

Black, and nothing comparable to the brilliant public service of Senator Byrnes that preceded his brief service on the Supreme Court.

Comparisons are also inevitable with two southerners who have been denied a place on the Court in this century—Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina and Judge Clement Haynsworth of South Carolina.

Dean Pollak, of the Yale Law School, when pressed for such a comparison of the nominee with Judge Parker said as follows:

Senator, Judge Parker has been very much in my mind because though I know there is a variety of view about him and in his later years he wrote a number of opinions with which I disagree, I have always thought of him as a judge of very considerable distinction, and it has been to my mind a very real question as to whether the Senate was not in error in declining to consent to his nomination. But the adjectives you use in referring to Judge Parker, the brilliance, the excellence, the ability that you properly ascribe to him, are not, I respectfully suggest, adjectives that can appropriately be attributed at this stage to this judge, the nominee who is now before you. (Transcript, Page 248)

I supported Judge Haynsworth for reasons now a matter of record. It is my view that the Senate erred in failing to consent to his nomination. While studying the Haynsworth record I was impressed that detailed briefs were presented by nationally respected legal scholars as evidence of Judge Haynsworth's abilities and, in general, praise of his judicial work in various areas of the law. Read cumulatively, they presented the portrait of a diligent, able and thoughtful judge with a quality in his work that assured he could serve with distinction on the Supreme Court of the United States. I find no comparable evidence in the Carswell transcript nor has

any been presented subsequent to the hearings.

I hope I am mistaken in my assessment of Judge Carswell. The demands upon the Court during the remainder of this century will be great. It is quite possible that this nominee, if confirmed, might well serve for most of the balance of this century. This has been a difficult decision and I have come to have regrets about a system that has subjected three of the last four nominees to the type of national debate that has resulted. Nevertheless, for me there remain unanswered questions about the nominee. I believe we must seek excellence and require candor from those who are to administer justice on the highest court in our Nation.

I cannot consent to this nomination.

THE PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Resolution 211, seeking agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on limiting offensive and defensive strategic weapons and the suspension of test flights of re-entry vehicles.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, as a reminder to Senators, may I say that immediately upon the disposition of the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, under the previous order the able senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is to be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour, following which it is to be assumed that the majority leader will set aside a period for the transaction of routine morning business,

before the unfinished business is laid before the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 7, 1970, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6, 1970:

AMBASSADORS

Arthur K. Watson, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Walter C. Ploeser, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

William D. Brewer, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mauritius.

William C. Burdett, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David M. Abshire, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Vice Adm. John Marshall Lee, U.S. Navy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BOOM IN ABILENE EVIDENCE AMERICANS STILL LIKE IKE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year has passed since the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Our former President and general of the Army rests peacefully, his labors done and his accomplishments remembered by Americans as a testament to their country's greatness.

Ike is buried in a simple chapel crypt at Abilene, the town that he grew up in and remembered through his life with fondness. Eisenhower Chapel is near the museum that contains the personal effects and papers of a life of selfless service and dedication to good works. Nearby, also, is the Eisenhower boyhood home, typical of the humble origins of many of our greatest leaders and most of America's heroes.

In the year since Ike was buried in

Abilene, over three-quarters of a million citizens have paused to pay their respects and ponder the significance of his work, his life, and how he lived it. Abilene has welcomed visitors to its historic places with warmth and quiet dignity befitting the memory of the general.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 2, the New York Times carried an article about Abilene—1 year after Ike came home to rest. I know all Americans will be interested in reading this piece for it reflects some of the reasons why I am deeply honored and highly privileged to represent the citizens of Abilene in the Congress.

The Times article is reproduced as follows:

BOOM IN ABILENE EVIDENCE AMERICANS STILL LIKE IKE

(By Drummond Ayres, Jr.)

ABILENE, KANS., April 1.—The charisma is still there, even in death.

In the year since Dwight David Eisenhower was brought back to this old frontier town and lowered into the rich prairie soil of which he always seemed so much a part, more than 782,000 people have come here to pay their respects.

They stand silently at the foot of his simple chapel crypt, heads slightly bowed, remembering that 35-million-vote smile.

They visit the adjacent museum to relive the drama of the general's longest day, tiptoe through the library housing his presidential papers, troop through his boyhood home to soak up the atmosphere of an America that was less complicated and more cocksure.

Because Americans by the thousands, still like Ike, Abilene is prospering. Since April 2, 1969, the days of his burial, cash receipts at the several dozen local restaurants, motels, gas stations and stores have increased 10 to 30 per cent, the biggest spurt since 1867, when the Union Pacific laid its tracks into town and started hauling out the Texas longhorns coming up the Chisholm Trail.

Some of Abilene's 8,500 residents, such as Ernest Morse, president of the Citizens Bank, are beginning to use the word "boom" to describe the economic changes. In a recent luncheon visit to the Chamber of Commerce office to get the latest facts and figures, Mr. Morse said, "there's a little boom underway. Net worth is up just about everywhere."

Other indicators tend to support Mr. Morse's view.

Two new chain restaurants recently opened on the outskirts of town, where the big Victorian houses with their wide, grassy

lawn give way to a scattering of gas stations on the edge of an endless expanse of wheatfields.

In the heart of the business district, a \$140,000 fried chicken carry-out store is all shiny glass and plastic amid the drab rows of two-story brick stores and the hulking gray grain elevators that dominate the skyline for miles around.

Thirty-five new motel rooms have just been added, giving the town more than 350 beds. National motel chains are sending in men to survey the situation and purchase land.

Real estate prices are soaring. A well situated business plot that brought \$5,500 several years ago was sold a few weeks back for \$15,000.

The prosperity is much welcomed, of course, though it does not appear to have been deliberately sought.

Advertisements for the Eisenhower chapel, museum, library and home are subdued and couched in unadorned language. Few gaudy Eisenhower souvenirs are on sale—no pen-nants, no hats, no badly rendered busts.

In this respect, Abilene seems to be making a special effort to live up to the general's strict code of manners and ethics.

Rude, brash Abilene, the town whose storekeepers, saloon operators, gamblers and cowpokes defied even the fast guns of Wild Bill Hickok, is no more.

FEW COWBOYS AROUND

For the most part, only memories and history remain.

When the railroad pushed farther west and south in the early eighteen-seventies, the herds of longhorns and the wild cowboys followed, leaving Abilene broke, exhausted and quiet.

Today the local high school football team calls itself "the Cowboys," but most of the players have never tackled a steer. On the outskirts of town, there is one of those reproductions of an Old West Street. It tries hard to recapture some of the long-gone flavor but succeeds only in roping in tourists' dollars.

The few real cowboys still around often shun the traditional range role, perhaps rightly so. Sometimes they can be found at the local drugstores, lounging in the ancient wireback chairs and drinking coffee instead of stringing wire and mending saddles. Many wear baseball caps, bib overalls and galoshes.

They talk about at lot of things, from inflation to the war in Vietnam, neither of which is popular here. But, more than anything, they like to discuss the feedlot short-horns, that tasty modern-day steer that never trades wits with a cutting horse, never fights the tug of a lariat, never feels the sear of a branding iron and never knows the joy of ruminating on a cud of tough prairie grass.

The atmosphere in Abilene today is described by Henry Jameson, the town's unofficial historian, as "almost the complete opposite of the atmosphere of a century ago." A baldish former wire service reporter who now publishes the Daily Abilene Reflector-Chronicle, Mr. Jameson paused a moment the other day, glanced at an autographed Eisenhower picture hanging over his desk, then began to reflect.

"We have become a town of moderation," he said, "and we now see ourselves as products of the same environment that produced Ike. He is always very much in our subconscious and most of us are trying hard to be the sort of solid citizen he was."

Mr. Jameson preaches this same line in the columns of his paper. The most recent example being an editorial headlined "Ike, the Moderator."

The local radio station, KABI, is also a strong believer in moderation.

"Our programs," says Doug Lyon, the general manager, "are designed to be 'middle of the road contemporary.' That's our audience. 'We aren't too rocky, not too square. We

play all, from Glen Miller and Lawrence Welk to Tom Jones and Johnny Cash.

"The only thing we don't play is the stuff with the bad lyrics about sex or dope. I take that off the air—because the kids ought not to hear it."

Whether Mr. Lyon's censorship has had a beneficial effect is anyone's guess. Whatever the case, the young people of Abilene seem at times to be almost as conservative as the old folks.

They do not picket, or wear extremely long hair, or dress in ultramodern pants and shirts. While they rough-house around at the local drive-in and hot-rod up and down the main street on weekends, they commit few serious crimes, stay away from drugs and father few illegitimate children.

OLD WEST SPIRIT PERSISTS

The most serious breach of youthful conduct in the last year was the vandalizing of a schoolroom.

Abilene's young people also face censorship at the 40,000-volume local library. A youngster can visit a local bookstore and buy a paperback copy of Gore Vidal's "Myra Breckinridge," but, unless the library staff judges him or her "mature," a hard-cover copy of the best-seller can not be checked out.

The same rule applies to the current top best-seller, Dr. David Rubin's "Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex But Were Afraid to Ask."

A case of sorts, can be made that a smattering of Abilene's Old Wild West spirit still exists in a nightclub called the Red Pussycat.

The club, with a fine collection of go-go girls and strippers, opened only a few weeks ago in the remodeled lobby and ballroom of the old Sunflower Hotel, once an Eisenhower favorite. While no call has yet gone out for a modern-day Bill Hickok, the town fathers are beginning to show some signs of strain, particularly those who have dropped by and discovered just how much fun there is in a little sin.

PATRONS ARE HOPEFUL

The other night, for example, one of the go-go girls went into a choreographic frenzy that left her platform rickety, the reflecting mirror broken and her pasties on the floor.

There was a moment of delightful pandemonium. But then the club management rushed in, shut off the jukebox and, with it, the action.

As for the strippers, they do not really strip. But one of them came to Abilene with a record of arrest for indecent exposure, and hope persists among the patrons of the Red Pussycat.

A shapely club waitress, Mrs. Jan Haden, says one need only visit the newly opened night spot to find out that Abilenians are "the same as everybody else, at heart."

Her supervisor, Mrs. Dick Saffle, is somewhat less charitable. After a few cross words with an irate local citizen, she said, "They said this town wasn't ready for the Red Pussycat. Well, every weekend we pack them in, 200 or 300 at a time. It's time the hold-outs came out of their dream world and dropped in to see what the rest of the world has been watching on television for years."

EXPORTS VERSUS IMPORTS—THE CASE OF FEAST OR FAMINE

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

MR. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many who share my deep concern over

the rising flood of imports into this Nation, gains which are being made at the expense of our own domestic prosperity.

Competition is healthy, an open market is good, but the trade policies of this Nation in recent years have led us straight down the path from flourish to perish.

We all know about the \$7 and \$8 billion trade surplus enjoyed by the United States a few short years ago—an export margin which helped offset large foreign expenditures for mutual defense and foreign aid.

Today we still continue down the path of foreign adventure, but our favorable balance of trade has all but disappeared, and, in spite of number juggling, may very well have completely disappeared.

The problem is most urgent—American industry is at a complete disadvantage. Our Government has opened the domestic market to heavily subsidized foreign goods without insuring equal opportunity for American markets abroad.

I have written the President to urge careful reexamination of our trade policies, and urge my colleagues to also give of their time to deal with this matter.

Failure to act can only mean certain jeopardy to our already faltering economy—a case in point is well illustrated by this recent article appearing in the Wall Street Journal:

ZENITH TO LAY OFF ABOUT 3,000 THIS YEAR, ONE THIRD ARE BLACK; JAPANESE ARE BLAMED

WASHINGTON.—Zenith Radio Corp. said it will reduce its U.S. work force by about 3,000 jobs this year, and more than one third of those laid off will be blacks.

Joseph S. Wright, Zenith chairman, disclosed the layoff plans in a letter to Commerce Secretary Stans. The letter was quoted by Kenneth N. Davis Jr., Assistant Commerce Secretary for Domestic and International Business, in a speech to the Electronics Industries Association meeting here. Mr. Davis said he received Mr. Wright's permission to quote from the letter.

In it, Mr. Wright said that, in addition to the layoffs this year, when the company's new plant in Taiwan starts up in early 1971 it will generate 4,000 jobs "that will probably be lost in this country." He said the "most tragic part" is that "due to seniority 38% of those laid off are blacks." In 1968, the Chicago-based electronics concern employed an average of 23,000 workers.

Mr. Wright said the electronics industry "is engaged in a life-and-death struggle" with the Japanese and criticized the Government for its lack of support in this struggle. He said the Japanese government substantially subsidizes its exports and assists "in keeping out any U.S. competition that they don't regard as desirable."

In contrast, the Zenith chairman complained, the U.S. Government has shown "little if any interest in our problems." He pleaded with the Commerce Department to "look into this matter and at least stop indicating to people that there isn't any significant problem."

Mr. Davis said Mr. Wright's sentiments on trade are "becoming widespread here" and criticized the failure of Japan and the European nations to recognize this. He said this doesn't represent a "protectionist" view but is rather an insistence that the U.S. "obtain fair and equitable trading terms with other nations."

The Commerce Department official also suggested that Common Market representatives apparently misunderstood the U.S. position during informal trade discussions last week.

"What could be particularly troublesome is that there doesn't appear to be recognition by the Europeans that there are serious differences between us that need attention now," he said.

THE MAINTENANCE OF OUR ECOLOGY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been brought to my attention a truly significant speech on a matter of vital importance to all Americans—the maintenance of our ecology for future generations. Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., chairman of the board of North American Rockwell Corp., presented these remarks to the Executives Club in Chicago. A member of President Nixon's Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, Mr. Rockwell has good suggestions for our country and makes a strong contribution to the dialog concerning our environment.

Under leave heretofore granted, I insert Mr. Rockwell's excellent speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY WILLARD F. ROCKWELL, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, NORTH AMERICAN ROCKWELL, BEFORE THE EXECUTIVES CLUB, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 20, 1970

ALASKA: THE POLLUTERS' UNPROMISED LAND

Three thousand miles north and west of this dining room there is unfolding one of the great ecological dramas of our time.

A relatively unspoiled wilderness has come face to face with monumental twentieth century pressures for exploitation of its resources.

The State of Alaska is face to face with a man-made problem: How to achieve maximum use of its natural resources without the familiar triple debacle of depletion, pollution and disaster.

It's not the first time Alaska has been under similar pressures.

But now, for the first time, the State has the opportunity to checkmate the twentieth century exploiters and polluters with twenty-first century scientific tools and management techniques. It has a unique opportunity to use a coordinated systems approach in planning, organizing, directing, and controlling its future growth.

In order to appreciate the full significance of that opportunity, let's pull back for a moment and survey our own situation here in the Continental United States

ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER

We're faced with environmental disaster. For more than a century we've done everything conceivable to ruin our land for future generations.

During this same period, conservationists were crying in the wilderness. Finally, the country started to pay attention, and we thought that we had salvaged something. But today, the specter of environmental pollution has again threatened our land. Until very recently we seemed to be losing the battle.

But something happened just recently to turn this whole sorry situation around.

Just 40 days ago, we, the people were

pushed solidly and decisively, and it was exactly what we needed.

I'm referring to President Richard Nixon's Message on Environment which he sent to the House and Senate on February 10, 1970. The President proposed a 37-point program, embracing 23 major legislative proposals and 14 new measures in five major categories:

Water pollution control.
Air pollution control.
Solid waste management.
Parklands and public recreation.
Organizing for action.

NATIONAL AUDIENCE

The President addressed himself directly to the municipalities of America that are polluting our waters; he spoke to industries that are discharging their wastes into those waters; he spoke to the oil industry and to the automobile industry; to the electric utilities. He spoke to the manufacturers of beer bottles and milk cartons, and hair shampoo. He spoke to big land developers. He spoke to you, and he spoke to me.

For years many Americans, and I believe I can number myself among them, have been speaking as often as we could about the vitally important problem of preventing the pollution of the Planet Earth, about the need for a coordinated systems approach to overwhelming problems of Environmental management.

As a member of President Nixon's Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, I've had an even deeper appreciation of those problems.

However, at times I felt as though we alone couldn't supply the necessary push.

WILLINGNESS TO SHARE COST

In the past six months the crisis in environment came to a head. Our citizenry is at least partially aroused as evidenced by a Gallup poll indicating a willingness to shoulder the cost of clean-up. And we now have the national leadership we so desperately need.

We're not alone in coming to grips with these suffocating environmental problems. It's a global threat. England, France, Switzerland, Chile, Peru, Mexico, Japan—all have problems. The West German Government has allotted 1.5 billion dollars for just one project—to clean up the Rhine River.

We know that it's going to be expensive. President Nixon, in his message, quoted a figure of \$10 billion alone over a five-year period just for the construction of municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor lines needed to meet our national water quality standards.

All of us are going to be sharing the cost—through higher taxes, higher rents, higher fuel costs, higher commodity prices. The only thing more costly would be to do nothing.

Alaskans are aware of the waste of natural resources and careless pollution here in the continental United States. They know the story of the gigantic cesspools that we call lakes and the horrors that we call rivers. They know about vanishing wildlife.

STATE PROBLEMS

Pollution, too, has been more than a word to Alaskans. According to a Department of Interior report published two years ago, water pollution in numerous areas is becoming serious. Raw sewage discharge in the greater Anchorage area has resulted in gross pollution of Cook Inlet.

Mining and construction have resulted in local siltng of streams and concurrent damage to fishery resources. Water discharged from sea food canneries, pulp mills and oil producing poses a threat to both stream and coastal water quality in the Kenai Peninsula and in southeastern Alaska.

Despite the offenses already committed

Alaska is still the promised land of fabulous resources.

MISTAKES WON'T BE REPEATED

As guardians of this treasure, Alaskans are determined that the mistakes perpetrated in continental United States will not be continued up north.

Determination is one thing—the money to carry out that determination is another.

Until recent times, surplus money was as scarce in the treasury of the State of Alaska as it is in many of the older states.

In 1967, the total revenues for Alaska, which has a population of 280,000, were \$290 million.

Slightly more than half of that sum came from the Federal Government. About one-fourth was collected in various taxes within the State.

Then—almost overnight—Alaska had the necessary funds to back up its determination to use its resources wisely and to control its environmental future.

I'm sure all of you are aware of the North Slope oil find.

OIL COMPANIES REVENUE

Last Fall, more than \$900 million was paid by a score of oil companies to the State of Alaska for additional leases in the North Slope area.

The discovery of the North Slope oil field is just the beginning of similar openings of natural resources that will inevitably follow.

The State's mineral potential will dwarf the most fabulous stories of the past. Only a fraction of the territory has been thoroughly explored for minerals—probably less than one percent.

Therefore, I am convinced that we are about to see in Alaska an inevitable pattern toward urbanization and industrialization.

Alaska is already concerned about the effects on geography and wildlife of this new way of life.

The easily scarred tundra, the delicate vegetative layer of mosses, lichens, grasses and sedges, is already, without man-made interference, in a critical balance with nature. Any break in its surface could leave unhealed scars for years and become a focus for erosion. As a result, seed test farms have already been established near the drilling operations to find suitable cover to replace the gouged-out tundra.

Gentlemen, I've been an ardent conservationist most of my adult life. I've fought in some of the battles, and I've fought them hard, and I intend to continue the fight.

But let me make it clear: I'm not advocating we turn the State of Alaska into a fish and game preserve.

WELL-DEVELOPED ECONOMY

Alaskans are entitled to, and must have, all the benefits of a strong, well-developed economy.

They have every right to bring the oil to the surface, to mine the minerals, to harness the waters for electric power. They have every right to harvest the crops from both the land and the sea.

But Alaskans have a great opportunity to reassess, before they are locked into rigid positions, the relationship between technology and the environment. And I'm happy to tell you that they already appear to be reacting with great responsibility.

Less than three months after the oil lease money was deposited in the banks, the State of Alaska, in conjunction with the United States Department of Interior, called a meeting of experts.

In essence, the experts were asked by the State, "What's the best conservation practice we can follow here in Alaska? What's the most feasible development course we can chart? How should we manage our natural resources?"

Just think about this for a moment.

What if this country, a full century ago, had been able to make a master survey of all its natural resources?

Better yet, if the country could have acted upon that survey?

What if, a full century ago, systems analysts, resource and environmental specialists, and management specialists had been summoned by the Governors of Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York and been told, "Here's how our population is going to grow over the next century. Here's a projected pattern of industrial growth. We want you experts," the Governors would say, "to conduct a complete and precise inventory of our natural wealth. We want you to tell us the what, where, and how much of everything."

"We'll develop the organization," the Governors would continue, "assemble the team, and prepare the requisite legislation and authoritative charters to carry out the plan."

IMPORTANT DIRECTIVE

And finally this most important directive which, had it been given and enforced, could have saved this nation the present blight of environmental degradation. "A word of caution," the Governors would have said to the experts one hundred years ago, "The beauty and purity of the land and its water and its atmosphere must be preserved."

The state is most fortunate because there are now available for use in environmental and resource control new scientific tools and new management techniques. These are the direct outgrowth of twenty-five years of intensive research and development stemming from the Korean war, the cold war, and the flight of the Apollo to the Moon.

Of direct interest to Alaska is the fact that we now have spacecraft for communication, navigation, weather forecasting, crop monitoring, and mineral prospecting.

And the aerospace industry in addition has developed management systems for extremely complex endeavors.

Most exciting are the new scientific tools that are now, or shortly will be, available.

ELECTRONIC EYES

Within a very few years, sensitive, unblinking electronic eyes and new photographic techniques will be focusing from satellites on undeveloped areas, such as Alaska, bringing a great technological revolution in oceanography, geology, agriculture, forestry, geography, cartography, hydrology, geodesy, and other related fields.

They will be prospectors in the sky, leading to the discovery of new mineral, water and food storehouses. They will allow men to inventory accurately the natural resources.

In forestry and agriculture resource management, it is now possible to classify and evaluate the extent and health of vegetation resources.

In water resource management, it is now possible to establish water tables, snow and ice pack, lake and river status, and location of fresh water in salt water regions.

In wildlife and game resource management, it is now possible to locate and track major herds, locate conditions favorable to support of animal life, and improve our ability to locate commercially valuable fisheries.

A few weeks ago in an issue of the Saturday Review, I read the following summation: "With all his gifts, man has been able to effect vast change, making his life different from that of those who lived before. His capacity for invention and his sense of creative splendor have constructed great civilizations.

"But he has never been in command of his works,

"He has never been in balance."

End quote.

TASK OF RESTORATION

Here in the lower forty-eight we have almost been defeated by that loss of com-

mand and lack of balance, and we're turning now to a task of restoration.

But Alaska is different. The state has been bruised, but not defeated, in this environmental struggle.

It has an unparalleled opportunity to be in command of its works.

It has an unparalleled opportunity to stay in balance.

It can do so if its people continue with their expressed determination to remain free and unfettered from senseless exploitation and pollution.

It can do so if its people accept the acknowledged heavy cost.

It can do so if it reaches out for the scientific and management tools now available.

Alaska, for generations acclaimed as the land of opportunity, offers this entire nation a last chance to be convinced that men can control their environmental destiny, that men can inherit the Earth without despoiling it.

Thank you.

FLOYD IVERSON RETIRES

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished public servant retired on April 2, 1970, after nearly 40 years of duty with the U.S. Forest Service. I refer to Floyd Iverson, regional forester of the intermountain region in Ogden, Utah, since March 1957. Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, said of Floyd Iverson:

During his years with the Forest Service, Mr. Iverson served with distinction in many varied assignments from Forest Ranger to Regional Forester. His outstanding leadership in resource management and administration of the 19-forest Intermountain Region was recognized with a Supervisor Service Award in 1962 and with the coveted Bridger Award of Utah State University in 1964.

The Deseret News, Salt Lake City, paid well-deserved editorial tribute to Mr. Iverson on April 2, 1970, and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

WELL DONE, FLOYD

Sometimes an umpire is needed to get things done in all walks of life.

That was often the role played by Floyd Iverson, who is retiring from his job as Regional Forester with the U.S. Forest Service after 38 years of service.

The Forest Service's multiple use concept, which Mr. Iverson has enthusiastically championed, is essentially an arbiter's job. For the Regional Forester helps decide in his everyday job how much emphasis must be given to timber production, grazing rights, recreation and watershed development.

And who else but an umpire or a diplomat could reconcile the differences between livestock men and conservationists? Mr. Iverson helped develop an open-minded policy on which both could agree—one of his topmost contributions while serving as chief of the Intermountain Region.

Moreover, he and other foresters like him were working on conservation and the environment long before it became popular to do so.

The public owes a debt of gratitude for

the beauties of nature that have been preserved for us and future generations by men like Floyd Iverson.

THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a truly great nation should encourage and strengthen its cultural activities. It is ironic that most European countries much smaller than America for years have been much more interested and concerned about culture than the United States. This is unfortunate, but it can be corrected with legislation that will probably reach the House floor this spring—extension and expansion of the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, which was only a beginning.

Yet, some day, I believe we will join other nations who honor and love culture, and who have placed it high on their agenda of life. A nation that is not rich in culture is like a country without freedom—it is only half alive.

In 1965, when the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities was established, I helped sponsor the legislation, because I believed then—as I believe now—that we should help develop those important areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that although it is imperative to concentrate much of the Nation's efforts in solving the problems of the cities by reordering our national priorities, the field of culture should not be ignored as in the past.

Our Nation's defense is vital, but the arts and humanities are also important. One would not reach this conclusion after examining the budget for fiscal 1971, for the record shows that the Federal Government plans to spend \$40.79 of every \$100 for defense costs in the 1971 budget, but that only 2 cents of every \$100 is allocated for the arts and humanities. Such a disparity is unfair, unwise, and unsound in a free country.

President Nixon deserves praise for urging that the amount for the arts and humanities be doubled and the late President Kennedy also deserves credit for advocating strengthening of the field of culture when he said:

The quality of America's cultural life is an element of immense importance in the scales by which our worth will be weighed.

Mr. Speaker, by extending and expanding the arts and humanities, we can improve the quality of this Nation's life, not only for the present, but for future generations as well. A nation should be strong in every area if it has the resources. We have the resources, but we do not have the will and commitment. If a country is strong economically, but is lethargic in culture, the nation is weakened, both in vision and purpose.

So I hope that when the legislation reaches the floor, the House will pass the bill that calls not only for extension, but expansion of the program to give culture in this Nation additional strength and encouragement.

HOW COMMUNISM IS FARING IN AFRICA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a most shocking and disturbing article on the Communist activity in Africa. Mr. Richard J. Bocklet depicts a country-by-country report of major Communist activities. I commend him for his in-depth reporting.

The Article, "How Communism Is Faring In Africa" follows:

HOW COMMUNISM IS FARING IN AFRICA

(By Richard J. Bocklet)

After a 10-week, first-hand investigation of Communist activities in Africa, the following picture emerges:

Reds are cashing in on the Arab countries' struggle with Israel. Heavy sums of economic aid, armaments and training personnel have poured into Northern Africa since the June 1967 war. Egypt, Algeria, Sudan and Mauritania are the most important sites of Red influence. And with the recent coup, Libya might be the next scene of Communist inroads.

East Africa, Tanzania, Zanzibar and Zambia maintain Red guerrilla training bases for the "southern sixth" of the continent.

On the west coast, Russians aid Federal Nigerian forces; Red China the rebellious Biafrans. No matter who wins, Communists expect to gain influence. Leftist-leaning Congo-Brazzaville, Guinea and neighboring Mali provide training camps, arms and propaganda distribution centers in this part of Africa. Down south, in the Bight of Biafra, the recently independent Equatorial Guinea is a new area of Russian interest.

Countries where Reds have lost ground and are closely watched include: Congo-Kinshasa, Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Senegal, Dahomey, Ghana, Morocco, Central African Republic and Tunisia.

Communist China, in particular, has suffered setbacks over the last two years. A cutback in activities due to the domestic strain of Mao's "cultural revolution" and gauche political activities are the main causes. (In Tunisia, for example, the Chinese Embassy frequently issued press releases highly critical of the government's pro-West stance. Then, when two Chinese ping pong experts seemed more interested in political propaganda than the game, the delegation was sent packing. And in Kenya, the Chicoms stirred up such activity with Mao's "little red book" that it was finally banned and the Chinese chargé d'affaires expelled.) Also, Nationalist China has about 450 agrarian specialists in over 20 countries. With no political or infiltration strings attached, these aid projects have piled up genuine friendship for Taiwan.

Red Chinese aid so far totals about \$175 million, with over 3,000 Chinese personnel on the continent. Mao's China is officially recognized by 12 countries: Algeria, Congo-Brazzaville, Egypt, Guinea, Kenya, Morocco, Mali, Mauritania, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda and Zambia. Taiwan boasts relations with 22. Despite this numerical difference, however, Communist bases in the dozen countries service every area on the continent.

Here is a country-by-country rundown on the major Communist activities:

TANZANIA

In Tanzania, on Africa's east coast, an estimated 1,000-man team is surveying the 1,200-mile Tanzanian-Zambian Railway. This \$250-million project will keep the Red Chinese

deeply involved here for the next five years. Chicoms, Russians and East Germans use the capital, Dar es Salaam, and the off-shore island of Zanzibar as major arms shipments depots for southern, central and western African guerrilla wars. Zanzibar is so riddled with training bases that no foreigner—even diplomats stationed there—can travel five miles from the capital without a special pass. Even on the airport road, three training camps can be spotted.

In Tanzania's southern Mtwara Province, South African and Mozambique guerrillas receive instruction and sanctuary. This off-limits area is dotted with Mao's propaganda signs and Chinese advisers are seen frequently. And, although denied by Biafran officials, reports persist that Red China airlifts arms and supplies into rebel-held areas from Tanzanian airstrips.

ZAMBIA

In neighboring Zambia—which touches on Rhodesia and Portuguese-ruled Mozambique and Angola—Red Chinese, Russian and East German experts staff training camps. The Zambezi River between Zambia and Rhodesia has been the scene of sharp attacks and counterattacks. And in August, Portuguese Foreign Minister Alberto Nogueira stiffly warned President Kenneth Kaunda to dismantle guerrilla bases functioning there "under pressure of the Organization of African Unity and other external forces." Already 500 to 600 members of the Angolan Popular Liberation Movement have received training in Zambian camps.

CONGO

Another Red stronghold is Congo-Brazzaville. Located on Africa's west coast, this country offers training and aid to guerrillas operating in Portuguese Angola and neighboring Congo-Kinshasa. Best estimates say about 100 Russians and 100 Chinese are presently stationed here. They are working with some 300 guerrilla trainees in camps about 200 miles north of the capital.

In Brazzaville itself, a favorite parlor game is estimating which Red group is currently "in." Castro instructors were here for the last several years training the country's Civil Guard along the same lines as the Cuban Militia. As this leftist force increased its power, however, the threatened military staged a coup d'état a year ago. Since then, Cubans have become quite scarce.

In this bastion of "scientific socialism"—where Mao quotes and hammers and sickles decorate pages of the ruling party paper—both Russians and Chinese are very active. In August, for example, the Soviets opened a \$2-million hospital while the Chinese dedicated a \$5-million textile manufacturing complex just outside Brazzaville.

The government maintains no relations with the United States, Great Britain or Congo-Kinshasa. These countries are its editorial whipping boys—the first two for their capitalist systems and the latter for following them. The Viet Cong, of course, are considered international heroes. Anti-Western and anti-American sentiment is so fierce at times that travelers are attacked en route from the ferry landing to Maya-Maya Airport just outside Brazzaville.

SIERRA LEONE

Another Red country pushing hard in Africa is East Germany. Egypt and Sudan recognized it several months ago. Commercial representatives and consultants are located in Tanzania, Zanzibar, Guinea, Congo-Brazzaville, Morocco and Tunisia. It's the job of local Africa-GDR friendship groups to promote trade, cultural exchanges and eventual diplomatic recognition.

From July 16 to 19, Sierra Leone—on Africa's west coast—played host to the "Friendship Africa-German Democratic Republic Conference." Some 200 delegates from the United States, the Soviet Union and Africa attended. The East Germans alone sent

a 50-man team headed by GDR Minister of Communications Rudolf Schulze. These included trade unions, youth, women in the world today, and, of course, relations between the Eastern bloc and Africa.

Although denying government sponsorship of the conference, the minister of land, mines and labor, the deputy minister of finance and the prime minister himself addressed the body. In his speech, the deputy minister of finance, Mr. O. Cole, called the prime minister "comrade Dr. Siaka Stevens" and exoriated "imperialists, colonialists, and neocolonialists." "However, notwithstanding the temporary setbacks in our liberation movements," he remarked, "it shall not be too long when general Africa will crush the imperialists like bugs."

The ruling All Peoples' party newspaper *We Yone* editorialized at the conference's end: "Much as we are prepared to continue our long-cherished association with our past colonial masters and others, it would be suicidal for us to ignore the rest of the world..." The consensus of qualified opinion is that East Germany has made significant inroads toward diplomatic recognition here.

GHANA

In Ghana, once an important center of Communist activities in West Africa, the Red star has ebbed. Marxist President Kwame Nkrumah was ousted by a military coup while on a visit to Peking in February 1966. The Communist Chinese were quickly sent packing, as were the North Vietnamese and North Koreans. Although allowed to remain, Russian diplomatic personnel are closely watched.

In October 1968 the Ghanaian authorities seized two Soviet fishing trawlers within territorial waters. Looming in the background were undertones of a plot involving elements of the Ghanaian navy. And a month later the Armed Forces commander was arrested on charges of links to pro-Nkrumah exiles in London. Reports stated that a conspiracy had developed in December 1966 and that the actual takeover date was to be Dec. 24, 1968. Although the Russian ships and crews were finally released, deep feelings remain that the trawlers played a role in the abortive coup plan.

The general opinion here, though, is that Nkrumah lacks real support in the military, intellectual circles or with the masses. Ghanaians are deeply resentful of the \$1-billion debt his free-spending regime left them. His Convention People's party is outlawed and his old enemy, Dr. Kofi A. Busia, has just been chosen prime minister in a democratic election.

MALI

Although Socialist President Modibo Keita of Mali was deposed a year ago, this West African nation of nearly five million persons still has a strong Communist presence. An estimated 1,000 Red Chinese technicians are building and operating sugar, match, cigarette and textile factories. The Chicom embassy issues weekly progress bulletins; Mao propaganda banners and his "little red book" are visible. Children receive lessons in Marxism, although their content has been watered down since the coup.

The Soviet Union and the East European bloc have pumped in an impressive \$320 million in aid since 1960, and show no signs of tiring. The Russian-built sports stadium and the omnipresent advertisements of Soviet goods and East German Interflug flights dot the capital city of Bamako.

Despite the coup, Soviet-leaning Keita aides still hold high positions in the Foreign and Finance ministries. Scores of Russian-trained civil servants staff government agencies. And recently, the ministers of social welfare and defense paid business calls at the Kremlin.

Despite its "positive nonalignment," Mali makes no secret of support for the Viet Cong. It was among early recognizers of the VC's

Provisional Government. But the consensus of opinion is this: "Maliens are traditionally very pragmatic people. They can take aid from a country one day and turn their back on it the next. For example, Mali officially recognized the Viet Cong government right after the U.S. had shipped Mali about \$2 million worth of corn and sorghum during a critical food shortage. The ruling clique is not as deeply committed to the Red bloc as the previous regime, and the Communists know this."

GUINEA

In neighboring Guinea, President Sekou Touré's Marxist regime felt the tremors of Mali's coup. Recently, security forces rounded up suspected subversives—both civilian and military. Seven high-ranking Army officers received death sentences for plotting against the Touré government.

With the demise of Keita in Mali and Nkrumah in Ghana, Guinea is West Africa's last bastion of "scientific socialism." Nkrumah himself resides in Guinea's capital, Conakry, as co-president with Touré, editing a political magazine.

Both Soviet and Chinese instructors operate training camps here. Among others, guerrillas fighting in neighboring Portuguese Guinea find haven. Extremists of Sierra Leone's All People's Congress reportedly were armed and trained in Guinea before their party won power. And observers in Senegal assert that Red literature filters into their country from Guinea.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Diplomats in western Africa are closely watching Soviet moves in Equatorial Guinea, freed from Spanish control in October 1968. Snuggled in between Gabon and the Cameroons, its off-shore island, Fernando Poo, now plays an important role in Biafran relief flights.

Russians are sending a 14-man diplomatic delegation here. In comparison, Red China is not represented and the United States embassy has only several people. Observers emphasize that the airstrip on Fernando Poo is especially good and capable of jet-age transport. Air rights gained here, it's felt, would place Russian planes within convenient distance of any country in western or central Africa.

LIBYA

In September the 18-year reign of conservative King Idris I was ended by a left-wing military coup. The immediate areas of concern were the \$1-billion worth of private American oil investments and the Wheelus Field Air Base. The \$100-million base, staffed by about 2,500 U.S. airmen, will be closed by December 1971, it was learned. Shutting down British bases at Tobruk and El Aden is to follow. So far, payment for these investments have been guaranteed.

Qualified observers see two developments taking place: First, the Communist bloc will try for trade inroads. Military aid will be offered to replace the British and American pullouts. The Communists will capitalize on intense nationalistic feeling here and discredit the United States as an important supporter of Israel.

Second, under a "Socialism, Unity, Freedom" banner, Libya tips the balance in the 14-member Arab League toward the radicals. Already a prime contributor to Arab defense (about \$100 million annually), Libya could well increase its payments, permitting heightened Arab guerrilla activity. There's also a possibility it will permit training bases. All this presents a dim sight to pro-West Tunisia, sandwiched in between the radical Algerian and Libyan regimes.

SUDAN

To the north, in Sudan—the largest nation on the continent—an Army-led coup d'état last May ushered in a leftist Revolutionary Council. Of this 24-man ruling body,

five ministers were members of the Communist party's Central Committee, with seven others from the party's rank and file. Excepting three, the remainder are considered anti-West with heavy Red leanings.

Explained one diplomat to me: "Prior to the Arab-Israeli war, the U.S. pumped \$15 million annually into here; West Germany maintained three aid groups. To the government's surprise, all assistance immediately stopped as Sudan broke relations with these countries for 'supporting' Israel. Internally, despite a deep conservative ideology, the Reds, although officially outlawed, were able to function and recruit. The Communist party grew to about 50,000 members—the biggest in Africa. And with the complexion of the new government, their work has apparently paid off."

Shortly after taking power, the Revolutionary Council announced its "Socialist course" and condemned "reaction and imperialism." It promptly dispatched a high-level mission to Moscow and established diplomatic relations with East Germany, North Korea and the Viet Cong Provisional Government.

An estimated 150 Russian military instructors are presently in Sudan with another 250 technicians working on five hospital projects. The Soviet Union supplied Sudan with artillery and tanks; ships were delivered from Yugoslavia. The Red Chinese, too, maintain an embassy and a trade mission in Khartoum.

Bordered by Egypt, the Red Sea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Congo-Kinshasa, Central African Republic, Chad and Libya, Sudan provides a strategic Red base in central and southern Africa. Reliable information states that Red advisers staff training and rest centers for Chad and Ethiopian guerrillas. At one staging area, Kassala, regular shipments of arms and rebels follow the 15-mile route into the Eritrean region of Ethiopia.

EGYPT AND ALGERIA

On Africa's north coast, the radical Arab nations of Egypt and Algeria are also very close to Moscow. Both have received substantial amounts of military hardware—estimates say \$2 billion worth went to Egypt since the Arab-Israeli June 1967 war.

Associating the United States with Israeli victory, Arab leader President Abdel Gamal Nasser looked eastward for support. Shipments of tanks, planes, artillery, radar and advanced weaponry arrived. Also, some 4,000 military and technical advisers poured in to modernize Egypt's army and defense system. Several hundred members of the Egyptian Air Force were trained in Moscow to pilot Soviet-supplied MIG-21s and supersonic Sukhol-7 jet fighter-bombers.

More recent events foreshadow even greater Soviet influence. Last June, President Nasser switched Air Force commanders in favor of a general just back from training in Moscow. Just a month before, reliable sources say, Czechoslovakia delivered around 100 amphibious armored personnel carriers. And, in an apparent policy shift, the Soviet Union has been shipping pontoons and other material needed for canal crossing. The supply of fighter planes has also been speeded up.

On August 4, Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan charged Soviet personnel with actually planning and directing Egyptian attacks. "To my regret there has recently been some operational advice. If in the past they distributed arms and told the Egyptians how to use them, Soviet experts now tell them what to do. They not only build fortifications and teach them how to operate a cannon, but they say 'you must now do this at such and such a time and in such and such a place.'"

But this close Russian-Egyptian relationship has left Algerian officials wary. While welcoming their estimated \$250 million worth of Soviet military equipment, they want to keep operational procedures in their own hands. The 3,000 Russian technicians in

Algeria are closely watched; they are given clearly defined assignments with Algerians calling the tune.

Despite the flurry of reports of Soviet naval activity in the Mediterranean, the best information in Algiers is that there are no Russian naval bases here. Even the famous former French base at Mersel-Kebr is reportedly operated by hired French technicians and Algerians—but not Russians.

More important, though, are the air bases in the interior of the country. These former French airstrips have been modernized and, it is felt, give the Soviets important outlets to southern and central Africa. And with the removal of the U.S. Wheelus Field in Libya, Russians gain added strategic advantage.

But while the Soviet Union is deeply committed in both Egypt and Algeria, many Middle East observers think there is inherent friction. Commented one Western diplomat to me: "Communism is alien to the Arabs' religion and cannot be foisted on government leaders or the masses. The Communist party is hounded, its members jailed, its literature closely watched. As far as Arabs are concerned, communism is fine for Viet Nam or Asia but they seem determined to close the doors to it here. Russians realize this, but continue their handouts valuing the Arabs' international support as payment."

However, amid the political maneuvering and lavish economic and military outlays, not to be forgotten is the mass of public opinion across the continent. Recent space feats have won us the admiration of many Africans. Throughout Africa, the United States Information Service's Apollo 11 buttons are the vogue. Formerly it was Mao buttons.

In Addis Ababa, where I was when Apollo 11 reached the moon, thousands maintained all-night vigils around the USIS Center, listening and viewing details. As the spaceship landed, they broke all the show windows. But, as a local newspaper commented editorially, "out of joy and support for the United States, not in protest."

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as I have for the past several years, I am providing herewith for public scrutiny full information regarding my income for the past year and my personal financial holdings.

My personal income for the past year included my congressional salary of \$39,374.98, miscellaneous income from speaking engagements of \$2,348, a long-term capital gain of \$750 on the sale of about \$3,000 in stock, and \$1,000 in interest income, for a total income for 1969 of \$43,472.98.

I own 1,000 shares of stock in Monarch Savings & Loan Association, worth about \$20,000.

I own a home in the District of Columbia in which I have an equity of about \$17,000.

I own an unimproved parcel of real estate in my congressional district in which I have an equity of about \$4,000, and I own a half interest in another unimproved parcel of real estate in my district in which my equity is about \$15,000. I have no other real estate holdings.

My total assets are less than \$100,000.

GETTING THE LEAD OUT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, getting the automobile manufacturers and the oilmen to combat air pollution by getting the lead out of the combustion engine has been slow and plagued with an apparent lack of effort. At long last, however, it appears that these two groups are taking steps in an effort to help cleanse our air.

Since the American public has put its support behind antipollution measures, automakers and oilmen have said that tetraethyl lead, a gasoline additive which contains harmful polluting ingredients, can soon be eliminated from auto fuels. It is interesting to note that only a few months ago both automakers and oilmen had stated that the removal of lead was not possible in the immediate future. Now, both groups have reversed their earlier positions. Automakers now say that 1971 cars will be able to run on unleaded gasolines and the oilmen now say that lead-free fuels will be available.

Burbank television station KNBC pointed out this reversal in an editorial broadcast on March 9, 1970. The editorial goes further, however, by offering additional steps which the station believes are necessary to alleviate pollution and by also suggesting a method for encouraging the public to use lead-free gasolines. Because it offers information and suggestions worthy of consideration, I submit the editorial for publication in the RECORD.

The KNBC editorial follows:

GETTING THE LEAD OUT

It's beginning to look as if the auto and oil industries have the tetraethyl lead situation nearly solved. After several months of public sparring, to keep from being accused of a conspiracy, the automakers have announced that most 1971 cars can be delivered ready to use unleaded fuel. And the oilmen now say the fuel will be ready when the cars are.

This is quite a step forward for them, but it's an even bigger step forward for the rest of us. We could debate the health hazards of tetraethyl lead, but no one will say it's good for us.

There's another advantage of getting the lead out that seems to have been lost in the shuffle. For several years now, a number of researchers have been working on a device known as a catalytic muffler. It works like any other muffler, except that it also contains chemicals which change harmful hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen from the engine exhaust into non-harmful gases such as carbon dioxide and free nitrogen. With this kind of muffler, cars can meet our air purity needs.

There are several more steps we'll have to make, including a mandatory inspection program and perhaps even a mandatory change-over program, so that all cars use these exhaust purifiers.

But there's one immediate problem in all this for state and local government. As things stand now, there's no real compulsion for people to buy unleaded gasolines when

they're available, and some companies feel the lead-free fuels will cost us more than what we're paying now.

If you can accept the idea that the power to tax is the power to destroy, there may be some merit in the idea of raising the tax on all gasoline with lead, and cutting the tax for lead-free gas. This would give all of us a compelling reason to use the "clean" fuels, and discourage us from buying cars that can operate only on hi-test.

KNBC supports the idea of heavy taxation of gasoline containing tetraethyl lead.

FAVORABLE COMMENTS ON THE VOLUNTEER ARMY CONTINUE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, sometime before the Selective Service law expires next year, Congress must decide what to do about the military draft. While further reform of the present law is a possibility, I am convinced—as are many of my colleagues—that the most desirable solution is abolition of the draft and the institution of an all-volunteer army. Happily, this idea has won increasing support since the Gates Commission released its report in February recommending that a voluntary force be created.

Several news articles from various papers reflect this favorable sentiment. What is to me most interesting is the Plymouth Review's statement that a thorough reading of the Gates report convinced the editor that past opposition to a volunteer army was unjustified. In the words of the Review:

A study of the commission's report will convince any open-minded citizen, we believe, that this distinguished body is correct in recommending an all-volunteer armed force.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to include the Plymouth, Wis., Review editorial, James Jackson Kilpatrick's article from the Washington Star, and William F. Buckley's viewpoint as presented in The Paper in Oshkosh, Wis.:

[From the Plymouth Review, Mar. 26, 1970]

COMMISSION MAKES STRONG CASE FOR ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

Is an all-volunteer armed force a good thing for the country? We didn't used to think so. It seemed to us that we should always have some draftees, to leave the loaf.

After going through the full 211-page report of the president's commission on the subject, however, we have changed our mind. The most telling blow against the draft, or conscription, we felt, was contained in one word: "discrimination."

The draft, the commission said, is highly discriminatory and constitutes an actual, excessive tax on those forced to serve.

"In a political democracy," the report said, "conscription offers the general public an opportunity to impose a disproportionate share of defense costs on a minority of the population."

That minority is not black or white—it's the young who happen to be chosen, the commission noted. In effect, the commission calculated, the draftee pays taxes at a rate

of 51% of income compared with perhaps 15% for the average non-draftee of the same age.

In World War II, the commission pointed out, when 16.4 million men served in the armed forces, that was only 12% of the total population, 17% of the adult population and 56% of the adult male population between 18 and 45. "Not everyone eligible to serve does so," the commission said, even in such a global war.

"Defenders of conscription often argue that every young person has the duty to serve his country . . . The real question is not whether young people have such a duty, but whether the duty does not extend to the entire populace. Is it right and proper that a large tax be confined to a small fraction of our young able-bodied males in order to relieve taxpayers in general from having to pay higher taxes?"

The commission concluded its discussion on this point by saying: "It is hard to imagine a means of imposing the cost of defense, or any other government activity for that matter, more in conflict with accepted standards of justice, equality and freedom in the United States" than conscription.

A study of the commission's report will convince any open-minded citizen, we believe, that this distinguished body is correct in recommending an all-volunteer armed force. If you want to go into the matter deeply, send \$1.25 to the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, and ask for a copy of the commission report on the all-volunteer armed force.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 5, 1970]

THE DRAFT IDEA ATTRACTS LITTLE ATTENTION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is altogether remarkable when you consider the bitter turmoil surrounding the draft, how little attention has been paid to a well-reasoned proposal for ending it. Six weeks have passed since the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force brought in its unanimous report, but nothing has come of it on Capitol Hill.

Not even the young people seem aroused. A college editor who sees dozens of campus newspapers says the all-volunteer idea has evoked scant discussion. Some of our young men, it appears, are less interested in solving their problem than in yelling about it. But one of the facts of political life is that only a squeaky wheel gets grease; the commission's proposal will surely die unless it attracts more support than it has drawn thus far.

The commission has recommended nothing that is revolutionary or even novel. Until 1948, the United States always had relied upon a voluntary armed force except for major wars. What the commission is urging is simply that we return to tradition: Let us put our first reliance upon regulars who serve by their own free choice.

Is the idea feasible? The commission is convinced that it is. In recent years we have become so accustomed to the draft that a notion has taken hold that all servicemen are the victims, directly or indirectly, of General Hershey's press-gang. This isn't so. All regulars with more than four years of service—38 percent of the total—are true volunteers. Roughly half of the 500,000 men who enlist each year also take up arms regardless of the draft.

What this means, in the commission's view, is that the problem of maintaining a stable force of, say, 2½ million volunteers is not nearly so difficult as many persons have assumed. Such a force can be achieved "by improving pay and conditions of service sufficiently to induce approximately 75,000 additional young men to enlist each year from the 1,500,000 men who will annually turn 19."

These inducements, granted, would cost a

great deal of money. A basic pay increase alone would run to \$2.7 billion a year. But the commission advances cogent arguments in support of this pay boost, no matter what becomes of the all-volunteer idea. In simple equity, our servicemen have a raise coming. The commission recommends that base pay for personnel in the first two years of service be hiked from \$180 a month to \$315 a month, with comparable increases for young officers.

Suppose, for the moment, that such a pay scale proved effective in terms of an all-volunteer force. Is such a force desirable?

On this point, reasonably minded men may disagree. It is objected, for example, that "volunteer" is no more than a pretty word for "mercenary." Many critics have speculated that the requisite pay scales would be so attractive to low-income blacks that a disproportionate number of Negroes would wind up in military service. There is some fear that a large professional army would pose a threat to civilian government.

The commission marshals effective responses to all these objections. Nothing to the nation's history, prior to 1948, suggests that an all-volunteer service is significantly different from a force composed of mixed regulars and conscripts. Negroes presently make up 10.6 percent of the armed forces; they might constitute 15 percent of an all-volunteer arrangement—hardly enough to have it said that whites were hiring blacks to defend the country for them.

From the military standpoint, the concept holds great attraction. While most draftees accept military service philosophically and become good soldiers, others spend their time fomenting dissension. The rate of re-enlistment among conscripts is much lower than the rate among "true volunteers," which means that thousands of expensively trained men must be replaced every year. In war, as in most of the brutal games men play, experienced professionals are better than fresh-caught recruits.

All this makes sense to me. The idea ought to make sense also to the millions of young men who now suffer financial loss and personal disruption by reason of the draft. What are they waiting for? If they don't get behind the concept of an all-volunteer service, no one else is likely to push the concept for them.

[From the Paper, Mar. 12, 1970]

MILITARY CONSCRIPTION SHOULD END

(By William F. Buckley)

It is going to require a considerable act of will to put into effect the recommendations of the Gates Commission as we turn gradually over the next year and one half in the direction of an all-volunteer army. The Senate Armed Services Committee doesn't much like the idea, and went so far as informally to reject Mr. Nixon's proposed successor to Gen. Hershey because of his undiluted enthusiasm for the idea.

On the American scene in general, the libertarians and conservatives are in favor of the all-volunteer military because we believe in the presumption of voluntariness in all things. The left-liberals opposed conscription less because of their attachment to individual freedom than because they see here an opportunity to deflate the military.

In between is a large group of people whose objections are, roughly, in two parts. On the one hand, they argue that there is a great danger in a typically military class. That the opportunity might then come to the military class to dominate the civilian executive and even, as they do on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays in Latin America, take over the government.

An additional argument is the notion that military training is good for any young man, and that moreover it does something to incorporate him into America—to American-

ize him, if you will. In the great debate on what was then called "universal military training" in the late forties, President Truman fought to clinch the case in favor of conscription by saying proudly, "Look, I've served in the military, and look what it did for me!" That was not taken by the public as a conclusive argument in favor of UMT, but along came Korea, to make the argument academic.

Abolitionists of conscription must concede a couple of points to the opposition. It is true that a professional military class is less desirable than, say, a militia. Arguing the point in the Federalist Papers, Hamilton wrote, "There is something as far fetched and so extravagant in the idea of danger to liberty from the militia, that one is at a loss whether to treat it with gravity or with rallery; whether to consider it as a mere trial of skill, like the paradoxes of rhetoricians; as a disingenuous artifice to instill prejudices at any price; or as the serious offspring of political fanaticism."

But the virtues of the militia—which, like Switzerland's, stays and works at home except when in training, or when engaged in duty—are transferable to an army which needs, let us say, to keep 300,000 men in west Europe. And the question is whether such as they should be volunteers, or conscripts.

The other objection, less often stated, is that things being as they are, inevitably the army will emerge much higher than 10 percent black. The objection is raised not because there is anything undesirable about the black fighting man. But because we will have come up with what will strike many as a mercenary army, collected from those ghettos fostered by our system, and utilizing the victims of those ghettos who are now invited to protect with their lives their white brothers who make life intolerable for them at home.

I grant this is caricature. But so are the rantings of Herblock—precisely because the world is full of men and women who seek to hobgobline and, if at all possible, to dishonor the motives of America. (There is absolutely no doubt that tomorrow's economic textbook will be saying that in the post-Vietnam age, America solved its unemployment problem by recruiting a highly paid volunteer army.)

How does that add up? Surely we should end conscription, and the sooner the better. The additional cost is easily compensated for in a fairly short run by the economic productivity of those who do not enter the army, and therefore remain home and pay taxes. And, in the long run, by the lowered cost of training—the fruits of professionalization. Meanwhile, we shall have asserted once again our devotion to the principle that that which is not required of a citizen, he should not be compelled to do.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

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

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

How long?

**TRUTH ABOUT THE OIL SPILL IN
THE GULF OF MEXICO OFF THE
COAST OF LOUISIANA**

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the recent oil spill off the coast of Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico, but truth about the situation is lacking from most accounts.

I am sure that most of the things which have been said or written have been done so with the proper motives, however, by not revealing the actual situation much harm has been done.

For that reason, it is imperative that I bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and the general public a resolution passed by the Plaquemines Parish Commission Council, which is the only parish which could be affected by the oil spill.

I am as concerned as anyone else about oil spills and pollution of our waters. The news media and individuals who have discussed at length the oil spill in the gulf have accomplished the opposite of their objectives.

They are destroying the market for seafood from this area of the country and at the same time are jeopardizing the livelihood of thousands of people in the area who work in the oil and service company industries.

The monumental amount of publicity which resulted from the oil spill left the impression that Louisiana seafood products, particularly oysters, have been seriously affected. The truth is there is no evidence of oyster contamination at this time and little or no evidence of serious damage to other seafoods or wildlife.

The resolution I am inserting will explain the situation clearly. I am greatly concerned for my constituents in this area of Louisiana who work in the seafood and oil industries, and it is important to all of them that the record be set straight.

Where livelihoods of individuals are concerned, there is no room for misleading and irresponsible statements, such as those coming out of this oil spill controversy.

We cannot get a more accurate picture than the one which is set forth by the Plaquemines Parish Commission Council because they are there and are on top of the situation.

For that reason, I highly commend its resolution to the Members of this body, and to the general public, with the plea that its words be read carefully:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, prior to the discovery of oil, gas and other minerals along the coastal areas of Louisiana, and in particular along the coastal area of Plaquemines Parish, the principal industry was the production of oysters, shrimp and other seafood and the seafood industry is now and will be a major source of income and food for our people after all of mineral production has been depleted, and therefore, this industry must be protected and perpetuated; and

Whereas, during the past 30 or more years we have witnessed the tremendous economic

growth of all of the coastal areas of Louisiana, principally because of the discovery and development of minerals; and

Whereas, during all of this time, minerals have been discovered and produced in the midst of our productive seafood estuaries, and although problems have existed between the seafood and mineral industries, these problems have generally been satisfactorily solved through the efforts of state and local interests and the producing Companies so that the seafood industry has survived and prospered and at the same time hundreds of millions of dollars in minerals have been produced providing thousands of jobs and millions in revenues to our state; and

Whereas, when it became evident that mineral production would extend from our estuary or bay areas into the open waters, the Federal Government confiscated our historical bays, lakes and inland waters within Louisiana's historic boundary and now dictates the development of these areas with endless regulations and flats to the degree that the production of minerals in this area is fast becoming uneconomical which will eventually force oil companies to search for oil in Alaska or in foreign countries, thus seriously affecting the economy of Plaquemines Parish and all of the coastal areas of Louisiana which will result in the loss of employment to thousands of our people; and

Whereas, at the same time the U.S. Government permits eastern and midwestern industries to barge deadly materials down the Mississippi River and dump them into the Gulf which causes infinitely more damage to our seafood and environment than an occasional oil spill could conceivably cause, and

Whereas, raw sewerage and other materials harmful to aquatic life flow from other areas down the Mississippi River into Plaquemines Parish daily causing untold damage to our fisheries and wildlife and serious concern for our potable water systems; and

Whereas, the widespread publicity of alleged contamination by the recent oil spill off Chandeleur Islands has seriously affected the market for Louisiana seafood products, particularly oysters, whereas, in truth and in fact there is no evidence of oyster contamination at this time and little or no evidence of serious damage to other seafoods or wildlife, and

Whereas, there are those who would claim that this oil spill incident is a major disaster, the truth is that the disaster is being caused by the do-gooders and news media who would destroy the market for seafood while professing to protect these interests and at the same time jeopardize the livelihood of thousands of people working in our area in the oil and service company industries; and

Whereas, the Parish of Plaquemines is the only Parish which could conceivably be affected by the current oil spillage so that the contamination problem affects only our area and none other;

Therefore: Be it resolved by the Plaquemines Parish Commission Council that it calls upon the federal agencies, particularly the Interior Department and the news media to proceed with reason and to correct the many errors which have been created in the minds of the public, so that the economy of our area will not suffer from the cries of outsiders who should be more concerned with solving problems of direct national concern than attempting to make a whipping boy out of the oil industry which has contributed so much to our economy while living side by side with the great seafood industry of our area.

I hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Plaquemines Parish Commission Council at a meeting held at its office in the Courthouse, Pointe a la Hache, Louisiana, on March 26, 1970.

J. E. LAFRANCE,
Secretary.

GOLDBERG AND CARSWELL

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the self-acclaimed altruists of the other body have drawn up a long list of qualifications which they—in their infinite wisdom—have determined should be applied to Supreme Court Justice nominees. They point to the present and past members of that august Bench and say that this fine history of highly qualified men cannot now be tarnished by such "political" nominations as Judges Clement Haynsworth and Harrold Carswell.

However, many of these holier-than-thou gentlemen have short memories. It was only quite recently that present Justices Byron White and Thurgood Marshall and former Justices Arthur Goldberg and Abe Fortas were confirmed by the Senate. The following editorial from the Birmingham, Ala., News succinctly points out some very important observations on the matter. I highly recommend it to my colleagues:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News,
Mar. 26, 1970]

GOLDBERG AND CARSWELL

We hadn't intended commenting again so soon on the Carswell nomination. He will or won't be confirmed by the Senate for reasons having little to do with his qualifications, and there is not much anyone can say which is going to have much influence with the so-called "liberals"—who are anything but—who have decided that the President of the United States has no right to appoint a conservative, strict constructionist judge to the court.

We hadn't, as we said, intended to comment again—but it is impossible to let pass without note the judgment by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg that Carswell is "not fit" to serve on the high court.

This is Arthur Goldberg, whose nomination to the Supreme Court by President John Kennedy was confirmed by the U.S. Senate—including many of the same men who now oppose Carswell—without a dissenting vote, despite the fact that Goldberg had not had one day of judicial experience and despite the fact that his whole career had been devoted to serving as lawyer for a special interest—organized labor, specifically the United Steel Workers and the AFL-CIO. (These are the same senators who accused Judge J. Clement Haynsworth of "conflict of interest.")

Many of these senators, it might be added, were in the Senate when the other of President Kennedy's Supreme Court nominees, Byron "Whizzer" White, was confirmed—again, without a dissenting vote. Like Goldberg, White, then an assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy in the Justice Department, had not a single day of judicial experience.

Even more of the senators who opposed Haynsworth and now oppose Carswell had come to the Senate by the time President Lyndon Johnson made his first appointment to the Supreme Court—Abe Fortas. Like Goldberg and White, Fortas had a reputation as a lawyer, but had no judicial experience whatsoever. He was better known as a political associate of the President. Like the other two, Fortas was confirmed by voice vote, with no dissenting vote recorded. President Johnson's second appointee,

Thurgood Marshall, was serving on the federal bench at the time of his appointment, so it cannot be said that he had no judicial experience. But before his appointment to the bench (and previously to the post of U.S. solicitor general), he, like Goldberg, had made his reputation primarily in the representation of one special interest—civil rights groups. The only opposition to his confirmation was dismissed as motivated by Southern racism and was trampled down.

Without any comment at all on their performance on the Supreme Court, the point is that each was the appointee of a "liberal" president, and that while each had factors presumably weighing against nomination for service on the highest court in the land (lack of judicial experience or close identification with special interests), all were routinely approved.

And now here comes Goldberg to say that Judge Carswell is "not fit."

We wondered what our reaction had been to Goldberg's own nomination, and checked the files.

"The obvious thing to say of President Kennedy's appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg to the Supreme Court is that here is another case of political reward," *The Birmingham News* said editorially on August 30, 1962. "Mr. Goldberg has no previous judicial experience. He is known exclusively as an attorney dealing with labor union matters."

"Yet if this yardstick is to be the major criterion in measuring capacities of promise of judges, one could conclude only that the American judicial system is rife with incompetency. The opposite is the case . . ."

"Presidents, of either party, do name on basis of politics. But they also have shown a considerable feeling for what lies within a man. There are exceptions, but agree or disagree with judicial histories or opinions, the overwhelming majority of Supreme Court justices have been men who served well, thoughtfully, and contributed to creation of a spirit of justice."

It seems to us that President Richard Nixon is entitled to the same presumption of good faith and careful consideration of qualifications of Supreme Court nominees that President John F. Kennedy was entitled to (and got). It seems to us that G. Harrold Carswell (and Clement Haynsworth before him) is entitled to the same benefit of the doubt that Whizzer White, Abe Fortas, Thurgood Marshall and—yes—Arthur Goldberg got.

The anti-Carswell (really, anti-Nixon or anti-strict constructionist) forces' desperate effort to block him not only smears a man who, if confirmed, inevitably will carry with him to the high court some of the stain of doubt, not only cheapens and further erodes public confidence in one of the basic foundation stones of our system of government—it is directly opposite to the treatment which "liberal" nominees of at least equally questionable qualification received.

Has Goldberg forgotten? Have the senators who voted to confirm him forgotten? Or has their sense of fair play been blunted by pettiness and "liberal" dogmatism?

ANN ARBOR HOCKEY TEAM

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I think it proper to give special recognition to athletic teams of distinction. In this case the distinction reflects not only the superior qualities of team members but a community program that ex-

emphasies the very best of personal responsibility and civic spirit.

Recently, the Ann Arbor Bantam A hockey team won the championship in its division in the North America Silver Stick competition in Port Huron, Mich. During the past 8 years more than 2,600 hockey teams from North America have vied for championships in this tournament.

Canadian teams have overwhelmingly dominated this competition, a reflection of the excellence of Canadian hockey. Only two U.S. teams have ever won a championship, one of them being the Ann Arbor team. Only great skill, dedication, and team spirit could have led to this achievement.

The team victory, however, did not come out of a vacuum. The Ann Arbor hockey program for youth is one of the very best in the country. Once such status is achieved it all may have seemed easy and inevitable in retrospect. But, Mr. Speaker, we know all too well that excellence comes only through great desire and hard work.

I am very proud of this young hockey team, all other participants in the Ann Arbor hockey program, and the community which has so faithfully supported hockey in Ann Arbor. All are to be commended.

The following are members of the Ann Arbor hockey team:

Mr. Elmer Burgett, president; Mr. Roland Seguin, coach; Kevin Davis, Jack Mortell, Mike Straub, Bob Fahlgren, Tom Ufer, Tom Kittel, Randy McLelland, Joe Roberts, George Morley, Bill Dufek, Steve Manville, Mike Kalmbach, Jim Hense, Duane Rose, Mark Levenson, and Randy Roberts.

F-111—"POLITICS AND EMOTIONALISM"

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Astronaut Bill Anders, now executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, says—and with what truth—that the F-111 has been the victim of politics and emotionalism. As is becoming increasingly clear much of the treatment that has been afforded this great aircraft has been nothing short of shameful. Once in a while the true expert, and a respected and brave American, opens the door to let in the light of truth.

Colonel Anders goes on to say that he himself plans to fly the F-111 as soon as possible and I am certain that his reaction to this aircraft will be the same as that of all the other pilots and commanders who are unrestrained in their praise of what has been called the greatest and most advanced aircraft in the inventory of any nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the news item to which I have been referring as it appeared in the March 21, 1970, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

I also wish to include two additional

news stories, one from the Washington Sunday Star of March 22, 1970 entitled, "The Impossible Dream for the F-111 is Coming True." This story is by Orr Kelly and should be read by every Member of the Congress with the greatest attention.

The third of these articles appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 6, 1970, and deals with the bad publicity the F-111 has received.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a little justice, time for an honest and fair appraisal of the F-111. These stories are a step in the right direction:

F111 MALIGNED, SAYS APOLLO 8 CREWMAN

The swept-wing F111 is a great aircraft that has been unfairly treated, the executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council said here Friday.

Air Force Col. William A. Anders, one of the three-man Apollo 8 crew, said the plane is a victim of "politics and emotionalism."

"It is unfortunate that unjustified attention has been placed on the F111," said Anders.

"In this country we have always had trouble of one form or another getting any new aircraft operational," Anders commented at a press conference.

The aircraft, he said, simply got caught in the squeeze of a "political . . . emotional argument" which he called unfortunate and undeserved.

Anders said he plans to fly the F111 as soon as possible.

He said when it comes to piloting an aircraft nothing gives him more pure pleasure "than flying a Bell H13 helicopter."

Anders' Christmas time space flight in 1968 with Air Force Col. Frank Borman and Navy Capt. James Lovell Jr. earned him the spotlight of the world and special praise from President Johnson.

He said he has a simple answer for those who question why we need make more than one trip to retrieve moon samples.

"I submit that it would be most difficult to try to learn about Texas by dipping down and scooping up samples of the surface of any single part of this state . . . it is obviously very different in different sections of the state."

Anders promises the April 11 flight of Apollo 13 will be "the most interesting and the most dangerous . . . It will land on the highlands and bring back different data."

He said his role in the Apollo 13 flight will be to accompany Vice President Spiro Agnew to Cape Kennedy and detail events for him.

He said America's success on her moon flights has put this nation ahead of original planning on the number of vehicles needed, and the United States is in the enviable position of being able to use these vehicles to explore more fully the moon.

"Our next exciting project is the Sky Lab where we'll put one to three men in earth orbit, using Apollo hardware," Anders told newsmen.

The astronaut had special praise for the Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport.

"This is a fine example of what needs to be done to handle the air traffic control problem . . . build more well-planned, major airports."

He and U.S. Rep. Olin "Tiger" Teague were guests earlier at a luncheon at the Petroleum Club for the Government Affairs Committee of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM FOR THE F-111 IS COMING TRUE

(By Orr Kelly)

Gen. F. F. Everest had an impossible dream when he became commander of the Tactical Air Command early in 1959.

His dream was an airplane that could cross

the ocean without refueling and yet fly at supersonic speeds when it got close to its target; a plane that could fly high and slow or low and fast; a plane that could find its own way in and out of increasingly sophisticated defenses.

The dream has come true. But it also has, in many ways, become a nightmare.

The plane is the F-111, once known as the TFX.

Sen. John J. McClellan, D-Ark., will resume hearings Tuesday on the TFX program that filled the headlines for 10 months in 1963 and then went into hibernation after the assassination of President Kennedy.

Ironically, after all the controversy surrounding the program, the F-111 now is almost exactly what Everest dreamed of in 1959—and almost all the other factors that made the program so controversial have faded away.

One of the major issues about the plane was the decision of Robert S. McNamara, in one of his earliest actions after taking office as defense secretary, to push the Air Force and Navy into developing the same plane to serve them both.

Since the Air Force first dreamed of its plane, the program has gone through five transformations—and is now back essentially to the original Air Force concept.

But, largely because of the long controversy, the Air Force will get far fewer of the planes than it had hoped for. Air Force officials have told Congress in recent days that the money requested in the 1971 budget will be used both to carry out an expensive inspection program to avoid problems with the wing structure and to buy enough planes to fill out a fourth wing of F-111 fighter-bombers. This will end the construction program, at least as things stand now.

This is a far cry from the plans in 1964 when a total purchase of 2,411 planes for the Air Force and Navy was approved.

The Navy dropped out of the program in early 1968, shortly after McNamara left the Pentagon, and is now developing its own plane, the F-14, as it had wanted to do all along. The British, who had originally hoped to buy their own F-111 fleet, dropped out and the Australians are talking, as if they, too, want to get out.

The result is that, of six different models of the plane to be developed and built, only two will go into service. There will be 77 strategic bomber versions for the Air Force and the remainder will be tactical fighter-bombers.

The McClellan Committee, in its renewed hearings, thus will find that the cost of each plane has risen far above the original estimates.

In recent testimony, Gen. James Ferguson, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, outlined the reasons for the increase in costs, which included technical problems and inflation.

"However," he added, "the biggest single cause of the increase in unit flyaway cost has been caused by the decrease in the total quantity procured and the extended time frame in which the extended aircraft were to be produced."

"For this reason, we have seen the estimated average unit flyaway cost rise from \$2.8 million to just over \$8 million."

The decision to cut back on production of the plane is a source of considerable frustration for both Air Force officers and officials of General Dynamics, which won the contract over Boeing in a bitterly contested competition in the early 1960s.

According to an analysis done by the company, 58 percent of the work done by fighter-bombers in World War I, Korea and Vietnam has been interdiction—hitting military and transportation targets behind the enemy's front lines. This, according to the analysis, is exactly what the F-111 is designed to do best.

The analysis also shows that the decision to cut off F-111 production has come when the cost for each additional plane could be expected to drop sharply.

If the number of planes to be produced under present plans is divided into the program's total cost, the amount for each plane comes to \$13.3 million. (Ferguson's figure of \$8 million included only the airframe, engines and electronic equipment for each plane and not a share of the research and development costs.)

But the company's analysis shows that most of the money to be invested in the program already has been spent and that the cost of additional planes could drop to as little as \$1.8 million apiece if construction were continued.

As things stand now, the total number of planes to be built probably will work out to 552. Of these, 77 are strategic bombers; two are the British version, now used for testing; seven are the Navy versions, also used for testing and 24 are the Australian version, which could end up in the U.S. Air Force. The remaining 442, which include 18 research and development planes, are the tactical fighter version.

The McClellan hearings are expected to last as long as two weeks, with a break for the Easter recess.

In the more than six years that have elapsed since they attracted such attention, much of the heat has left the F-111 controversy.

McNamara has moved on to the World Bank, the contract has turned out to be something less than a golden bonanza for General Dynamics and the plane, despite the wing problem that has grounded most of the fleet, has a good safety and performance record.

When the hearings end, it is unlikely that an answer will have been found to one of the most intriguing questions surrounding the whole F-111 program. That is whether or not the fight over the F-111 was a necessary and desirable part of McNamara's effort to exert civilian control over the Pentagon and whether, after all the controversy and cost, that effort was successful and worth the cost.

BAD MANAGEMENT, BAD LUCK, AND BAD PUBLICITY HAVE DOGGED F-111

(By Holmes Alexander)

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV.—There is a black smudge on the gray rocks of the canyon. The smudge marks the spot where last December 22 on Gunnery Range No. 5, an F-111 with its two-man crew lost a wing and went into a crash heard round the world.

If you didn't hear it, that would be only because you are not attuned to peacetime military disaster. The accident caused the official grounding of several hundred F-111s, about 80 of which are located here at the largest tactical fighter base in the world, larger in area than the State of Connecticut, and probably more immediately important to our lives and fortunes than the Atomic Energy Commission Proving Ground just across the Nevada ridges.

Officially, I say, they are grounded. In fact they are being ferried to various places, including the General Dynamics plant at Fort Worth, Tex., as part of the grand investigation for airworthiness. A defect hardly larger than the half-moon on your thumb-nail, a "bruise" in a piece of steel, is supposed to be the cause of the accident while an F-111 was doing a routine run at gunnery practice.

The grounding, I would surmise, on the basis of many interviews, is more official than actual. If World War III broke out today, I don't doubt that the F-111, defect or not, would be in the midst of it.

This is not a plane that we could leave on the runways if a national emergency called for an all-out effort.

ITS CAPABILITIES

The disaster is that the President does not have it upon instant call. If he did, he would have the only warplane in the world that could carry a stunning blow in convention or nuclear bombs to a crucial target at below radar-detection levels in the dead of night and in the foulest weather.

Darkness and the worst climatic conditions are duck-soup for the F-111. From about 2,000 miles out, it could go to Warsaw or Moscow, Hanoi or Havana, and in all probability its presence would not be known until the target was hit. Not that we are a sneak-attack nation, but this plane in the President's poker hand would be a powerful persuader.

PSYCHOLOGICAL VALUE

The disaster is that public misunderstanding has squandered the value of a technological American breakthrough that does not rank much below our men-on-the-moon exploits. The F-111 amounts to a medium-range manned missile which ought to be the boast of our aerial arsenal. But it has become a spiked-gun because of freak accidents and a barrage of abuse by the same dissident groups who want to see the United States brought low in every encounter from the schoolyard to the courtroom to the battlefield.

The disaster is that the Defense Department under Secretary McNamara deceived the Congress and bewildered the American public by making extravagant assertions that the aircraft's experimental model, the TFX, would be the nonpareil multi-purpose aircraft.

NOT MULTI-PURPOSE

In order to get approval for the best tactical fighter-bomber in the world, the McNamara team exaggerated its capabilities for Navy use, for Army and Marine Corps close-up support, for transatlantic strikes. When the plane could not perform all these missions, it was rated as an "expensive disappointment" instead of an achievement.

It, in reality, is matchless in its speciality of being the supreme weapon for all-weather penetration and interdiction—a bolt of lightning that can strike a stop to an invasion of West Europe where American security is most at stake—and do so without population slaughter.

COMBAT EXPERIENCE

The disaster is that the F-111 was sent prematurely to Southeast Asia in the spring of 1968. Eight planes in all, a trifling unit of commitment, were dispatched to Thailand for use against heavily defended, high-priority targets in North Vietnam where we were losing too many fighter-bombers in day-light raids. Many veterans of the Vietnam air war are here at Nellis, and a day or two among them is enough to piece together what happened to the F-111 in combat.

In 55 missions, the plane was extraordinarily successful. Not one is known to have been hit by enemy fire or even discovered in action by the enemy until after the attacks had been made. But the F-111 hadn't been thoroughly shaken down in stateside tests, and there were malfunctions.

VIETNAM LOSSES

Three planes and two crews were lost in milkruns to relatively soft targets; bombing-pauses and bombing-halts prevented the plane from proving itself in significant action.

The disaster is that the F-111 crews, although trying to keep busy at academical work, won't be flying target-practice and other proficiency missions for four or five months, if then. By a combination of bad management, bad luck and bad publicity, the best plane in the American inventory is suffering the malnutrition of disuse.

If it were in active service, its weight might well be felt in the negotiations for settlement in Vietnam and the Middle East, and in the

bargaining over strategic arms in Vienna. As matters are now, this powerful weapon is in danger of becoming a wasting asset at the full prime of its potentially influential lifetime.

THE PEOPLE'S VOICE ON VOTING RIGHTS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body have an imminent opportunity to make a decision which would confirm the rightful place of America's younger citizens in the political arena, and very possibly begin to reestablish for many of those young people a true credibility in the governing process, and the institutions we representatives serve.

As longstanding advocate of admitting 18-year-olds onto the voter rolls, I am particularly pleased to see that a public mandate for the measure published this weekend by the American Institute of Public Opinion—the Gallup poll.

According to this survey, six out of 10 respondents, unhindered by the alarmist misconceptions of those who have lost touch with the young adult generation, do believe 18-year-olds should be granted voting rights. I believe that, too, and hope the results of this survey do not go unnoticed by my colleagues who are as yet unconvinced.

The report follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1970]

GALLUP POLL: 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE FAVORED

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—If the House of Representatives follows the lead of the Senate and approves of lowering the voting age to 18, it will be in accord with the wishes of the American people as recorded in surveys over the last 17 years.

Six adults in every ten in the latest survey (58 per cent) think persons 18, 19 and 20 years old should be permitted to vote.

A majority of persons 21 and older have expressed support for lowering the voting age since July, 1953, when 63 per cent did so. Only 17 per cent voted in favor in 1939 when the first Gallup survey on this subject was conducted.

Many of those interviewed who favor lowering the voting age maintain that "if a person is old enough to fight, he's old enough to vote."

The Senate on March 12 approved, 64 to 17, legislation that would lower the voting age to 18 in all elections. The House will shortly consider this legislation.

Following is the question asked in the latest Gallup survey completed just last weekend. A total of 1350 persons 21 and older were interviewed in more than 300 localities across the nation, and asked this question:

Do you think that persons 18, 19 and 20 years old should be permitted to vote, or not?

Here are the latest results:	Percent
Should	58
Should not.....	38
No opinion.....	4

In all surveys on this issue, older persons—who tend to be more affluent and more conservative than younger persons—are most opposed to lowering the voting age to 18.

CADET STEPHEN L. KNOWLES

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Cadet Stephen L. Knowles, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence E. Knowles of Beloit, Wis., was recently named a winner in the 1969 Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, letter writing contest. Stephen, a 1966 graduate of Memorial High School in Beloit is presently attending St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., where he is a member of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps. It is my honor to share his stirring letter with my colleagues:

CADET STEPHEN L. KNOWLES

My hopes for America's future are really that America will fulfill her mission in history, that the hopes of generations of Americans will be more perfectly realized. The hopes I have for this country are certainly not new ones, but they are part of the very fiber that binds our nation, the Constitution of the United States.

I refer specifically to the Preamble of that document, penned in 1787, when the nation was still struggling in its infancy. Though its provisions were meant as an indictment against the government chaos of the Articles of Confederation, the hopes which it embodies stand as a challenge to the people of the United States today. The words of the Preamble are familiar to every schoolboy:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The Constitution certainly established a more perfect Union than that of the Articles of Confederation. The other provisions of the Preamble can still be seen as a rallying cry for a better America.

"Establish justice," the founders wrote. Certainly there is justice available in America today, but is it always available to every man? Crowded court dockets which delay justice, corrupt judges who impede its administration, and all the other faults our legal system is heir to must be overcome if the dream of justice for all is to be fulfilled.

Is there "domestic tranquility" in America today? Riots and assassinations blot the bright hopes of our Founding Fathers. My hope is that in the future America will have true domestic tranquility, where differences are settled peaceably and rationally. But domestic tranquility must never be restored at the expense of justice.

Though we have provided, and must continue to provide for the "common defense," we must take care that we do not do so to the detriment of the "general Welfare." We must be sure that we are not in the position of defending a nation poorly housed, clothed, and nourished. The needs of all the people must be met if the United States is to realize its dream.

The "Blessings of Liberty" have made the United States unique in all the world, and we must preserve our cherished heritage of freedom. Liberty must never be curtailed to stifle orderly dissent, but dissent must never override the right to express antithetical viewpoints.

My hopes for America's future are thus embodied in words written long ago in our history. Yet they are words which will continue to express the hopes and strivings of all Americans for generations to come.

**THE FARMERS' PROBLEM:
SURVIVAL****HON. BILL ALEXANDER**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, having been raised on a farm in Arkansas, I am fully aware of the crisis facing American agriculture. The American farmer is the most efficient producer of agricultural products in the world. They are good taxpaying citizens who do not deserve the second-class treatment they often get.

A few days ago, I received a letter from a farmer in northeast Arkansas asking for farm legislation which will "boost and support agriculture." This is what the American farmers want, as this most thoughtful letter by Mr. Mack L. Howington of Lepanto, Ark., indicates. Because his letter presents information that is of interest to people throughout the country, I include it at this point in the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues:

THE FARMERS' PROBLEM: SURVIVAL

"Survival of the fittest" is a phrase applied to a process in nature in which living things constantly compete with each other to live. Some thrive—some barely exist—some die. The American farmer, caught in a cost-price squeeze of his own unmaking, has doubts in 1970 that even the "fittest" of farmers will survive.

Can concern and worry pay the farmer's creditors? Can complaining to his congressman assure him of positive action or favorable legislation? Can re-shuffling his figures pay the taxes? Can producing more and receiving less and paying more produce a profit?

A concerned farmer who is interested in the survival of the farmer has prepared this report to acquaint the American consumer with the farm problems. Lacking an agricultural public relations department, individual farmers must act. A solution? The farmer feels that the failure of the giant agricultural industry would have repercussions which would reverberate around the world.

The facts, statistics, and case histories reported are drawn or were obtained from local (Poinsett County, Arkansas) sources—individual farm records, gins, elevator operators, the Extension Service of the University of Arkansas, and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Although the report is local in scope, one farmer's problem is every farmer's problem.

The world looks with envy upon the agricultural industry in America—the exception being the American consumer. Why does today's farmer view the future of agriculture with pessimism and alarm? Why The Gloom! Graphic evidence of a multi-faceted problem gives support to the farmer's claim that his problems are real:

- (1) Empty farm houses standing in mute testimony to the fact that profits on farms are not adequate;
- (2) Average age of farmers and their workers rising due to lack of opportunity or incentive (Who knows what effect this will have in future years!);
- (3) Farm equipment being repaired for "one more year" or equipment being "custom-rented";
- (4) Crops growing up in weeds due to high costs of chemicals, poisons, and labor;
- (5) Figures in farm accounts showing that income does not match expense;
- (6) Farm sale notices filling the newspapers—"Work a lifetime; sell all on a Tuesday . . .";

(7) Wives working to supplement the income—to compensate for rising costs of education, household furnishings, health expenditures, and clothing;

(8) Bankruptcy or foreclosure listings—perhaps more painful than an obituary notice. "A way of life is dead."

These farm problems are the result of a revolution unparalleled in agricultural history. The American farmers have been eager to adapt and apply new technology and research findings to their agricultural enterprises. The American farmer, with his LEARN-HOW-KNOW HOW abilities, has increased his food and fiber production rate to such an extent that domestic consumption uses only 80% of his total crop; the remaining 20% must be exported. Had the farmer remained at farm output rates of 1900-1925, not only would the United States be importing one-third of its total food and fiber requirements, but the consumer would be paying much higher prices for food. LEARN-HOW-KNOW HOW leads to SHARE-NOW! Farm specialization, coupled with research, education, and mechanization, enables one farm worker to supply 35 to 39 persons (compared with 23 supplied as recently as 1957-59). Since 1919-21, crop production per acre is 75% higher, and output per man hour of farm work is five times greater.

On the basis of these statistics, why, in the name of production success, do the farmers have economic problems? Fact: in 1969, the prices farmers received in relation to prices they paid were 78% of the 1910-14 base period (used for computation of these figures). Question: "Hasn't farming basically changed during this time? Thus, is this 1910-14 base period really valid?" Unquestionably, all phases of farming have changed during this period. Mules and turning plows have been replaced by tractors; tractors have been replaced by larger and better tractors. In the rice fields, combines and dryers have replaced the old binders and threshers; self-propelled combines. Chemical placed the pull-type combines. Chemical herbicides have replaced hoe hands in row crops; cotton picking machines have replaced hand pickers in the cotton fields.

But while all these magnificent new machines were coming along to take most of the back-breaking drudgery out of farming, other radical changes were taking place (changes affecting the farmer's survival). Competition from the ever-expanding industrial complex of the cities lured many of the most capable laborers from the farm with wage offers which farmers could not possibly match. To check the drain of the labor force, farmers were faced with higher wages to be paid even though the worker was only gainfully used six months of a year. "Work" must be "furnished" even though productivity of the farm was not increased nor was per unit cost of the crop reduced. In other words, farmers began to experience an "overhead" cost they had not had previously. Machinery costs, already high, continued to climb rapidly although farm prices remained static or declined. As a result, farmers have needed to increase productivity—both of their labor and their land—to stay in the same place. Hard work resembling treadmill action! To illustrate the cost-price squeeze, the following figures were taken from local (county) farm records and farm-related businesses.

COTTON

Long live King Cotton! Is the King dead? Cotton is probably the crop with the most serious problems. An east Poinsett County gin was asked to take the account of a typical customer and report the prices that customer received for cotton in the years 1949-1969. The price obtained each year was averaged with the two following years to overcome price fluctuations and give a steadier price picture. In the three year period, 1949-50-51, the average price received by the farm-

er for cotton was 35.23¢ per pound. At that time, hand choppers were paid about \$3.00 for a 10-hour day; tractor drivers got \$4.00 to \$5.00 for an 11-hour day. In 1953-54-55, the price was 34.55¢; in 1958-59-60, 31.31¢; and in 1963-64-65, 30.12¢. During this time, production costs were steadily rising; chopping was up to \$5.00, and tractor driving rose to \$7.00 per day.

In 1966 a new cotton program was effected. Under this program, cotton would be sold on the open market at a "world price", and a subsidy would be paid the producer for the difference between a "fair market price" in this country and a "world price" on his cotton that was produced for "domestic consumption"—an amount deemed 65% of his allotted acres. To follow up the example of the Poinsett County typical farmer—in 1966, his price received was 23.23¢ per pound; his subsidy payment was 9.42¢—making a total of 32.65¢ he received for 65% of his cotton crop. This is assuming he made a normal yield (which few cotton farmers did in 1966 or 1967 due to adverse weather conditions). In 1969 the sum of the price received and the subsidy payment was 36.79¢, but this price is for the 65% domestic allotment only. If 100% of the allotment were planted, the other 35% was sold for 22.06¢. This is a complicated program; many details have been omitted for the sake of clarity. Look at the 1949-50-51 price of cotton—35.23¢. Then look at the 1969 price on the domestic allotment alone—36.79¢. During this time, chopping costs rose from 30¢ per hour to 1.30 per hour. Tractor driving costs from \$4.00 per day to \$1.30 per hour (tripled). Machinery costs have skyrocketed; yet cotton prices have remained the same or dropped, even with subsidy payments included.

The cotton survival problem boils down to this: the American farmer is expected to sell his product on a free (world) market and, at the same time, buy on a "protected" market.

WHEAT

Wheat is not a major crop in Poinsett County, Arkansas, but it is a top crop in other parts of the nation. Local elevators paid \$1.50 per bushel in 1965. In 1968-69, wheat prices ranged from \$1.13 to \$1.16 per bushel—the lowest price for wheat since the depression days of the 1930's. (The development and progress of civilization can be linked to the history of wheat—so what's in store for agriculture?) Meanwhile, the price of a combine has spiraled from \$6,000 to \$12,000. The farmer receives about 2¢ for the wheat in a one-pound loaf of bread in the grocery store. What is the price of the bread?

SOYBEANS

Soybeans—the Wonder Crop. The farmer wonders if this farm crop that supplies animal feed, food for human beings, and many raw materials for industry will survive the cost-price squeeze. The farmer wonders if this 2½ billion dollar plus crop can hold its own in the market. Soybeans came along to take up acres which had gone out of production of other crops. Until the last two years, beans had provided a steady, if not large, source of income. Soybean prices have always been subject to erratic patterns due to little or no carry-over; consumption equalled production. A short bean supply would drive up the price. In 1968, however, a fairly large bean surplus developed as a result of high price supports which the federal government instituted to promote more production. Farm records show that in 1961, local elevators paid \$2.28 per bushel; in 1964, \$2.68; in 1966, \$2.85; in 1968, \$2.43; and in 1969, \$2.32. The present price of beans approximates the 1961 price while many farm costs involved in their production have doubled. The farmer WONDERS if the soybean bubble is about to burst!

RICE

The rice industry looks at cotton and soybeans and finds itself in a similar economic

bind. Even though Arkansas is one of the three leading rice growing states, rice farmers in western Poinsett County are having financial problems. Rice producers have been fortunate in that they have been able to increase their productivity dramatically and thus have not experienced so great an economic strain as cotton and soybean farmers. Yet rice farmers are caught in a cost-price squeeze also. Figures from a local elevator show the following prices per bushel paid to farmers for rice: 1962, \$2.30; 1964, \$2.20; 1966, \$2.20; 1968, \$2.30; and 1969, \$2.30. As these figures show, the price received by farmers for rice has remained almost constant while most all production costs have risen considerably. As mentioned earlier, combines, the harvesting machines for rice, have almost doubled their costs of ten years ago; other machinery, labor, equipment repair, poison, fuel, insurance, rent, taxes, irrigation—all reflect price increases to compensate for their own rising costs. What about the rice producer? Like all farmers—no bargaining power—he takes what he is offered (not always willingly)—but he pays the asking price.

MORE DILEMMA

How have farmers compensated for their lowering net income? "Another notch to take up the slack?" Cliches cannot answer so serious a problem. The American farmer has produced more volume of product to obtain the same income. Today, most farmers have larger crop acreages with more crop specialization. Statistics show that fewer farmers are farming the same number of cultivated acres. An improvised formula can show how the farmer has hung on: More work plus more fertilizer plus top production plus larger investment plus better weed control plus research plus more acreage plus gamble equals same income. Economic treadmill again! The margin of profit is so low that there is no room for failure—no allowance for a drought or hail storm; it takes several good crops to make up for one bad. A living farm economy? A surviving farm economy? A dead farm economy?

Why haven't farmers banded together? Why haven't farmers tried to control their production to affect supply and demand—thereby pushing prices up? Traditionally, farmers have been independent, free-thinking individualists who do not want to give up the freedom of doing as they want on their own farms. A price below cost for one farmer may give another farmer a profit. A solution to a farm problem may satisfy one farmer but draw a violent reaction from another. Why have farm organizations had trouble with farm programs? With the exception of rice, price-supported crops have never presented a united front for their needs. It seems to be necessary for government control to be exercised to some degree, therefore, in order to keep stocks of these commodities within reasonable bounds. It is in the public interest that the nation have a healthy agriculture which is an integral part of the whole economy. The agricultural industry may expect that farm programs of the future may be justified only insofar as the public interest is concerned, since these decisions will probably be political and not economic ones.

If the public were as interested in Why Farmer Can't Survive as it is Why Johnny Can't Read, perhaps even Congress would remove the agricultural complex from its political sparring ring. The American farmer is in desperate need of friends.

He is a minority group.
He does not want sympathy.
He does not march.
He does not riot.
He does need your understanding.
He does need your ears.
He does feel his grievances are more serious than some which receive front page headlines.
He does want to survive.

If the great agricultural industry falters or fails, what happens to America? Economists and historians have taught that the Great Depression of the late 1920's and the 1930's was triggered by the farmer failing to share in the prosperity—agricultural depression.

HEALTHY AGRICULTURE IS PUBLIC ASSET

Why should the American consumer be concerned about or desire a healthy agricultural industry? First, the percentage of income spent by the average American family for food is between 16 and 18 percent. Compare this with 35% for Western Europe; 50% for Soviet Russia; 70% for some Asian countries. American farmers are providing their fellow countrymen with food at the cheapest rate ever paid in comparison to income earned. In 1900, a farmer received 87¢ from a \$1.00 paid for food; today, he gets 40¢ of the dollar. If a housewife would divide her "groceries" into food items and non-food items, her ideas about the high cost of food might change. Approximately 20% of the money spent in the grocery store is for non-food items.

Farming is big business; its demands produce jobs and more jobs. (It has been reported that for every 2,500 jobs created in the synthetic fiber industry, 11,000 jobs are lost in the cotton industry.) In 1966 (the latest figures available), farm assets were 226 billion dollars, or \$25,000 invested for each employee. These assets amounted to two-thirds of the value of all United States corporations at that time. Farm buying power means six million jobs. (When the farmer loses his buying power, the impact shakes the entire industrial complex tremendously.) Another 10 million jobs are created by transporting, processing, storing and selling farm products. Farmers spend 30 billion dollars a year for farm-related goods and services and another 15 billion for other life necessities and luxuries. Farmers use more petroleum than any other single industry; use 9% of all domestic rubber production; use 5 million tons of steel—one-third that used by the entire automobile industry. Agricultural products are the greatest contributing factor in dollar sales of goods abroad. Agricultural exports help alleviate the balance of payments deficit. Farming is big business!

These statements give substance to the fact that farming is vitally important to the national economy. Bringing the focus down to the local level shows that farmers spend 70% of their income directly on their farms or in towns of fewer than 5,000 population. This income is the life blood of all communities in northeastern Arkansas, as well as for other rural areas of the nation. (These small communities have felt the pinch of cost-price squeeze in their pocketbooks.) How important are the smaller communities to the nation?

MISUNDERSTANDING OF FARM PROGRAMS

Two of the biggest criticisms of farm programs by people outside the industry are: (1) subsidy payments to "big" farmers and (2) payments for "not growing" some crop. The critics point to huge agricultural appropriation figures as evidence that the government is heavily subsidizing agriculture. The facts are that a large part of the agricultural appropriations goes for programs other than subsidies and price support payments. Food stamp programs, school lunch programs, all USDA food inspection programs, experimental research, and administrative expense of these and other programs take a large bite out of the "subsidies" which Mr. Farmer always gets credit for receiving.

A concerted effort, by urban-dominated Congress, misinformed consumers, and some news media, is being waged to limit the direct subsidy payments made to "big" farmers to a level which would eliminate all medium to large acreage farmers. As previous figures indicate, this payment is approximately one-third of the gross price a cotton farmer gets for his crop. Any farmer

falling within the limiting area would suffer even more than he already is. Any farmer growing more than 250 acres of cotton would lose. And the farmer would have no assurance that the limited subsidy figure would not be lowered eventually to \$5000 to even \$3000—which would affect practically every cotton farmer in the county. The idea that a "big" farmer is more efficient than a "small" one is a myth. The facts indicate otherwise. The farm unit has had to grow to maintain income levels; volume does not always spell "efficiency". The small farmer who has a working unit sized to economically utilize his equipment is far more efficient than a large farmer. He has no management expense; by doing most of his own work, he not only eliminates much of the necessary labor costs but all of the "overhead" expenses incurred by retaining a labor force full-time. Despite his efficiency, the small farmer has suffered loss of income too.

Many other segments of our economy are subsidized by large payments from the federal treasury. American ships, built by American workmen, are financed by a 55% subsidy from the government; American seamen's pay is also subsidized since it cannot compete with foreign workers' salaries. Airlines, newspapers, railroads, housing projects, direct rental payments, education, public libraries, vocational schools—all receive subsidies. In fact, nearly all segments of the American economy are subsidized, directly or indirectly. (What if all subsidies to all receivers were limited? Would the national economy collapse?) Why is no mention made of limiting these subsidy payments? Why are subsidized farmers the only group singled out for criticism? Is the farmer merely a "whipping-boy"?

DOES AMERICA NEED HER FARMERS?

Will the farmer survive this economic problem which mainly is two-fold: cost-price squeeze and the limitations payment. This, then, is in essence the farm problem. The farmer can shout about his economic strait until the cows come home; improve his farming know-how; practice soil conservation; employ the best available labor; keep accurate records and use the keenest accountants. . . . But withal, he must inevitably recognize this: in today's highly competitive market, the business that does not show a profit does not survive! Finish!

Do the American people think they are getting enough of a bargain in the products the farms produce that they are willing to subsidize some segments of agriculture at a level of income that will allow the farming people of the nation an income comparable to the remainder of the people? Are they willing to support farm legislation which will make farming attractive enough and profitable enough that young people will again become interested in careers on the land? If not, can the American people replace the food and fiber that will not be produced here in this country with that from some other source? Can they create jobs for those who will not be needed on the farms? These and many other questions will have to be answered soon. Does America need her farmers?

SAMUEL H. MORRISON

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to know Sam Morrison as a friend and counselor. The lead editorial of the March 31, 1970, Poughkeep-

sie Journal speaks for all of us who have a sense of personal loss in the death of Sam Morrison.

The township in which I reside in, Dutchess County, N.Y., was fortunate that Sam Morrison was a resident. He dedicated himself as mayor of the village of Millbrook, as the supervisor of the township of Washington, and as a member of the county board of representatives.

His interests extended beyond his village and township to the organization and promotion of the annual Dutchess County Fair, one of the finest and largest in New York State.

But basically, as the Journal editorial states, he was "a truly gentle man."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Journal's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SAMUEL H. MORRISON

The death of Samuel H. Morrison results in a sense of personal loss to the many friends he acquired in the long years he devoted to public service.

Having served on the Dutchess County Board of Supervisors and Board of Representatives, "Sam" was the embodiment of stability during an era of significant change. As chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee until his retirement from the board last year, he was instrumental in maintaining a fiscal balance with county finances that results in the enviable credit rating Dutchess enjoys to this day.

He was an agriculturalist by profession, and leaves behind him not only an outstanding career but a record of service to associations such as the Dutchess County Agricultural Society and the Dutchess County Cooperative Extension Service that attests to his interest in community service.

"Sam" Morrison was a soft-spoken man with a subtle wit and a ready smile. These qualities, melded with patience and compassion for human foibles, made him one of the most thoroughly liked political leaders the county has ever seen.

It is a measure of his dedication to the welfare of his fellowman that, even when failing health dictated that he slow down, he maintained a close liaison with the county board. And, even after his retirement from the county scene last year, he returned often to sit on the sidelines to hear at least what was going on.

The death of "Sam" Morrison not only has deprived the county of a fine political and agricultural leader. It has taken from our midst a truly gentle man.

REPRESENTATIVE GUDE'S AIR POLLUTION EXHIBIT

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 and 18 my distinguished colleague from the Eighth Congressional District of Maryland, the Honorable GILBERT GUDE, sponsored an exhibit which acknowledged the successes which we have obtained thus far in our war against air pollution, and which also dramatically demonstrated the real urgency of continuing to combat this menace. Over a dozen representatives of government, industry, and private enterprise contributed their valuable time and effort toward making this venture the

outstanding success it was. Those who exhibited were:

- American Chemical Society;
- American Petroleum Institute;
- Architect of the Capitol;
- Automobile Manufacturers Association;
- Chrysler Corporation;
- Department of Agriculture;
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;
- Department of Transportation;
- Fisher Scientific Company;
- Ford Motor Company;
- General Motors;
- General Services Administration;
- Institute of Gas Technology;
- Metropolitan Council of Governments;
- National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences;
- Potomac Electric Power Company;
- Research Cottrell Company; and
- Resources Research, Inc., a subsidiary of TRW.

Their response was prompted by a deeply felt conviction in the ideals of what now must be considered a national movement, a national mood.

This is not the first instance in which Mr. GUDE has shown his concern over this problem. Three years ago he sponsored a similar exhibit at a time when only a few realized the potential trouble we are facing if the senseless destruction of our environment is not halted. But today the war on filth has truly become a national, even universal, concern.

Mr. GUDE's recent exhibit was particularly significant to all who attended primarily because it dealt with specific achievements, with specific problems—the facts and figures of the pollution crisis speak with more eloquence than well-worn rhetoric.

I would like to insert in the RECORD some remarks made by Mr. GUDE at the opening of the exhibit:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GILBERT GUDE

I want to welcome you, and thank you for coming. Three years ago I sponsored a display here on Capitol Hill dealing with the problem of air pollution. There was a feeling at that time, among many observers, that air pollution was a growing menace, but the response of the exhibitors was mild. The feeling at that time did not approach the concern and even panic proportions we are experiencing today.

The problem of environmental pollution and its consequences to life on this planet today are topics of debate and concern ranging from international conferences to classroom projects in elementary school. And I am pleased to have students and teachers from Maryland schools and Montgomery College here to see firsthand evidence of the problem and the efforts and progress toward the solution.

We have all heard the forecasts of doom with estimates for survival, in some cases of a mere 30 years for man on this earth at our current rate of pollution. I do not think we should dismiss any of these prognostications lightly insofar as they are made by substantial, thoughtful scientists. But for our purposes here today, I believe the definite specific medical evidence of the problem is enough to make us turn to work against pollution with increased vigor. Specifically, these charts which use data supplied me by the American Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association are a clear indictment of the villain. In a careful scientific study, which took into consideration the smoking factor as a cause of emphysema, a midwestern city with polluted air had cases of advanced emphysema in all age groups while in another midwestern city with relatively

clean air, advanced emphysema was uncommon in any age group. Furthermore, there were six times as many cases of severe emphysema in the city with polluted air as the city with clean air. (See reference at end.)

In the exhibit on emphysema of the National Institute of Environmental Health, you will see a graph showing the really alarming increase of this disease from less than 2 deaths per 100,000 in 1950 to more than 12 deaths per 100,000 in 1966. This is just one of the diseases where man is choking to death on filth.

We are making some progress against some pollutants—and again specifically I call your attention to the 46% reduction in oxides of sulfur in Washington air demonstrated in the Council of Governments exhibit. I am particularly pleased because this came about as a result of an ordinance enacted by the D.C. Council under legislation I sponsored in 1967. Also, the Kenilworth dump, which played a stellar role in my '67 exhibit, is dead and literally buried.

But I do not propose any note of complacency—we've got a big job to do yet. The fossil fuel burning internal combustion engine deserves and is getting a lot of attention as you can see from the extent of the exhibits on the automobile.

One other specific item is the exhibit by the Department of Agriculture. Plants are also air pollution victims. Clearly we can't sweep the air pollution problem under the rug by moving polluters to the country. Plants are susceptible, as well as the animals in the field and forest. We've got to deal with air pollution where it is.

I mention these items to let you know that we have tried to make this an exhibit of specifics of air pollution—the specifics of the problems, the laws, the research and the solutions.

I asked government, industry and private groups to give concrete data and examples, and I want to thank each and everyone of the exhibitors from government, industry and private groups for their contribution and hard work.

(NOTE.—The two cities are St. Louis, Missouri, and Winnipeg, Canada. Data from "The Emphysema Profile" in Two Midwestern Cities in North America," by S. Ishikawa, M.D.; D. H. Bowden, M.D.; V. Fisher, M.D.; and J. P. Wyatt, M.D., Winnipeg, Canada, and St. Louis in *Archives of Environmental Health*—Vol. 18, April 1969.)

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY
WINNING ESSAY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States sponsors a Voice of Democracy program in which high school students are asked to write a broadcast script. All five winners of this year's contest on "Freedom's Challenge" were guests of honor at the VFW congressional dinner and received a personal congratulation from President Nixon. I would like to include the essay of the third-place winner, Stephen Flynn, of Mobile, Ala. A 17-year-old McGill Institute senior, Stephen is president of the debating team, editorial manager of the school newspaper, a member of the student-teacher senate, a member of the National Honor Society, and he has at-

tended the national high school institute in debate at Northwestern University. Stephen plans to study law at Florida State University. The VFW should be commended for their sponsorship of such a fine program. After reading this essay, I think you will agree that we all can take pride in the patriotism and faith in America displayed by this young student:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE—THIRD PLACE

(By Stephen Flynn)

Sable Island lies in the Northern Atlantic some 100 miles off the shore of Nova Scotia. In the winter months this area is the brunt of fierce No'easters, storms which raise the sea into waves as high as 30 feet and have the capability of breaking a destroyer in half. Fishing boats must pass near the island to reach harbor. The waters are treacherous in fair weather. During the constant storms of winter navigating is nearly impossible. More than 5,000 people lost their lives to Sable's shores before the installation of the Sable lighthouse and radio beacon. With the lighthouse, the death toll has greatly decreased. The lighthouse must have a keeper who is deposited on the island at the close of the calm summer and must remain, in solitude, until the end of the turbulent winter. Such a man, on whom so many depend for their lives, must be exceptionally stable mentally and physically.

The United States is a beacon in which the flame and freedom burns bright. The rays of light which beam forth from this flame guide billions of people through the constantly raging storm of slavery, tyranny, and despotism. We, the citizens of the United States, are the guardians of this freedom. It is our privilege, our responsibility, our duty to keep it brightly kindled.

Freedom issues us a challenge; that challenge being the very existence of freedom. If we are to fulfill our responsibility this challenge must be met. There are two basic tasks which must be achieved before freedom's flame is completely safe. First, freedom must be assured for all. Secondly, liberty must not degenerate into license.

Lord Acton tells us that, "The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities." The United States has come far in assuring the liberties of its minority groups. Yet there are those who would mentally shackle others to one opinion through terror and violence. Others continue to discriminate against humans of a different skin color, a factor over which none of us have control. How can the beacon of freedom burn bright if the qualities of freedom of speech and the right to pursue happiness are not enjoyed by all? Voltaire said, "Prejudice is the reason of fools." Let us never fall into this pit of ignorance. Let us enlighten those who have. In this way freedom will be assured for all, and the first part of our battle will be won.

The second segment of this battle to ascertain freedom's existence is the fact that liberty must not degenerate into license. Each man's liberty extends to the point of hindering the freedom of others. Once beyond that point, one man's freedom impedes the freedom of his fellowman, and liberty becomes tyranny or anarchy, which is the tyranny of the strong. Every American is endowed with the right to peaceful assembly and the right to express dissent. These rights do not represent, and cannot be construed to represent a license to destroy and threaten the lives and property of others. This destroys the freedom of others to pursue happiness. Mme. Roland states, "O liberty! What crimes have been committed in thy name!" It is criminal to abuse our freedoms, thus destroying the freedom of others. It is criminal to attempt to justify this abuse of liberty with the Constitution of the United States. We

must convince those who do so of the criminality of their actions. If mere words are too weak, then the law must be called upon to protect the freedom of all and prevent liberty from degenerating into license.

This, then, is the very essence of freedom. These two principles, the assuring of freedom for all and the prevention of liberty's degeneration into license, are weapons for the answering of freedom's challenge; the existence of freedom itself. If not carried out, they are weapons for freedom's demise.

Tonight a solitary watchman will brave the cannon roar of a North Atlantic storm in order to protect the lives entrusted to him. He will remain faithful to his task. Will we, the citizens of the United States, remain faithful to ours? We have been given two means by which we can assure the existence of freedom. Will we use them? Will we be faithful to the task?

PRESIDENT NIXON'S FAMILY
ASSISTANCE PLAN

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. CONABLE, Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee has approved President Nixon's family assistance plan. As you know, this plan encompasses his welfare reform proposals and is expected to reach the House floor in the near future. These proposals have been wisely supported as well as attacked. The Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter of March 23 presented a clarification of the President's proposals and answers to the principal objections which I feel is an excellent summation. I would like to recommend this article which follows, to my colleagues attention:

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WELFARE PLAN—TOUGH
QUESTIONS VERSUS ANSWERS

The House Ways and Means Committee has approved President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan, encompassing his welfare reform proposals, and the measure is expected to reach the House floor soon. The proposals have been widely supported—and attacked. The following questions and answers have been prepared by the *Newsletter*, with the assistance of committee staff members and the Administration, to answer the principal objections and to clarify the President's proposals.

What's wrong with the present welfare system?

Just about everything. Nobody likes it. The cost is too high and is growing too fast, despite general prosperity. Since 1961, the number of families on welfare has more than doubled to 1.7 million. The number of recipients—as opposed to families—has grown from 3 million to 6.7 million. By 1975, the total is expected to be near 12 million, while annual Federal and State costs will zoom from \$4.2 billion to \$8.8 billion, an increase of more than 100 percent.

Most important, the basic philosophy of the present welfare system is considered wrong. Instead of encouraging and enabling people to care for themselves, it encourages them to stay on relief. Because most of the states provide welfare only when there is no father at home to provide support, family breakup often results. President Nixon said: "The situation has become intolerable."

What improvements does the President propose?

He proposes to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program—heart of the present welfare system—with a Family Assistance Plan which would provide a basic income for all parents who cannot adequately support their families. For a family of four with no more than \$720 income, the payment would be \$1,600 a year; for a family of four with \$2,000 income, the payment would be \$960 a year. These payments would be uniform throughout the country. Presently, welfare payments to families vary, with some as low as \$39 per month. Families headed by a working parent would receive the same basic benefit, plus additional financial incentives for continuing to hold a job. These are the "working poor."

What's the definition of "working poor" and why should they get Federal benefits?

The working poor are those who, although fully employed, earn less than what the government calls the poverty line. A basic weakness of the present welfare system is its denial of welfare to the family with a working father living at home. This often encourages the father to leave home in order to qualify his family for welfare. Obviously, it is unfair to penalize the father who is willing to work. More important, it is socially disastrous to encourage family break-ups.

How would the President's program encourage persons to work, rather than stay on relief?

The President has specified that all employable persons accepting Federal welfare payments register for work or job training, "and be required to accept that work or training, provided suitable jobs are available. . . ." He also specified that "adequate and convenient day care would be provided preschool children wherever necessary to enable a parent to train or work." Ill or incapacitated adults would be excepted. As part of his program, the President has proposed greatly expanded child day-care centers and job-training programs.

One objection to the President's program holds that no significant number of persons covered would be qualified for work. What are the facts?

New studies of the adult population that would be covered by the Family Assistance Act estimate that of the 7.5 million who would be eligible for the program in 1971, 3.2 million are potentially employable. Of these 1.4 million already are working full-time, and would continue working.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has reported that a federal work-incentive program (WIN) which is similar to the President's proposals, has been a failure. Why?

Because there were major defects in the program as administered by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. One defect was the requirement that local welfare agencies ask individuals to accept only work or training deemed "appropriate." The Department of Health, Education and Welfare took an extremely lenient view of what was appropriate, leaving most of the discretion to the states, some of which ruled that persons, on the relief should not be required to work. Moreover, WIN did not provide adequate day care for children whose mothers otherwise could work. President Nixon's program, as detailed above, would correct these defects, and many others in the system as it is today.

What about the objection that the President's program goes too far too fast, and ought to be preceded by pilot programs?

Ordinarily, this would be a sound approach. But today we are confronted with a crisis in welfare programs. We need complete overhaul—now. There isn't time for more experimentation.

Is it true that the President's plan would be the first step toward a guaranteed annual income?

No. Everyone able to work or train for work would be required to register with the gov-

ernment and make himself available for work or training. Actually, we already have a guaranteed income under the present system. The 1.7 million families currently on welfare are, for the most part, guaranteed an annual income. In New Jersey, for example, a welfare mother with three children receives \$4,175 per year whether she works or not.

How much more than the present welfare system will the President's Family Assistance Plan cost? How can the increase be justified?

The President estimates that his proposals will increase Federal costs during the first year (1971) by \$4 billion including \$600 million for job training and child care. But that \$4 billion is about the same as the projected Federal cost of the present welfare system by 1975. The President points out that the "start-up costs" of his program, which would lift many persons out of dependency and onto the work rolls, will eventually cost far less than the continually increasing costs of an existing welfare system that can only go from bad to worse.

What the President seeks is to lessen dependency, rather than perpetuate and enlarge it.

RED RULE IN EAST EUROPE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with news headlines discussing complications in the Far East and Middle East, Soviet manipulation of Eastern Europe is overlooked and no longer subject to consistent news treatment. Therefore, it was with great interest that I noted the emphasis on Soviet domination of Eastern Europe as commented on by the distinguished foreign correspondent of the Copley Press writing in the Monday, March 16, Sacramento, Calif., Union, as follows:

RED RULE IN EAST EUROPE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—For the last 20 years the best Communists in Eastern Europe have been fighting to escape a Soviet noose, says Artur London.

The former Czechoslovak vice-minister of foreign affairs, who lives now in France, was one of the survivors of the Rudolph Slansky trials in 1952. His new book "Confession" offers new insight into the repressive power of the Soviet politico-police machine which in 1968 crushed every vestige of liberalization in Czechoslovakia.

London brings to light the decisive role of Stalin's minions in the 1950 Czech trials and purges and raises the possibility of a new series of trials to eliminate any residual or potential Czech opposition. With the Red army in control, anything is possible.

By coincidence, London's story is fully corroborated in a secret 402-page document smuggled out of Czechoslovakia recently.

It represents the findings of a special committee set up by the short-lived Dubcek government in 1968 to examine the secret archives of the security police and determine the truth of the trials of 1950s.

The arrival of the Soviet army in Prague in August of 1968 prevented official release of the document.

The smuggled document, says the London Sunday Times, "contains a mine of new knowledge."

"It spells out for the first time the depth of Russian involvement in the Czech terror," says the newspaper.

Stalin, the document says, suffered from a paranoid fear of "imperialist" conspiracies and saw them even when they didn't exist.

The security of "socialism" in Czechoslovakia imposed in 1948 was in danger, he decided, because the Czech security police was "too soft and too indecisive."

In 1949 Stalin sent two "advisers" to Prague with extensive power and responsible only to Lavrenti Beria, Soviet police chief. They touched off a reign of terror, with mass arrests—more than 10,000 political prisoners in Bohemia and Moravia alone—on trumped up charges with "confessions," extracted by torture.

At stage-managed trials, a select group of accused acted like robots, giving self-incriminating "evidence." By 1952 the Red judges had sentenced 233 to death; 178 were executed. They included such high Communist officials as Vlado Clementis, the foreign minister, and Rudolph Slansky, the secretary general of the Communist Party.

Ancient history? Obviously not to Czechs. If it was, why would the Dubcek regime set out to exonerate Slansky and the others?

REBELLION, SURE—TO SLAP DOWN THE SLOBS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. K. Ross Toole, of the University of Montana, says:

As a professor and the father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not—and the trouble is that minority threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over.

Professor Toole's message is very important, I feel, and I suggest it for the reading of my colleagues:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Mar. 22, 1970]

REBELLION, SURE—TO SLAP DOWN THE SLOBS

(NOTE.—The author is a faculty member at the University of Montana, holds a Ph. D. from UCLA and formerly was director of the Montana Historical Society, director of the Museum of the City of New York, director of the Museum of New Mexico and a rancher in Montana. His treatise, written originally as a letter to a brother, is reprinted from the Billings Gazette.)

(By K. Ross Toole)

I am 49 years old. It took me many years and considerable anguish to get where I am—which isn't much of anyplace except exurbia. I was nurtured in depression; I lost four years to war; I am invested with sweat; I have had one coronary; I am a "liberal" square and I am a professor. I am sick of the "younger generation," hippies, yuppies, militants and nonsense.

I am a professor of history at the University of Montana, and I am supposed to have "liaison" with the young. Worse still, I am father of seven children. They range in age from seven to 23—and I am fed up with nonsense.

I am tired of being blamed, maimed and contrite; I am tired of tolerance and the reaching out (which is always my function) for understanding. I am sick of the total irrationality of the campus "rebel," whose bearded visage, dirty hair, body odor and "tactless" are childish but brutal, naive but dangerous, and the essence of arrogant tyranny—the tyranny of spoiled brats.

SOFT TOUCH

I am terribly disturbed that I may be incubating more of the same. Our household is permissive, our approach to discipline is an apology and a retreat from standards—usually accompanied by a gift in cash or kind.

It's time to call a halt; time to live in an adult world where we belong and time to put these people in their places. We owe the "younger generation" what all "older generations" have owed younger generations—love, protection to a point, and respect when they deserve it.

We do not owe them our souls, our privacy, our whole lives, and above all, we do not owe them immunity from our mistakes, or their own.

Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth; it has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation on earth in the history of mankind has dared to do.

It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man's history.

It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself, and committed itself, and taxed itself and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

Its mistakes are fewer than my father's generation—or his father's, or his. Its greatest mistake is not Vietnam; it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth, and its sick preoccupation with the problems, the mind, the psyche, the *raison d'être* of the young.

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what is right, by what accomplishment should thousands of teenagers, wet behind the ears and utterly without the benefit of having lived long enough to have either judgment or wisdom, become the sages of our time?

The psychologists, the educators and preachers say the young are rebelling against our archaic mores and morals, our materialistic approaches to life our failures in diplomacy, our terrible ineptitude in racial matters, our narrowness as parents, our blindness to the root ills of society, Balderdash!

Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No 18-year-old is simply the product of his 18 years; he is the product of 3,000 years of the development of mankind—and throughout those years, injustice has existed and been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress—and man has persevered.

TOLERANT

As a professor and the father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not—and the trouble is that minority threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over.

I dislike that minority; I am aghast that the majority "takes" it and allows itself to be used. And I address myself to both the minority and the majority. I speak partly as a historian, partly as a father and partly as one fed up, middle-aged and angry member of the so-called "establishment"—which, by the way, is nothing but a euphemism for "society."

Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society, it is the heart of the pie. Too many "youngsters" are ego-centric bores. They will not listen, they will only shout down. They will not discuss but, like four year olds, they throw rocks and shout.

Arrogance is obnoxious; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment.

Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slob who occupy our homes, our administration buildings, our streets and parks, urinating on our beliefs and defiling our premises? It is not the police we need, (our generation and theirs) it is an expression of our disgust and disdain.

Yet we do more than permit it, we dignify it with introspective flagellation. Somehow it is our fault. Balderdash again!

Sensitivity is not the property of the young, nor was it invented in 1950. The young of any generation have felt the same impulse to grow, to reach out, to touch stars, to live freely and to let the minds loose along unexplored corridors.

Young men and young women have always stood on the same hill and felt the same vague sense of restraint that separated them from the ultimate experience—the sudden and complete expansion of the mind, the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

UNORIGINAL

Today's young people did not invent it; they do not own it. And what they seek to attain, all mankind has sought to attain throughout the ages.

Shall we, therefore, approve the presumed attainment of it through heroin, speed, LSD and other drugs? Shall we, permissively, let them poison themselves simply because, as in most other respects, we feel vaguely guilty because we brought them into this world?

Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need; it is merely strength. The strength to explain, in our potty, middle-aged way, that what they seek, we sought; that is somewhere but not here and sure as hell not in drugs; that, in the meanwhile, they will cease and desist the poison game. And this we must explain early and hard—and then police it ourselves.

Society, "the establishment," is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. The fact that we have only been minimally successful is the story of all generations—as it will be the story of the generation coming up. Yet we have worked up a number of wonders.

We have changed it. We are deeply concerned about our failures; we have not solved the racial problem but we have faced it; we are terribly worried about the degradation of our environment, about injustices, inequities, the military-industrial complex and bureaucracy.

But we have attacked these things. We have, all our lives, taken arms against our sea of troubles—and fought effectively. But we also have fought with a rational knowledge of the strength of our adversary; and, above all, knowing that the war is one of attrition in which the "unconditional surrender" of the forces of evil is not about to occur.

We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully. That is the kind of war society has always fought—because man is what he is.

Knowing this, why do we listen subserviently to the violent tacticians of the new generation? Either they have total victory by Wednesday next or burn down our carefully built barricades in adolescent pique; either they win now or flee off to a commune and quit; either they solve all problems this week or join a wrecking crew of paranoids.

Youth has always been characterized by impatient idealism. If it were not, there would be no change. But impatient idealism does not extend to guns, fire bombs, riots, vicious arrogance, and instant gratification. That is not idealism; it is childish tyranny.

The worst of it is that we (professors and faculties in particular) in a paroxysm of self-abnegation and apology, go along, abdicate, apologize as if we had personally created the ills of the world—and thus lend ourselves to chaos. We are the led, not the leaders. And we are fools.

As a professor I meet the activists and revolutionaries every day. They are inexcusably ignorant. If you want to make a revolution, do you not study the ways to do it? Of course not.

Che Guevarra becomes their hero. He failed; he died in the jungles of Bolivia with an army of six. His every move was a miscalculation and a mistake. Mao Tsetung and Ho Chi Minh led revolutions based on a peasantry and an overwhelmingly ancient rural economy. They are the pattern-makers for the SDS and the student militants.

I have yet to talk to an "activist" who has read Crane Brinton's, "The Anatomy of Revolution," or who is familiar with the works of Jefferson, Washington, Paine, Adams or even Marx or Engels. And I have yet to talk to a student militant who has read about racism elsewhere and/or who understands, even primitively, the long and wondrous struggle of the NAACP and the genius of Martin Luther King—whose name they invariably take in vain.

INCOMPETENT

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the U.S. in the 1930s, recently remarked to me: "These 'radicals' couldn't organize well enough to produce a sensible platform let alone revolt their way out of a paper bag."

But they can, because we let them, destroy our universities, make our parks untenable, make a shambles of our streets, and insult our flag.

I assert that we are in trouble with this younger generation not because we have failed our country, not because of affluence or stupidity, not because we are antediluvian, not because we are middle-class materialists—but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in its place and we have failed to put them back there when they got out of it.

We have the power; we do not have the will. We have the right, we have not exercised it.

To the extent that we now rely on the police, Mace, the national guard, tear gas, steel fences and a wringing of hands, we will fail.

What we need is a reappraisal of our own middle-class selves, our worth and our hard-won progress. We need to use disdain, not Mace; we need to reassess a weapon we came by the hard way, by travail and labor, firm authority as parents, teachers, business men, workers and politicians.

The vast majority of our children from one to 20 are fine kids. We need to back this majority with authority and with the firm conviction that we owe it to them and to ourselves.

Enough of apology, enough of analysis, enough of our abdication of responsibility, enough of the denial of our own maturity and good sense.

The best place to start is at home. But, the most practical and effective place, right now, is our campuses. This does not mean a flood of angry edicts, a sudden clamp-down, a "new" policy.

It simply means that faculties should stop playing chicken, that demonstrators should be met not with the police but with expulsions. The power to expel (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

More importantly it means that at freshman orientation, whatever form it takes, the administration should set forth the ground rules—not belligerently but forthrightly.

BOOT 'EM OUT

Expulsion is a dreaded verdict. The administration merely needs to make it clear, quite dispassionately, that expulsion is the inevitable consequence of violation of the rules. Among the rules, even though it seems gratuitous, should be these:

1. Violence, armed or otherwise, the forceful occupation of buildings, the intimidation by covert or overt act of any student or faculty member or administrative personnel, the occupation of any university property, field, park, building, lot or other place, shall be cause for expulsion.

2. The disruption of any class, directly or indirectly, by voice or presence or the destruction of any university property, shall be cause for expulsion.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. It is one of the oldest rights and necessities of the university community.

The failure of university administrators to use it is one of the mysteries of our permissive age—and the blame must fall largely on faculties because they have consistently pressured administrators not to act.

Suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsions, suppose they march, riot, strike. The police? No. The matter, by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then pass to the courts.

If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the awful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order.

Courts are not subject to fears, not part of the action. And what militant will shout obscenities in court with contempt hanging over his head?

Too simple? Not at all. Merely an old process which we seem to have forgotten. It is too direct for those who seek to employ Freudian analysis, too positive for "academic senates" who long for philosophical debate and too prosaic for those who seek orgasmic self-condemnation.

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed up with nonsense. We need (those of us over 30), tax ridden, harried, confused, weary and beat-up, to reassert our hard-won prerogatives.

It is our country too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it, and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

PATTERN OF 1919 BEING USED AGAIN

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that unless there is a drastic change in the American way of life, the apathetic attitude of our citizens toward world communism may be the ultimate downfall of this Nation.

The American public must not sit idly by and permit those who advocate the overthrow of our Government to accomplish their ultimate goal.

I have been furnished with a copy of a letter to the editor which appeared in the Nashville Banner on March 17, 1970, concerning a raid conducted by the British Army of a Communist headquarters in occupied Dusseldorf, Germany, in 1919.

Astonishingly, the rules practiced in
CXIV—658—Part 8

1919 are an echo of the rules being practiced in America today in the international plot of the Communists to overthrow our Government and the governments of other non-Communist countries throughout the world.

The parallel between these rules, and what we know for a fact is being practiced by Communist conspirators, is appalling, to say the least.

I feel the letter to the editor which follows is self-explanatory and should be made available for readers of the RECORD:

1919 DISCOVERY A CLUE TO RED REVOLT FORMULA

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BANNER:

Never one to believe Communism has any great depth of control in our country, I read something revealing and decided to send it to you.

In May, 1919, the British Army raided a Communist headquarters in occupied Dusseldorf, Germany. Among the papers seized was one entitled, "Rules for Bringing About a Revolution."

These rules that make incredible reading in 1970 America, are:

"Corrupt the young. Get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

"Get control of all means of publicity and thereby get peoples minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays, and other trivialities.

"Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

"Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding these latter up to ridicule, obloquy and contempt.

"Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

"By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

"Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of the government toward such disorders.

"By specious arguments cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged world, ruggedness.

"Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless."

Need more be said?

(Mrs.) JANICE MOOREHEAD GRANT.

PARKVILLE SOLDIER WINS BRONZE STAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Staff Sgt. Douglas A. Rush, a fine young man from Maryland, was recently awarded the Bronze Star Medal in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage by including the following article in the RECORD:

PARKVILLE SOLDIER WINS BRONZE STAR

Army Staff Sergeant Douglas A. Rush, son of Mrs. Aida D. Collins, 3014 Woodring Ave., Parkville, received the Bronze Star Medal in Vietnam.

S. Sgt. Rush earned the award for meri-

torious service in connection with military operations against hostile forces in Vietnam while assigned as a supply sergeant in Company A of the 1st Signal Brigade's 69th Signal Battalion.

S. Sgt. Rush entered the Army in December 1967 and completed basic training at Ft. Bragg, N.C., where he was stationed before arriving overseas in July 1968. He also holds the Army Commendation Medal.

The sergeant was graduated from Baltimore City College in 1967 and attended the Baltimore College of Commerce. Before entering the Army, he was employed by the Ward Turner Machinery Company in Baltimore.

The award was presented Jan. 19.

ZERO DEFECTS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the concept of zero defects appeared on the American scene in 1961. Some are still learning about this idea, which is a management tool with motivational aspects, and which strives to eliminate defects attributable to human error. It involves an organized and cooperative effort to inspire all personnel at all levels of production within an organization to do their job right the first time, every time. One of the most significant areas of application has been with defense contractors. A pioneer in this effort is a small company in my congressional district, Hoxley, Inc., which received the "Outstanding Supplier of the Year—1968" award, given by the General Electric Missile and Space Division. This award calls attention to the fact that Hoxley provided error-free components for the reentry systems department of General Electric throughout the year 1968.

Many throughout the Nation have joined enthusiastically with the Government in promoting the zero defects concept. It is a money saver, a time saver, and it leads to the perfection of the end product. Those of us who have worked with zero defects since its inception know how well this idea has been accepted by industry and Government, and we feel we are now on the crest of a wave of success. But we need and want your help.

This country has become the leader of world products through the dedication of individuals who are concerned that if we are to remain a first-class power, we must return to our American pride of craftsmanship. The challenge is well delineated in an article which recently appeared in U.S. News & World Report of April 6, 1970, entitled "Japan's Drive To Outstrip United States." The article is subtitled "15 Years of Explosive Growth—And More To Come" and indicates that Japan's gross national product will jump from \$24 billion in 1955 to an estimated \$375 billion in 1975.

We have only to take a quick glance at a few of the many items in which Americans have excelled and in which we are now losing ground to other countries—TV, radio, machine tools, computers, and shipbuilding, to name a few.

Are we to go on recklessly living on our past laurels without stopping to challenge ourselves? Are we going in the wrong direction? The article to which I refer is graphic proof that we must reunite and build only products that can be stamped with pride, "Built in America by Craftsmen."

I have introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 1094, calling for official recognition of National Zero Defects Week. Adoption of this resolution would be one more step toward the perfection we should achieve in American products.

Let us renew the national team spirit and ability to work together that have propelled us to our position of greatness.

One of those in Government who have been dedicated to this cause is Lt. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, Director of the Defense Supply Agency. Following is a speech he delivered today to the American Society for Zero Defects third annual national symposium. I commend it to your attention:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. EARL C. HDLUND, USAF, DIRECTOR DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY, AT THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR ZERO DEFECTS, THIRD ANNUAL NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM, ANAHEIM, CALIF.

It's a pleasure to be with you today and convey the best wishes of the Department of Defense for a most successful symposium. I think that I can speak for the thousands of servicemen who place their lives on the line every day with full confidence in the quality you have built into the planes, ships, tanks and all the other equipment and supplies they are using. But, regardless of your type of business or where your products are used, I am sure all of us recognize that there is a continuing need for programs to maintain the highest possible standards of quality, reliability and performance. This need has been dramatized again and again in press releases regarding consumer dissatisfaction with a wide range of products and services, in government inspection and failure reports, and in the increasing number of actions being taken by industry to correct deficiencies in products already sold.

As a point of departure for this symposium, we might well ask what's the cause of these well documented and publicized defects? My answer is management—and many of us in this room have contributed to these errors by not making an all out frontal attack on some of the classical management doctrines still being practiced in our organizations. Make no mistake—the success of any operation—military or commercial—is first and foremost the responsibility of command or management. We managers must spotlight the need for a realistic appraisal of our policies and management techniques which may have been necessary and right at one time, but are obsolete in today's fast changing world.

For example, during World War II when American industry was forced to increase the size of their organizations, develop new production line techniques and train thousands of new employees, we relied heavily on management engineers or systems analysts to predetermine the tasks to be performed and then carefully programed these tasks to insure minimal time, cost and effort. These management techniques worked well and they enabled us to develop new standards of performance leading to a higher level of production than any nation in the history of the world. However, this was war—everyone was personally involved and our motivation to do the best possible job, regardless of the task assigned, was clearly related to survival.

After the war, American industry regrouped and converted plants to take advantage of the many technological and scientific

breakthroughs stemming from the war. We had achieved a position of world leadership in the engineering, production and distribution processes and this know-how served us well in developing world markets for our products and staying ahead in the field of military hardware—business was good and management tended to relax and rely on the proven policies and procedures responsible for this relatively high level of prosperity and affluence. Then, in the fifties our nation began to take notice of the inroads foreign industry was making on our commercial markets and of their success in military, aerospace, and other scientific areas. This competition for world leadership developed into what was commonly referred to as the cold war.

Our international prestige was being seriously threatened and we were amazed to find that we were behind in several scientific fields not the least of which was the space program. Scientific and technological breakthroughs were occurring at an ever increasing pace and improvements in almost every field of endeavor resulted in changes rendering old methods obsolete.

These changes dictated an ever increasing degree of specialization, automation and adjustment in order to mass produce the highly complex and sophisticated products of today's world. Further, the more we advanced the state of the arts, the more demanding the specifications, the greater the need to improve the quality and reliability of our products. Management recognized this need by increasing the emphasis on quality control, inspection, and operational testing. These measures were effective, but they caused production delays and high costs due to rework; and only directed attention to an isolated fault in procedures, inferior material or an individual worker's carelessness. We were starting this corrective action at the end of the production line and each such action normally sought the solution of a specific problem and did not go beyond the cause of the individual action. This was not good enough; it represented the carrot and stick theory of management and our quality problems began to compound themselves every time we updated our capabilities.

Obviously these actions at best only represented stop gap measures and some of our more farsighted managers began to review their management procedures and their application to entire organizational structure. They found that those in less responsible jobs were rebelling against this stepped up tempo of change and automation. Many saw themselves a mere number in the organizational structure, in danger of being replaced by machines or becoming a slave to a system which gave them little or no freedom in how to best perform their tasks. This lack of recognition and sense of belonging was further influenced by the employee's inability to identify with the end product, because in most instances, they were but one of many contributors in the production process. They never saw many of their co-workers or their end products. This lack of employee motivation, sense of accomplishment and pride in the organization's products resulted in the development of a new theory of participatory management. Simply stated this theory is based on the principle that decisions are likely to be better, and to be implemented better, if those responsible for the implementation are allowed to participate in making them.

Under the participatory approach, the employee is given an area of freedom in determining how to best perform his tasks and the management support he needs to use this freedom effectively. Each level of management is asked to share its knowledge, skill, and experience with their subordinates and conversely let the subordinates take part in the decisionmaking process. In so doing, the subordinate can augment his own capabilities, and in turn pass this on to his

subordinates—right down to each individual worker.

Management was seeking the voluntary involvement and participation of each employee and a number of programs and techniques were developed to make sure each employee was given an opportunity to participate in determining the character of his tasks and responsibilities. One of the most notable was the zero defects program which was developed and used so successfully by the Aerospace industry.

It is a fundamental characteristic of the aerospace industry to try to outstrip its prior efforts. This comes not only from the constant pressure of competition within this relatively new industry, but from the external competition (or threat) from those countries whose interests are hostile to ours. Continued growth, technological breakthroughs, and improved standards of quality, are an absolute necessity to the success of these aerospace programs. In many instances design inventiveness was so rapid and operational experience was so limited that the outside limits of tolerance were difficult to establish and the costs of failure were so great that they literally could not afford to have one—for example, our Apollo program. Management therefore had to seek every possible means of assuring maximum awareness of the necessity of doing the job right the first time and building in a quality and reliability as near to 100 percent as possible—management needed everyone's help in understanding and developing solutions to their potential problems before they had a chance to develop.

There was no time to wait for inspections or tests to reveal malfunctions or errors if the stringent and demanding schedules and performance levels were to be met.

We (and here I mean the whole defense industry/aerospace team) needed everyone's help in whipping our quality problems; and when Martin Marietta initiated its zero defects program back in 1961, this provided the impetus for getting everyone on the quality team. The program was an immediate success at Martin and spread so quickly that in a matter of months many other aerospace firms adopted the program. And the main idea, as we all now know, was to place the responsibility for quality in its rightful place—with the people who are doing the job—with the people most knowledgeable for their individual tasks—and with the people who are in the best position to effect the changes necessary to insure that the job is done right the first time.

This recognition of the importance of the individual's contribution to not only his job but to the whole effort, the final product (or in our aerospace efforts—to mission accomplishment), cannot be overemphasized. Somehow we must continue this emphasis on helping find ways for each individual to equate his contribution to the end product so that improvement in performance comes naturally and easily. We must encourage everyone to use his brain and exercise imagination in the performance of his tasks. We must get people to be more observant so if one pair of eyes makes a mistake another pair will not agree without looking. We must get people to use their common sense, initiative and know-how in bringing their problems to management instead of waiting for management to initiate the corrective action.

It's not better theory that we need. This has been spelled out in all of our modern management and leadership textbooks and courses. I would imagine that everyone in this room has studied and discussed the principles of good management. But this is not enough, we're got to act, to develop a system giving everyone a piece of the action, and be judged by what we do—not by what we say. Zero defects is just such an action program but management must be convinced of the need for improvements; management must establish the proper climate

and administrative procedures; and management must be willing to sustain the program.

It is the policy of the Defense Department to adopt ZD programs in-house and to encourage their adoption by industry if ZD serves industry's interest. It is not, however, the policy of the DOD to demand that industry establish ZD programs. The DOD instruction which established the DOD Zero Defects program reads as follows:

"Defense contractors, on a voluntary basis, shall be encouraged to establish and maintain zero defects type programs as a mutual benefit to contractors and the Government at no additional cost to the DOD."

With respect to the DOD in-house activities, the DOD instruction provides the following:

"Zero defects programs shall be established, within available resources, in DOD 'in-house' activities responsible for production, maintenance and storage of material, and in such other activities where zero defects programs can be effectively used."

In accordance with this policy ZD programs—many very energetic and successful—have been adopted throughout industry, the military services and in the defense supply agency. In general these programs have worked out well and have served the interest of both the DOD and industry. From a personal standpoint, starting with my school days where the teachers helped point out faults; to my years as a flyer where pilot error was constantly being investigated; to today's climate where DSA and others sometimes get assistance from the General Accounting Office and Congress in pointing out shortcomings, I know of no organization or business that couldn't have profited from zero defects.

Keep in mind, however, that zero defects is not an end in itself and no group of ZD experts or practitioners can long sustain a program that is not integrated into the mainstream of line management. It must have top management's support and be made a regular part of each supervisor's daily routine.

I don't care what you call it, Zero Defects, Pride, VIP, CARE, PQ, or something that really swings like Hana Pookela (that's the Hawaiian name for superior craftsmanship) no motivation or employee participation program can long exist as a sideshow outside the mainstream of our management process.

I think we would all agree that the success of a ZD program depends on four factors:

- (1) Management direction and full support;
- (2) Intensive detailed planning and training;
- (3) Measurement of progress against goals that the employees have had a part in establishing and which mean something to them;
- (4) Establishment of procedures by which all employees can identify problem areas and submit recommendations for produce improvement with the knowledge that these recommendations are being sought, considered, and used by all levels of management.

Of these I would attach prime importance to the first and last. If the boss isn't in on the action and if the employees can't really make their voices heard—then ZD is meaningless. It is interesting to note that the general theme of ZD, particularly the error cause removal feature, is similar in philosophy to the concept of participatory management being pushed in the Defense Department by Secretary Laird and Mr. Packard. Mr. Laird recognized the need for enlightened management attitudes, improved communications and individual recognition when he said:

"In big organizations, it is easy for the

individual to become a cog in an impersonal machine. It is easy to become so bemused by the organization chart or the computer or the weapons system or the cost-effective calculus that one forgets about the human beings by whom and for whom these things are produced and used."

"It is easy to slip into an inflexible bureaucratic routine without ever pausing to see the deadening impact of this routine on initiative, innovation and leadership. It is easy to centralize the power to make directions and the power to spur action at the top of a large organization and, in the process, to stifle the bright idea and the restless energy of people down the line."

I am convinced that there are a lot of good ideas stemming from observant workers, foremen, and managers. We urgently need to promote the generation and communication of these ideas, and some of the speakers following me will describe how they are accomplishing this, and the results they are achieving. In fact, some of our greatest ideas stemmed from imaginative people who were able to perceive the significance of what they were seeing. I am sure most of you have heard the story of how penicillin was discovered when a piece of green mold accidentally drifted in through Alexander Fleming's laboratory window and destroyed some bacteria he was growing in a Petri dish.

Alexander Graham Bell worked for months to make a hearing aid for his wife and discovered the principles of the telephone. Clarence Birdseye watched Eskimos pull fish from the water. The fish were soon frozen. Adaptation of this idea led to the Birdseye Frozen Food business. A broken arm motivated Charles Kettering to develop the self-starter for automobiles. (I've done this myself on a Model T Ford.)

When a train wreck delayed his journey, George Westinghouse began to think about the value of an air brake. Thomas Edison adapted the principle of the motion picture camera from a mechanical toy. Benjamin Franklin cut the lenses of two pairs of eye glasses and made bifocals because he was tired of carrying two pairs of glasses.

While our ZD results may not be as dramatic, our observation has been that there have been many significant payoffs in terms of increased efficiency, lower costs and reduced expenses.

For instance, one company reported an approximate 40% reduction in defects over a two year period with estimated savings of \$2 million.

In an aerospace plant, where performance improvement and estimated cost avoidance are computed by comparing current quality performance with the quality performance during the first month that each department participated in the program—estimated annual cost avoidances amounting to over \$7 million were reported during the past two years.

Another company, in only one year, was able to reduce a 100% inspection tear-down of aircraft engines to one tear-down in 30 engines.

A drug manufacturer reported they have a classification of defects considered minor and non-essential but still objectionable to the customer. It might involve a slightly smudged label, or a scratched carton. Before the program, these harmless defects were running at a rate of around 1%. Within a year they were reduced to a quarter of that, and they are currently running at one tenth of 1%.

A bearing manufacturer reported a reduction of 60% in his scrap expenses and a 20% increase in production while using the same equipment and with no change in employment levels.

These are but a few examples of the cost effectiveness of zero defects programs; you

undoubtedly will hear of others during the course of this seminar. In fact my staff advises me that figures available from contractors with ZD programs reveal that for every dollar spent on ZD, they have averaged a return of \$12, and that this excludes intangible benefits derived from the program.

Although DSA is not designed to produce a profit for stockholders we are keenly conscious of costs in our operations. Last year we obligated over \$5 billion and administered 238,000 contracts for the military services and defense agencies with a value of \$54.7 billion. Insuring a quality product, according to specification and schedule, is still one of our biggest challenges.

Recently, my staff and I met with the logistic chiefs of each of the services, and their staffs. Although many logistic subjects were discussed at these conferences, one concern emerged loud and clear from all of these meetings. That concern was the need to place greater emphasis on controlling quality and reliability in our military procurements.

Our contract administration services people have been devoting a lot of time and effort to selling contractors the concept that good quality practices save money and enhance their competitive position. We are stressing to our plant representatives and contractors the need for effective contractor inspection systems and quality control programs and the need to sell zero defects.

DSA is applying substantial resources to insure the quality of the products procured for DOD and NASA. About 40% of our contract administration workforce is committed to quality assurance. We utilize about 9,000 of our people and expend almost \$100 million a year in these efforts at some 22,000 plants. I think much of this could be avoided if our contractors used ZD to augment and improve their quality assurance program.

DSA recognizes the benefits of ZD and have, along with other defense activities, initiated a viable, driving program. We have extended the program into every element of our organization and have encouraged all of our contractors to establish similar programs. We record tangible results through a quarterly reporting system which features:

Identification of the causes of errors; and the establishment of goals; supervisor and employee training; and recognition and award for results.

Our system regularly indicates that we are reducing errors, we are improving performance and we are obtaining the thoughtful participation of our employees at every level. For example, during the first half of FY 1970, DSA employees have submitted over 3,200 error cause identification suggestions, 2,000 of which were adopted. We have set over 1,500 motivating performance goals at our activities and to date have achieved almost half of these. Official recognition was given to over 2,000 of our employees for their contribution to the program.

Specific examples of DOD in-house activity savings are almost as dramatic as those reported by our contractors. For example, after initiation of a ZD program at a naval shipyard, welding shop workers turned out error free welding on 48,751 linear feet of section butts of a nuclear submarine. This is equal to 9.23 miles of welding without a defect—a significant quality achievement! This accomplishment will save the Navy approximately \$205,000 of total ship cost on the submarine.

At an Air Force operational base, reduction in jet engine test cell reject rates from 15% to 7% were achieved after initiation of a zero defects program.

One Army arsenal reduced scrap and rework in ordnance items with the result in validated savings of \$318,000 in a year.

A DSA supply center reported an error cause identification and removal action

which resulted in the procurement of zinc coated steel door hinges in place of the nickelplated brass hinges previously purchased which resulted in FY 1969 savings of \$208,800.

Finally, we now have about 1,500 prime contractors participating in the program and an estimate of some 20,000 subcontractors and vendors. This level of participation by cost conscious businessmen who are in a highly competitive market is clear evidence of the benefits they are receiving from the program.

On the contractor award side of the ledger, DSA has processed and approved over 1200 participation awards for presentation to our prime contractors. Eligibility for the participation award requires the accomplishment of several program milestones such as management support, 85% employee participation, goal setting, error cause identification and error cause removal suggestions, vendor participation and a recognition program. In addition, over 360 achievement awards, the second highest award available, have been presented. This award requires 90% employee participation and higher levels in all of the other criteria. Finally, almost 50 craftsmanship awards, the highest award available, have been presented since the inception of the defense program. The majority of these have been to aircraft and aerospace contractors who were among the first to recognize the merit of the ZD effort.

Let's continue to exhibit this same kind of management expertise in the future by demonstrating our ability to do a job well plus the desire to do it better. Let's talk about our future in terms of promise—not pitfalls. Let's talk about the growth that lies ahead for you, your organizations and your Nation.

We must learn to manage change and engineer progress to serve the ever expanding needs of our people.

It's my contention that zero defects is not a program you work on when you have time or when money is easy. It's when money is tight, competition is keen and conditions are not conducive to growth that we really need zero defects. It's an investment in our future and provides an excellent basis for charting our progress.

The greatest danger to management thinking in this age of specialization is obsolescence. Improvement is accelerating everywhere at such a rate that we need a planned program to meet the threat of obsolescence. Professor Schell from MIT used an analogy which I believe sums it up quite well, he said:

"We must ride the waves of change. A skilled practitioner takes his surfboard out from the shallows as far as two miles from shore. When an incoming wave reaches a certain point, he mounts the board ahead of the wave and rides his way into the beach, a two-mile jaunt. He doesn't change the wave; he doesn't alter it; he doesn't fight it. He capitalizes on it."

Remember—the surfboard rider is ahead of the wave, not behind it.

It's been a real pleasure meeting with you today and I am only sorry that prior commitments prevent me from remaining for the balance of your symposium—for I consider the attainment of your society's objectives to be critical to the future of our country.

Zero defects has and will continue to serve our national self-interest as well as the self-interest of each one of us as citizens of our communities, as citizens of this Nation and as co-workers in both the Department of Defense and Industry.

In closing, I think even the most skeptical among you agree that we must continue our quest for a better quality of effort and product in all our operations. After all, if we don't learn anything from our mistakes, there is no point in making them.

Thank you for your hospitality and attentiveness.

CANCER IN EVERY POT?

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, working with the Children's Foundation and the Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Jerrold N. Oppenheim has produced an alarming article indicating that the Government has spent vast amounts of money to develop a vaccine to prevent the development of cancerous lesions by chickens infected with avian leukosis. This approach, as Mr. Oppenheim notes, ignores the basic issue of whether chickens infected with the virus, whether or not they develop lesions, are dangerous to man and diverts resources from the effort, recommended by the Surgeon General, to develop a virus-free strain of chickens.

The article, "A Cancer in Every Pot?" appears in the first issue of PIC News. I include it in the RECORD, along with that newsletter's review of the USDA Advisory Committee on Criteria for Poultry Inspection:

A CANCER IN EVERY POT?

(By Jerrold N. Oppenheim)

The U.S. government has spent millions of dollars developing a cosmetic to mask the presence of cancer in chickens and thus save the poultry industry millions more. Virtually no funds have been spent to discover whether the disease is dangerous to man.

The disease is avian leukosis or chicken leukemia. The cosmetic is a new vaccine developed by government research laboratories. It neither cures the disease nor eliminates the virus which causes it. Instead, it merely makes the disease-carrying bird less repugnant to the eye.

Avian leukosis is characterized by lesions, and, in its more acute stages, tumors located most frequently on the liver, spleen, or skin. However, like most virus diseases, leukosis may be carried by animals that show no sign of disease. Such "carriers" or "shedders," as they are called, may transmit the virus just as easily as the clinically ill. USDA studies indicate that more than 90 per cent of a broiler flock may carry the disease if 10 per cent or more of the birds show the disease.

Most scientists agree that two viruses are responsible for lymphoid leukosis and Marek's disease, the two diseases of chickens which together are known as avian leukosis. By the estimate of Dr. Martin Sevojan, University of Massachusetts agricultural experimental station scientist, of a total of 5,030,000,000 pounds of young chickens federally certified as wholesome in 1968, a total of 60 per cent carried leukosis virus.

Leukosis viruses apparently are effectively killed during cooking when the inside temperature of the host chicken reaches 54°C—that's about 125°F—for 30 minutes. Chicken is not very palatable uncooked, but chicken livers are pretty tasty after only 10 minutes broiling. Eggs cooked sunny side up are barely cooked at all. Furthermore, raw poultry is often handled by persons with open cuts on their hands, such as workers, inspectors, and housewives.

Avian leukosis costs the poultry industry an estimated \$150-\$200 million a year in chickens condemned because of visible tumors. Naturally the producers are not overjoyed at the loss. They have campaigned for a weakening of condemnation standards and are enthusiastic about the cosmetic vaccine.

A former USDA official says: "The poul-

try industry brought constant pressure on the office of this administrator, and the poultry inspection staff was constantly defending its inspection criteria and standards from allegations that it caused the industry to lose too many birds."

A basic question is why those funds squandered on the cosmetic vaccine have not been spent to determine whether avian leukosis is hazardous to human health? The National Institute of Health (NIH) earmarked \$1.5 million on cancer research where avian leukosis is a model for the study, but the study is not directed toward its transmissibility to man. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) during the past two years allocated the largest part of a \$1.2 million leukosis research fund for the vaccine which keeps a chicken pretty.

The vaccine's development was detailed in January 1970 by Dr. Ben Burmester in *Poultry Meat*, an industry publication, and was discussed with much fanfare at a scientific meeting on virology by Dr. H. Graham Purchase in early February. Both are government researchers.

Dr. Burmester apparently voices the USDA view in his article. He expresses great enthusiasm for the vaccine. He writes, "the chicks become infected with the virus and they also become infected with the regular Marek's virus but the lesion is completely prevented. We're not preventing or stopping the spread of infection." (Emphasis added.)

Publication of information concerning the vaccine occurred only a few months after the USDA—in a June "purge"—changed the composition of its Advisory Committee on Criteria for Poultry Inspection (see chart). When reports were leaked that the new committee members submitted recommendations to weaken inspection criteria determining which chickens are to be condemned because of avian leukosis, public pressure forced Jesse L. Steinfeld, Surgeon General of the United States, to name his own committee to review the new recommendations.

Little is known of the Surgeon General's group, but one member, who prefers to remain anonymous, says that there was a definite split of opinion during an *ad hoc* meeting on January 29. Yet, only seven days later, USDA Secretary Clifford M. Hardin announced: "Even though there is no known link between poultry leukosis virus and human health, it is esthetically undesirable and unacceptable to pass for human food any poultry showing visible signs of leukosis lesions or tumors." His decision was based on an opinion from the Surgeon General.

The heart of that opinion states: "Not only is there no evidence that poultry products are a hazard to man as a possible cause of cancer, but the data strongly supports a positive statement that transmission of cancer from chickens to man does not occur." This is strange, considering that the Surgeon General's own committee of experts was split and the NIH public information office states categorically that no research has been conducted in this field. Further, there is disagreement among scientists at NIH on the issue.

An aide to Virginia Knauer, special assistant to President Nixon for consumer affairs, said, "The letters we have received are the most virulent that have come in on any topic. The housewives are really enraged at the possibility the ban will be relaxed."

One housewife wrote, "Dear Mrs. Knauer: We are having cancerous chicken tonight. You are invited." Another said that she did not want to wonder when she selected chicken at her local supermarket whether "the right leg was cancerous so it was cut off and I am getting the left one. A sick chicken (is) sick all over."

There is speculation that humans have been infected with avian leukosis.

Rhesus monkeys died within four months

after being inoculated with a virus (*Rous Sarcoma virus*) that causes cancer in chickens.

Dr. Robert T. Huebner, A National Cancer Institute (NCI) scientist, while certain that the viruses are not transmissible to man, is afraid that Marek's disease tumors might be capable of causing cancer when eaten. Still, Dr. Huebner can "justify not condemning them (chickens) when the cost thereof is considered."

Others have far more alarming views.

Dr. Padman Sarma, another NCI scientist, says that chickens infected with avian leukosis should not be eaten or handled by anyone. He is receptive to the idea of poultry workers wearing gloves and using face masks.

He also advises against eating soft boiled eggs. This latter concern is reinforced by Dr. Howard H. Temin of the University of Wisconsin Medical Center, who says that raw eggs should not be fed to new-born infants.

Dr. W. Ray Bryan, an NCI administrator, wrote, "It would be premature at this point to rule out avian leukosis viruses as a potential contributor to man's leukemia problem."

Dr. Earl J. Splitter, a USDA veterinarian, says that "It would be better not to have them (infected chickens) on the market."

Dr. Ludwig Gross, who received the United Nations prize for his original isolation of the mouse leukemia virus, writes, "Under present laboratory conditions, it appears that the mouse leukemia virus is limited in its pathogenic potential to mice and rats, and that the chicken leukemia virus is pathogenic only for chickens. We may well learn, however, in future studies, that this is not necessarily true and that under certain conditions the chicken leukemia virus may be able to pass the species barrier. Its possible harmful effect for humans has yet to be determined."

Dr. Sevoian, the University of Massachusetts researcher, is so concerned about the problem that "I don't sleep nights."

LATEST USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRITERIA FOR POULTRY INSPECTION

A survey of past and present USDA Committee members indicates that the June "purge" of the Committee dropped six members who were known advocates of strengthening or at least not changing the avian leukosis condemnation standards. But three new members were added, all favoring relaxation of the standard. The Committee's line up thus was changed from —8-4 favoring no change in standard to 6-2 favoring the marketing of more leukotic birds. (While technically the terms of Committee members are only for two years, 11 of the 12 members were routinely reappointed in 1967.) Dr. Burmester, a new member of the USDA Committee, was appointed to the Surgeon General's group.

Member	Views:—	
	1967-68	1969-70
Dr. Eugene W. Adams.....	No change.....	Dropped.
Dr. Frank R. Craig ¹	Relaxation.....	Relaxation. ²
Dr. Samuel A. Edgar.....	Relaxation.....	Relaxation.
Dr. Leland C. Grumbles.....	No change.....	Dropped.
Dr. Melvin S. Hofstead.....	No change.....	Do.
Dr. David Ibsen ¹	Relaxation.....	Relaxation.
Dr. Clyde A. Marsh.....	No change.....	Dropped.
Dr. Benjamin S. Pomeroy ¹	No change.....	No change.
Dr. Walter W. Sadler ¹	do.....	do.
Dr. Samuel C. Schmittle.....	Relaxation.....	Dropped: joined industry.
Dr. Martin Sevoian.....	No change.....	Dropped.
Dr. P. Philip Levine.....	do.....	do.
Dr. William J. Benton ¹	do.....	Relaxation.
Dr. Ben R. Burmester.....	do.....	Do.
Dr. Stephen B. Hitchner.....	do.....	Do.

¹ Did not answer questionnaire; information supplied by associates.

² No longer a member of the committee, but a member at the time of meetings.

Note: No change—Supports no change or strengthened criteria. Relaxation—Supports a relaxation of standards.

Dr. Craig, according to his colleagues, was a consultant to the Southeastern Poultry and Egg Association and now is at Holly Farms Poultry Industries, Inc. Dr. Schmittle is at Vantress Farms, Inc. Dr. Ibsen consults with the industry as part of his extension work, as does Dr. Marsh. Dr. Sadler served as an unpaid consultant on the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Pacific Dairy and Poultry Association and Dr. Edgar has served the industry in many paid and unpaid positions. Dr. Hitchner owned a vaccine business which he and his partners sold for \$1.5 million to Abbott Laboratories, for which he continued to consult. Dr. Burmester is a member of the advisory committee of the National Poultry Research Foundation, an industry-sponsored institution, and makes numerous presentations to various industry groups and trade publications. J.O.

AIR WAVE POLLUTION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Barron's, the weekly publication covering activities in the business and financial fields, carried a front-page, in-depth treatment of the Pacifica Foundation, a radical organization of some 20 years' standing which is operating five radio stations and is applying for a fifth. According to the author of the Barron's article, Mrs. Shirley Scheibla, Pacifica has consistently abused its status as an educational broadcaster by airing statements of sources advocating violence against American institutions, the Communist line on the Vietnam war, and anti-Semitism, to name but a few areas. This is not surprising, for a number of years ago the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings on Pacifica and documented its leftist leanings. These disclosures apparently made little difference to a liberally oriented Federal Communications Commission as Pacifica continued on its merry way dispensing its brand of "education." With new leadership at the Commission, it is hoped that corrective action will be taken.

I insert at this point the article, "Air Wave Pollution," by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla which appears in the April 6 issue of Barron's.

[From Barron's, Apr. 6, 1970]

AIR WAVE POLLUTION—THE PACIFICA FOUNDATION HAS BROADCAST IT FOR YEARS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On April 21 the Federal Communications Commission will open hearings on competing applications for this city's last available educational FM radio station. The proceedings should attract nationwide attention, if only because one of the applicants is the ultra-leftist Pacifica Foundation. Though Pacifica has been highly controversial ever since FCC licensed it to operate its initial radio station 20 years ago, this will be the Commission's first hearing involving the Foundation, which now has five. It began launching its fifth, in Houston, early this month, and its right to continue to operate hangs upon the outcome of the Washington case.

According to FCC files and the Congressional Record, programs broadcast recently over wholly owned Pacifica stations have fea-

tured regular news commentaries by identified Communists and Black Panthers, tapes made by Radio Hanoi, Red Chinese propaganda and advocacy of blowing up police stations and fire houses. Hence the case will involve official clarification of fundamental issues of public policy. For one thing, it raises the question of whether such programming is in the public interest, which the Commission, in the licensing of broadcasters, is supposed to serve. Is it proper to ban cigaret advertising because smoking might be detrimental to health, but continue to license Pacifica stations which time and again have allegedly advocated mass violence and murder? Is such programming protected by the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and/or the legislative ban on censorship?

The hearings may result in a tightened FCC definition of an educational broadcaster. They also may focus public attention on the failure of the Commission to investigate the financial backing of applicants once they qualify as "educational."

The case already has shown how little the agency does to keep track of over 7,600 stations now operating under license. The FCC has no monitoring staff; a complaints branch of exactly five full-time people handles complaints involving all of them. It also has revealed how matters of great import referred to the Justice Department sometimes fail to reach the top authorities. Thus, while the Pacifica case involves allegations of subversion and incitement to riot, Deputy Attorney General Richard R. Kleindienst told Barron's that nothing involving Pacifica has been brought to his attention.

By the time the Pacifica case proceeds from the hearings before a trial examiner and reaches the full Commission, the term of one of its most liberal members, Kenneth Cox, will have expired. Thus, Pacifica also is likely to supply an indication of whether a new Republican majority will reverse the liberal bias which the agency has displayed to date in broadcasting licensing. The case also will indicate how far FCC's ultra-liberal commissioner, Nicholas Johnson, can go without disqualification.

The record indicates that the FCC should have considered most of these questions in a public hearing and acted on them long ago. FCC's complaint files bulge with letters and telegrams—some dating back years—from citizens voicing alarm over Pacifica's programs and beseeching the Commission to act. On June 2, 1969, Mrs. Hans K. Ury of Berkeley wrote the FCC about the role she said KPFA played in the so-called People's Park riot. According to her letter, KPFA broadcast appeals by Max Scheer, editor of the underground publication, Berkeley Barb, for reinforcements to go to the site to battle the police.

The complaint prompted an FCC letter of inquiry to the station, which drew this response from station manager Alfred Silbovitz: "Mrs. Ury's allegations are without foundation. Station personnel at no time encouraged listeners to oppose the police or to go to the scene of the news event that was being covered." The files indicate no further action by the Commission, although a wire from Martin Rabkin to the FCC indicated that KPFA was ordered by the Berkeley police to stop its live, on-the-scene broadcasting of the riot.

A letter to the Commission from David Bolender of Long Beach alleges that on March 7, 1969, a member of the Black Panthers said over KPFA that Los Angeles police kill black babies and exhorted his audience to kill the Los Angeles police. Again, Harvey S. Frey, M.D., of Los Angeles wired the Commission, "I request that you obtain and save a tape of the program, 'Black Is Beautiful,' broadcast by KPFA on February 16, 1969. The statements made by the host of the program at about 5:50 p.m. constitute in my mind a

direct incitement to riot, murder and robbery."

Complaint files on Pacifica's New York station, WBAI, are even thicker. On April 7, 1968, Robert Potter of Clifton, N.J., wrote that after the death of Martin Luther King, WBAI carried a speech which urged listeners "to blow up power plants, police stations and water stations in retribution for the death of our leader." That same month, Herman H. Kahn of New York expressed concern about a WBAI broadcast of a news report from Moscow consisting of verbatim quotations from Pravda and Izvestia concerning the assassination of Dr. King. Mr. Kahn said it was "a thinly veiled call to arms, riot and revolution. . . . I was told in advance about this broadcast by Negro friends who advised that a telephone chain squad was formed to urge Negroes throughout the metropolitan area to tune to this station. . . . If ever there was a call to riot, this was it. If ever there was a shout of fire in a crowded theater, this was it."

William B. Ray, Chief of the FCC Complaints and Compliance Division, replied to Mr. Kahn that the Commission must not censor, and that expressions of views which involve no clear and present danger of serious substantive evil come under the protection of Constitutional guarantees of free speech.

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) forwarded to the Commission a letter from M. I. Thomas, president of Tempo of Passaic, N.J., which said that on January 10, 1969, WBAI broadcast programs of Black Panthers, including Mrs. Eldridge Cleaver, in which "they spoke at length on the reasons for eliminating certain members of the Negro community who did not conform to their standards of militancy. The elimination in the context of the discussion was a clear synonym for murder, and I cannot help but be concerned about its effect upon a large and perhaps unsophisticated radio audience. I note that the station Folio (program guide) presents these Black Panther programs on a regular basis, and it is possible that this poison is being broadcast with alarming frequency."

Robert V. Cahill, legislative assistant to the FCC chairman, wrote Senator Javits: "If Mr. Thomas has reason to believe that station WBAI has failed on an overall basis to present opposing viewpoints on any such issue and will furnish specific factual evidence, the Commission will make appropriate inquiries."

All Pacifica stations, including WBAI, readily acknowledge that they regularly broadcast programs by homosexuals for homosexuals. When one listener requested time under the fairness doctrine to present his case against homosexuality, WBAI responded to FCC that "the tone and content of his literature has not indicated to us that he would be able to contribute constructively to a discussion of the general issues." FCC apparently let the matter drop.

On December 26, 1968, Lester Campbell, a former teacher of Afro-American History at a junior high school in New York, read a blatantly anti-Semitic poem over WBAI. Over the same station on January 23, 1969, Tyrone Woods, representing Concerned Parents and Students of Bedford-Stuyvesant, said, in part: "What Hitler did to six million Jews is nothing in terms of what has been done to black folks over hundreds of years. . . . As far as I am concerned, more power to Hitler. Hitler didn't make enough lampshades out of them."

The poem was dedicated to Albert Shanker, head of the United Federation of Teachers, and brought a prompt protest to FCC from the Federation's director of public relations, Dan Sanders. Representative Emanuel Celler (D., N.Y.), himself Jewish and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech does not allow WBAI to ignore "the clear and

present danger in permitting anti-Semitic views to be sent over the air."

Swamped with other complaints, FCC investigated and found that WBAI afforded adequate opportunity for the presentation of opposite viewpoints, though there is no evidence in the public files that such viewpoints actually were broadcast. The Commission took no further action in the case.

Francis X. Worthington, chief of the Civil Section of the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department, told Barron's that in his opinion, incitement to riot is not actionable unless a broadcast advocates a specific time and place for a riot. Asked if he believed the Department could prosecute for a broadcast advocating blowing up police stations, he said he did not believe so unless it said which police station and when. He explained that he based his opinion on the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Yates case. In that case the high tribunal ruled advocacy of violence legal if it is "divorced from any effort to instigate action toward that end."

FCC's new chairman, Dean Burch, asked if he felt FCC could move against broadcasters who carry programs advocating blowing up police and fire stations, replied, "Of course we can; that's against the law."

FCC need not rely on complaints to realize that Pacifica presents highly controversial programs. The Foundation has filed with the Commission examples of its programming, which include the following: "From The Center: On China. Although the People's Republic of China refused to send a representative to the Pacem in Terris II Convocation in Geneva, their view was forcefully expressed by Paul T. K. Lin, associate professor of history at McGill University in Canada. This tape is one in the series produced by the Fund for the Republic project, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif. . . .

"Washington Confrontation. A weekly series in which a panel of journalists interview politicians, political figures, civil servants and other Washingtonians. Panelists are Seymour Hirsch, author of Chemical and Biological Warfare; Andrew Kopkind, U.S. correspondent for the New Statesman and a contributing editor of Mayday (Barron's, January 12); James Ridgeway, also of Mayday, and Lee Webb, Washington correspondent of Ramparts. . . .

"Colin Wilson: Human Evolution and the New Psychology. Mr. Wilson discusses the natural sciences and their effect on psychology, touching on LSD and other mind-changing drugs. The talk was delivered in San Francisco at the Esalen Institute lecture series."

According to the Congressional Record of February 8, 1966, Pacifica stations broadcast parts of tapes produced by Radio Hanoi, made copies and then turned them over to the FBI. They reportedly urged the United States to withdraw from Vietnam and suggested ways for American soldiers to avoid serving there.

A broadcast of Radio Hanoi monitored by the U.S. Government reported on an interview North Vietnamese Minister of State, Xuan Thuy, gave to Robert Rinaldo of Pacifica in Paris in 1968. According to the monitored version of August 14, 1968, the interview carried this statement by Minister Thuy: "In South Vietnam under the leadership of the NLFV, the Liberation armed forces and people have won ever greater victories in their fight against the U.S. aggressors and their lackeys. At present, they are stepping up the People's War and launching continuous attacks to annihilate a great number of puppet troops and to wrest back real power to the people so that the United States will find it impossible to continue its war of aggression and materialize its neo-colonialism in South Vietnam."

Some Congressmen who have told the Commission they do not believe it is in the public interest to license Pacifica stations have received scorching letters from Max D. Paglin, FCC executive director, telling them that it is not appropriate to comment on "pending adjudicatory matters."

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson refers to Pacifica in a new book he has written, How to Talk Back to Your TV Set. On pages 212-213, he says: "Many communities have the blessing of community-supported non-commercial stations. The Pacifica Foundation operates radio stations WBAI in New York, KPFA in Berkeley and KPRK (sic) in Los Angeles. It has recently begun a new station in Houston."

Last December Commissioner Johnson told the Senate Communications Subcommittee, "I have never received in my office, to my knowledge, a letter from anyone complaining about a Pacifica program." However, FCC files contain a letter dated August 19, 1968, addressed to Mr. Johnson from Michael I. Neidich of 302 McCall Avenue, West Islip, N.Y., who identifies himself as "Electronic Engineer, MIT '60." Mr. Neidich wrote in part, "I would like to register a complaint concerning FM radio station WBAI in New York City. . . . My children of impressionable age have access to my FM receiver, and at 7 a.m., they should not be subjected to the vocabulary which so often emanates from this station. . . . I can only interpret the programming of WBAI a direct affront to the good people who are the lifeblood of our nation, and I cannot see how you can allow them to continue."

The files also contain a letter of September 16, 1968, addressed to Mr. Neidich and signed by Mr. Johnson, in which the Commissioner said, in part, "One problem in dealing with this type of concern is that the Commission may not censor programs unless they are clearly obscene. And as you know the legal standards for obscenity are not completely clear."

Several members of Congress have asked for an exhaustive FCC investigation of Pacifica and for an opportunity to present their information on the foundation to the Commission during a hearing. They have been curtly told that they should have filed a formal petition within a stated time period. Though the Commission has not so informed them, they could appear as witnesses (for the competing applicants) at the April hearing.

A former FCC member flatly states: "Pacifica is the most outstanding case in point demonstrating the Commission's liberal bias in licensing." The foundation's first license was for KPFA in Berkeley back in 1949. At that time the station was affiliated with a university and won an "educational" rating. Thereafter, according to Congressional testimony, all new Pacifica stations automatically were classified as "educational" without the need for a university affiliation or other qualification for such status. The classification meant that Pacifica stations did not have to disclose their financial backing to the FCC.

In 1954 Pacifica acquired a license for a second Berkeley station, KPFB. According to Commissioner Cox: "When Pacifica sought a second station in the Berkeley area to fill a gap in its coverage the Commission itself suggested. . . . that the Foundation could perhaps qualify for an educational FM channel. . . . In many cases the only aspect of the station's operations which has educational overtones is that the facility is used to train students in broadcast techniques."

In 1954 the Commission also announced a proposed rule which would have denied a radio license to anyone who was a Communist or not of good moral character. Pacifica blasted the proposal as an unconstitutional extension of regulatory power. In 1960, with

the rule-making proceeding still pending, FCC awarded Pacifica still another station, WBAI in New York City.

By 1962 FCC dropped the proceeding, without adopting the anti-Communist rule. The following year the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held extensive hearings on alleged Communist influence in Pacifica. Despite many startling disclosures, the subcommittee never issued a report, and no action resulted.

On January 22, 1964, FCC renewed Pacifica's licenses for its stations in Berkeley and New York and, without a hearing, gave it a new license for an educational station in Los Angeles. The decision said nothing about how any of the stations happened to qualify for educational status. It did say, in part, however: "Under the public interest standard, it is relevant and important for the Commission to determine in certain cases whether its applicants, or the principals or its applicants, for broadcast licenses or radio operator licenses, are members of the Communist Party or of organizations which advocate or teach overthrow of the Government by force or violence. . . . The Commission therefore has followed a policy of inquiring as to Communist Party membership in these radio licensing situations where it has information making such inquiry appropriate. Because of information coming to the Commission's attention from several sources, the Commission requested information from Pacifica Foundation on this score. On the basis of information obtained from Government sources, the Foundation, and our own inquiry, we do not find any evidence warranting further inquiry into the qualifications in this respect of Pacifica Foundation."

Though FCC today still quotes from that portion of the decision in answering complaints on Pacifica, there is nothing to show the findings of that inquiry in the public files of the agency. At the request of Barron's, an FCC official looked into FCC's confidential files and said they also contained nothing on the matter. Several officials who were with FCC at the time of the inquiry said they received no report on it.

On November 11, 1963, The New York Times reported, "Directors of the Pacifica Foundation decided yesterday against filling out questionnaires submitted by the Federal Communications Commission on possible Communist affiliations. . . . The FCC had called for sworn answers from the foundation's executive members, directors, officers and general managers on whether they had ever belonged to the Communist party or any organization teaching or advocating forcible overthrow of the Government."

But still the complaints about Pacifica programs poured into the Commission. When the foundation applied for renewal of its California licenses, FCC wrote it that the complaints raised questions as to whether "you have conformed to your own program supervisory policies and procedures on which FCC relied in granting your prior renewals."

Pacifica replied that because of some changes in personnel there had been deviations from Pacifica policies and procedures, but that it had sent a memorandum to all personnel and volunteers to make sure they did not recur. An FCC official says the agency failed to check up on whether the memorandum was enforced, and there is nothing in the public files of the Commission to indicate such a check. Pacifica continued to win license renewals without hearings.

Pacifica was discussed at a one-day hearing last December, chiefly on the subject of obscenity, before the Senate Communications Subcommittee. Commissioner Cox testified that FCC doesn't know where Pacifica gets its funds. At this point, Senator Edward J. Gurney (R., Fla.) asked, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if you found out the

sources of funds for the Pacifica stations, particularly in view of your testimony that Pacifica broadcasts Communistic material as well as other stuff?"

Commissioner Johnson seems to know more about Pacifica's finances than Commissioner Cox. In March 1969 he said that Pacifica stations are not primarily supported by public grants or private foundations. "The stations are sustained by contributions from the listeners in their respective communities." Their ability to survive, according to Mr. Johnson, proves they are serving the public.

However, information on file with the FCC in connection with Pacifica's Houston application, and stamped, "Received September 30, 1969," indicates that J. R. Parten pledged \$10,000 to Pacifica for construction of its Houston station. According to information on file with the Internal Revenue Service, Jubal R. Parten is a director of the Fund for the Republic.

The Fund initially was created with a contribution of \$15 million from the Ford Foundation. At the 1963 Senate hearings, Catherine Cory Gumpertz, then a Pacifica vice president, testified that Pacifica's KPFA had received support from the Ford Foundation. (She also acknowledged having been a Communist.) She disclosed that Pacifica had received a contribution from Consumers' Union Foundation.

IRS information also shows that the term of Hallock Hoffman as the Fund's secretary-treasurer expired in November 1969. According to Pacifica's application for the Washington station, Mr. Hoffman is chairman of the board of Pacifica. It also lists him as a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. (Though the application doesn't show it, the Center was set up by the Fund for the Republic.)

Recent newspaper reports indicate that the Center asked for the resignations of five of its most liberal fellows, including Mr. Hoffman, in the wake of continuing criticism of its board chairman, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Despite the evidence that Pacifica broadcasts propaganda, its tax-exempt status rests upon its articles of incorporation which state, "The purposes of this corporation shall be:

"(a) To establish a Foundation organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes . . . and no substantial part of the activities of which is designed to carry on propaganda. . . .

"(e) In radio broadcasting operations to promote the . . . public presentation of accurate objective, comprehensive news on all matters vitally affecting the community. . . ."

Among those charged with carrying out those lofty obligations are some of the stars of the 1963 Senate hearings on Pacifica. In 1963 Dorothy Healey was identified as both a Communist and a regular commentator for Pacifica, and the foundation still lists her as both in its program guide. An appendix to the Senate hearings noted a sharp contrast between KPFA's glamorous description of her and the facts as revealed in public records, which show she "has dedicated her lifetime to the furtherance of the international Communist conspiracy . . . dedicated to the overthrow of the United States by force and violence."

In Congressional testimony, Stephen M. Fischer, current Pacifica vice president (and assistant to the publisher of Scientific American), denied any knowledge that the Communist Party is a conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. government, although he admitted having been a Communist in his youth.

At the time of the 1963 hearings, Steve Murdock was acting editor of People's World, West Coast organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee 10 years earlier, he had been identified as a member of

the Communist Party. The July 13, 1968, issue of People's World said, "Steve Murdock, political writer for the People's World, will be heard in a commentary over KPFA at 7 p.m. . . . Murdock will be heard every two weeks during the summer."

During the 1963 hearings, William Mandel was identified as a frequent writer for the Communist Daily Worker who took the Fifth Amendment when asked if he had ever been engaged in sabotage or espionage against the U.S. At the time Pacifica emphasized that he was a regular broadcaster but not a commentator. Today, it lists him as a regular commentator and "authority on the USSR."

Henry Elson, Pacifica secretary, apparently is too young to have figured in the 1963 hearings. People's World has identified him as a former University of California student who was active in the Resistance and later served as attorney for Wayne Greene, a Negro charged with attempted murder, assault on a police officer and possession of a firebomb.

Donald Ray Gardner, development manager for Pacifica in Houston, currently is under indictment for alleged failure to report to the armed forces for induction. Julius Lester, a Pacifica program producer, has stated in an article in the National Guardian that he is trying to follow in the footsteps of Lenin, Mao and Castro.

The program guide for KPFA lists Elaine Browne as a regular commentator; it identifies her as "Deputy Minister of Information, Black Panther Party of Southern California."

Nevertheless, Commissioners Johnson and Cox, in a joint dissent, have said the decision to hold a hearing on Pacifica (for the first time in 20 years) is "disgusting" and constitutes harassment.

While the Commission refused to order a hearing on Pacifica's application for the Houston station, it said that the grant of the Houston broadcasting permit will be conditioned upon the outcome of Pacifica's Washington application. Meantime, Pacifica has completed construction in Houston and begun broadcasting under "test authority" last February 24. It may continue to do so until final disposition of the Washington case by the FCC, which is expected to take about a year. According to the March 7 issue of The Peace Times, the Pacifica Houston station is giving the (New Left) Moratorium office eight half-hour programs beginning in March.

FCC Chairman Burch, who has been on the job only a few months and still lacks a majority, says he expects the Commission to approach the problem of subversion on a case-by-case basis. But he cautions that in trying to prevent subversion, the agency must guard against harming the very freedom it tries to save. "We can't deny a license just on the basis that an applicant appears to be subversive," he adds. The chairman says he also plans to look into the definition of educational broadcasting. High time.

CRITICS IGNORE HUMAN QUALITY OF CARSWELL

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is scheduled to vote today on the motion to recommit the nomination of Judge G. Harold Carswell to the Judiciary Committee. It is my considered judgment that this motion will be and should be defeated.

Few men nominated for public service have been subjected to such vicious

and unprincipled attacks as has Judge Carswell. The slightest pretext is used for huge pronouncements by his opponents, but the facts of his judicial service and the high regard in which he is held by the overwhelming majority of those who have practiced before him or served with him in the courts are glossed over.

Charles Bartlett in the Evening Star of this city had a very striking column on April 2, 1970, which expresses very clearly my feelings in this regard.

I would ask that those who have been so critical and unfair would search their own hearts and consciences and apply the same standards for southerners which they accept for themselves.

If this had been done, Judge Carswell would have been speedily confirmed just as he was unanimously confirmed by the Senate to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, the second highest judicial position in the Nation.

The article follows:

CARSWELL'S CRITICS IGNORE HIS HUMAN QUALITY

(By Charles Bartlett)

The strategy of recommitment on the nomination of Judge Carswell is not justified by an obvious need for further hearings. In fact, the rolling attack on the Florida judge has been stuck in its groove for some days by a dearth of new disclosures.

The liberal establishment, with its sword unsheathed, generates an awesome sound and fury. It has succeeded in shaking the certainty of Carswell's confirmation and leaving him flayed and naked before the world. It has riled the controversy to a passionate pitch in which Carswell's human credentials are obscured by the assault on his qualifications as a judge.

This human quality is the missing ingredient in the picture being drawn by Carswell's critics. It is the reason why the nominee has not been decimated by the liberal onslaught. Its de-emphasis seems specially poignant to this reporter after meeting with the judge and hearing the sentiments of neighbors in his home country.

Carswell does not impart a mediocre impression. He wears an air of friendly outspokenness which suggests that he is perceptive and sincere. He has assurance and a graceful sense of humor. He describes himself as more aghast than any critic at the offensiveness of his disinterred campaign speech. His conservative bent is undisguised but he comes through as an imaginative man generously blessed with decency and warmth.

No disclosure of the Senate debate has pierced this impression. It is affirmed by men of character in Tallahassee. In fact, the common denominator of Carswell's most bitter opponents is that they have not known him personally. A gamut of those who have—from LeRoy Collins to former NAACP lawyer Charles Wilson—yields reassuring evidence of respect.

Realistically, Carswell must also be measured against the Nixon commitment that produced his nomination. For better or worse, candidate Nixon appears to have promised that President Nixon would name a Southern Republican federal judge to the high court. Eliminating the Eisenhower appointees now too old for promotion and assuming that the pact precluded the selection of a judge whose rulings had alienated his region, the most appealing choices left for Atty. Gen. John Mitchell were Clement Haynsworth and Carswell.

The pragmatic inspiration for Mr. Nixon's commitment does not make it a less valid step towards healing scars left by radical

change in the mores of the black belt South. This region will not always deserve a seat on the court because it is growing to be like other regions. But it does at this point deserve and need one to encourage and recognize its reluctant embrace of constitutional equality.

A Southerner yes, some say, but not Carswell. But where can the search lead from here? Perhaps to a less deserving judge or to some brilliant Southern lawyer whose private involvements will test the skill of an army of investigators. Civil rights activists may be able to probe their way through a whole phalanx of Nixon nominees, possibly making in the end the dubious point that no Southerner is pure enough in heart to sit on the Supreme Court.

Why not Carswell? The case against him is almost entirely based, as Sen. John S. Cooper has said, on speculative opinions concerning his ability and capacity for growth. He is charged with persistent racism because he participated peripherally in the revival of a private golf club in 1956.

But surely this was a no more serious departure from principle than the readiness of a distinguished group of committed liberals—Senators, editorialists, and columnists who staunchly oppose Carswell—to maintain through the years their membership in a Washington luncheon club which will not consider Negro members and barely tolerates Negro guests.

For all these men, from Carswell to the liberals, nothing more hypocritical than an accommodation to convenience is involved. But Northern liberals need to be more cautious in applying yardsticks to Southerners which they do not accept for themselves.

Carswell represents the evolution of the last bastion of Southern recalcitrance. It seems far wiser to accept him as a gesture of conciliation than to risk, in repudiating him, the renewed isolation of a region trying to break with its racist past.

COST EFFECTIVENESS AT PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, N.H., is unique in that it is the greatest single source of submarine skills and crafts within the naval shipyard complex. Practically all of its productive output is devoted to submarine work. In an age of specialism, Portsmouth is a specialist's yard—its expertise embracing the entire range of work in the design, construction and maintenance of nuclear-powered submarines. The importance of these skills today is manifest in the high priority assigned to our nuclear submarine fleet as a principal segment of our national defense posture.

During the past 5 years, Portsmouth has been working under the handicap of a pronouncement by the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, which decreed that the shipyard would be phased out by 1975. Despite the ill effects of the ever-present threat of closure, the dedicated work force at Portsmouth has demonstrated through consistent high performance the true meaning of cost effectiveness.

The cost-reduction program sponsored

by the Department of Defense seeks to stimulate ideas for the improvement of work techniques and procedures in order to achieve real economy as well as greater effectiveness in operation. All ideas submitted are carefully audited and the originators of beneficial suggestions, which result in worthwhile savings, are awarded cash prizes. Specific goals are assigned to each shipyard in accordance with established criteria as to the magnitude and scope of work performed. Since 1964, Portsmouth has made an exemplary showing in this program, in competition with a total of nine naval shipyards, as indicated in the statistics given below:

Cost reduction program history, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard

Annual goal:	
Fiscal year 1965.....	\$5,000,000
Fiscal year 1966.....	\$7,500,000
Fiscal year 1967.....	\$1,000,000
Fiscal year 1968.....	\$1,200,000
Fiscal year 1969.....	\$1,696,000

Cost reduction accomplished:	
Fiscal year 1965.....	\$7,970,000
Fiscal year 1966.....	\$9,462,000
Fiscal year 1967.....	\$2,100,000
Fiscal year 1968.....	\$2,040,000
Fiscal year 1969.....	\$2,114,900

Percent of goal attained:	
Fiscal year 1965.....	159
Fiscal year 1966.....	126
Fiscal year 1967.....	210
Fiscal year 1968.....	170
Fiscal year 1969.....	125

Amount awarded to suggestors:	
Fiscal year 1965.....	\$17,690
Fiscal year 1966.....	\$22,640
Fiscal year 1967.....	\$27,060
Fiscal year 1968.....	\$24,990
Fiscal year 1969.....	\$17,835

Standing among 9 naval shipyards:	
Fiscal year 1965.....	2
Fiscal year 1966.....	2
Fiscal year 1967.....	1
Fiscal year 1968.....	2
Fiscal year 1969.....	4

¹ Criteria for establishment of annual cost-reduction goal underwent change fiscal year 1967.

Relating this excellent program to current day-to-day performance at Portsmouth, it is a pleasure to call attention to recent awards presented for beneficial suggestions which have proven to have intrinsic value. A pertinent article in the March 20 issue of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Periscope follows:

SHOP 38 FOREMAN PORTSMOUTH'S BENEFICIAL SUGGESTER OF MONTH WITH IDEA SAVING GOVERNMENT \$8,135

Kenneth D. Richardson, foreman machinist in the Outside Machine Shop, is suggester of the month at Portsmouth, with an adopted beneficial suggestion saving the Government \$8,135. His suggestion pertains to predetermination of snubber mounts on submarines and will be sent out to the other naval shipyards with the recommendation that the idea be adopted Navy-wide. The idea also has intangible benefits.

He received a cash award of \$460 for suggesting a method of obtaining readings to determine spacer thickness to obtain snubber mount clearances. The improvement idea has been incorporated into the latest drawing revision and has resulted in increased safety for Shipyard workers in addition to being credited with saving time.

Richardson is the top suggester among a group of constructive thinkers whose improvement ideas will save the Government

\$19,568. Other workers sharing \$1,880 in extra take home pay include:

\$430 Award—Roland K. Usher, Jr., (additional award) Planning.

\$100 Award—Leo J. Rizzo, Shop 56.

\$90 Award—Paul E. St. Jean, Q/R Assurance.

\$85 Award—Arthur S. Harding, Jr., Shop 06.

\$50 Awards—Charles S. Griffin, Shop 38; Robert R. Gagnon and Nelson J. Schnitzler, Jr., Planning.

\$45 Award—T. G. Vento, Q/R Assurance.

\$40 Awards—Robert W. Bridle, Shop 38; Robert A. Brown, Shop 56; Perley E. Armistage, Jr., Planning.

\$40 Joint Award—Robert J. Courl and Douglas E. White, Q/R Assurance.

\$30 Awards—Leo L. Rizzo, Shop 56; Robert A. Brown, Shop 67.

\$25 Awards—John A. Knowlton, Shop 02; Alvin K. Hanson and Frank J. Drinczyk, Shop 06; Rene F. Camire, Shop 17; George L. Jensen, Shop 31; Jerome J. O'Keefe, Shop 51; Frederick G. Rockett, Shop 58; Harry R. Fish, David M. Ogilvie and Jerome B. Hayatt, Jr., Shop 67; Donald J. Porter, Supply.

\$25 Joint Award—ENI Philip A. Randt and ETR2 Steven P. Ward, submariners on ALBA-CORE (ASGG569).

The Beneficial Suggestion Honor Roll by shops and other units is as follows:

Number and amount of awards		
Shop 02	1	\$25
Shop 06	3	135
Shop 17	1	25
Shop 31	1	25
Shop 37	1	90
Shop 38	3	550
Shop 51	1	25
Shop 56	4	195
Shop 67	4	105
Planning and Estimating	1	50
Design Division	3	520
Q/R Assurance	2	85
Supply	1	25
Military personnel	1	25

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to send to Ninth District residents each week a report on an issue before Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include several of the reports I have distributed this year:

TAX REFORM

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 provides tax reform and tax relief. It is natural that the relief aspects have received most public comment, but it is no misnomer to refer to it as a reform act.

First, how much tax relief is there? The quick answer is "a lot, but not for your 1969 taxes."

The relief occurs because the per capita exemption rises to \$650 July 1970, to \$700 for 1972 and \$750 for 1973. On the average, this means tax relief as follows:

Income	Tax relief (percent)
\$3,000	70
5,000-7,000	20
10,000-15,000	16
15,000-20,000	8½
20,000-50,000	5
50,000-100,000	1½
Over \$100,000	Taxes increased

The minimum standard deduction is gradually increased to a level of 15 percent of adjusted gross income with a ceiling of \$2,000. This will take about 5 million taxpayers off the rolls and simplify the preparation of tax returns for millions more.

Single people, who now bear an unusually heavy tax burden, will receive substantial tax relief. They will not pay more than 120 percent of the tax liabilities of married couples at comparable income levels.

Secondly, how much tax reform is there? The Bill is remarkably free of new tax preferences and deals with all but one area taxpayers use to avoid completely income tax (i.e., interest on State and municipal bonds).

That celebrated group of 155 individuals who paid no Federal income tax although they had incomes in excess of \$200,000 a year will have to start paying taxes now, almost without exception.

The Bill reduces deductions, exemptions and other tax benefits, and it also provides a secondary line of defense which supplements the remedial provisions by providing a minimum tax on tax preferences. This may be the most striking feature of the new legislation, and it may make the bill the most significant tax reform bill since the inception of the income tax.

The minimum income tax lumps together a long list of current provisions of the tax law (depletion allowance, rapid depreciation, etc.), and requires that the taxpayer add up all his income that is sheltered from tax by the operation of these various devices. If the total amount so sheltered exceeds \$30,000, plus the amount of tax the individual is paying on his other income, he must pay the minimum tax on the amount of the excess. The rate of the tax is only 10 percent, and that may be a defect, but at least it is a good start, especially when no one knows exactly how the minimum income tax concept will work out in practice.

The Bill taxes the income that churches receive from ownership of businesses. It taxes individuals who have operated charitable foundations for personal or financial benefit. Charitable foundations are required to pay out 6 percent of their income annually for their stated purposes and must pay an audit fee. Limitations are placed on their ownership of businesses and restrictions on making grants to individuals.

The Bill limits deductions for charitable gifts of appreciated property, imposes heavier taxes on financial institutions, reforms multiple surtax exemptions for corporations. It reduces the amount of rapid depreciation that can be deducted from income before any tax is calculated in real estate, and curbs farm losses.

Interest deductions are limited, and the oil depletion allowance was reduced from 27½ percent of gross income to 22 percent. Capital gains are more heavily taxed by eliminating the 25 percent alternative rate for all gains in excess of the first \$50,000 gain.

Probably no one would agree with all the provisions of the bill. It is filled with compromises, and represents no one's idea of a perfect tax bill. Nonetheless, considering the complexities of tax reform, the bill remains something of a legislative miracle.

FARM LEGISLATION

One of the items high on the agenda of the Congress in 1970 will be farm legislation. Among the shortcomings of the 91st Congress last year was the failure to reach an agreement on future agriculture policy. The Omnibus Farm Act of 1965, the legislation which sets the guidelines for current farm policy, expires at the end of this year.

To date, there has been no clear indication, either from the Congress or from the Administration, on the direction of new farm policy. The Department of Agriculture has appeared to be unsure of what it wants and hesitant to speak out. The House Agriculture

Committee has been working since mid-summer on early drafts of a new farm program. The Senate Agriculture Committee has yet to begin consideration of farm policy legislation.

In its early deliberations, the House Agriculture Committee has been confronted with three distinct programs. Many observers believe, however, that the committee most likely will extend the existing programs rather than establish new ones.

The new proposals include:

1. Farm Bureau proposal, which includes a five-year plan to phase out acreage controls, base acreages, marketing quotas and direct payments for wheat, feed grain and cotton by 1976.

It would also direct the Secretary of Agriculture to retire at least 10 million acres of farmland a year from 1971 through 1975 as part of the cropland adjustment program.

Loan rates for wheat, feed grains, cotton and soybeans would be set at not more than 85 percent of the previous three-year price, beginning with the 1971 crop year.

A transitional program, to encourage small, low-income farmers to transfer to non-farm jobs also would be established.

2. Coalition proposal, backed by such organizations as the National Farmers Union, the Grange, and the National Farmers Organization, asks that present programs not only be kept, but expanded.

It proposes increased direct payments and price support loans for corn and equivalent increases in other feed grains.

A soybean program, with acreage reductions and diverted acreage payments, also would be established. Price support loans of 75 percent of parity would be offered.

The proposal would extend market order authority to any commodity, subject to approval by a majority of affected producers.

Consumer protection reserves of wheat, feed grains, soybeans and cotton would be established.

Existing cotton and wool programs would be extended.

Export certificates for wheat comparable to domestic wheat certificates would be provided. Wheat certificated for export would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity, with a floor of 65 cents.

3. Department of Agriculture proposal would establish a "set aside" plan in which farmers would leave unplanted part of their allotments. Feed grain farmers would divert from 30 to 50 percent of their bases, and leave unplanted conserving base acres. (Example: Feed grain farm of 300 acres, of which 200 are feed grain base, would divert 60 acres under 30 percent set-aside, and another 50 acres out of conserving base, leaving 190 acres to be planted as owner wishes.)

Those participating would be eligible for price-support loans on all crops raised.

The proposal would establish a land easement plan in which the Government would acquire the cropping rights of whole farms, while allowing owners to continue using their acres in other ways. The plan would retire from 3 to 4 million acres annually.

It would include a retraining and assistance program for low-income farmers to encourage their transfer to non-agriculture jobs.

The proposal also would include lower loan levels for commodities, as low as \$1.05 for wheat, compared to the current level of \$1.25.

Farm policy is among the most difficult items on the national agenda, and it demands the attention of every American. Each of us is totally dependent upon the food the American farmer produces and his place in the economy must be protected.

POSTAL CRISIS

After two centuries of service, the U.S. postal service was hit by the largest walkout ever staged against the Federal government. It tied up the nation's economy; caused thousands of postal employees to break their

tradition of public service, defying their national leadership and their oath of office; set a precedent for future strikes by other government employees; challenged the doctrine that there is no right to strike against the Federal government; caused the President to declare a national emergency and order troops into New York City.

Few in the Congress would deny that postal workers have legitimate grievances. Their wages begin at \$6,176 a year and after 21 years of service rise slightly more than \$2,000. In New York, their pay scale is \$1,500 below the garbage collector's. They seek a salary schedule that begins at \$8,500 and rises to \$11,700 in five years. They also want more generous retirement benefits and a larger government payment of their pension and health plans.

Federal workers are supposed to be covered by a comparability plan which guarantees wage parity with people doing the same kind of work in outside industries. But there is a built-in time lag which puts Federal employees 21 months behind comparable civilian wages.

There has been a lengthy tie-up in the Congress on pay legislation and it has become involved with the question of postal reform. The President has indicated he would veto any postal pay plan which did not include the establishment of a postal corporation.

The House of Representatives has a fair record in dealing with the problems which have prompted the unrest in the postal system. It passed a comprehensive pay bill last August, but the Senate passed a very different version, and the two Houses have not worked out the differences between the two bills.

The postal strike is another example of the Congress not being sufficiently responsive to the needs of the people. The postal workers were caught in the fight against inflation and they were victims of political maneuvering among Congressmen, between the House and the Senate, and between the Congress and the President. So there is plenty of blame to be shared by all.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the strike is that the grievances of the workers developed to the point where they felt that a strike was necessary. The strike was not unexpected. Anyone familiar with the postal system knew the danger of it. As one postal worker put it, "Power is the only language that Washington understands," and they walked out.

Hopefully, there will now be a strong impetus to support basic reform in the postal system. Congress must provide realistic pay scales and desirable working conditions for our postal employees. We must devise machinery capable of meeting worker grievances and preventing the deterioration of government-employee relations. That machinery should include fact-finding, mediation, conciliation, and, when everything else fails, compulsory arbitration.

All of us, as a result of the walkouts, have come to realize what a vital element the postal system is in our communications systems, and how much we depend upon it.

INNOCENTS ABROAD

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks there will be a great surge of Americans venturing overseas. Last year well over 5 million Americans of all ages traveled to even the most remote corners of the world. And this year, it is pre-

dicted that there will be an increase of 15 to 20 percent. A large percentage of these Americans traveling abroad are young people.

As a member of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have become increasingly aware of the numbers of these young Americans arrested for narcotics violations. Equally alarming is the number of convictions and lengthy incarcerations of these young Americans.

Frequently, they turn in desperation to U.S. consular officials ignorant of the fact that there is little that can be done to help. Neither the power nor the prestige of the U.S. Government can prevent a narcotics violator from being prosecuted and convicted to a lengthy sentence in an almost primitive jail. For these young Americans a summer trip has become a "bummer."

The word is out in our youth culture that drugs are cheap and accessible abroad. Unfortunately, this same grapevine has not spread the word that many countries are vigorously enforcing their narcotics laws and that many Americans are arrested without the recourse to our legal and constitutional safeguards, such as bail, due process and the right of appeal.

We are sending a new generation of innocents abroad without properly cautioning them about a new and serious risk.

It seems romantic and daring to young Americans far from their homes and supervision, in different cultures, to experiment with hashish and other drugs. In some areas, such as Afghanistan, hashish may be purchased legally, and very often it is carried back to Greece, Turkey, and Western Europe where it can be sold for a handsome profit.

However, there is one thing wrong with such a plan. More and more of these amateur smugglers wind up in cold and antiquated dungeon-like jails with the prospect of long, often mandatory, sentences from which there is no appeal.

In fact, each day in the newspaper one can read tragic stories of Americans who have gotten involved with narcotics abroad and have received severe sentences.

I can assure you that there are many U.S. consular officers abroad who can cite the most gruesome circumstances where the use, transport or sale of narcotics has reduced the young American traveler to a degraded, health-broken subject of an animal-like existence.

Consular Officers have horrified me with accounts of teenage Americans receiving 5-year sentences for merely possessing marihuana; with tales of unscrupulous hashish sellers who double their income by acting as police informers, and with stories of innocent persons who agreed to transport packages for friends which turned out to be narcotics and resulted in a year's imprisonment after a year of waiting in jail for trial. I shudder at the thought of an American girl serving a 3-year sentence in an old jail in southern Spain while caring for her infant born in jail; and of the 19-year-old boy from Ohio who will be in an ancient Lebanese mental asylum for the next 2 years because he used hashish.

The incidence of narcotics arrests is increasing. The number of Americans arrested in February 1970, totaled 118, compared with 50 arrests in February 1969. On February 28, 1970, 404 Americans were under detention in foreign countries on narcotic charges; this compares with 142 in 1969. In Spain alone nine Americans were arrested for drug offenses in October 1969; 11 in November; nine in December; six in January 1970; and 15 in February 1970. Furthermore, the number of vagrancy cases is increasing in that country. Reports from Spain indicate that the expected travel explosion this summer and the behavior of young Americans abroad can impose a most unfortunate strain on relations between the two countries.

Although the Spanish authorities have well publicized the consequences of smuggling narcotics, particularly on the Morocco-to-Spain ferries, the easy availability of narcotics in Morocco is a constant source of temptation.

Mexican authorities unofficially report that approximately 1,222 Americans were deported from Mexico during 1969 and several hundred more have already been deported in January and February of this year. The authorities state that 96 percent were deported as a result of involvement with narcotics. Furthermore, this figure does not reflect a significant number of Americans informally deported at border crossing points. In Mexico City 17 Americans are presently being held on serious narcotics charges. Most of these people are awaiting sentencing and have been incarcerated for extensive periods of up to 1 year. They can expect an average sentence of 4 years. Persons arrested on narcotics charges in Mexico cannot go free on bail pending sentencing and usually wind up spending many months in prison before their case is actually heard. Legal fees in cases involving narcotics are always extremely high and most Americans involved have been forced to borrow substantial sums of money from relatives in the United States in order to meet their legal obligations.

According to available statistics, the ages of persons arrested for narcotics range between 18 and 49. The median age of those arrested was 29.7 years, thus showing that by far the greatest number arrested are below 30 years of age.

The following chart shows that the arrests for narcotics are not limited to any particular country or area:

Country	Arrests in February 1970	Total under detention
Mexico.....	17	119
Spain.....	15	48
France.....	9	26
United Kingdom.....	9	23
Italy.....	19
Japan.....	8	19
Sweden.....	6	17
Germany.....	3	17
Jamaica.....	15	14
Greece.....	13
Lebanon.....	12
Israel.....	4	11
Canada.....	2	10
Morocco.....	3	6
Bahamas.....	8	5
Bolivia.....	5	5
Denmark.....	5
Netherlands.....	5
Turkey.....	5
India.....	2	3

I think it would be appropriate to include in the statement representative penalties for possession and trafficking in narcotics:

France: Possession, varies, but less than for trafficking. A minimum of 3 to 4 months pretrial confinement; trafficking, 1 to 5 years jail.

Mexico: A minimum of 6 to 12 months pretrial confinement, then: sentence usually under 5 years unless more than one-half ton of drugs involved.

Spain: Penalty depends on quantity of drugs involved: Less than 500 grams—fined and released or released on bail until trial. More than 500 grams—heavy fine plus minimum of 6 years jail.

Italy: Possession—one American recently fined \$317 and sentenced to 2 years jail; trafficking—3 to 8 years.

Sweden: Possession—one American recently sentenced to 1 year in jail. Attempted sale—one American sentenced to 1 year, 9 months. Permanent expulsion from Sweden usually follows release.

Greece: Possession—fine and sentence to few months jail. Trafficking—one American recently sentenced to 18 months another to 5 years.

Germany: Possession—one American sentenced to 2 years for possession of large amount of hashish.

Japan: Sentences are based on the quantity of narcotic involved. For small amounts, as are usually the case, sentences are light or often suspended, followed by deportation. One American found with 600 grams of hashish was sentenced to 2 years. Most Americans arrested on narcotics charges are seamen.

Lebanon: Possession and use—1 to 3 years in detoxification asylum—usually a mental hospital. Trafficking—3 to 15 years. Minimum sentence usually given to Americans.

Jamaica: Possession—minimum of 18 months.

Bahamas: Possession—Americans have been sentenced to from 3 months to 1 year in jail.

Turkey: Possession—3 to 5 years; trafficking—10 years to life.

It is reasonable to ask, and it is well to understand, just what the U.S. Government, acting through its consular officers abroad, can do to assist Americans who are detained for narcotic violations. You must keep in mind that sovereign countries can and do make their determination on what penalty a conviction for possession or trafficking in narcotics should be.

Upon learning of the arrest of a U.S. national, the consular officer would determine the reason for detention and the official charges lodged. He would seek to visit the detainee as soon after learning of his arrest as possible to inform him of his rights and provide the detainee with a list of attorneys from which to select defense counsel. He would assist the detainee to make contact with family or friends to inform them of his difficulties and to seek help from them, if that is what the detainee wanted. He would report on the situation to the Department of State and keep it informed of developments. He would thereafter maintain contact with the detainee, his counsel

and local officials to determine the nature of treatment accorded the detainee, that processing of the legal charges is not delayed beyond a period considered desirable by the defense counsel and the detainee, and to assist in every appropriate manner with any difficulties that might arise in relation to the condition of detention or other matters relating to the individual's detention.

The consular officer is precluded from giving legal advice or expending official funds in situations of this nature.

I feel that everything possible should be done to acquaint our American youth with a full knowledge of the consequences of any illegal acts abroad. The above survey of foreign law discloses that most countries have severe penalties for involvement with drugs, marihuana, and other narcotics. Forms of jurisprudence vary and often we find that right to legal counsel, writ of habeas corpus, bail and bonding procedures, probation, and other guarantees which we have in the United States, are not available in some foreign countries and are limited or curtailed in others. I do not wish to be critical of any country and their laws; I merely take this opportunity to point out and warn of the consequences that can be expected from illegal acts and to discourage young Americans from going overseas in search of easy access to narcotics.

Travelers, please keep in mind: If the laws of a particular country are violated, there is nothing a U.S. Government official can do to keep an offender from prosecution and possible imprisonment.

As an addendum to this statement I would like to include the case studies of some American youngsters arrested and jailed abroad on narcotics violations. These case studies are culled from the reports of foreign service consular officials.

IN THE NEAR EAST

Ed had been drifting in the Near and Middle East when he found himself broke and appealed for help to the nearest American Embassy. The embassy assisted him to obtain funds for travel to Europe where he could make use of an open ticket to return to the United States. Unfortunately for Ed, he carried 1.2 kilos of hashish—about 2.6 pounds—with him and was arrested in a Middle Eastern capital while en route to Europe. Ed's family is not well-to-do, and the payment of his fine and lawyer's fee was a heavy burden. In spite of the small amount of hashish involved, he was sentenced to 1 year imprisonment for possession for personal use. A short time later, he was sentenced to an additional year for the use of hashish while in prison.

Since it appears that Ed is a habitual user, he may be held in a mental hospital for the duration of his sentences, or until it can be shown that he is free of the drug habit.

IN MEXICO

Jeannie met four young Americans on the American side of the border and was invited to accompany them on a jaunt into Mexico. When she accepted their invitation she did not know that their trailer carried 250 pounds of marihuana.

As they crossed the Rio Grande, the trailer was searched and the marihuana was found. The Mexican police were not impressed by Jeannie's story that she had just met her four friends and did not know about the marihuana. The five spent Thanksgiving 1969 in a Mexican jail awaiting trial. Now that it is Easter, they are still in jail awaiting trial and they will be fortunate if their case is heard by midsummer. If convicted they could spend the next 4 years in jail.

IN THE CARIBBEAN

John and Mary, honeymooning last year on a Caribbean island, were picnicking one evening on a beach. Their picnic was interrupted by police who arrested them for possession of marihuana.

The newlyweds were thrown in jail, where they remain awaiting trial. There is no bail on this island. It is expected that they may have to languish another 6 months in jail before their case is even heard. If convicted, they face long sentences.

IN ASIA

Dick was found living in an Asian graveyard on the Indian subcontinent with a religious sect headed by a "baba." He had been surviving on tea, unrefined sugar, coarse bread, a few vegetables, and a narcotic intoxicant. He was mentally disoriented and 85 pounds under his normal weight. His body was covered with open and festering sores.

His presence in the graveyard was discovered by two other Americans who reported what they had seen to the local American consul. The consul visited Dick five times in the graveyard before the young American consented to hospitalization.

On one visit, Dick told the consul he doubted he could survive the approaching winter snows, but he felt he could not leave unless the baba gave him permission. On another visit, Dick told the consul he was a heavy user of narcotics.

The consul had no legal authority to insist that Dick seek repatriation or assistance. The local authorities refused to step in and force Dick's hospitalization because he was a self-proclaimed member of this religious sect and his health was actually no better or worse than the other members of the sect.

Dick finally consented to leave the graveyard after the consul contacted his family and assured him that they would help him. Dick was admitted to a local charity hospital, where he was diagnosed as suffering from schizophrenia, acute malnutrition, and exposure. The sores on his body were such that two skin graft operations were necessary to close them.

After several months of treatment, Dick's family arranged his repatriation to the United States.

In 2 years of traveling in Europe and Asia, Dick served a short sentence in Asia Minor for possession of a knife. Later he was arrested, convicted, fined, and deported by a European country for smuggling, possession, and use of marihuana.

He then drifted into the Near East and Asia. The consul considered Dick fortunate because the penalties for using and smuggling narcotics in some of the coun-

tries through which Dick passed range from confinement in primitive prisons to execution.

Dick is now believed to be under psychiatric care in the United States.

"TIGER" TEAGUE—TEXAS
LEADER 1969

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it was a unanimous selection when they named "TIGER" TEAGUE as 1969 Oak Cliff Man of the Year. Because, in the Dallas community everyone is delighted that he represents us in Congress.

His Sixth District extends from Dallas through the middle of Texas. But, his influence and hard work is felt in every section of the Lone Star State.

Ray Zaubler, editor and publisher of the Oak Cliff Tribune writes a most interesting story on March 31, 1970. Headed "The Gentleman from Texas" it is an interesting description of the popular and highly respected "TIGER" TEAGUE.

The article follows:

THE GENTLEMAN FROM TEXAS

The human dynamo who represents Southwest Dallas County in Congress has undoubtedly become the most powerful Texan in Washington, D.C. He is Olin Teague, affectionately known as Tiger, one of the most respected statesmen in Congress.

For a relatively new state, Texas has enjoyed almost unprecedented power in the highest echelons of government.

Two native born Texans have become President, two became Vice Presidents, two became Speakers of the House and one Senate Majority Leader.

At one time, unprecedented in American history, a native Texan served as President while the Speaker and the Majority Leader were also native of the Lone Star State.

Let's fill in the names for those whose recollections of U.S. history may be foggy, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson were Presidents. Cactus Jack Garner and Lyndon Johnson were Vice Presidents. Jack Garner and Sam Rayburn, who served longer than any man in history, were House Speakers, while Lyndon Johnson was Majority Leader.

Tiger Teague probably comes nearest to continuing this mantle of leadership than any man representing the Lone Star State in Washington since LBJ retired.

While he is too shy and too reticent to admit it, Teague has been unofficially asked if he would assume one of the top posts in the Democratic party on several occasions. Eventually he might even have become Speaker.

But Teague likes to operate from the middle. He is almost totally non-partisan in his approach to government, alluding to himself as an American first and a reasonable conservative second.

"I don't like controversy and raw partisan politics," Teague has explained to this writer on many occasions. "And fortunately, the greatest portion of Congressional business is conducted without any regard to party lines."

Olin Teague, who spends most of his weekends with friends in Dallas and especially in Oak Cliff, has incredible credentials.

He is the only man among the 435 members of the House and 100 members of the Senate assigned to three committees. He is best known for chairing the Veterans Affairs Committee. He is second ranking member of the Science and Astronautics Committee and chairman of the Manned Flight Sub-Committee. Alone from Texas he sits on the august Ethics Committee.

An infantry battalion commander in World War II, Teague is the most decorated member of Congress. Landing on Utah Beach on D Day, he crawled across most of France to the Rhine River in 90 days of the bloodiest fighting of World War II.

Hit by an artillery shell in the foot on a mission back to headquarters which was so dangerous he refused to dispatch a runner, Tiger almost bled to death before help arrived.

He was hospitalized almost two years and 14 operations were required to save a portion of the leg and foot. The whole ankle was blown away and his foot hung by muscle and tissue which stubbornly refused to mend.

Finally, a team of persistent Army surgeons fashioned a workable fusion of leg and foot which left one limb four inches shorter. A 14-pound orthopedic shoe now makes it possible for the peripatetic Tiger to move about tirelessly in his work.

It was while he was convalescing that Teague started to think about his future and decided to make his race for Congress. He was still in uniform in August 1946 when he won a special election for the vacated Sixth District seat.

A hopeless underdog against two well-known, well-respected attorneys Teague moved determinedly about on his game leg, a man with a burning cause. While the two lawyers chopped unmercifully at one another, both spoke with deference and dignity about their war-hero opponent.

It was not until the last two weeks of the campaign that the two barristers realized that they were letting their doughty and determined opponent slide by them.

Tiger won handily in a stunning upset and in 14 subsequent terms has had only one opponent, Bill Moore of Bryan, who ran a bitter and fierce campaign trying to unseat Teague.

Politics is the passion of Teague's life. He lives and breathes his profession. "God couldn't have invented a greater system for governing men than the Founding Fathers of America devised," Teague declares with earnestness.

"Now 200 years later I would change only two things," he added. "I would take the Supreme Court out of politics by allowing the State Supreme Court justices to nominate 10 men for each opening from which the President could make his nomination."

"Then I would amend the Electoral College to allow each presidential candidate his percentage of popular vote by states," Teague allowed. "This might preclude militant minorities, pressure blocs and even dishonest election officials from stealing close states," he concluded.

Tiger's personal code of conduct and his professional ethics are so lofty that it is difficult to realize that there are still men cut from this grain in politics.

"I have a fierce conscience," he explains, "and I figure we don't pass this way but once. I have to be able to look at myself in the mirror and to live with myself."

Teague returns tainted campaign contributions and remains a very poor man. He is reluctant to accept any help except for filing fees and plane rides back and forth to Texas.

"I don't want to have the responsibility of accounting for Tiger Teague Fund excesses," he says bluntly. And he means every word of it. Recently when his daughter was mar-

ried, he had to cash in some securities and tap his small savings account to defray costs of the wedding.

Probably best known by war veterans for his sponsorship of legislation covering ex-service personnel, Teague's record in this field is unbelievable. The bills which come out of the Veterans Affairs Committee bear the approval and backing of all members . . . Democrat or Republican—conservative or liberal.

His veterans legislation breezes through the House by 401 to 4 or 390 to 16, sometimes even unanimously, so thorough is the preparation and so impeccable is his reputation.

And in the last few years Teague has become the chief Congressional spokesman for the space effort.

A man with young and progressive ideas, Teague maintains that nothing is technically impossible. He believes that the United States space effort will eventually see man racing to the stars and through the planets of our own solar system in his lifetime.

Tiger shows very little patience to those liberals who keep weeping that federal funds should first be used to eliminate poverty on earth before space is fully explored.

"Some of earth's major dilemmas will be solved in space," Teague maintains. "And already the feedback from space technology and space exploration has provided tremendous scientific advances for all mankind."

"What is wrong with creating jobs, advancing science and attacking new frontiers?" Teague demands impatiently. And along with the chief administrators of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Teague expresses bitter disappointment with President Nixon's curtailed budget for this program.

"Our space successes in the moon landings have been the greatest triumph of the Nixon administration," Teague avers. "The moon walks made the Nixon trip to Europe and Asia, yet he listens to liberal advisers who support poverty programs which have never worked and which will never work."

In a speech before Texas Press Association in Longview this winter, Teague remarked: "Here I am an old country boy with a degree in animal husbandry from Texas A&M and find myself the chief Congressional spokesman for the most sophisticated scientific program in man's existence."

In the same vein Teague points out that he had never lived in a place with indoor plumbing or running water until his first night at A&M.

"Yet, until I read the goals of The Great Society, I never realized I was reared in abject poverty."

But, Teague continues, if anyone had accused his father of rearing his five children in poverty, there would have been a bruising battle. "My father was a proud man and we were well-scrubbed, well clothed, well-fed and each had an opportunity for education."

A handsome and trim man in his collegiate and Army years, Teague has now become a little paunchy. He loves good food and his Bourbon with branch water. In fact, his doctors constantly plead with him to watch his weight.

His most prominent facial feature is his square jaws, which show determination. Yet, he has such warmth that people in every walk of life are attracted to him.

Close friends are so fiercely loyal that most will admit they dearly love the little law-maker. And his friends stretch into every part of the world and include tycoons of industry, nabobs of finance, titans of technology, scientists, educators, generals and privates, doctors, lawyers and Indian chiefs.

It is remarkable how he can find time to stay in close touch with such a tremendous number of folks. But he does and he loves it. Yet, he keeps a backbreaking pace in Washington.

He is in Cape Kennedy for space shots, in Huntsville for space research and in Houston for splash-downs on every space adventure. And still he roams his district which stretches 240 miles from Dallas and Fort Worth to Houston with some frequency.

His great prestige and power has been a boon to defense and aerospace industries in Texas, especially in the Dallas and Fort Worth megalopolis.

One of the most amazing facets of his personality is his basic shyness. After nearly 30 years of public service he still detests speech making, is uncomfortable at testimonials in his honor and doesn't have a public relations specialist on his staff.

When exhorted to speak out on national issues, he answers in plain sincerity: "My messages are read where they count most. The right people know what I am thinking and what I stand for on important issues."

For instance he shook loose \$30,000,000 to air-condition and refurbish the Lisbon Veterans Administration Hospital in the dying days of the last administration with a personal appeal to President Johnson.

Then in Dallas he let other Congressmen take the credit because they needed the political brownie points.

It was Teague who gave original encouragement to the four war wives who went to Paris to talk to the North Vietnamese about the prisoner of war issue. The four girls hear from him regularly now. They are part of his little "North Texas family" as he refers to a group of his closest friends in Dallas.

Another clue to the esteem and stature in which he is held was the offer of the Texas A & M presidency after the falling health of General Earl Rudder became public knowledge.

Those who think they know something about rabid Aggie partisans don't know anything until they hear Teague talk about the alma mater. And if anything would lure Teague from politics, this was perhaps the solitary offer.

But he declined the position, again explaining with simplicity: "I now have the only job which I ever want. I love Congress and I have no other ambitions than to serve my country, my state and my district."

Born in Woodward, Oklahoma, Teague was reared in Mena, Arkansas. His father was a lumberman, eking out a living from a small sawmill. There was Olin and four girls in the family.

He won the nickname "Tiger" on the softball diamond. He was such a fierce competitor for a small player, that he spurred his teammates to many close wins. One of them dubbed him Tiger when he was exhorting the team with constant chatter. He played ball until his foot was maimed.

His wife, the former Freddie Dunman of Fort Worth, has been a quiet but powerful motivating force in his life. They have two sons and a daughter. The oldest boy is a flier who completed two tours in Vietnam. The younger son, also an officer, was a spy in Laos before the name of the small Asian country was known to the average American. And now he is pulling a second voluntary tour in the war zone.

The daughter, Jill Virginia, was recently wed. There are grandchildren around now and these are new delights in the Congressman's life.

Since arriving in Congress in 1946 Teague has authored more than 200 pieces of legislation. Nearly all of the major bills on veterans affairs bear his signature. And now he has shaped a good many of the measures which created the space program and manned flights.

Even with the lame foot, he still swims in the Capitol pool and plays paddle ball on the Congressional courts. He loves gin rummy and whiles away many of his hours

in planes playing with a host of different partners.

Seated one day in the Saddle 'n Spur in the Marriott Motor Hotel in Dallas with friends, he was being served by a polite young Negro waiter. The maitre d', an older Negro, approached and admonished his youthful aide: "Take good care of that man, son," he urged, "for he is your Congressman in these perilous times."

Which was very good advice. For as long as there are patriots with the zeal and dedication of Tiger Teague serving in our government, the future of this country is in good hands.

MILITARY REPORTS A FUEL COST CUT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that after 8 years of effort, proponents of legislation to permit conversion from the use of coal to natural gas at Fort Richardson, Alaska, was finally approved. It was a long drawn out struggle. Those of us who participated in that battle can take pride in the fact that the conversion cost was amortized in less than a year, and the saving to taxpayers now amounts to \$1,141,540 annually.

The one person more responsible than any other for this achievement was Dale Teel, vice president and general manager of the Alaska Pipeline Co., and now an official of the Anchorage Natural Gas Corp. Here is a citizen whose efforts and foresight contributes very directly to the saving of more than a million dollars a year—a saving which will continue indefinitely. Every American taxpayer benefits from this saving.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article, entitled "Military Reports a Fuel Cost Cut," which appeared in the April 3 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times. The article follows:

MILITARY REPORTS A FUEL COST CUT

A year's experience in the operation of the Ft. Richardson heat and power plant using natural gas instead of coal as primary fuel has produced substantial savings to the taxpayer, not only in fuel costs, but in operating labor cost and maintenance of equipment states a press release from the Ft. Richardson information office.

An important side benefit of special interest to residents in the Anchorage area has been the marked decrease in air pollution, the result of discontinuance of coal fires, the Army states.

Conversion of the plant from coal to gas operation was made possible with funds granted by Congress in 1967. During the numerous discussions and hearings conducted in Alaska and Washington on the subject, the Army predicted that if gas were used the annual maintenance and operation cost would be about \$985,000 cheaper than it had been with coal.

That estimate has proved to be conservative. The actual experience shows a saving of \$1,141,540, and this despite an increase in the quantity of heat and power needed and an increase in wages for the employees involved.

It has been found that the efficiency of the firing equipment improved; that fuel

costs were less; that the total cost of labor was down; and expenditures for maintenance and repair decreased markedly.

Amortization of the cost of converting the plant to handle natural gas, originally estimated to take ten months, was accomplished in eight, the Army states.

Another saving that has been realized came by not having to purchase and install smoke arrestors and other air pollution control equipment to counter the effect of burning coal. If the system had not been changed to gas, the Army faced an expense of more than a million dollars for that purpose, the article stated.

USING BANK CREDIT TO MEET SOCIAL NEEDS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a year now I have publicly recommended that the Federal Reserve Board review its policies with an eye to assisting the Government in its efforts to meet the vast social needs of the Nation. Specifically, in a letter to the new Board Chairman, Dr. Burns, late in January, I proposed that the Board consider taking necessary steps to channel available credit through the banking system toward such areas of need—most particularly, housing. In my judgment, selective controls on credit can prove a highly effective weapon in stabilizing our economy and reordering our national priorities.

I was pleased, therefore, to read in the Washington Post article recently that at least one member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors is sympathetic to my proposal. The article reports comments of Andrew F. Brimmer made in a San Francisco speech last week. According to the press report, Mr. Brimmer endorses the credit plan. Mr. Brimmer explains in some detail how the plan might be implemented.

The reporter, Hobart Rowen, observes that Dr. Burns is on record as opposed to involving the Fed in credit controls. Nevertheless, I am hopeful that Dr. Burns may one day soon agree with Mr. Brimmer that the Fed has a clear responsibility to play an active role in helping to solve the great national social problems we face today.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1970]

BRIMMER LINKS LOANS, SOCIAL NEED

(By Hobart Rowen)

Federal Reserve Board Governor Andrew F. Brimmer yesterday called for a complete re-examination of the techniques of money management in this country and suggested that the Fed, for the first time, be permitted to regulate bank loans according to social or economic priorities.

His proposal would enable the Federal Reserve to take account of public policies by giving, for example, highest priority on loans to housing and a lesser priority on loans for consumer credit or business mergers.

At the same time, Brimmer warned against easing up too quickly on the Fed's existing level of monetary restraint for fear of restimulating inflation.

In a speech to the San Francisco Bond Club, Brimmer insisted that inflation is far from licked. Indirectly, he was critical of recent administration moves to ease budgetary restraints.

"By the end of this year," the Fed official said, "the pace of inflation may still be rising at a rate well above what most Americans would find acceptable in the long run."

His speech, copies of which were released here, made clear that the Federal Reserve Board would not be unanimous if it decided to pursue a distinctively easier monetary policy at the moment, as urged by some economists and businessmen.

RETREAT INDICATED

In recent congressional testimony, Fed Chairman Arthur F. Burns indicated that the Fed has retreated modestly from the unusually harsh money policy that prevailed last year. Brimmer didn't indicate that he favored no change in policy; in effect, he was saying: Don't overdo it.

His personal assessment, he told the Bond Club, is that "the time has certainly not come to lay aside the effort to achieve and maintain a reasonable degree of price stability in this country. And we should remind ourselves that the attainment of the objective was the mission on which the Federal Reserve set out in December, 1968."

Brimmer's novel suggestion for controlling not only the total volume of bank credit but also the intended use of the loan money, is certain to be controversial.

Chairman Burns has made the point in congressional testimony that the best contribution the Fed can make in the "social priorities" field is to attend to its own business—that is, as he defined it, preserving and protecting the stability of the dollar here and abroad.

The desirability of minimal interference with "normal business decisions and the economic force of the market place" was recognized by Brimmer in his speech.

But he insisted that without the kind of control he suggested, the Fed's over-all policies of restraint had been effectively dodged by big banks—notably multi-national banks—that can tap money resources outside of normal channels.

Brimmer's plan to put new curbs on bank credit would utilize the Fed's authority to set reserve requirements, in cash, that banks must hold against the loans they make.

LEGISLATION REQUIRED

His suggestion would require legislation, inasmuch as he would apply it to all commercial banks in the country, not just members of the Federal Reserve. In essence, it would force banks to keep an additional amount of cash on hand, against domestic loans.

The percentage of the additional reserve would vary according to a schedule "that might be established from time to time" by the Fed. Thus, Brimmer said, the Fed could not only exert a further restraint on total lending, but have a better chance of achieving over-all objectives of monetary policy.

"If the objective of public policy were to give priority to loans to meet the needs of state and local governments," Brimmer explained, "it could be given effect through a reserve ratio against such loans smaller than the ratio for other loans."

"Loans to acquire homes could be exempted—if public policy calls for giving housing the highest priority—by setting the requirement at zero. In contrast, if policy calls for substantial restraint on consumer credit or on loans to business, the reserve ratio applicable to such loans could be set quite high."

"In fact, any array of loan priorities could

be adopted and the reserve requirement scaled accordingly—depending on the changing needs of public policy."

The objective of the Brimmer plan would be to raise the cost of bank lending by reducing the marginal rate of return to the bank. He would demand additional cash reserves to the amount of lending above some predetermined amount.

He offered this illustration:

"Let us assume that such a supplemental reserve requirement had gone into effect at the end of 1968. Let us take \$220 billion . . . on the books . . . as of that date. Suppose further that a bank were required to set aside cash reserves equal to 20 per cent of the amount by which its outstanding loans exceeded the (end of '68) amount . . . Since loans at member banks rose by about \$20 billion last year, they would have been required to put up an additional \$4 billion, under these assumptions. Since their required reserves averaged about \$27 billion in 1969, this would have represented an increase of roughly 15 per cent."

Brimmer came to the conclusion that "the time has come" for a major re-examination of the Fed's tool kit for controlling bank expansion because of what happened last year.

He said that the Fed had set out, as one of its objectives, "a sizable moderation in the expansion of business loans." But he said that the Fed did not achieve full success. In fact, Brimmer pointed out, the business loans on the books of commercial banks rose almost as much as in 1968.

To a large degree a "handful of multi-national banks"—he counted 20—and "a sizable number . . . dominant . . . in their regions"—he counted 60 of those—were the most successful in averting the full degree of intended monetary restraint by access to the Euro dollar market, or selling commercial paper.

In avoiding much of the impact of tight money, Brimmer said, the big multi-national and regional banks "can maintain—or even expand—their earning assets . . . The larger local banks, although also much larger than the average bank in the country, can do so to a much lesser extent."

Brimmer observed that the Fed had applied flexibility to the use of reserve requirements in the recent past. His new suggestion is parallel to an earlier idea, since adopted by the board, which establishes a marginal reserve requirements of Euro-dollar borrowings. Currently, a proposal to require reserves against commercial paper sold by bank-related corporations is under study.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the momentum for correcting and improving the imbalance of consumer representation within the Federal Government is now reaching a significant point. I think it very likely that Congress will act during this session on new legislation on consumer representation.

I have sponsored, since 1965, legislation to establish a Federal Department of Consumer Affairs. My basic legislation, which has been refined and, I hope, improved, with each successive year, was based originally on the proposal of the late Senator Estes Kefauver.

Last year the House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings on my proposal, H.R. 6037, which was cosponsored by nearly 100 Members of the House and the Senate—the latter's version being S. 860.

Shortly after those hearings, I began to work intensively with consumer experts to produce a consensus version of my legislation which already had considerable support from knowledgeable spokesmen like Ralph Nader, Mrs. Esther Peterson, Consumers Union, and the Consumer Federation of America. In a short period, we agreed upon a revised version of H.R. 6037 which took account of some reservations these spokesmen had on my plan for a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs although they were in basic agreement with me on the need for a new Federal agency for this purpose.

The principal changes from the original version of H.R. 6037 are these: First, the new unit of Government will be an independent consumer protection agency, not a Cabinet-level department; second, there is no transfer of existing consumer programs to the new agency as was envisioned in the original bill.

Our efforts produced H.R. 6037, as amended, which is the version now under consideration by the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, chaired by Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota. This subcommittee is also considering several other proposals on consumer representation, including that sponsored by the administration.

The subcommittee will resume hearings next week on my revised bill and related proposals. Representatives of consumer groups, business organizations, and labor and trade organizations will submit testimony on Monday, April 13, and Tuesday, April 14, 1970. I am fully confident that the subcommittee will soon report out an important bill from these hearings which will set new and higher standards for consumer representation in the Federal Government.

I include below the text of my revised bill together with a short summary:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY ACT

OFFICERS

Administrator, appointed by President with senatorial consent.
Consumer Counsel.
Director of Consumer Information.
Director of Consumer Safety.
Director of Consumer Research.
Director of Economics.

REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMERS BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES AND COURTS

The Consumer Counsel with a staff of attorneys, economists, and scientists, will intervene in matters pending before courts and federal agencies which substantially affect consumers. Every federal agency must notify the CPA when taking consumer-related actions and must furnish it with its consumer data, including access to investigatory files.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

The Administrator will transmit an annual report to Congress on the CPA's activities and accomplishments, its legislative recommendations, and an evaluation of federal consumer programs particularly with respect to improved coordination.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

The CPA will receive, evaluate, act on and, if necessary, transmit to the appropriate agency, consumer complaints.

CONSUMER INFORMATION

The Division of Consumer Information will develop and disseminate information—including product test results—from public and private sources which will benefit consumers.

CONSUMER SAFETY

The Division of Consumer Safety will take over the responsibilities of the National Commission on Product Safety upon its termination. It will also design and develop improved safety features for categories of consumer products that are considered unsafe.

CONSUMER RESEARCH

The Division of Consumer Research will encourage, initiate, and coordinate research and studies leading to improved products, services, and consumer information.

CONSUMER EDUCATION

The CPA will encourage, initiate, participate, in consumer education and counseling programs (including credit counseling).

STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE

The CPA will give technical assistance to states and local governments for the establishment of consumer protection offices and arbitration programs.

SUBSTITUTE TEXT FOR H.R. 6037

That this act may be cited as the "Consumer Agency Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the interests of the American consumer are inadequately represented and protected within the Federal Government; and that vigorous representation and protection of consumer interests are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency within the Executive branch of the Government the Consumer Protection Agency (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Agency"). The Agency shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall be in the Agency a Deputy Administrator who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as may be prescribed from time to time by the Administrator and shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Administrator during the absence or disability of, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of, the Administrator.

(b) The following officers of the Agency shall be appointed by the Administrator and shall perform such functions, powers and duties as are prescribed in this Act and as may be prescribed from time to time by the Administrator—

- (1) the Consumer Counsel, who shall be the chief legal officer of the Agency;
- (2) the Director of Consumer Information;
- (3) the Director of Consumer Safety;
- (4) the Director of Consumer Research; and
- (5) the Director of Economics.

(c) No employee of the Agency while serving in such position may engage in any business, vocation, or other employment which is inconsistent with his official responsibilities. No individual may be appointed or serve as an officer under subsection (a) or (b) while he holds legal title to, or beneficial equitable interest in, share capital exceeding

in market value \$5,000 in any corporation engaged in the protection, distribution, or sale of goods or services affecting consumers.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator shall be responsible for the exercise of the powers and the discharge of the duties of the Agency, and shall have the authority to direct and supervise all personnel and activities thereof.

(b) In addition to any other authority conferred upon him by this Act, the Administrator is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this Act, to—

(1) subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, appoint, employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties;

(2) employ experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and compensate individuals so employed for each day (including travel time) at rates not in excess of the maximum rate of pay for grade GS-18 as provided in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and while such experts and consultants are so serving away from their homes or regular place of business, to pay such employees travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates authorized by section 5703, title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently;

(3) appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act, and to pay such members (other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government) while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Administrator compensation and travel expenses at the rate provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection with respect to experts and consultants;

(4) promulgate such rules as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in him or in the Agency, and delegate authority for the performance of any function to any officer or employee under his direction and supervision;

(5) utilize, with their consent, the services, personnel, and facilities of other Federal agencies and of State and private agencies and instrumentalities with or without reimbursement thereof;

(6) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of the work of the Agency and on such terms as the Administrator may deem appropriate, with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, territory, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, or with any public or private person, firm, association, corporation, or institution;

(7) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 665(b) of title 31, United States Code; and

(8) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) Upon request made by the Administrator, each Federal agency is authorized and directed—

(1) to make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent within its capability to the Agency in the performance of its functions; and

(2) Except where explicitly prohibited by law, Executive orders, and rules relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, to furnish to the Agency such information, data, estimates, and statistics, and to allow such access

to investigatory files, as the Administrator may determine to be necessary for the performance of the functions of the Agency.

(d) The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include a comprehensive statement of the activities and accomplishments of the Agency during the preceding calendar year including a summary of consumer complaints received and actions taken thereon and such recommendations for additional legislation as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to protect the interests of consumers within the United States. Each such report shall include a summary and evaluation of selected major consumer programs of each Federal agency, including, but not limited to, comment with respect to the effectiveness and efficiency of such programs as well as deficiencies noted in the coordination, administration or enforcement of such programs.

FUNCTIONS OF THE AGENCY

SEC. 5. (a) The Agency shall, in the performance of its functions, advise the President and the Congress as to all matters affecting the interests of consumers; and protect and promote the interests of the people of the United States as consumers of goods and services made available to them through the trade and commerce of the United States.

(b) The functions of the Agency shall be to—

(1) advise Federal agencies and report to the Congress on the coordination of all Federal programs and activities relating to consumers and help resolve differences arising among Federal agencies with respect to such programs and activities;

(2) assure that the interests of consumers are timely presented and considered by the appropriate levels of the Federal Government in formulation of Government policies and in the operation of Government programs that may affect the consumer interest, and represent the interests of consumers in proceedings before Federal agencies and courts to the extent authorized by this Act;

(3) pursuant to section 8 of this Act, receive, evaluate, act on, and transmit complaints to the appropriate Federal or other agency concerning actions or practices which may be detrimental to the consumer interest;

(4) develop information from other Federal agencies, other public sources, and private sources which is of benefit to consumers, including—

(A) test results and analyses of consumer products and services, and

(B) information concerning commercial and trade practices which adversely affect consumers, and to disseminate such information in the most efficacious manner possible, including the publication and distribution of periodicals and other printed material which will in easily understandable form inform consumers of matters of interest to them;

(5) conduct economic surveys in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of this Act;

(6) encourage, initiate, support, and coordinate research and studies leading to improved products, services, and consumer information;

(7) encourage, initiate, and participate in consumer education and counseling programs (including credit counseling);

(8) cooperate with and give technical assistance to State and local governments in the promotion and protection of consumer interests (including programs to arbitrate consumer complaints and establish State and local consumer protection officers);

(9) cooperate with and assist private enterprise in the promotion and protection of consumer interests; and

(10) submit recommendations annually to the President and directly to the Congress on measures to improve the operation of the

Federal Government in the protection and promotion of the consumer interest.

(11) publish and distribute periodicals and other printed material which will inform consumers of matters of interest to them; and publish and distribute in a Consumer Register material which will include notices of Federal hearings, proposed and final rules and orders, and other useful information, translated from its technical form into language which is understandable by the public.

(12) (a) conduct hearings, conferences, surveys and investigations, including economic surveys & investigations authorized by Sec. 12, anywhere in the United States or its territories, concerning the needs, interests and problems of consumers which are not duplicative in significant degree to similar activities conducted by other Federal Agencies.

(b) For the purpose of conducting hearings, surveys and investigations, the Agency shall have all powers which are conferred upon the Federal Trade Commission by section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to the conduct of investigations made by that Commission under that Act, except that the Agency may not grant to any person any immunity from prosecution, penalty, or forfeiture in accordance with the provisions of such section 9 without first obtaining the written consent of the Attorney General and serving upon such person a duly certified copy of any consent therefor granted by the Attorney General. The provisions of section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act shall apply to the act or omission of any person, partnership, or corporation with regard to any subpoena, order, requirement, or information of the Agency to the same extent, and with the same effect, as if such act or omission had occurred with regard to a like subpoena, order, or requirement, or with reference to like information, of the Federal Trade Commission.

REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMERS

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever there is pending in or before any Federal agency or court of the United States any investigation, hearing, or other proceeding (except a criminal proceeding) which may, in the opinion of the Agency, substantially affect the interests of consumers within the United States, the Agency through its Consumer Counsel may intervene and, pursuant to the rules of practice and procedure of that agency or court, may enter an appearance in that proceeding for the purpose of representing the interests of such consumers.

(b) Whenever the Consumer Counsel determines it to be in the consumer interest, he may request the Federal agency concerned to initiate such appropriate investigation, hearing, or other proceeding as may be authorized by law with respect to such agency.

(c) Upon undertaking any action authorized in subsection (a) or (b) above, the Agency, through its Consumer Counsel, shall present to the agency or court, subject to the rules of practice and procedure thereof, such evidence, briefs, and arguments as it shall determine to be necessary for the effective representation of the interests of consumers. The Consumer Counsel, or any other representative of the Agency specially designated by him for that purpose, shall be entitled to enter an appearance on behalf of the Agency before any court of the United States (except the United States Supreme Court) or Federal agency, without other compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such court or agency, for the purpose of taking any action which is authorized by this section.

(d) This section does not authorize inter-

vention by the Agency before State regulatory bodies.

PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER INTEREST IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 7. Every Federal agency in taking any action of a nature which can reasonably be construed as substantially affecting the interests of consumers of products and services including, but not limited to—

- (1) the promulgation of rules, regulations, or guidelines,
- (2) the formulation of policy decisions, or
- (3) the issuance of orders, decrees, or standards, shall—
- (4) provide specific notice of such action to the Agency at such time as notice of the action is given to the public; and
- (5) take such action in a manner calculated to give due consideration to the valid interests of consumers in terms of price, quality, safety, accuracy, effectiveness, dependability, information and choice.

In taking any action under paragraph (5), the agency concerned shall indicate concisely in a public announcement of such action the effect of its action or decision on the consumer interest.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Agency receives from any source, or develops on its own initiative, any complaint or other information disclosing a probable violation of—

- (1) any law of the United States,
- (2) any rule or order of any administrative officer or Federal agency, or
- (3) any judgment, decree, or order of any court of the United States involving Federal matter.

affecting the consumer interest, the Agency shall take such action within its authority as may be desirable, or shall transmit promptly to the Federal or other agency charged with the duty of enforcing such law, rule, order, judgment, or decree, for appropriate action, such complaint or other information.

(b) Whenever the Agency receives from any source, or develops on its own initiative, any complaint or other information disclosing any commercial or trade practice detrimental to the interests of consumers within the United States which is not included within the category specified in subsection (a) of this section, the Agency shall take such action within its authority as may be desirable, or shall transmit promptly to the Federal or other agency whose regulatory or other authority provides the most effective means to terminate such practice, such complaint or other information.

(c) The Agency shall ascertain the nature and extent of action taken with regard to complaints and other information transmitted under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(d) The Agency shall notify producers, distributors, retailers or suppliers of goods and services of complaints concerning them received or developed under this section.

(e) The Agency shall maintain in a public document room for public inspection and copying an up-to-date listing of consumer complaints, arranged in meaningful and useful categories, together with annotations of actions taken by the Agency, as well as copies of all complaints received by it pursuant to this section, but with the names of the complainants removed if so requested by the complainants. Those consumer complaints deemed by the Administrator to be frivolous or vague shall be maintained in the public document room but shall be clearly identified as frivolous or vague.

DIVISION OF CONSUMER INFORMATION

SEC. 9. (a) There shall be in the Agency a Division of Consumer Information which

shall be headed by the Director of Consumer Information.

(b) The Division of Consumer Information shall develop on its own initiative, gather from other Federal agencies and non-Federal sources, and disseminate to the public in such manner, at such times, and in such form as the Agency determines to be most effective, information, statistics and other data concerning—

- (1) the functions and duties of the Agency;
- (2) problems encountered by consumers generally within the United States, including particular commercial and trade practices which are detrimental to the interests of such consumers; and
- (3) products and services available to consumers of the United States, including product test results and studies and other information relative to product performance.

(c) All Federal agencies which, in the judgment of the Administrator, possess information which would be useful to consumers are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Agency in making such information available to the public.

(d) The Division of Consumer Information shall compile (in a manner meaningful and useful to consumers) and disseminate to the public on a continuing and systematic basis, information developed or received by the Agency, but shall avoid duplicating the consumer informational services of other Federal agencies.

DIVISION OF CONSUMER SAFETY

SEC. 10. (a) There shall be in the Agency a Division of Consumer Safety which shall be headed by the Director of Consumer Safety.

(b) The Division of Consumer Safety shall, pursuant to rules which shall be established by the Administrator to protect the right of all interested parties to be heard, conduct a continuing study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous products. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

- (1) the identity of products (except products excluded under subsection (e) of this section) which are determined to present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public;
- (2) the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection;
- (3) the protection against such hazardous products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and
- (4) a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against such hazardous products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement and suggestions for improvements.

(c) The Division of Consumer Safety shall avoid to the greatest extent practicable publishing such information in a form which would separately disclose the business transactions of any person, trade secrets, or names of customers, which shall be held confidential.

(d) The Division of Consumer Safety, together with the Division of Consumer Research, may design and develop improved safety features for categories of consumer products which are deemed unsafe.

(e) Except for review under subsection (b) (4) and development under subsection (d), this section shall not apply with respect to products regulated under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Hazardous Substances

Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.).

DIVISION OF CONSUMER RESEARCH; TESTING BY THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

SEC. 11. (a) There shall be in the Agency a Division of Consumer Research which shall be headed by the Director of Consumer Research.

(b) The Division of Consumer Research shall—

(1) oversee and coordinate all activities of the Agency relating to product research and testing;

(2) develop methods for testing materials, mechanisms, and structures used in consumer products and for improving consumer services;

(3) test products and articles or request of others to test articles and products used or intended for use by consumers;

(4) make recommendations to other Federal agencies with respect to research, studies, analyses, and other information within their authority which would be useful and beneficial to consumers; and

(5) investigate and report to Congress on the desirability and feasibility of establishing a National Consumer Information Foundation which would administer a voluntary, self-supporting, information tag program (similar to the "Tel-Tag" program of Great Britain) under which any manufacturer of a non-perishable consumer product to be sold at retail could be authorized to attach to each copy of such product a tag, standard in form, containing information, based on uniform standards, relating to the performance, safety, durability, and care of the product.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce (hereafter referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall establish facilities or utilize existing facilities for the purpose of determining, through testing, the performance, content, safety, durability, and other characteristics of a product offered for sale or intended to be offered for sale by a manufacturer and shall cooperate with the Administrator to the greatest extent practicable in performing this responsibility. Testing by the Secretary is authorized only upon a request made by a manufacturer or the Administrator. Requests for tests by the Administrator shall take priority over requests by manufacturers, unless the Secretary determines in writing that the consumer interest would be better served by the testing of a manufacturer's product. In carrying out such testing, the Secretary—

(1) shall charge for the services performed under the authority of this section and such charges shall be based on both direct and indirect costs, and the appropriation or fund bearing the cost of the services may be reimbursed or the Secretary may require advance payment subject to such adjustments on completion of the work as may be agreed upon;

(2) may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any such functions, and as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section to the National Bureau of Standards with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers;

(3) may perform functions under this section without regard to section 529 of title 31, United States Code;

(4) may request any Federal agency to supply such statistics, data, progress reports, and other information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this section and any such agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary and,

to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary; and

(5) may, to the extent necessary, acquire or establish additional facilities and to purchase additional equipment for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this section.

(d) Neither the Secretary nor the Administrator shall declare one product to be better, or a better buy, than any other product.

(e) The Administrator shall maintain surveillance over products which have been tested to assure that such products and information disseminated about them conform to the test results.

(f) In the case of any test requested by a manufacturer under this section, such manufacturer—

(1) may suggest but not direct, control, or otherwise influence the type of tests to be conducted by the Secretary, and

(2) may publicize the results of the tests conducted by the Secretary, but in so doing may in no way distort, falsify, or misrepresent such results.

DIVISION OF ECONOMICS

SEC. 12. (a) There shall be in the Agency a Division of Economics which shall be headed by the Director of Economics.

(b) The Division of Economics shall—

(1) conduct economic surveys and investigations with respect to matters of interest to consumers, including—

(A) the levels of prices for goods and services affecting consumers and the factors entering into their establishment.

(B) the suitability of goods and services affecting consumers, and the factors influencing such quality and suitability, and

(C) the degree to which the trade and commerce of the United States succeeds in satisfying consumer needs for goods and services; and

(2) analyze and disseminate to the public information obtained through these and other investigations and surveys.

(c) Prior to conducting major economic surveys and investigations authorized by this section, the Director of Economics shall take all practicable and reasonable steps to ascertain whether any such economic survey and investigation would duplicate in significant degree recent economic surveys and investigations by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission. If, in the determination of the Administrator, such a duplication would occur and the survey or investigation results of the other agency are available, the Director of Economics shall not undertake such proposed economic survey or investigation, unless the Administrator determines that said economic survey or investigation is absolutely essential to the performance of the duties of the Agency.

CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby established in the Agency a Consumer Advisory Council (hereafter referred to in this section as the "Council") to be composed of twelve members appointed by the President for terms of two years without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code. Members shall be appointed on the basis of their knowledge and experience in the area of consumer affairs, and their demonstrated ability to exercise independent, informed and critical judgment.

(b) (1) Of the members first appointed, six shall be appointed for a term of one year and six shall be appointed for a term of two years as designated by the appointing power at the time of appointment.

(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed only for the remainder of such term. Members shall be eligible for reappointment and may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

(3) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner by which the original appointment was made.

(4) Members of the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates not in excess of the maximum rate of pay for a GS18, including traveltime and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

(c) The President shall designate the chairman from among the members appointed to the Council. The Council shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Administrator shall be an ex officio member of the Council.

(d) The Council shall—

(1) advise the Administrator on matters relating to the consumer interest; and

(2) review and evaluate the effectiveness of Federal programs and operations relating to the consumer interest and make recommendations thereto, including with regard to the adequacy of the—

(A) administration of existing consumer protection laws and the need to enact new laws;

(B) coordination of consumer programs and operations among the Federal agencies, and between the Federal Government, State and local governments and private enterprise;

(C) consideration of consumer interests by decisionmaking Federal agencies;

(D) attention devoted to the consumer problems of the poor;

(E) availability of information necessary for the making of intelligent consumer decisions;

(F) existing consumer protection agencies and the desirability of establishing a new Assistant Attorney General for consumer affairs within the Department of Justice to prosecute consumer fraud practices; and

(G) existing organization within the Federal Government of consumer protection functions and the need to reorganize such functions.

(e) The Administrator shall make available to the Council such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its activities. The minutes or a verbatim transcript of each Council meeting shall be kept and made available for public inspection.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, modify, or impair the statutory responsibility and authority contained in section 201(a)(4) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 481(a)(4)), or of any provision of the antitrust laws, or of any Act providing for the regulation of the trade or commerce of the United States, or to prevent or impair the administration or enforcement of any such provision of law.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as relieving any Federal agency of any authority or responsibility to protect and promote the interests of the American consumer.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as eliminating the need for consumer representation within the Executive Office of the President.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 15. As used in this Act—

(1) The terms "commerce" and "corporation" have the meaning given in such terms,

respectively, by section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44).

(2) The term "Federal agency" means any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government and any independent board, commission, corporation, or other instrumentality of the Government charged with the administration of any statute of the United States.

(3) The term "antitrust law" includes—

(A) each provision of law defined as one of the antitrust laws by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 12) commonly known as the Clayton Act;

(B) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.);

(C) section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 13), and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1936 (U.S.C. 13a), commonly known as the Robinson-Patman Act; and

(D) any statute hereafter enacted by the Congress which prohibits, or makes available to the United States any remedy with respect to, any restraint upon or monopolization of commerce, or any unfair trade practice or unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce.

(4) The term "State" includes any State or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 16. (a) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(54) Administrator, Consumer Protection Agency."

(b) Section 5315 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(92) Deputy Administrator, Consumer Protection Agency.

"(93) Consumer Counsel, Consumer Protection Agency.

"(94) Director of Consumer Information, Consumer Protection Agency.

"(95) Director of Consumer Safety, Consumer Protection Agency.

"(96) Director of Consumer Research, Consumer Protection Agency.

"(97) Director of Economics, Consumer Protection Agency."

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 17. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Agency such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 18. (a) This Act shall take effect 90 calendar days following the date on which this Act is approved, or on such earlier date as the President shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, except that section 10 of this Act shall take effect no later than the date on which the National Commission on Product Safety expires.

(b) Any of the officers provided for in this Act may (notwithstanding subsection (a)) be appointed in the manner provided for in this Act at any time after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the Director of Consumer Safety may not be appointed until after section 10 of this Act takes effect. Such officers shall be compensated from the date they first take office at the rates provided for in this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish the Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of the consumers, and for other purposes."

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF CARL L. CARLSON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 16, the citizens of the city of Gardena, Calif., are honoring the city's fire chief, Carl L. Carlson, who is retiring after 35 years' service with the Gardena Fire Department—the last 11 of which have been as fire chief.

The year 1935 marked the beginning of two long and successful relationships. On October 19 of that year, Chief Carlson married the former Gerry Thomson of Burbank. The Carlsons have two children: Carl George of Estacada, Oreg., who is a highway engineer for the U.S. Government; and Sonya Hoffman of San Jose. The two children have provided Carl and Gerry with six grandchildren.

The second endeavor which began in 1935 was Chief Carlson's career with the Gardena Fire Department. His competence and devotion to duty led to his appointment as chief in 1959, after nearly a quarter of a century with the department.

In addition to providing outstanding service to the community with the fire department, Chief Carlson is active in many civic organizations. His interest in youth is illustrated by his participation in the Gardena YMCA, the Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts, and the DeMolay. He served on the Gardena YMCA board of directors for 10 years. Chief Carlson was a committeeman for Boy Scouts Troop 253 for 3 years and Cub Pack 253C for 3 years. He was a dad adviser to the Gardena Order of DeMolay for 5 years.

For 10 years Chief Carlson was a member of the Gardena Valley Kiwanis.

He was the 50th master of Gardena Free and Accepted Masons No. 372 in 1956, and was the only master to have been born in Gardena. In 1969, the chief was the high priest of Royal Arch Masons, chapter 137. Presently, he is a member of council, commandry, Al Malaikah Shrine, and Ed Toga Shrine Club.

Chief Carlson's activities in professional organizations have added much to the professional competence of the Gardena Fire Department. Since 1935, he has been a member of both the California State Fireman's Association and the Harbor District Association of Firemen. For the last 10 years, Chief Carlson has been a member of the International, Western, and California Fire Chief's Association.

In 1964 and 1965 he served as membership chairman of the California Fire Chief's Association.

For the last 2 years he has served as chairman of the liaison committee for California fire chiefs to the California Fire Prevention Officers Association.

Chief Carlson is a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Gardena.

In his spare time, he enjoys the outdoor sports of fishing, hunting and golf,

In addition, the chief enjoys building and working with his hands.

Chief Carlson has been a tremendous asset to the city of Gardena, and the Gardena Fire Department will not seem the same without his presence.

I join with the citizens of Gardena in commending the chief for a job well done.

NEEDED: MORE MONEY FOR THE FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, cost overruns seem to be making quite a bit of news these days. Some of them point to lavish overexpenditures in pursuit of marginally effective if not downright unnecessary programs. Others, however, point to a crying need for adequate funds for programs directed at meeting those domestic programs which are national in scope and vitally important to the welfare of our citizens.

The present inability of Federal housing programs to meet this year's housing program needs is one such example. It is a significant example, not just in its reflection of the inadequate funding of such housing programs as rent supplement, model cities, urban renewal, homeownership, and rental housing assistance, but because underfunding of housing programs is characteristic of our approach to so many fundamental domestic problems. We institute far-reaching programs, holding out the bright promise of meeting serious domestic ills, and then default on those promises by our failure to appropriate sufficient funds to make them a reality; nowhere is this situation more evident than in Federal housing programs.

But lack of money alone cannot fully explain some of the worst failures of Federal housing programs: In particular the meager supply of low- and moderate-income housing built since the 1949 Housing Act became law, and the high percentage of housing built under such programs which is financially unattainable by low- and moderate-income earners. High land and construction costs, the outmoded technology of the construction industry, the complexity and redtape of the "grantmanship" game—which make it difficult if not impossible for community groups and small investors to take full advantage of Federal programs—are all contributory factors to the present housing crisis. However, insufficient funding certainly has exacerbated such problems and has stood as a major roadblock to their solution. In the face of such financial inadequacies, it is not too surprising when these programs fail to meet their intended goals. No program, no matter how innovative, will be effective without adequate financial resources.

Today, I am introducing a bill, previously introduced by my colleague, Mr. RYAN, and 23 other sponsors, to provide supplemental appropriations to the fol-

lowing programs: Urban renewal, model cities, homeownership—235—and rental housing—236—assistance, and rent supplement program.

This bill would increase the 1970 appropriations for urban renewal from \$250 million to the authorized \$650 million. The model cities appropriations of \$575 million would be increased by \$450 million, bringing the appropriation up to the authorized \$1 billion. The \$50 million appropriation to the rent supplement program would be increased to the authorized \$118 million. Homeownership assistance for low-income persons—235—would be increased from \$90 million to \$130 million; and assistance for rental or cooperative housing for low-income families—236—would be increased from \$85 million to \$130 million.

These supplemental appropriations would help to relieve the present cost-squeeze on local agencies and municipalities which threatens the effectiveness of their housing programs. But the question here involves not simply the need to meet obligations incurred for housing programs of this year or of keeping faith with the agencies, municipalities, and the people who rely on them. At base, adequate funding is a matter of keeping faith with those goals set by this body more than 20 years ago and reiterated on many occasions since—"a decent home for every American." In recognition of the failure to meet this goal, the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act projected the need for 26 million new housing units by the end of this decade. Only 2 years later, we are already falling far behind the needed rate of construction, clear evidence that the gap between what we say we want and what we are willing to back by full financial assist-

ance is tragically wide. If Congress does not see fit to provide that adequate backing for its stated goals, the "housing gap" will continue to widen. As obligations go unmet, the road to a decent home for all Americans will continue to lengthen.

PFC. DONN LORBER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 6, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Donn Lorber, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage, and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PFC. DONN LORBER DIES IN VIETNAM; LAST WROTE: "I'M PRAYING LIKE YOU TOLD ME"

In the last letter his family received in Brooklyn, Pfc. Donn M. Lorber wrote, "I'm praying like you told me."

Of his gun position near the Cambodian border, he said, "there are mosquitoes and big rats running when we sleep."

At 4 p.m. on Easter Sunday an enemy mortar scored a direct hit on Private Lorber's gun position. He died at the age of 20.

DROVE TRUCK, LAYED BRICK

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. William G. Lorber, of 3913 Second Street, Brooklyn, and a graduate of Mergenthaler Vocational High School.

After graduation in June, 1968, he worked at two jobs: driving a truck for Hawkins Food Market in Brooklyn and laying brick for a construction company.

He was drafted six months ago, received his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and went to an artillery school at Fort Sill, Okla.

BIDS PARENTS GOODBY

On February 16 he left Baltimore for California, from where he was airlifted to Vietnam five days later. As he left his parents at Friendship, he said, "If my buddies are to go, I want to be with them."

In addition to his parents, his survivors include two brothers, William J. Lorber, of Sacramento, Calif., and Larry S. Lorber, of College Park, Md., and a sister, Karen Marie Lorber, 11, of home.

THE LATE "TIC" FORRESTER

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more courageous, a more dedicated, and a more patriotic Member of this body than the late and lamented Elijah Lewis Forrester, who was known to his friends as "Tic."

This Georgia Congressman was always the same—affable, concerned, energetic, and anxious to do whatever might be good for the country he loved. He was a statesman in every sense of the word. This Nation suffers from shortage of men like "Tic" Forrester.

News of the death of this great American came as a severe blow. To me he was a personal friend who would have walked an extra mile if the occasion arose. He was a man of great honor, and the respect he commanded from all who knew him was both understandable and remarkable.

Let us hope and pray there will be more "Tic" Forresters on the American scene in the years ahead.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 7, 1970

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, our need is our prayer this day, uttered or unexpressed. We do not pray for easy lives, but that we may be stronger men. We do not pray for tasks equal to our powers, but for powers equal to our tasks. We do not pray for simple solutions to complex problems, but rather that Thou wilt show us the next step. So wilt Thou help us to do Thy work with good courage, and to be Thy faithful servants unto our life's end.

In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 6, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a limitation of 3 minutes on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar under New Report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The bill clerk read the nomination of Fred J. Russell, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.