, and for the past thirty years, off and on, in Philadelphia.

After taking a mail-order course in journalism, he earned a living by pounding a typewriter for newspapers and magazines. He served as a writer in the U.S. Navy for three and a half years during World War II.

Afterwards he owned a newspaper.

AUTHOR OF BOOKS

He first attracted nationwide attention in 1953 as the author of "Washington's Officers Slept Here." The book, advertised as a "remarkable roll call of houses that played an important role in the American Revolution," was the first time that one of the houses that General Pulaski occupied was described thoroughly and enriched the history of American Poles.

Among other books that he has written are "John Siney: The Miners' Martyr," "Latimer Massacre," "Forgotten Fathers," and "Anthony Sadowski: Polish Pioneer."

His first involvement with colonial architecture, almost two decades ago, ended in a bitter controversy with the Valley Forge Park Commission over the quarters occupied by General Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben during the winter encampment of 1778.

The commissioners thought they would get rid of the Polish thorn in their side by razing the building in 1965, but Pinkowski would not quit.

PROVED STEUBEN CASE

He showed proof that Steuben occupied at least four different quarters at Valley Forge and forced the Park Commission to call the last one the German drillmaster used "Steuben's Quarters." For this he received a gold medal from the Steuben Society of America.

Within recent years Pinkowski has earned a reputation as a finder of many hitherto unknown facts about important Polish figures in American history.

One of his major discoveries was the grave of Anthony Sadowski (1669-1736) in Douglassville, Pa., as well as his last will and testament.

In addition to many Sadowski facts, he found in the most historic part of Philadelphia, the last residence in America of General Thaddeus Kosciuszko. The house, built in 1775, is located at Third and Pine sts.

He also found, in the woods of Spottsylvania County, Virginia, the grave of Ladislaus Wankowicz, a Confederate officer during the Civil War who inherited part of Kosciuszko's estate.

His discoveries of Pulaski memorabilia are endless, ranging from one of the Polish general's quarters in New Jersey to the names of soldiers and officers who were in his famous legion.

AN EXCELLENT CHOICE FOR FCC

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Topeka State Journal has pointed up the outstanding qualifications of a native Kansan for the post

of Federal Communications Commissioner. I commend President Nixon for his appointment of Robert Wells to the FCC. The article follows:

AN EXCELLENT CHOICE FOR FCC

For the first time in history, a working broadcaster has been nominated to serve as one of the seven commissioners on the Federal Communications Commission. It is significant that President Nixon chose a Kansan.

Robert Wells, 50, of Garden City, has a long record of community service in his home town and western Kansas. He has served as chairman of the Kansas Fish, Forestry and Game Commission. In Garden City, he has been active in church, civic and business affairs. He served two terms as president of the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters and currently serves on the Radio Code Board of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Wells is general manager of Radio station KIUL in Garden City and also supervises the broadcast operations of Harris Publications, including radio station KTOP in Topeka. He is publisher of the Garden City Daily Telegram.

Those who are knowledgeable about radio and TV say that Kansas is blessed with some of the better managed radio and TV stations in the country. Wells, with his fine record of community service, is typical of what citizens should expect from good broadcasters.

In private conversations with friends, Wells has let it be known that he feels the FCC should be tough with radio-TV operators who take advantage of their licenses. And he's well qualified to know what constitutes a good broadcaster, one who is really dedicated to serving his community.

Wells will be on the spot as the first man chosen from the ranks of broadcasting to help regulate the industry. He'll have one of seven votes, and if nothing else, he should help bring to the commission a better understanding of some of the practical problems of radio-TV operation.

President Nixon has also nominated Dean Burch of Arizona to be FCC chairman. One of the top endorsements for Burch is a letter from former FCC Chairman Newton Minow to the New York Times. Minow, a Kennedy appointee with a record as a tough FCC chairman, noted that Burch had served on a commission studying political campaign financing with Minow as chairman. Minow said . . . "In our close work together, I have observed his unswerving and impartial dedication to the public interest in all our deliberations. He has an incisive mind, and I have repeatedly seen him demonstrate fairness and courage . . ."

The President has nominated two new names for this top agency, subject to Senate confirmation. It's obvious the President deliberated carefully and made good choices. It's also good to know a Kansan is among the seven who will supervise the nation's air media.

HANK VISCARDI—A DEDICATED MAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention a man who has quietly, yet continually been a courageous example and a champion of many handicapped persons across the Nation.

Henry "Hank" Viscardi, whom I have been privileged to know as a friend for a considerable number of years, was born without legs. Yet the pace that he has maintained and the positive attitude he has always held, would rival many men who have never experienced any handicap.

Throughout the many years I have been friendly with Hank Viscardi I have always greatly valued his warm and gentle nature. It is a nature however which does not belie a strength of purpose.

In the past 15 years, he has helped to train thousands of paraplegics at the Human Resources Center, in Albertson, N.Y., which is within the Third Congressional District which I am proud to represent here in Congress. The Human Resources Center is a large plant which trains handicapped persons to be productive members of society.

Hank Viscardi's philosophy of life can best be summed up in his own words taken from a graduation speech he gave last June to 10 mostly wheelchair high school students about to receive high school diplomas:

To succeed you must look for opportunity in every difficulty and not fear the difficulty in every opportunity.

During my association with this distinguished gentleman I have come to see how closely he lives by this homily. Moreover, I have seen him give others the strength to overcome the too-easy tendency to wallow in self-pity. He has time and again shown many handicapped persons that an individual who has a handicap is totally capable of living a worthwhile and happy life, and that self-esteem is a birthright to be coveted rather than to be traded for self-pity and self-deprecation.

Thanks to Hank Viscardi, our country is richer with the skills of many handicapped persons.

At the same graduation last June, another talented and distinguished friend of mine, *Newsday* Publisher Bill Moyers, also delivered a commencement address.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include excerpts from his speech in the *RECORD*, since I believe it is ample testimony to the accomplishments of Hank Viscardi and the fine school with which he is so closely associated.

The excerpts follow:

NEWSDAY PUBLISHER BILL MOYERS AT HUMAN RESOURCES SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT

The more difficult the world to tame, the more each of us must return to those around us for help. As we do, we have much to learn from communities like the Human Resources Center. It may sound strange, but I suspect a common sentiment of visitors to this school is one of envy; envy of the emphasis on the individual, but envy, too, of the irrepressible spirit of community which pervades every corner of the place. There is a spirit here all too rare in our agitated world. We are living in a time not unlike that described by Jeremiah: "The fathers have eaten a sour grape, & the children's teeth are set on edge." But that is not true here. With the leadership of the remarkable Henry Viscardi & of Headmaster Switzer, you are realizing the ideas of human dignity & personal worth.

For this is an uncommon facility serving uncommon children, children so severely disabled that they cannot attend an ordinary

school . . . uncommon children . . . but seeking the common destiny which every child wants & deserves . . . a chance to learn . . . a chance to participate . . . a chance to play & laugh . . . a chance to contribute . . . a chance to know not pity & consolation from society but pride & challenge within society.

This school & this center are examples of how LI can be mobilized not for the destructive power of war but for the uplifting power of compassion. We are told that the power of the atom's nucleus is dependent upon the speed of light; the power of the nucleus of man, which is love, is dependent upon the speed of human enlightenment. And this is what Human Resources is all about.

Because of their own will to achieve, & because there were people willing to help, they have shown us the grace of triumph against all odds. What they have done, this country can do. The lesson at this center & of this school is clear: Show some superiority to misfortune. I believe in time all America will hear.

HYDROGEN POWER CALLED FEASIBLE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as a part of today's discussion on the Atomic Energy Commission's appropriation bill, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant scientific breakthrough in nuclear research.

A San Diego scientist, Dr. Tihro Ohkawa, announced that a plasma—or hot gas—has been held in a magnetic field for .07 of a second. Confinement of plasma is an essential condition for controlling thermonuclear fusion for the production of power. Dr. Ohkawa heads the controlled thermonuclear research program which is jointly sponsored by his company, Gulf General Atomic, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

A thermonuclear power reactor would have many advantages, including the use as fuel of heavy hydrogen cheaply produced from the ocean.

The details of this noteworthy achievement are contained in an article from last Friday's *San Diego Union*, written by science writer, Bryant Evans.

The article follows:

HYDROGEN POWER CALLED FEASIBLE BY SAN DIEGO SCIENTIST
(By Bryant Evans)

A San Diego scientist from the Gulf General Atomic laboratory here disclosed at a meeting of nuclear scientists in Russia yesterday what is believed to be a milestone in the effort to control the awesome power of the hydrogen bomb for peaceful purposes.

Dr. Tihro Ohkawa, director of the GGA fusion project, said in Dubna, U.S.S.R., he had been able to contain a thin gas at a temperature of a million degrees for a fourteenth of a second. This is several times longer than has been done before.

Before leaving for Russia, Ohkawa told *The San Diego Union* he believed the way is clear to scale up his experiment to create a true fusion, or thermonuclear, power reactor.

He said it may be possible to build such a reactor on a laboratory scale in as little as

five years. Building a practical power plant could require another 15 years of engineering development.

Dr. Edward C. Creutz, vice president and technical director of Gulf General Atomic, said, "Now it has become necessary to recognize the fusion process, the basic source of heat of the stars, as one which will be of economical importance within the lifetime of most people now living."

A thermonuclear reaction is the opposite of the reaction that takes place in atomic fission reactors. Instead of splitting heavy atoms, such as uranium, to release power, the thermonuclear reaction fuses light atoms together to yield energy. Hydrogen nuclei are joined to make helium.

A thermonuclear reactor would have many advantages. Its greatest is that it could be fueled from the inexhaustible supply of heavy hydrogen that can be cheaply extracted from the oceans. In addition, it would be inherently safe and would produce none of the poisonous fission products that offer difficult disposal problems.

For 15 years physicists have been trying to make hydrogen atoms collide and fuse in a controlled system. Since such a reaction requires temperatures of millions of degrees, no solid substance could be used to contain the hot gas—or more correctly, plasma—for the reaction to take place. The solution had to come in the creation of a magnetic bottle to hold the jumping atoms of the plasma.

BOTTLES LEAK

This proved hard to do. The magnetic bottles leaked so fast that they were no good. One physicist described the problem as similar to squeezing an invisible inflated rubber balloon with soapy hands.

Seven years ago Ohkawa conceived a machine he called the "multipole." It was a big tub that could build up a doughnut-shaped electric field. Four metal rings that conducted a powerful current created the doughnut shape. Each of them, however, built up a magnetic pressure that made the field bulge inwardly. This gave the doughnut a cross section that looked something like a Maltese cross.

"The shape of the field was such," Ohkawa explained, "that if an atom was looking for a way to get out, it found that it was fighting a pressure that increased, no matter which way it went."

Ohkawa's first multipole machine worked well enough to be encouraging, but supports for the rings caused a loss of energy. Some energy leaked through the walls. Then Ohkawa built a larger machine which tended to overcome these losses.

This is the machine that can contain the million-degree plasma for .07 of a second.

By making a computation that involves the temperature, the density of the gas and the magnetic pressure, Ohkawa said he was able to attain a "magic number." By this he meant a number that had to be obtained before it was clear that the method was good enough to be scaled up for a true thermonuclear reaction.

The next step will be to build a machine that is 100 times hotter and contains plasma 1,000 times denser than the multipole. To do this, Ohkawa said he will have to get rid of the metal conducting rings. He has built another smaller machine that uses the plasma itself to conduct electricity. It is called "the doublet."

It will take three years, he said, to design, build, and test a bigger doublet. If it produces the calculated results, then it will be time to start designing a reactor, Ohkawa said.

DESIGN LIKELY

In his comment on the development, Creutz said, "Dr. Ohkawa and his group have succeeded in containing plasma long enough to demonstrate that the design of a full-scale

thermonuclear reactor may be within the time planning period of a company such as Gulf.

"Similar progress has been made in the Soviet Union. It appears now that the long-time dream of obtaining abundant power from the heavy hydrogen of the ocean will be realized."

TRUMPED UP CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the campaign against Judge Haynsworth by the liberals has no parallel for sheer ruthlessness in recent political history. Their trumped up charges against him are nothing short of libel. However, if one confined himself to reading the Washington Post and New York Times, it might be understandable why there would be opposition to President Nixon's nomination. Fortunately, these newspapers, and I use the term rather loosely, are only read by a fraction of the American people, and I venture to say, even among their most avid patrons there no doubt exists a great deal of skepticism as to their accuracy.

Judge Haynsworth has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Americans are not going to be duped by the terrible smear being waged against him. The supporters of Judge Haynsworth in Congress have submitted numerous editorials and articles from throughout the country endorsing him. Just this past Monday, the Evening Star had an excellent editorial as well as a column by David Lawrence pointing out the fallacies in the various arguments being advanced against his nomination. As a part of my remarks I would like to include these items as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 6, 1969]

HAYNSWORTH NOMINATION

As the Senate Judiciary Committee prepares to vote on the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., to the Supreme Court, there is growing evidence of anxiety on the part of his supporters.

This emerged most clearly last week in the letter written by President Nixon to Senate Minority Leader Scott, and made public by Senator Hruska of Nebraska, a Haynsworth supporter. This was an unusual thing for a President to do, and in effect it will put Mr. Nixon's prestige on the line when the Senate gets around to voting on the nomination.

The President said he was familiar with the complaints raised against the nomination and that he had "most carefully" examined the report. "There is nothing whatsoever," he continued, "that impeaches the integrity of Judge Haynsworth. There is no proper faulting of his position vis-a-vis civil rights or labor."

We fully agree with these conclusions. The testimony of those who opposed Judge Haynsworth because of his supposed attitude on civil rights and labor was so weak as to be meaningless. The ridiculous attempt to link the judge with Bobby Baker and thereby discredit him merely reflects discredit on the authors of this shabby undertaking.

On the matter of integrity, the President again was right. The Haynsworth opponents, however, as we understand their position, do not contend that he is lacking in integrity. The thrust of their complaint is that his stock dealings while a member of the federal judiciary are indicative of a certain lack of sensitivity with respect to proper ethical standards. There has not yet been any showing that Judge Haynsworth permitted his stock holdings to influence his judicial ruling or that he profited improperly as a result of any court decision in which he joined. Unquestionably, the record in this respect leaves something to be desired. One hopes Judge Haynsworth exercises greater care in the future. But we do not believe that this record, as it stands now, can justify a vote against confirmation.

HAYNSWORTH BATTLE A POLITICAL ONE

(By David Lawrence)

What's really behind the opposition that has been manifested in the Senate against the confirmation of Clement H. Haynsworth, Jr., as a justice of the Supreme Court?

The answer is to be found in analyzing closely the political game. Those senators, for instance, who are fighting the man who has been serving as chief judge of the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals take their cue for the most part from expressions that have come from the leaders of the AFL-CIO and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other Negro organizations. The theory appears to be that the rank and file will be convinced that Judge Haynsworth is anti-labor and anti-Negro.

A United Press International poll says that 21 Democrats and eight Republicans thus far are opposed to confirmation, while 31 are for it. There are 40 "undecided," which means really that they hesitate to reveal at this time how they feel.

One of the reasons why the eight Republicans are willing to go on record as against Judge Haynsworth is that they come from populous states. They doubtless think that they have to take into account the situation in the big cities where the Negro and labor votes could make the difference between victory or defeat for them in the elections in 1970 or 1972.

Of the 31 senators who have told the UPI that they favor Judge Haynsworth, 14 are Democrats and 17 are Republicans. Most of the Democrats are from the South, and they look askance at the utterances by spokesmen for "civil rights" groups who have come out against Judge Haynsworth.

As for the labor leaders, it is well known that they maintain organizations which do a lot of electioneering in political campaigns and openly boast that they have the backing of a majority in the House of Representatives. They have substantial support in the Senate, too. The AFL-CIO does not hesitate to issue each year a list showing the percentage by which each member has supported the pro-labor side in legislative battles.

On the surface, the main weapon of opposition to Judge Haynsworth is an alleged lack of ethics in sitting on cases which supposedly could affect his financial holdings. Nobody has brought forth any proof of dishonesty or of prejudice related to his possession of securities. Judge Haynsworth did own some stocks in a company whose principal customer was a defendant in a lawsuit before the Court of Appeals on which he served, but the significance of this has been exaggerated. A smear campaign has been launched in the press in which several senators have participated.

It so happens that these charges were once investigated by the late Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and were considered as no barrier to continuance on the lower court.

The American Bar Association also has found nothing wrong in Judge Haynsworth's behavior. But how is the public to make up its mind when the anti-Haynsworth senators deliberately ignore such findings while making headlines by implying there was dishonesty?

The Senate Judiciary Committee has made a thorough inquiry, and its report will recommend confirmation of Judge Haynsworth. President Nixon has had every fact related to the record of Judge Haynsworth and his personal holdings of securities studied thoroughly and, despite the planted rumors of a withdrawal of the nomination, the White House says that nothing of the sort is contemplated. If the President backed down, he would lose the respect of a huge number of white voters as well as millions of citizens who don't like to see artificially stimulated suspicions and unproved charges of lack of integrity hurt the reputation of an honest man who has been named to be a Supreme Court justice.

It is obviously unfair for critics to base their opposition on political grounds, including attempts to curry favor with labor unions and "civil rights" organizations. Incidentally, a substantial number of senators didn't allow such bias to interfere with the confirmation of a Negro lawyer, Thurgood Marshall, or of a former counsel of labor unions, Arthur Goldberg, as associate justices of the Supreme Court just a few years ago.

THE JEWISH BRAILLE INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and privilege for me to salute the Jewish Braille Institute of America, which on October 2, 1969, dedicated its new international headquarters at 110 East 30th Street, Manhattan.

I was invited to speak at the dedication ceremonies by the institute's president, Judge Emil N. Baar, and it was a pleasure for me to submit a message, which was read by Judge Baar to the large audience of distinguished community, religious, and public leaders. The institute has worked magnificently in behalf of the blind, not only in this country but in 30 other nations around the world.

I want to call attention to some of the services performed by the Jewish Braille Institute of America, Inc., and give recognition to the dedicated Americans all over the country for their support of the institute.

At the dedication ceremonies the distinguished speakers, in addition to Judge Baar, included Charles Friedman, vice president of the institute, who was chairman of the program; Rabbi Nathan Perilman of Temple Emanu-El, who gave the invocation; Mrs. Sol Henkind, president of the National Women's League United Synagogue of America; Mrs. Meyer Karlin, president, Women's Branch, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; Dr. Edwin Lewison, professor of American history at Seton Hall University, who is blind and who has been helped by the institute

since the age of 7; Mrs. David M. Levitt, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods; Dr. Jacob Fried, executive director of the institute; Hon. Rehavam Amir, New York City Consul General of Israel, who fixed a Mazuzah on the entrance door of the reception room—a Mazuzah that was presented to the institute by the blind of Israel and Rabbi Judah Nadich of Park Avenue Synagogue, who made the benediction.

My remarks, which follow, clearly outline the work of the institute and its efforts to help people to help themselves. I therefore submit these for the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

As we dedicate this new building of the Jewish Blind Institute of America, we dedicate more than mortar and bricks. We dedicate the dedicated heart.

When I view all of the problems pressing in upon us (and it seems to me that all of them come across my desk), I reach the same conclusion over and over again—that many of these problems can be solved if enough people care. When I first came to Congress in 1923, there was a social atmosphere in the country of "let the devil take the hindmost," a national shrug of the shoulders, so to speak. The national conscience refused to face the facts of poverty, disease, illiteracy; to face the need of helping people who could not help themselves. There was no discourse, public or private, save for a figurative handful, on "one-third of a nation, ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed".

But then consider what happened. It was as if a nation had begun to dream and to try to translate those dreams into reality. People, their lot in life, *did* matter. We may conclude that the tragic advent of the Great Depression was the spur, but whatever the spur it is the deepest meaning of our lives to have witnessed the growth of the conscience of a nation. I know now that compassion and understanding will endure though the road toward them will many a time twist and dip.

You share that optimism with me because if you did not, you would not this day be engaged in this ceremony of dedication.

Until the Jewish Blind Institute undertook its mammoth task, the blind and near blind were excluded from the history and heritage of Judaism. Jewish blind and near blind, scholars of history and theology suffered the deprivation of secure and documented knowledge. Jewish youth could not be prepared for their spiritual right—the Bar Mitzvah. So the blind were doubly blind, divorced from the world within as well as the world without. Today the Jewish Blind Institute includes a library of 20,000 Braille volumes of Judaica. It has completed its first introduction of a Hebrew Conversation Course in Braille. It has more than 1,300 full length talking books on records and 500 on tapes. There is the unique Fragrance Garden so that blind visitors through the sense of smell and touch can have some realization of the beauty of plant life. And the plants are identified by plaques in Braille. I need not enumerate further. You who are here know about the cultural evenings, the aid to University students, the service to every land throughout the world to give the blind and near blind concrete participation in the synagogue and community, to share with the sighted the holiness and history of a people. Thus, this is a structure that houses the light of learning. So it must be, for we are People of the Book. And if the Jewish people have any mission at all in the world, it is to open the paths of learning, to commingle the secular and spiritual so that man be complete in body and soul.

I said earlier that the giant conscience of America is astir and awake. It will not be

silenced and while there will be periods of public lethargy, of public indifference, and even public fatigue in wrestling with the great social problems, the national conscience will never sleep again. I believe this. And I believe this not out of intuition, nor innocence, but out of the experience and struggle which has come to me in holding public office for 47 years. We will take our wealth and put it at the service of the poor, the diseased, and the illiterate. Bitter though the struggle may be, we *will* rebuild our cities and give decent housing, decent schooling, equality of opportunity to all the residents. Thus, I am reminded of a story. A Hollywood mogul ordered a castle built for him with every luxurious appointment he could think of. After the first night's occupancy of that castle, he awoke all sweaty and hot. He looked out the window and realized he had no trees for shade. Forthwith he ordered his workmen to plant huge trees outside the bedroom window, and lo and behold, that very night it was done. The next morning the mogul awoke out of a blissful sleep and he viewed the trees from his window he sighed plaintively, "what God couldn't do if He had money."

Some of our missions will come to pass because more and more people have learned, as you have learned, the beauty and the fulfillment of caring. Technology, of course, will help just as it is helping now in the area of your great interest. The computer is being put to use to electronically transform a letter into Braille so that it can be felt. I am sure that this development has caught your interest and that you will pursue it in determining its usefulness and practicality.

In speaking of the future, I am *not* saying that evil and greed and prejudice and jealousy and lust for power will be eliminated. These are part of the human conditions and unless we recognize that these forces exist and will continue to exist, we cannot go forth to do battle. Hysteria as well as rigid doctrine arise out of fear, as do hatred and retreat. As we examine our own fears and begin to understand their nature, then and only then will we be prepared to understand, grapple with and conquer evil, step by step if need be.

It is not necessary that each one of us take on every big battle, engage in every "good" cause. It will suffice if we commit ourselves to, let us say, two or three endeavors. That you stand ready to accept commitments is demonstrated by the very existence of this building. You have brought and will bring the sightless nearer to God and man. You have imaginatively touched their out-stretched hands and have brought blessings upon them and yourselves.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR SAIGON REGIME REPORTED

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is an unofficial contest underway in some quarters to see who can come up with the most unrealistic plan to get our troops out of South Vietnam at the earliest possible moment, and never mind the consequences.

As we all know, one of the most loudly repeated arguments of those who are opposed to our policy in South Vietnam is that the Government of South Vietnam is "undemocratic" and does not represent the true feelings and aspira-

tions of the people in that unhappy land. Strangely enough, those preaching that line have nothing to say about conditions in Czechoslovakia, but that is another story.

A column appearing in the October 7, 1969, edition of the Washington Evening Star by the respected and knowledgeable expert on foreign affairs, Mr. Crosby Noyes, points out the dramatic progress being made in South Vietnam with respect to strengthening local government throughout the country at the expense of the local Communist infrastructures which the Communist military units have depended upon for supplies and support.

I recommend that all of my colleagues take the time to read this encouraging report by Mr. Noyes and include the column in the RECORD at this point:

GROWING SUPPORT FOR SAIGON REGIME REPORTED

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

SAIGON.—A visitor to Vietnam is impressed by the contrast in moods: The frantic impatience in Washington to get the war over with at almost any price and the determination here to see it through, however long it takes.

This is not a contrast between Western pragmatism and Oriental fatalism. It is rather a very different reading of what is actually happening in Vietnam that is shared here by Vietnamese and Americans alike.

Skepticism, to be sure, is justified. How many times since 1965 have we heard that we had finally turned the bend, that there was light at the end of the tunnel and that it was just a matter of time until things were under control?

The difference today, however, is that it is no longer a matter of time. Today, even the skeptics who take the trouble to look for themselves agree that things are coming under control. The military threat is being contained and the authority of the government is being extended in the hamlets and villages where the contest in Vietnam ultimately will be decided.

One can hear, of course, the snorts of derision and disbelief. For a good many Americans, the very possibility of such a thing is the purest anathema. In the mind of the opposition, the unpopularity of the "tyrannical and oppressive" regime in Saigon has become a fixation. Or, more important, it has become an essential club with which to force ever more disastrous concessions from a nervous administration in Washington.

Yet the facts are not really a matter of dispute. Whatever success has been achieved in "building democracy" from the top down—a problematical process, given the fragmentation of the country's political leadership—there is no question that impressive progress has been made in establishing a democratic foundation and a sense of participation at the village level.

The degree of local autonomy that has been achieved may be modest by Western standards, but it greatly exceeds anything that has existed in Vietnam since the time of the French administration. Until now, all local officials were appointed by central provincial administrations. And all local projects, from building of schools and roads to digging wells, have been at the direction of the central authority.

This system has been radically changed by a somewhat crude but effective program of systematic bribery.

This year, all villages have been offered direct, no-strings-attached funds by the Saigon government, to be spent on anything the villagers wished—but with an important condition. Villages with elected councils and

chiefs received a stipend of 1 million piasters—or around \$8,300 at official rates. Those with appointed leaders received 40,000 piasters. Needless to say, village elections have been held by the thousands throughout the land.

A serious effort, furthermore, has been made to build the prestige and the authority of the village chief. In a radical departure from past practice, the police, local self defense and popular forces have been placed under his direct authority. Each month, thousands of village and hamlet officials are taken to Vung Tau on the coast south of Saigon for a cram course in basic local administration, with a good deal of political indoctrination thrown in.

The upshot of this effort is that today for the first time there is the beginning of mass participation in the political life of the country. The main beneficiaries have been the local authorities, who have now become personages in their own right, and the central government which brought about the change. The chief casualty has been the local Communist infrastructure in the villages—the painfully constructed political and strong-arm apparatus in which the Communist main-force military units depend for supplies and support.

For those who believe that nothing of value is being accomplished in Vietnam and that the proper course for the United States is to throw in the towel as quickly as possible, this is, perhaps, a disturbing conclusion.

The fact is, however, that the most competent and cautious estimate here is that the present government in Saigon enjoys more solid support than any so far. And that, in these circumstances, it is very unlikely to make the sweeping concessions to the enemy that American doves have been demanding so insistently.

THE TORCH STILL BURNS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, October 8, 1969, we commemorate the 25th anniversary of Wendell Willkie's death. He was a man ahead of his time whose leadership inspired a generation and moved the world.

Wendell Willkie understood long before our landing on the moon that we are in fact one world and all must ride on one planet together. He saw clearly that minority rule was not possible, that all men were equal and that freedom was indivisible.

Wendell Willkie particularly appealed to the youth of our country and in some ways he was happiest when young men and women were seated around him.

He provided a new sense of purpose to the Republican Party and at a critical time in World War II always placed the Nation first. Narrow partisanship was not in him, a quality clearly recognized by President Roosevelt.

Wendell Willkie could light up a room by entering it and he could lift the hearts of a nation. More importantly, he had the vision to see the future and the courage to march forward toward it. The New York Herald Tribune was proud to be the first major newspaper to endorse him for the Presidency and the whole

world, I believe, treasures his spirit and values his contribution to all mankind.

I am including in the RECORD an editorial which captures much of the spirit of Wendell Willkie and which his wonderful wife and helpmate throughout the years, Edith Willkie, believes particularly apt today. I join with other Members of the House in expressing our simple thoughts and admiration to Mrs. Willkie and Philip and all their family from a grateful nation.

The editorial referred to, follows:

THE TORCH STILL BURNS

Two years ago, in the bright beauty of an October afternoon, Wendell Willkie came home to Indiana, to return to the rich earth from which he sprang. On a green hillside over which flamed the tapestry of October, the man whom Indiana gave to the world was laid to rest. On the place where he slept, the leaves came drifting down from the hackberry and linden sentinels for his eternal rest.

The great voice that had been raised for freedom was still. But even death can not quench a dream, and a flaming spirit lives beyond mortality. Wendell Willkie had fired the thoughts of men, and touched their hearts, and the world picked up his torch. His words live, and his dream moves on toward realization. Greatness does not die.

Symbolic recognition of that truth is afforded, as fully as can be expressed in stone, by the memorial that has just been placed at his grave. This is truly a shrine to freedom. It has the idealism of the cross, the sword of the spirit, the torch of humanity, the book of inspiration, and the laurel of victory.

It is the torch and the book that will carry the message of Wendell Willkie to those who come in the years ahead to the East Hill cemetery in Rushville, there to pay homage to one who was a friend to all mankind. There is no fire in the granite torch. Rather the flame is in the words graven on the book that all may read as they rest and meditate. They are the words that were Mr. Willkie's creed:

"I believe in America because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our minds, to observe our different religions.

"Because we are generous with our freedom, we share our rights with those who disagree with us.

"Because we hate no people and covet no people's lands.

"Because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance.

"Because we have great dreams and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams come true."

Mr. Willkie lived those words, as all Americans should live them. And his heritage to his fellow countrymen is contained in these other lines on the book taken from his speeches and "One World":

"There are no distant points in the world any longer—our thinking in the future must be world wide.

"We must establish beyond all doubt the equality of men.

"The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of people by other peoples is not freedom.

"Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to every one, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin.

"The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law.

"Only the productive are strong, only the strong are free.

"It is inescapably true that to raise the standards of living of any man anywhere in

the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man, everywhere in the world.

"Whenever we take away the liberties of those whom we hate we are opening the way to loss of liberty for those we love.

"The moral losses of expediency always far outweigh the temporary gains.

"The test of a people is their aim and not their color."

Those words still speak to a world that has yet to know their full meaning. They are as true as the ages. And as long as there are living men to read them, and warm hearts to respond, the spirit of Wendell Willkie will endure. His torch still burns.

TOMORROW'S SHIPPER REQUIREMENTS

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's capacity to move freight is vital to the economic well-being of our commerce both domestic and foreign. Each of us knows that despite continuing steps forward, many problems exist in the transportation lifeline.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. G. Russell Moir presented at the 24th Annual National Defense Transportation Association Forum at Atlanta, Ga., on September 23, 1969. Mr. Moir is the chairman of the Freight Forwarders Institute and of the U.S. Freight Co.

The remarks follow:

TOMORROW'S SHIPPER REQUIREMENTS

(By G. Russell Moir)

When I was originally invited to participate in this panel, I had some reservations because of the theme "Tomorrow's Shipper Requirements." The question in my mind was whether participation should not be confined to shippers, however, I soon concluded that it was equally important for carriers to project tomorrow's requirements, therefore, I am happy to be a part of this program today.

As many of you probably know, U.S. Freight Company is involved in a varied number of transportation activities, however, for the purpose of these remarks, I will address myself only to our freight forwarder operations. I also have the privilege of serving as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Freight Forwarder Institute, therefore, I am here today as a representative of the freight forwarding industry as well as my own company.

The freight forwarder, of course, is an important part of the national transportation complex. The 62 Class A forwarders regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission handled approximately 17 million shipments in 1968 with revenues of almost \$600 million dollars. Our bill for salaries alone came to \$81 million. It is quite obvious, therefore, that our contributions to the American transportation system are considerable.

Furthermore, we are no "Johnny Come Latelys" on the transport scene. Freight forwarding's origins go back to the infancy of the American railroads. We grew, literally as well as figuratively, side by side. One of the forwarders' most important functions in the 19th Century was to coordinate L-C-L service on the sprawling but disconnected rail lines. Our "partnership" with the railroads has

long been a successful "case history" of private enterprise transportation working together for the shippers' benefit as well as our own. As one result, freight forwarders are, today, the nation's most experienced and most skilled small shipment specialists. Small shipments are not a sideline with us; they are our lifeblood!

Most important, the early forwarders envisioned the rail, highway and water carriers of their day as separate but interdependent parts of the country's transport system... a significant historical and intellectual contribution in view of today's emphasis on coordinated transport. Freight forwarders a Century or more ago were joining together the capabilities of existing carriers and offering shippers service on a single bill of lading with the forwarders assuming full responsibility for the move. This great service concept was revolutionary at the time and it remains today, a cornerstone of our industry. In short, freight forwarding innovated the concept of intermodal coordination in the mid-1800's, long before its more recent "discovery" by the politicians, the press and the publicists.

Freight forwarders serve more than the nation's business/industrial community, however. We provide regular service to and from every significant military installation in the United States. Our International services handle traffic routed to bases abroad and we are prime movers of cargo destined for Vietnam. Among the membership rolls of N.D.T.A. itself can be found the names of many forwarders who give unstintingly of their time, talent and experience to help ensure our nation's transportation pipeline will operate at maximum efficiency in times of emergency.

The pioneering part played by forwarders in developing and implementing important technological advances in transportation history has long been recognized. More particularly, I refer to containerization and its application in the form of piggybacking.

History shows that forwarders and some railroads, working closely together, were the first to make containerization a realistic transportation tool. Universal Carloading was a highly successful container operator in the 1920's until a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1931 torpedoed the freight-all-kind rate that made containerization a practical and economical shipping alternative for both customer and carrier.

A brief quote from the Commission's 1931 report shows the role of the forwarder in that early venture in containerization:

Quote: "It is impossible to have an accurate conception of container service without considering the part played by the forwarding companies. The Universal Carloading & Distributing Company... is the largest operator of containers."

"The forwarding company not only performs a concentration service at origin, but a distribution service at destination. Each is important. If a large wholesaler has 4,000 pounds of freight for one destination, divided into 20 consignments, he could not use the container unless he had an agent at destination to deliver the shipments. The forwarding company is just as essential to him as it is to 20 different shippers at origin who have freight for one destination," unquote.

The forwarder was ready but the regulatory climate was not ripe for containerization that day. However, the innovative spirit of the forwarders plus a good deal of hard, imaginative effort and a willingness to experiment laid the groundwork for later ventures into piggybacking when the regulatory climate was more amenable to change. That time arrived in 1958 when the railroads published piggyback rate plans 3 and 4 that finally permitted forwarders to revive the transportation "revolution" that they had helped to generate decades before. Since that time, piggybacking has grown at phenomenal speed and once again it was the forwarders who demonstrated what could be done.

Unfortunately, the forwarders' success in pioneering new forms of coordinated intermodal transportation has not been equaled in the legislative arena. Even after more than a Century of public service we are still victims of contradictory law that inhibits us from maximizing our skills and knowhow in small shipment transportation and putting them to work for the American shipper.

One of the great structural weaknesses of common carriage is the chaotic state of transportation law. This has been common knowledge for a number of years but efforts to correct the situation have met with little success. Our regulators and the Department of Transportation are fully aware of this condition and if we are ever to have some semblance of order and even-handed justice in transport law the main thrust for change must come from outside the industry itself. The position of the forwarding industry in this regard serves as a graphic illustration.

I will refer briefly to only two respects—and I do not exhaust the list—in which Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, enacted in 1942, unrealistically inhibits the usefulness of the forwarding industry. One involves the gathering and distributing operations of the industry and the other pertains to the relationships between forwarders and the railroads with whom they work.

In providing completely coordinated transportation, forwarders work with motor carriers primarily for the assembly and distribution of individual shipments of freight within cities and for some distance around them, and with railroads primarily for the long-haul movement of consolidated lots of freight between forwarder terminals. Forwarders need the ability to make arrangements with both types of carriers on a flexible and realistic basis, so that maximum efficiency may be obtained from complete coordination.

Unfortunately, by administrative determination made in the early days of forwarder regulation and never changed, the "terminal areas" of forwarders have been frozen at the formula prescribed for line-haul motor carriers which, with minor exceptions, extends a maximum of 5 miles beyond city limits. Beyond those areas forwarders must arrange with common carrier truckers to assemble and distribute their freight and, even though they may do so by contract in most cases, the flexibility of being able to use local or forwarder-owned trucks, geared to the forwarders' operations, is destroyed.

The express agency, which like freight forwarders uses rail service primarily for longer hauls and trucks in the shorter distances, always has been permitted to fix its terminal areas to suit its operations, and the I.C.C. has reaffirmed the right of REA to do so. Forwarders require the same flexibility to coordinate the motor and rail segments of their service which REA has been granted. We intend to again make a plea for flexibility in our terminal areas before the regulatory agency.

Even more frustrating is the legal "iron curtain" that prevents forwarders from dealing with their railroad partners as common carriers, from tackling, together, a total problem and instead relegates forwarders to the role of shippers in their dealing with rail carriers. The real irony of this situation is brought into focus by the situation that exists today in piggybacking. Truckers, who are the most formidable competitors of both the rails and the forwarders, have the lawful right, as the law has been interpreted to ship their trailers by rail at tariff rates—the only basis open to forwarders—or on the basis of joint rates and divisions, or under undisclosed contract charges. This, I say, is bad policy, indefensible law, and uncommon sense.

We have not given up the battle for administrative and legislative relief—the necessity for equality of treatment is essential not only for the forwarders but for that vast multitude of voiceless shippers who must

suffer constantly spiraling transportation costs. Is it any wonder that private carriage is gnawing ever more deeply into the vitals of public transport? Of the 16 million trucks registered in the United States less than one million are for-hire, subject to I.C.C. regulation and the disparity is growing.

To alleviate at least part of this problem, and to give the small shipper a more competitive alternative, a bill was introduced in Congress earlier this year that would authorize the railroads to publish, if they so choose, tariffs for use by other regulated common carriers... motor, water and freight forwarders. These tariffs would enable railroads and freight forwarders to establish even closer working arrangements. There would be nothing secret about these arrangements, of course. The rates, if established, would be processed through the regular rate-making machinery of the railroads and published and filed with the I.C.C. Railroads would have complete control of terms and conditions as well as the level of charges.

Transportation law at present is such that it places the rail carriers and their forwarder partners in a straight jacket which prevents them from combining their services in a manner that would produce the most efficient and economical service for the shipping public. This lack of flexibility, plus rising costs, have combined to force the forwarder out of literally all short haul operations. As a result, the shipper has for all practical purposes one choice of short haul service remaining—that of the motor carrier.

Passage of the legislation can re-open competition in the short-haul transportation market. Of that I have no doubt. History shows that competition is the most important regulator of both transportation services and transportation rates. The I.C.C. can fix rates but it cannot prescribe efficiency nor enforce operational economy. As you know all too well, where there is no competition there is no incentive for a carrier to operate efficiently or economically. The monopolist's own failures then are passed on to the customer in the form of higher rates for the same inadequate service he had been receiving previously.

In closing I would like to quote from a speech given a few months ago by Ben Blaginski, President of the Southern Pacific Railroad. His remarks place the naturally close relationship of the railroads and the forwarders in crystal clear perspective.

Quote: "... Today the forwarders are, in a practical if not a legal sense, an L-C-L arm of the railroads. Changed conditions make it fitting that this should be the case, because forwarders perform certain jobs they are now doing better than the railroads can. My view of how private enterprise transportation ought to work in this great nation is that those who can handle the business most efficiently ought to be allowed the chance to do so," unquote.

To which sentiment we forwarders echo a fervent "amen." Thank you very much for your kind attention.

CONGLOMERATES—GOOD OR BAD?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we seem to be going through an era wherein certain people have the feeling that there is an inherent evil about big business. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article which appeared in the June 30 edition of Barrons entitled "Curse of Big Business":

CURSE OF BIGNESS: THE TRUST-BUSTERS HAVE DECLARED WAR ON SUCCESS

The world of anti-trust, so Alan Greenspan, noted economist and adviser to the Nixon Administration, wrote in Barron's years ago, smacks of Alice in Wonderland. These days the most exciting writings in the field unexpectedly also seem to share the kind of literary distinction once reserved for James Joyce's *Ulysses*; while not banned in Boston, they have come perilously close to being suppressed in Washington, D.C. The U.S. Department of Justice, to illustrate, in May belatedly released the Task Force Report on Anti-Trust Policy prepared at the behest of President Lyndon Johnson and submitted to him last July. Justice, however, was blind to an even more provocative survey of the same realm made for Mr. Nixon by George J. Stigler, Charles R. Walgreen Distinguished Service Professor of American Institutions at the University of Chicago, and a group of colleagues. Not until the privately owned Bureau of National Affairs published most of the text—and an enterprising Senator put it in the Congressional Record—did its contents see the light of day. Thanks to International Telephone & Telegraph Co., finally, the American people were treated to a tidbit, in the form of a Working Paper for the Nixon Task Force on Productivity and Competition, by Professor Stigler on the tantalizing issue of corporate reciprocity (you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours).

Scholarly inquiry has never been too popular in bureaucratic circles, especially when it clashes with (in George Stigler's famous phrase) "the promiscuous collection of conventional beliefs and personal prejudices" that all too often passes for public policy. In the case of antitrust enforcement, philosophic prejudice—if not, as some angry critics have charged, political or personal bias—lately has run wild. With the full support of Attorney General John Mitchell, the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, headed by Richard M. McLaren, has shockingly escalated the cold war on big business. Lacking a mandate from Congress—in a brazen effort to push existing law beyond generally accepted bounds—Messrs. McLaren et al. have brought suit against so-called conglomerates. The trust-busters also have launched an attack on reciprocity, i.e., the widespread practice of buying from customers and selling to suppliers. They have gone so far as to decree, without a shred of discernible authority, that the top 200 U.S. manufacturing concerns, and those of "comparable size" in retailing, mining or other lines, henceforth may be barred from effecting any merger or acquisition whatsoever.

Highhandedness came naturally to the New Frontier and Great Society; in the low-key, tolerably conservative Nixon Administration, however, it is unbecoming to say the least. It also flouts a mounting weight of evidence, academic and otherwise, which suggests that in theory and practice alike, anti-trust activity makes less and less sense. Thus, Professor Stigler in his Working Paper shrugs off reciprocity as "quantitatively negligible," and, in most cases, "harmless and pointless." As to conglomerate mergers, the Nixon Task Force cautions the trust-busters against moving "on the basis of nebulous fears about size and economic power"; the Johnson group actually has a kind word to say for mergers and their spur to efficiency. The proposed ban on the top 200 corporations, finally, strikes us as a naked affirmation that official policy is aimed not at corporate wrongdoing, however vague or ill-defined, but at mere bigness. At long last, anti-trust has carried its built-in biases to their logical conclusion. It has indicted success.

To judge by the recent burst of anti-trust activity, malefactors of great wealth, real or imaginary, overnight have occupied the na-

tion's executive suites. In barely six months' time, Assistant Attorney General McLaren has filed suit to block conglomerate mergers involving Northwest Industries, Ling-Temco-Vought and ITT. As if to show equal disapproval of the fat-cat Establishment, the trust-busters also threatened to bring action against First National City's proposed acquisition of a large insurance company, a move that effectively killed the deal; they also recently charged U.S. Steel with violating the antitrust laws by engaging in reciprocity, thereby impelling the company hastily to sign a consent decree. Early this month, in what has been described as "perhaps the toughest anti-trust speech delivered by a top government official since the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt," Attorney General Mitchell assailed "super-concentration" and promised to balk the top 200 U.S. manufacturers in their monopolistic designs.

Bread and circuses from the Democrats, sound and fury from the Republicans, the significance of which (like most of the effort in this murky realm) persistently eludes qualified critics. On reciprocity, for example, Professor Stigler points out that such transactions, to be acceptable to both parties, must hew to competitive terms, i.e., those freely available throughout the marketplace. Such dealings, he goes on to state, by definition harm nobody, including would-be competitors who merely sell their output elsewhere. "Reciprocity," sums up Professor Stigler, "is probably much more talked about than practiced, and is important chiefly where prices are fixed by the state or a cartel." The Nixon Task Force report echoes these views: "The economic threat to competition from reciprocal buying arrangements is either small or non-existent."

As to conglomerate mergers, neither Task Force supports the vendetta which Justice has launched. Here is the pertinent passage from the Stigler report: "We seriously doubt that the Antitrust Division should embark upon an active program of challenging conglomerate enterprises on the basis of nebulous fears about size and economic power." The Johnson study goes further. "An active merger market," it found, "suggests a healthy fluidity in the movement of resources and management in the economy toward their more effective utilization." As Barron's pointed out in March, the conglomerate thrust largely mirrored the excessive, and short-lived, availability of low-cost credit, and the encouragement of a bull market in stocks which now has painfully expired. Merger stories are hard to come by these days. On the contrary, if General Host and Ling-Temco-Vought are any guide, the sale of corporate assets may be the order of the day. Wall Street, as we have said before, liquidates mistakes; Washington perpetuates them.

What it is seeking to perpetuate today is the myth that there is something inherently evil about bigness. If the implications weren't so grim, the newly announced policy of discrimination against the 200 top manufacturers would be ludicrous. Size evidently is measured not by sales or earnings but assets, a yardstick which in future will encourage deconsolidation of foreign affiliates, spin-off of subsidiaries and other devices to escape the less-than-charmed circle. Some of the unlucky 200, moreover, scarcely seem deserving of the dubious honor. Numbers 44 and 154 happen to be Anaconda and Cerro, which stand to lose a chunk of their assets to the Chileans and Peruvians. The list also includes the major cigarette companies, which a hostile government is virtually forcing into other lines of work. The top, it has been said, is a slippery place; the trust-busters would add immeasurably to the risk. By penalizing success, they also willy-nilly put a premium on mediocrity.

On this score Alan Greenspan, who taught us that "Bad History, Worse Economics

Spawned Anti-Trust" (Barron's, February 5, 1962), deserves the next-to-last word. "Whatever damage the anti-trust laws may have done, whichever distortions of the structure of the nation's capital may have been thrown in the way of business organizations, these are less disastrous than the fact that the effective purpose, the hidden intent and the actual practice of the anti-trust laws in the United States have resulted in the condemnation of the productive and efficient members of our society because they are productive and efficient." Perhaps Messrs. McLaren and Mitchell should catch up on their reading.

CONGRESSMAN DOWDY DISCUSSES THE GREATEST VIRTUE

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the lifetime of man there have been discussions, and sometimes arguments, on the greatest virtue. More often than not these thought-provoking gatherings have begun with a question like, "What is the greatest gift you can give to your children?" Many words come to mind such as honesty, kindness, generosity, sincerity, and on and on without end. On Saturday, September 27, 1969, our esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN DOWDY, Democrat of Texas, spoke to the Southeast Texas IOOF and Rebekah Association meeting in Vidor, Tex., on this very subject.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all of my colleagues this outstanding and very timely presentation entitled, "A Pledge to Care":

A PLEDGE TO CARE

In July of 1957 the British people opened and dedicated what they call the House of Citizenship on its beautiful new premises and in its beautiful new building near Aylesbury. Lady Mountbatten, wife of England's great wartime hero, made the dedicatory address, and in the course of it she said that if she had her choice of human qualities, these are the ones she would choose in order of priority: first, courage; second, loyalty; and third, tolerance.

A commentator in an English magazine, *Time and Tide*, objected to what Lady Mountbatten gave by way of advice to the young people in the audience. He pointed out quite rightly that all three of these virtues or qualities were secondary in the sense that any gangster might have all three. He might have incredible courage to do things he had no business to do, and inordinate loyalty to the gang who supported him, and a certain kind of tolerance toward a man who would rather be a mobster than a monk!

He wished that something better than that could have been offered to the young people in the audience, and therefore he raised this interesting question: what would be your choice of the most important virtue? If we are middle-aged, we might begin with the traditional cardinal virtues—justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude. Or we might be so bold as to put humility first.

The commentator's answer, however, rather surprises us. He said, "I think I should put kindness first." *Time and Tide* is not a religious periodical, mind you, but a purely secular one, and yet this anonymous commentator protested against courage, loyalty, and tolerance as claiming first place

in a man's life, and suggested kindness in their place—although the same objection might be made to kindness that he made to the other three. A gangster can be kind.

Suppose we change and strengthen the word: Kindness, I am afraid, has become too mild a term for what the commenorator probably had in mind.

Compassion is a better word. It comes a little closer to what was meant and suggests some of the passion that is implied, a feeling with and for other people, a capacity to suffer with and for other people, I suggest that the much-used word care is even better.

Care can mean anxiety, and, as such, of course, all sane men and women shun it and try to root it out of their lives. But care, turned round, can mean that deep concern of one person for another, that amazing composite of a cultivated imagination and an insatiable desire to be part of life and to be of use. It means that capacity in human beings to get outside of themselves and to care about people and to care about life, to affirm life because they believe it is good, because in spite of all the shadows which darken their path, they approach life positively as they care about it and yield themselves to it. Whether it is to music or sports or work or the rocks of their geological surveys or the stars above them or the sea around them, whatever it is, they care about it and they care deeply.

In fact, if you reflect for a moment, you might almost divide the people of the world into two groups, those who care and those who don't.

Sooner or later, every man and every woman has to decide where he wants to stand, in which group he would like his life to be lived. You may question: What has this to do with our gathering here today? I hope you will see that the answer is everything. We Odd Fellows and Rebekahs are especially committed by the teachings and principles of our common fellowship to the practice in everyday life of that commanding ideal of care, translated into terms of service to our brothers and sisters and to all men everywhere. The principles and ideals of Oddfellowship embrace courage, loyalty, and tolerance, to be sure, but at their heart is that imperative quality we have designated as caring. We care.

Think for a moment how the great biblical incidents which are so important to us all embody and proclaim this golden motif of caring.

The story of Isaac and Rebekah, so beautifully told in the 24th chapter of Genesis, is probably the oldest and certainly the greatest love story in ancient literature, breathing as it does an atmosphere of gentleness, of respect, and of loyalty which contrasts vividly with the harsh spirit of that age and time in which women were little better than chattel slaves. The person of Rebekah speaks to us across the centuries in terms of that dignity and modesty which the Judaeo-Christian tradition helped to secure for women. It is a story which truly hallows marriage and family life as well.

Then the story of Jonathan and David. How often in moments of confusion we can best win through to victory over some lesser or greater difficulty by pressing boldly forward to meet and resolve it. In Bible times, the young David ran to meet the giant Goliath and overthrew him.

But reckless courage is not enough. David carefully chose the stones for his sling before going into battle. David understood that God lovingly governs his universe; he turned in prayer to this divine intelligence, acknowledged its unfailing presence and power, and was conscious of its direction of his meeting with Goliath. Knowing that God is good and all-powerful, evil could be nothing more than a deception and an illusion. Goliath seemed solid enough, but David was not frightened by his threatening bulk, because

he knew that the Lord was with him, and he proceeded to successful combat.

And in like manner, as we are enlightened by the tenets of oddfellowship, we see right through the flimsy pretensions of strife and turmoil in our daily living, and go boldly forward to dispel them.

In the great drama of David and Jonathan we see both courage and loyalty revealed in mutual care and affection, one bond of trust. Their abiding friendship is portrayed in several passages in the 1st book of Samuel (18: 1-4, 19:1-7, 20:1-42, and 21), notably in the very moving account of their mutual pledge or promise: "Then Jonathan said to David, 'Go in peace. And as regards the oath that both of us have sworn in the name of the Lord, may the Lord be witness between you and me, between your descendants and mine for ever.'" This remarkable example of trust and friendship on the part of Jonathan and David at the very moment that the former's father, King Saul, was seeking to destroy David, is among the greatest moments of the Hebrew Bible.

In the 2nd book of Samuel we may read (9:1-13 and 21:7) how in after years, Saul and Jonathan both dead, David the king remembered his pledge to protect the seed of Jonathan and so showed kindness to Meribai, Jonathan's crippled son, who from that day "always ate at the king's table." Later, in a time of famine and war, when David was prevailed upon by the Gibeonites to destroy the surviving descendants of Saul, only Meribai, Jonathan's son, was spared "on account of the oath by the (name of our) Lord that bound them together, David and Jonathan." It is a note of humanity and fidelity in that grim narrative of blood-vengeance and hatred.

Last, but far from least, we turn to the life and example of Jesus, and to his matchless parables. He talked constantly about care—the father who cared for his wayward son, the shepherd who cared about the lost sheep, and the Samaritan who cared about the man who was stripped and left for dead. Here is a parable which includes and demonstrates all the qualities we have mentioned—courage, as shown by the willingness of the Samaritan to stop by the roadside and involve himself in human need when he might have passed by safely and quickly (what a message for us today when fear or indifference leads so many to turn away); tolerance, as shown by the unquestioning response of the Samaritan to the plight of a Jew, despite the bitter hatred which existed between the two peoples; and loyalty, the quality of steadfast concern which moved the Samaritan to return later to make certain that all was well. And, finally, overarching all else, care.

The story of the good Samaritan was told in answer to a question asked by a lawyer, "And who is my neighbor?" The answer of the parable is any and every man in need whom you are able to help. Jesus himself cared, especially for the people nobody else cared for, the people who had been left out in life, and He gave only one test to those who would follow Him, and the test was this—that they care about their fellow men.

Indeed, St. John, in his first epistle, put it in the most point-blank way he could when he went so far as to say that God is care: "God," he wrote, "is love." Baron Von Hugel, the great English spiritual counselor and philosopher, at the end of his life of Christian devotion (in 1925), put it even more emphatically, more plainly, when he said, "Caring is everything. Nothing matters but caring."

Of course, sometimes, even though we have prayed, as did David, the scene still seems confused and discouraging. Then is the time to pause and reflect on our teachings. In God's presence, there are no contests. To infinite, ever-present love, all is love, and

* From the Jerusalem Bible.

there is no defeat. As we advance in the certainty of divine direction, evil is powerless, and we win through to victory.

Today's challenge may appear to threaten our health or the health of someone near to us. It may concern our home, our friendships, our business or professional affairs. It may be a temptation to insist on following our own way instead of God's, or it may suggest that we have no responsibilities to our fraternity, and need have no concern for others in our community. Whatever form it takes, we do best to face them squarely and under God's guidance, just as David, to meet them promptly.

In this way our thoughts and actions are divinely guided at each step to expose our most menacing problems as no more than delusions. Thus we do not shrink from close action, but go forward fearlessly. Thus today's challenges are successfully met; our problems are overwhelmed; our victories are decisive.

Thus, through our troubled nation and all the world today are afflicted with violence and conflict, yet we see that the violence and conflict have their roots in the lack of human caring and concern. It is our privilege in this society to uphold and to practice those ideals which are at the very heart of our religious heritage, ideals sorely needed in these difficult days. May we find fresh inspiration and resolve in the teachings and principles of oddfellowship, that we may better serve our nation, our world, and our God.

OUR RHODESIAN POLICY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Rhodesia should be an anathema to this Nation. The white minority of that country, who have consciously and legally separated themselves from the black majority and have forcefully and arrogantly superimposed white will on them, has violated every value the United States professes to hold as cherished.

Yet, our Government has not only refused to sever our ties with Rhodesia, but has also begun to subtly shift America's policy from Lyndon Johnson's "negative neutrality" to a "positive neutrality."

This is an extremely dangerous course of action. Our foreign policy is only as strong as the moral base which supports it. Whatever base our Rhodesian policy had during the Johnson years is now being rapidly eroded. It must change, or the United States will slip yet further in the eyes of all conscientious nations of the world community.

The distinguished columnist, Mr. Carl Rowan, has recently written a brilliant column on this country's Rhodesian policies. The article precisely points out the bankruptcy of current American action in Rhodesia, and some of the negative reactions to them from the third world nations. It is well worth reading, and I urge my colleagues to do so. The article follows:

NIXON SILENCE ON RHODESIA COSTLY

(By Carl T. Rowan)

President Nixon went to the United Nations with a forlorn plea to the 126 nations repre-

sented there to pressure Hanoi into peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war.

Nixon will get no help, no sympathy, no consolation from most of these 126 nations. The reason is that, in the eyes of much of the world, whatever moral justification we once had in Vietnam is rapidly disappearing.

If the President wonders why, all he need do is look at White House policy—or lack of policy—where the racist, outlaw regime in Rhodesia is concerned.

There has been a not-so-subtle shift of attitude in the White House from the Johnson administration to the Nixon administration, with the latter showing a lot more sympathy for the tiny white minority that has seized Rhodesia under conditions where, barring ultimate violent overthrow, that minority will forever rule and suppress the black majority.

For two months, the white House has sat on a State Department recommendation that the United States pull its consulate out of Rhodesia, but the White House has declined to do so. Thus, the U.S. consul general, Paul O'Neill, recently returned to Salisbury, an act that the ruling regime called the best possible boost to the morale of the white minority.

A U.S. that pursues this kind of policy can't possibly have good relations with black Africa. So whatever little help the African countries might give in extricating the U.S. from a grievous dilemma in Asia is not going to be forthcoming.

A country that ignores basic principles of human worth and decency, that overlooks a brazen trampling of the rights of self-determination in Rhodesia, will never be convincing when it says it is in Vietnam only to guarantee to the South Vietnamese the right to decide their own destiny.

White Rhodesians are in the process of approving a new "constitution" that will make that land an even more pernicious police state than it has been these last several years.

That constitution will make it impossible for Rhodesia's 4,800,000 Africans ever to wrest power legally from the 228,000 whites.

In theory Africans might someday achieve "parity"—that is, an equal number of seats in parliament. But there is a neat little stipulation that this can concur only after Africans pay an equal share of income taxes.

The hooker here is that Africans now pay only about one percent of the taxes. One reason is that while the average wage for a European is about \$4,000, it is only \$400 for an African.

Not in a millenium will Africans reach the economic level where they can meet the tax qualification. Nevertheless, the Ian Smith regime has raised other qualifications for voters, an act designed to exclude thousands of blacks from elections.

Finally, the whites have put in another hooker providing that even after "parity," half the black seats in parliament will be named by the chiefs, who are mostly Uncle Tom servants of the whites, and thus under effective control of the minority regime.

Another outrage is the way the Smith regime has divided up the land. It has set aside 45 million acres for 4,800,000 Africans and 45 million acres for 228,000 whites.

The regime is now in the process of chasing Africans out of "islands" within the areas reserved for whites. The courts ruled that the Africans had the right to remain, but parliament got around this simply by passing a new law.

The new constitution extends to the government the right to censor the press and other publications, a right already exercised on radio and TV. Enshrined in the new constitution is the right of "preventive detention," without bail or speedy trial, of anyone arrested on charges of trying to overthrow the white dictatorship.

This is the kind of regime the White House

can't make up its mind about—despite the existence of a United Nations resolution calling upon member states to withdraw their consulates.

The rationale coming out the White House is that there are 1,100 Americans in Rhodesia, about 850 of whom are missionaries, and that we need a consulate to look after their interests.

We didn't even have a consulate in Southern Rhodesia until 1949 and the American missionaries there prior to that time managed to get along fairly well.

The other argument is that we need eyes and ears in Rhodesia to send back reports on what is going on in the southern end of Africa. We could post observers 10,000 miles away and the odor wafting out of Rhodesia would make it clear what is going on.

Someone in the White House apparently scoffs at the notion that morality—racial, social, or otherwise—ought to be a big ingredient in foreign policy. They assume that you go with power, and obviously the whites in Rhodesia have the power. They say you go with strength, and obviously the economic interests who want U.S. relations with Rhodesia to continue have more strength in Washington than do the weak, divided African countries that look with so much anger and disquiet on what is happening in the southern end of their continent.

But it was precisely this disdain for the moral elements in foreign policy, it was this notion that might ultimately makes right, that got the United States in the Vietnam dilemma that becomes a tighter, stronger web around Nixon every week.

ARTHUR GODFREY—CLEAN WATER CHAMPION

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, those of us who led the battle today for full funding of the water pollution program are deeply indebted to Arthur Godfrey for the help he so generously gave us just 2 weeks ago in launching the drive that culminated in today's vote nearly tripling the funds for water pollution control.

With his modest and humble manner, and with an earnest, deeply moving speech, he made a great impression on the 200-plus Congressmen and representatives of conservation organizations, labor groups, and the untiring League of Women Voters, who were gathered for the kickoff.

In addition to a factually sound and truly thought-provoking presentation, Mr. Godfrey further impressed all of us with his pledge to dedicate the rest of his public life to the cause of a cleaner, healthier environment. In a more recent speech, Mr. Godfrey stated his views on this subject with such clarity, such eloquence, and such precision that I feel it should be called to the attention of my colleagues. I insert Mr. Godfrey's statement in the Record:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR GODFREY TO THE NATIONAL WATER WELL ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 29, 1969

According to the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Arthur Hanbury and Kathryn Godfrey, who lived in a flat just off Amsterdam Avenue on

114th Street in Manhattan, reported a child (male) born to them on August 31, 1903.

According to my dear mother, what she had brought forth looked like nothing either parent had ever seen so it was some time before they decided it was me. The birth certificate doesn't record that I was given the name Arthur Morton. Apparently, that wasn't decided for some days during which the matter was argued back and forth. Finally, my father's first name and my mother's surname were agreed upon one night in a moment of extreme passion.

My arrival upon this planet was always shrouded in weird mystery to me—until recently, in deep analysis, it was established that my appearance was (a) a complete and rather inconvenient surprise, though entirely (if barely) legal; and (b) that I weighed in at a whopping 4½ pounds and was so puny and cold that my maternal grandmother took immediate charge as was her wont.

The birth took place in the kitchen where they had been preparing breakfast for my father who was home on his honeymoon. Grandmother, thinking I was freezing to death, jammed me into the oven. About an hour later, father noted the sudden appearance of freckles and red hair, removed me—thinking I was done. This later gave rise to the expression "half-baked."

1903: That was the year Orville Wright said to his brother Wilbur, "meet me at the bicycle shop in the morning and let's see what we can dream up." The automobile had already been invented, but no one could drive one without sending a man out on foot ahead to warn the people. Pollution in those days was of a different order and odor.

Ninety-nine percent of the vehicles were drawn by horses whose well-organized, compacted by-products were disposed of primarily by volunteer groups of English sparrows brought over a century before for the purpose. Secondary treatment was accomplished by white-uniformed street cleaners with great brooms and shovels followed by water-wagons in lieu of rain.

In those days New Yorkers actually looked each other in the eye and smiled as they passed. Stepping ever so carefully down a Manhattan street today—usually in the wake of some huge dog—I can't help but recall wistfully that horses seldom walked on the sidewalks.

The population of greater New York was only a couple of million then and, although raw sewage was emptied into the Hudson along with the wastes of a few factories, it was but a fraction of today's gook. Furthermore, the tides were able to keep the waters fairly fresh and clean. Staten Island beaches were sparkling and we even used to swim at Hunt's Point and Great Neck. Coney Island was like Walkiki and Far Rockaway was a paradise out of this world.

Every spring we had great shad runs up the Hudson, although the salmon had gone by the time I came along. So had the sturgeon. Would you believe that America used to export Hudson River caviar to Russia? It's a fact! And crabs: Oh man, beautiful blue crabs we pay seven and eight bucks a pound for today. The rivers and inlets around New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, and the north and south shores of Long Island Sound, on down the Jersey coast, Delaware River, Chesapeake Bay and so on were alive with crabs and clams and fish.

Garbage and trash weren't really much of a problem for the average household in those days, probably because we ate everything that came from the grocery. No non-biodegradables. No plastic bags or bottles. Glass containers were saved and used again and again. No beer cans: one rushed the growler: a bucket of suds from the corner saloon. Among men only a few swells ever smoked cigarettes: women never did. Most working men smoked a cigar down to a lip-scorching

butt and then stuffed it into a corn-cob pipe for the morrow. Old newspapers were bundled up and sold to the junkman when he came around once every six months or so in his disreputable old one-horse wagon with its line of tarnished brass bells dangling noisily across the tail-gate.

Not that New York smelled anything like Illiacs then. The abattoirs, for instance, the slaughter houses—were located on what is now posh Sutton Place—and what a stench they put out! The East River was no mountain stream then, either! I know it's hard to imagine, but parts of it smelled even worse than today!

Fortunately, financial reverses forced my parents to move out of New York when I was still very young. Heh! Financial reverses: that's the wrong word. If we'd had reverses, we would have been rich. We were poverty-stricken, as mother used to say. We moved over to Hasbrouck Heights in Jersey where we could get a house and a yard and a garden for \$25.00 per month, and we used to get dispossessed for non-payment of rent every so often even at that!

But nothing better could have happened to me because Hasbrouck Heights, though only ten or twelve air-line miles away, was a hick-town. Man, it was country—with farms and orchards and woods—real, deep thick woods and a great swamp at the foot of the hill—where I keep my airplanes nowadays—Teterboro Airport.

Being hungry and poor, I had to work—before and after school every day: mowing lawns, clipping hedges, beating rugs, delivering papers, later delivering bread and rolls and milk every morning and working on the farms and in the orchards. And I hunted and fished and trapped and learned the lore of the wilderness. Used to trap muskrats just about where runway 19 is now at Teterboro. [That was the big money: 90 cents to a \$1.05 a pelt which, I am told, is exactly what they are bringing today. Heh! Computing the inflation, I guess I used to get fifteen or twenty bucks a skin, didn't I?]

Well, the point of all this is that it was all beautiful background for the role I am playing today. Although the idea is often rejected by some, I am an entertainer of sorts and, reputedly, a salesman. Many of my contemporaries accord me the dubious distinction of having been the originator of my brand of broadcasting which they happily and profitably imitate and vastly improve upon. The difference between us is that I have done my homework. For decades, like all hunters and fishermen, pilots and sailors and farmers, I have been keenly aware of the progressive deterioration of our environment, especially since the end of World War II. The fishing has been getting worse all the time—not only in the streams but in the bays and inlets and in the ocean itself. Ducks and geese are 'way down. Many predator birds have vanished from some areas and, indeed, are now threatened with complete extinction.

We have more deer than we ever had in America (even when the Indians owned the place!) but that's because the predators—the wolves and coyotes and bears and pumas have vanished from the scene. The only predators left for deer are people—most of whom are lousy shots. Also, the big, deep woods are gone and have been replaced by plowed fields edged with thin little strips of woodland full of browse upon which deer thrive, until over-population sets in. When there are too many deer for the available browse, nature takes her toll during the winter. When the snows have melted we who haunt the woods stumble over hundreds of rotting carcasses.

We who sail have watched the once blue waters of western Long Island Sound turn to a sickly, smelly, yellowish gray. We who fly have observed the air in the sky getting thicker and thicker and browner and brown-

er—higher and higher! Recently, I flew a sleek little Learjet to Ft. Lauderdale for the PATCO convention in Miami. I flight-planned the trip for 41,000 but later asked for 45,000 and found the top of the visible pollution to be no less than 43—all the way to Florida—even 150 miles off Jacksonville!

Last June I was in Rome for four days attending the International Board meeting of the World Wildlife Fund. The trip over was made at night, but I came back on Sunday afternoon via Alitalia with one stop in London. All across Europe at 34,000 the gook was high above us and all the way across the Atlantic! Not clouds—not weather—Gook! Smog! Eeachh! Yesterday I flew my Gulfstream in from Virginia at 18,000 feet. It was what most people call a clear day. However, even with a head wind of 60 knots playing out of the northwest, it was almost impossible to see the ground through the smog.

This is what man—with his runaway technology has done to himself. For billions of years the vast atmosphere had the ability to keep itself fairly clean—clean enough, at least, to sustain life.

So did our rivers and streams and bays and gulfs and reefs and beaches. The forests were the water-sheds and the moisture, that fell from the clouds, was filtered through the soils, to the aquifers, through the streams, to the lakes and the oceans, clean and sparkling to be re-cycled through evaporation back to the clouds aloft.

And this process endured through the first two million or more years of man's existence. We didn't live in sufficient numbers to do much damage to our environment. There were never as many as one billion people alive on the face of the earth until about 1830, about which time his technology began to mushroom. Lo and behold, by 1930—one century later—we counted two billion souls. The third billion required only 30 more years and we are now, in 1969, well on the way to the fourth billion.

At this horrible rate of geometric progression, 30 years from now—at the turn of the 21st century—the world population will have reached over 7 billion! This once beautiful little planet was never meant to hold that many people!

But don't worry about it. We'll never make it. My ecologist friends tell me that they are very pessimistic. They say that man is fouling his environment much faster than nature can clean it up and, in consequence, will suffocate in his own filth. Not in a hundred years—or a thousand years—but within the next thirty years! That's no time at all, is it? 30 years? Let's see: 30 years ago Hitler struck in Czechoslovakia. To my generation that seems like just yesterday. That makes 30 years from now—just tomorrow! We haven't got much time, have we? Not in view of the fossil poisons we're spreading through the atmosphere, which includes our water. Business leaders are accustomed to reading graphs: here's the growth rate and here's the pollution rate. Sometime ago they crossed. The higher we bring the growth curve—the higher goes the pollution—and they'll never cross again.

The scientists have known about this for a long time and they've tried to tell us about it. But there have been no listeners to amount to anything. For years, mine was the only voice, in command of any kind of a national audience, that was ever heard on the subject. Until about three and a half years ago, it had been very difficult to document anything. What the bureaucrats knew, they weren't telling anybody, and as a result, were and are often at cross-purposes. Then along came a book called: "Moment in the Sun", by Bob Rlenow and his wife Leona, who spent 30 years documenting the facts. I've been quoting it and touting it ever since. And others: Barry Commoner's "Science and Survival", Wesley Marx' "The Frail Ocean," Paul Ehrlich's "The Population Bomb."

To my great satisfaction, the media are now full of conservation and ecology stories these days. Almost daily in the newspapers, magazines, news radio and on TV. I can tell you now that we of these media are very sensitive to public opinion and we have known for sometime that public concern far exceeds that of our leaders. In fact, it has become more than concern: it is a cry of outrage! According to the National Wildlife Federation, during April and May of 1969, 55% of the American public is very much concerned and 75% of them are willing to pay even higher taxes to help fight pollution.

But just for once, let's not look for a scape-goat. No person or group of persons in particular is to blame. We are all equally culpable. Do you remember reading about the slaughter of the buffalo? I'm sure it never occurred to a single greedy hide shooter that there would ever be an end to that herd of 75,000,000 bison. The factories which emptied their wastes into the rivers never dreamed they were polluting the open sea! The cities which pumped their raw sewage into the same rivers cared little about the complaints from those who lived down-river, who, in turn, shrugged and added their own filth. Nor did the power plants and factories spewing their smoke into the air dream that the atmosphere would one day become saturated with sulfur oxides. Add to that the carbon monoxide and the hydro carbons poured into the air—by the automobiles and motorcycles and trucks and motorboats. Eighty-six million tons per year, 70% of the total air pollution. Did I mention airplanes? We who fly have been dragging the horrible stuff ever higher until now, as I have said, it is to be found as high as 43,000 feet! Rain—which used to be the purest water available, washes the pollutants out of the air thus contaminating the soil and the sea. Imagine: rain water no longer pure! The girls tell me they no longer can use it to wash their hair.

Remember that beautiful photograph the astronauts brought back from the moon? There is our little planet, a beautiful jewel shining against that black cosmos—and the atmosphere—our air which we breathe is, proportionately, about as thick as the skin of an apple. We don't seem to realize: this is all the air we've got! That picture could have been the end of the Apollo project for my money. The view we thus obtained of our planet was the greatest contribution of all, in my opinion. Who needs those rocks they brought back?

And what do you think another of the worst polluters of water turns out to be? The out-board motor which by design actually dumps overboard—unburned!—anywhere from 10% to a third of the mixture of the fossil fuels—gasoline and oil that is required to run them. The amount depends upon how recently the motor was built.

I'm sure the last thing a vacationing boating enthusiast ever thinks of, as he joyously churns up and down our rivers and lakes, is that he is destroying with hydro-carbons the very environment he loves! And I'm told there are seven million of them in daily use in America alone!

The Goggi brothers of Staten Island have perfected a device which, because it re-cycles this fuel back into the motor, actually pays for itself in a season of use—but more important, it absolutely prevents the pollution of the water by even so much as one drop of fuel.

Everybody knows the story of DDT by now. It was regarded as a miracle when it first came out. Now science knows that it contains a lethal non-biodegradable poison that is causing the extinction of many organisms in the food-chain of life. You all know the story of the coal miners using live canaries to warn them of the presence of poisonous gases in the mines. O.K. The osprey, the eagle, the pelican and many other birds are trying to tell us the same thing now as they approach complete extinction. They are trying to warn us of our own impending doom.

All these things and others have happened because we have failed to take the time to study the ecological consequences of our technological discoveries before adopting them. Until recently, therefore, no one could point the finger of blame. But—now that we know our mistakes—somebody had better start doing something constructive or a lot of heads will roll.

We were momentarily heartened recently when President Nixon appointed a board to study our conservation problems. Then we saw who was on the board. Besides himself and the Vice-President, the appointees are all members of his Cabinet. Conservationists? Ecologists? Just one, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge. Thus, despite the fact that 70% of the air pollution comes from gasoline powered automobiles, the President just the other day magnanimously recommended the expenditure of 2½ million dollars for the development of a non-pollutant engine. Big deal! Why Bill Lear has already spent 4 million dollars of his own money and has committed 6 million more to the development of such an engine. He puts up 10 million of his own money, Uncle Sam 2½. I am really thrilled!

Also, despite Congress' authorization of a billion dollars for water purification over a year ago, both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations have asked for only 214 million—just a little more than one-fifth of what was required as of a year ago. We must stop water pollution, but more important, it seems to me, we must quit building these damn dams and quit re-cycling water that has already passed through incalculable numbers of relatives, friends and enemies.

Dr. Jay Lehr, the Executive Director of the National Water Well Association, tells me that 97% of our treasure of pure, unpolluted, fresh water in America is located underground, anywhere from just below the surface to less than a mile. Despite this, we insist upon re-cycling our surface water. In fact, approximately 85% of the water used by Americans is surface water from the polluted lakes and rivers and streams and run through highly inefficient purification plants. Dr. Lehr tells me that even if we Americans continue to use fresh water at the same rate that we do today, there is enough water stored in our aquifers to last 7,900 years. Therefore, we could double the use and still be safe for nearly 4,000 years even if it didn't rain another drop!

I am no longer enchanted with our great technology. I have seen what unchecked technology has done to the environment of this planet. I sense we have let machines get ahead of people. The computer is beating us to death.

We have created a gaudy illusion about air travel, for instance, thanks to the creative art of advertising. I say we—because I helped do it—since 'way back in the days when Juan and Rick and CR and Pat Patterson were pioneering. The walls and files of my office are jammed with trophies and awards and kudos and thank you's dating from the first broadcast ever done from an air-liner. Captain Eddie Rickenbacker and I did it together in his first DC-3.

Little did I dream that travelling by air would become a teeth-grinding challenge to passengers. Fighting traffic to the airport . . . parking space . . . reservations that disappear . . . wrong flight information . . . cramped seating . . . dismal food . . . airways traffic delays . . . prolix ticket people chattering away unreadably on the PA system . . . grueling hikes down long corridors of stifling airports. To be followed by more ground delays, with baggage that is lost or strayed . . . and five and ten dollar hauls by taxis—when available—to the center of town.

So now what's new? The 747, the jumbo jet, and the SST. I see where President Nixon recommends an expenditure of nearly a billion dollars to develop the SST. One billion for supersonic aircraft—2½ paltry

million for non-polluting engine development.

Which has the priority—the incredible snarl and stick on the ground . . . or an aircraft which to me—whatever color you paint it—is still an increasingly large bottle, with the same small neck. And who needs the SST? The very rich and very bored jet set that want to be sure to get to Paris for cocktails tonight. That's who!

I can't help but think of the genius who built the magnificent boat in his basement and can't get it out.

We are committing fortunes to the creation of these new aircraft, and the powers that be cite the economy, and international competition and world trade. That's going to be a great airplane, that 747, I have no doubt, and may make a buck or two for the stockholders—if they don't smash one of them up too soon. Oh, they'll crack a couple of 'em up; maybe three before we're through. I never heard of a new model that didn't sooner or later cross up the designers, did you? And don't forget, no matter what systems and back-ups we can dream up, they are nothing but little black boxes in the last analysis and it is still the imperfect human being who has the ultimate responsibility. Which reminds me: aviation better hold on to some of the old-timers who are reaching the retirement age! These big planes are gonna need lore and experience—and lots of it!

And where in the world does anyone get the idea that the 747 is going to solve any traffic problems? Sure, they'll haul 500 passengers to the coast or overseas. And what will we do with the planes they'll replace? Junk 'em? Of course not. They'll be sold to smaller airlines for use in the same areas and over the same routes. And just wait till we see the ground traffic at the airports. What's the average? Two point something people come out to see papa off and two point something more to greet his return? And you think it's hard to get your baggage now?

If that sounds cynical, so be it. It is my considered judgment after 40 years of flying, and 14-thousand some odd hours as a command pilot. Instead of developing bigger and greater monstrosities, why not use some of that money to modernize our traffic control systems? How about, for instance, an inexpensive transponder for light aircraft? For a couple of hundred dollars such a device could be made standard equipment on all light aircraft. It would be turned on automatically when the pilot turns on the ignition switch. He would have no control over it except that it would be set barometrically to operate below a certain altitude—say 1,500 feet—thus enabling traffic controllers to recognize the blip on the radar screen indicating the presence of a light aircraft below the big commercial carriers going to and from airports. If such a piece of equipment had been available, that horrible, fateful collision in Indiana the other day could have been avoided.

And let's get real brave and stop this stupid private automobile jam that goes on for 20 hours out of every 24 here and in all big cities! Let us provide fast, electric or steam buses on all avenues and all streets and ban all private cars and taxi-cabs and tell the trucks to get rid of their stinking diesels and gas engines and switch to electric or steam or get out.

Let's require tertiary treatment for all sewage and chemical toilets for all water craft. No more raw sewage in the harbors and rivers, lakes and oceans. Let's quit building dams and "developing" estuaries. Let's find some other ways of building monuments to engineers than at the expense of the environment.

Instead, let's start using—wisely—under ecological control—the vast treasure of 47 billion acre feet of pure water now lying untapped in the nation's aquifers.

But most important of all, let's face up to the fact that the real cause of our entire dilemma is simply people. Teeming billions of people—human beings—the most destructive, the most thoughtless, the most careless, the most vicious of all of earth's animals. Fancying himself with absurd and naive ego, created in the image of omnipotent deity, he has ruthlessly trampled most of this paradisaical planet underfoot. Where loving, grateful stewardship should have been his guideline, he has preferred the role of tyrannical despot. He has ridden roughshod insensitively over all opposition. He has "conquered" the wilderness, asking with incredible hypocrisy, for Divine blessing and guidance all along the way, even when engaged in the murder of millions of his own kind! But, where as in ancient times (and for 2½ million years!) nature always handled any runaway situations with dispatch (with plagues, pestilences, floods and fires) man with his developing technology has defeated her—temporarily—on every front. For the better part of a century—the blink of an eye-lid in the aeons of timeless history—man has been sailing blithely along completely unaware of his course and speed.

The destruction of his environment by his own greedy hand, will be his ultimate undoing. Extremely sober, highly respected ecologists predict utter catastrophe before the turn of the century—within 30 short years! This is the heritage we are leaving our children—no future at all! And they know it.

Well, I would be less than honest if I failed to tell you of those frightening truths, but I would also be less than human if I didn't hope. I am a dedicated volunteer for survival. Will you join me?

WORLD BANK CAMPAIGN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, I commented on the manifesto which came out of the World Bank Convention here in the District of Columbia—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 6, page 28736.

Itemizing the international bankers' programs, I suggested that no Member, to the knowledge of his constituents, would vote for such proposals.

I further remarked that if the same objectives were written in palatable language, thinly disguised, and labeled as "progressive," "mature," "flexible," and "humanitarian," many would feel constrained to so vote.

Past experience proves that the international bankers use their full power to confuse, persuade, and maneuver the American people to accomplish international aims.

The internationalists erupted into operation almost immediately. Yesterday, I received a leatherbound volume entitled "Economic Foreign Cooperation" which even bears my name, stamped in gold, on the cover. The book explained that underdeveloped nations do not like the word "aid," and henceforth the word "cooperation" should be used when referring to "our economic foreign programs." The book is illustrated with cartoons and written in a vocabulary and style addressed to about 10-year-olds—apparently the intelligence level that the senders must regard Members of Congress as possessing.

The World Bank coterie, through its former president has also recommended an inducement to Hanoi to end the war earlier; the "inducement" being a cool \$1 billion foreign aid package to Southeast Asia. What Congressman could vote against a billion dollar expenditure—not called "ransom" or "blackmail," but for "peace through economic cooperation?"

The former World Bank head indicates that North Vietnam might be interested in joining international organizations—the Asian Bank, the World Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more imperative that our colleagues become alerted to crafty promotions if they are to continue representing their constituents rather than the predetermined programs of the powerful World Bank cartel.

I insert a news clipping from the Christian Science Monitor:

SOUTHEAST ASIAN AID PACKAGE URGED AS INDUCEMENT TO HANOI

(By William C. Selover)

While President Nixon is concentrating on finding an end to the Vietnam war, Eugene R. Black, former World Bank president, has come up with what he thinks is an "inducement" to Hanoi "to end the war earlier."

This "inducement" is a cool billion-dollar aid package to Southeast Asia, designed to spearhead economic development in the area.

Ironically, Mr. Black makes his report, "Alternative in Southeast Asia," published by Praeger, at a time when he is no longer a part of the administration, when public enthusiasm for massive foreign-aid programs is at an all-time low, and when his voice remains largely unheeded.

He started his thankless task back in April, 1965, when President Johnson appointed him special adviser and asked him to come up with a plan for postwar development.

JOHNSON ROLE RECALLED

In his now-famous Johns Hopkins University speech, Mr. Johnson called on Mr. Black to devise a grand plan: "The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and the existence of more than a hundred million people," Mr. Johnson said.

He sent Mr. Black and a task force tramping throughout Southeast Asia with a few specific suggestions, spelled out in typical Johnsonian superlatives:

"The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA.

"The wonders of modern medicine can be spread through villages where thousands die every year from lack of care.

"Schools can be established to train people in the skills that are needed to manage the process of development."

Mr. Black believes that the American presence in Asia must be reduced dramatically following the war. He believes Mr. Nixon's suggestions for postwar Asian policy are valid.

WHAT SUGGESTION MEANS

"In the wake of a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam," he reports, "I think we will

have to substitute for an overwhelming American presence a multilateral framework for a policy of regional cooperation."

In other words, he suggests that Americans concentrate on bolstering regional unity—in an area which could thrive on such unification—and at the same time renounce what he calls "our present policy of overinvolvement in the affairs of Southeast Asia."

While such pronouncements are common on Capitol Hill these days, representatives of international finance have not been heard to take such a clear line.

"Everybody's tired of the war," Mr. Black says in his soft Georgia accent. "Businessmen would like to see it over."

He added: "Financial people are worried that we are spending this much money; they would like to see it spent in this country."

In every country Mr. Black visited in East and Southeast Asia, leaders asked the American banker if the United States would lose interest in the area following the war.

REGIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. Black assured them he would be very much surprised if it did. But he hoped continued interest would be in the form of contributions to regional banks and investments in developing projects.

Already, study of the postwar task has resulted in several examples of regional cooperation, including the Asian Development Bank which was an outgrowth of this program. The Mekong committee, according to Mr. Black, is also "extremely active" in making plans for long-term development.

Mr. Black is particularly interested in involving Japan in future regional economic pacts, as well as the Soviet Union, and even North Vietnam. "It is quite possible North Vietnam could benefit from the aid," he says.

"North Vietnam might be interested in joining international organizations, the Asian Bank, the World Bank—they might come in on a multilateral basis."

Furthermore, he said, they might "get power from the Mekong power plants."

But he also warns that it would be a great "setback" to regional cooperation if the Communists won the war. He agrees with the Nixon attempts to gain peace in the area. The lack of support for Mr. Nixon in this country, he says, "is going to make it very difficult to make peace." Those advocating deadlines for unilateral withdrawal, he says, "are playing into the hands of the North Vietnamese."

MORE TRIALS IN IRAQ

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, beginning in December 1968, the Government of Iraq has held a series of so-called spy trials, in which they subject innocent victims to an Iraqi inquisition.

In February 1969, a horrified world

witnessed the display in the public squares of the city of Baghdad of the mutilated and murdered bodies of the first of the "alleged spies." Since then, the total number of the tortured victims of the Iraqi barbarians has reached 54.

Many of those killed by the Iraqi executioners have been Jews, who were sacrificed for no other reason than the fact that they were Jews. The action by the Government of Iraq in holding these "kangaroo trials" and the imposition of the harshest penalty for the alleged crimes is a flagrant violation of every human standard of decency and a direct rejection of every human right.

This mockery of justice continues in spite of pleas from the highest authorities—Presidents, Prime Ministers, officials of the United Nations, the Pope, respected leaders from every nation and from every institution in the civilized world.

I call upon the Secretary of State, William Rogers, to make every effort to intervene with the rulers in Baghdad to put an end to these charades of justice and to free these innocent people from their torment. The United States should seek every available avenue of redress in the United Nations, and prompt that international body to apply to the prisoners of Iraq the protection of human rights accorded to every other member of the world society.

HON. JOSEPH RESNICK

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sadness at the passing of Joe Resnick. I extend my sincere condolences to his wife.

Joe was a warm and ebullient friend and a Congressman of the old school, an individualist to the core. He cared deeply for what was right. He cared less for party, and institutions and not a whit for those whose noses might be out of joint because of his actions.

He followed the road where his instincts took him, with a bulldog determination, and his instincts were right and sound.

And he followed the road as a pro. He knew his stuff. He did his homework.

It was this combination of bulldog tenacity, courage, and instinct for what was right and decent, along with Joe's high professionalism that made him such a significant Member of this body, and leaves us with such a sense of loss.