

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1970, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1970
(PAGES 2777 TO 4246)

At Kennedy in the first nine months of the year there were 448 reported cases of criminal loss of cargo, an increase of 369% over the similar nine-month period of 1968; the value of shipments lost in the first nine months of this year rose to \$2,859,148, an increase of 108% over the \$1,384,779 over a similar period in 1968.

The Bulova Watch Co. lost \$133,000 worth of imported watches at Kennedy Airport in the first six months of this year, 5% of all its air shipments. The figure is about \$100,000 over last year's first half.

WATCHES DISAPPEAR

The entire watch industry is being similarly victimized. Gerhard Ditesheim, president of the American Watch Assn., says \$2.5 million worth of watches and their components have disappeared since the beginning of 1967.

"In a good year," he says, "profits for the entire watch-importing industry probably amount to only about \$15 million. Such losses are of utmost seriousness to our industry."

The disappearance of a shipment often has graver consequences than just the loss of the cash value of the merchandise. Many importers and retailers have conducted costly promotions for new lines of such products as watches and apparel only to have the shipment stolen en route. Business lost in this manner, merchants say, can never be recovered and is not covered by insurance.

There's hardly a product, in fact, which the air cargo thieves ignore.

Leading the list of claims paid by the Marine Underwriters group were stolen shipments of knitwear and other wearing apparel. They accounted for 232 claims totaling more than \$1 million thus far this year. The loss of watches totaled \$41,631, photographic equipment accounted for \$209,337 of the payouts and fur coats and stoles, \$190,752.

Wigs seemed to have been in vogue in 1969 as well. The insurers paid five claims worth \$33,433 for human hair and 16 for manufactured wigs worth \$59,409.

Airline officials say that when the underworld is involved in a theft, entire shipments—often truckloads vanish. For example, a truck rolls up to an airline cargo loading dock, its occupants dressed in legitimate-looking uniforms. They carry fraudulent documents. They load their trucks with a shipment and drive off to dispose of it with an underworld fence.

Most observers feel that many thefts are accomplished with the help of airline or trucking employes who apprise crooks of the contents of the valuable shipments and times of arrival.

SALAMIS, TOO

In addition, employees often break open shipments and help themselves. A large importer of Italian salamis reported that in every single shipment, he loses about 10% of his sausages. The goods, he surmises, are eaten for lunch in the warehouses.

"Employes are so brazen," says one clothing importer, "they'll go home with a size 10 dress. When they find it doesn't fit their wives or the color isn't right, they'll bring it back the next day and 'exchange it.'"

Pan American recently caught three employes who had driven a cargo truck loaded with watches into the employe parking lot and transferred a \$14,000 shipment to an automobile.

The Bible committee hopes to spark legislation raising the amounts for which airlines are liable for shipping losses.

Current domestic air carrier tariffs provide for a limitation on the carrier's liability to 50 cents a pound on domestic shipments and \$7.48 a pound on international shipments (as specified in the Warsaw Convention.)

Excess valuation above the domestic limits may be declared by the shipper at a charge generally of 10 cents per \$100 of liability and shippers can insure their cargoes with

private insurance companies if they wish, though with the growing loss rate, the premiums are becoming "prohibitive" to most shippers.

One spectacular example of the air carriers' limited responsibility was underscored by a theft last September of \$262,000 in diamonds and cash from an air cargo terminal at Kennedy. The shipment weighed 48½ pounds making the air carrier's liability only \$362.79.

Meantime, the airlines point to specific steps towards a crackdown. In New York 43 domestic and foreign airlines and various other groups recently set up the Airport Security Council. Its aim is to curtail crime at New York's airports.

POLICE DOGS

The New York council, headed by Mario T. Noto, a former high official of the U.S. Immigration Department, has spurred a number of precautionary actions.

Noto says that a photographic badge system the council instituted already covers 90% of all airline employes at Kennedy and half of all the outsiders—such as truckers—who must gain regular access to cargo areas.

At the urging of the council, the airlines have instituted or are studying numerous antitheft means.

At Swiss Air's Kennedy facilities, guards patrol with police dogs; KLM recently began using a padlocked box for watch shipments. It is locked in Europe in the presence of airline employes and unlocked when the importer shows up for his shipments on the American end. KLM hasn't lost a watch since the system was set up.

Half a dozen airlines at Kennedy have started to use a dual lens camera called a "Regiscope." It takes simultaneous photos of persons picking up shipments and the cargo's documents. A number of airlines have installed a closed-circuit TV system so guards may watch all the movements in warehouses and some airlines have strongrooms for valuable cargoes which can only be unlocked at certain times or by using special card devices available only to authorized employes.

Many importers now get shipments in unmarked crates so thieves can't identify the products inside. Watchmakers no longer put names on boxes. They use secret symbols which are changed often.

Some manufacturers ship their finished goods in pieces. A shoe manufacturer reportedly ships all left shoes in one load and the right ones in another.

But despite some protective actions, most observers believe the airlines won't be able to move quickly enough to keep pace with the expected rise in air cargo transportation.

The use of air freight is growing at about 21% a year. Nearly 3 billion tons are being shipped by air into, out of and within the limits of the United States.

With the advent of the new generation of jet aircraft (the new Boeing 747 is capable of carrying the equivalent of 100 Volkswagen automobiles) air cargo is expected to quadruple in the next decade.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, after tracing population growth patterns in the United States for the past several decades, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that a great many of the critical problems facing urban centers have their roots in rural depletion.

Millions of Americans have been forced, for want of suitable economic opportunity, to relocate in and around the Nation's cities, adding to the too-heavy demands already placed upon public services and institutions and contrib-

uting their share to congestion and to the pollution of the urban environment. And more of the same lies ahead. If current trends continue, says James Sundquist, of the Brookings Institution, some 77 percent of the predicted 300 million people in our population at the end of this century will be jammed onto only 11 percent of the Nation's land area. That means that we will have substantially more city residents than then the entire U.S. population today.

The need for effective measures to stop the migration—and to reserve it—is clear. Unless we begin actively seeking a balance in the economic attractiveness of rural and urban areas, the cities—no matter how much Federal technical and financial help is made available—will become unmanageable and unlivable.

President Nixon has responded to these prospects with rhetoric, such as the reference in his state of the Union address to a "national growth policy." Meanwhile, however, his administration has been gradually dismantling the few programs aimed at rural development which were in operation at the beginning of 1969.

The actions and inactions which lead to concern are listed in a letter which I and a number of other Senators today send to the President. A similar letter is being transmitted by a group from the House of Representatives.

I urge all to read this letter to note why current policy has been and is creating a negative attitude among many leaders in rural America. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 10, 1970.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are becoming increasingly concerned about your Administration's approach to the problems and needs of rural America.

While the rhetoric of your State of the Union Address was encouraging, it is heavily outweighed by the apparent indifference and inaction which best describe the record of your first year. We are particularly distressed by the following:

The quiet dismantling of the Agriculture Department's Rural Community Development Service.

The assignment of the now curtailed USDA rural development responsibility to the Cooperative Extension Service—an agency which does not report to the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development.

The phasing out, without Congressional notification, of USDA's rural community recreation loan program and HUD's program of advances for public works planning.

The failure to support with staff or other meaningful efforts the nonmetropolitan multi-county planning program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The failure to seek meaningful improvements, aimed at strengthening family farm income, in agricultural commodity programs.

Despite Congressional directives calling for increased concentration on rural poverty, OEO rural programs are being reduced and eliminated. The Office of Rural Affairs has been abolished, and the only remaining staff unit with a broad rural function is being dismantled.

The naming of a White House Task Force to stimulate rural development has done little to produce action. The membership of this group shows it to be unrepresentative of

the cross section of the community actually concerned with rural development. Their meetings have been held in secret. Their report and recommendations are long overdue.

The appointment of a Rural Affairs Council within the Administration was accompanied with the announcement that it would not have its own coordinating executive officer.

The early-named Council on Urban Affairs immediately constituted a Subcommittee on "Internal Migration" to focus on the vital rural-urban balance question, but that group formulated no policy and died a quiet death.

These and other concerns are of extreme importance to our constituents, our communities, our States and regions. They are serious enough to have brought us together to direct this letter to your attention.

Mr. President, they are great enough that we respectfully request that you immediately begin setting forth a plan of action for rural America that will provide the leadership and resources necessary to not only avoid further economic deterioration, but to so broaden its development base and opportunities so that rural to city migration patterns will be reversed to the benefit of a restless Nation.

Sincerely,

HOWARD W. CANNON, THOMAS F. EAGLETON, J. W. FULBRIGHT, ALBERT GORE, FRED R. HARRIS, HAROLD E. HUGHES, DANIEL K. INOUE, B. EVERETT JORDAN, GEORGE MCGOVERN, WALTER F. MONDALE, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, FRANK E. MOSS, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, HARRISON WILLIAMS, RALPH YARBOROUGH.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I must also alert Senators to the fact that these distressing events will be further compounded if the administration's budget proposals for rural programs are permitted to stand.

A review of the budget shows it is requesting across-the-board reductions for the Agriculture Department's Farmers Home Administration. Certainly we will be told the reason for slashing programs to eliminate shameful living conditions in rural America is to help halt inflation. But I cannot accept this knowing full well the conditions which exist in the countryside.

The Farmers Home Administration, cut to a shell during the years of Ezra Taft Benson, had been given a new vigor by Secretary Orville Freeman. Now, in the 1971 budget, we see requested reduction of over \$100 million in key grant and loan programs of the agency.

For example, the President is asking for cuts of \$37.5 million for direct real estate loans, \$22 million in rural water and waste disposal grants, the elimination of the direct rural loan account program, reducing rural housing insurance loans by \$11 million, and cutting by 40 percent the self-help housing programs.

Hopefully, these proposed reductions will face opposition both in the Congress and by a concerned constituency. This past weekend, the formation of a National Rural Housing Coalition was announced. More than 100 National and State leaders from the fields of rural affairs, labor, religion, education politics, business and minority-support organizations make up the initial group of directors and sponsors.

Mr. President, the purpose of the coalition is threefold:

Develop and support legislation that establishes and adequately funds low-income housing programs for rural areas and small towns.

Build at the grass roots and at the national level an awareness that six million rural American families live in houses that jeopardize their health and degrade their lives.

Provide a focal point for all who want to insure that the congressional commitment of two decades ago—a suitable living environment for every American family—is fulfilled.

Serving as honorary chairman of the coalition are Senators GEORGE MCGOVERN and CHARLES GOODELL and Congressman JOHN CONYERS, JR. I am privileged to be listed among the committee of sponsors. Mr. Clay Cochran is chairman of the board of directors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD documents which list facts about the rural housing crisis, the National Rural Housing Coalition, its board of directors, and committee of sponsors.

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

FACTS ABOUT THE RURAL HOUSING CRISIS

One measure of the rural housing crisis is found in the 1967 Report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "People Left Behind." Using census data, the President's Commission reported the following condition of rural housing in America:

In 1960, 27 percent of occupied rural housing was classified as substandard—deteriorating or dilapidated—compared with 14 percent for urban areas.

Of the 9.2 million substandard occupied housing units in the nation, 3.9 million were in rural areas.

More than a million rural homes are dilapidated—structurally unsafe for human occupancy. Many of these homes are beyond repair.

Less than 1 in 4 occupied rural farm dwellings have water piped into their homes.

About 30 percent of all rural families still use the traditional privy.

Fewer than half of all rural homes have central heating. Most rural homes are heated by kerosene-, gas-, wood-, or coal-burning stoves. The result is uneven heating and an ever-present danger of fire.

Nearly 60 percent of all rural families with incomes of less than \$2,000 lived in houses that were dilapidated or lacked complete plumbing.

Another indication of the nature and scope of the rural housing crisis is found in Dr. George Rucker's paper, "Rural Housing: Need and Non-Response," published in 1969 by the Rural Housing Alliance. Dr. Rucker came up with the following facts:

Although they contain less than half the nation's households, rural areas and small towns account for more than half its low-income families and two-thirds of its bad housing.

On one part of rural America, its Indian reservations, nearly three out of four houses are either "substandard" or overcrowded or both.

Between 80% and 90% of the households occupying bad housing in rural areas and small towns will require Federal assistance to secure adequate housing.

Less than 15% of the low-income housing produced by HUD programs goes to the 60% of the low-income families which live in rural areas and small towns.

To properly house low-income rural and smalltown families approximately 7 million homes will have to be built or rehabilitated with Federal assistance during the next decade.

At current levels of federal activity it will take nearly 100 years to meet what should be our 10-year goal.

NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION

The Rural Housing Coalition is—

A group of people and organizations across the nation determined to wipe out rural shacks and replace them with decent homes.

A non-profit, non-partisan organization financed by contributions from its members.

The Rural Housing Coalition was formed because—

Two-thirds of all the Nation's bad housing exists in rural and small-town America.

Present housing laws are inadequately written, ridiculously underfunded, and simply incompetent to meet the housing needs and aspirations of the rural poor.

If the need for low-income, rural housing is even to be approached, the Federal government must assist in construction of at least seven million units during the coming decade—at our present level of federal activity, it will take more than a hundred years to get those houses constructed.

There does not exist a genuine, public commitment to alter the timetable and move low-income housing to a high position of national priority.

The Rural Housing Coalition will—

Strive to build at the grassroots and at the national level an awareness that America's rural poor—millions in number—live in shacks that stunt health and stifle spirit.

Provide a focal point for all who want to act to ensure that the Congressional commitment of 1949—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family"—is fulfilled.

Draw from the recent campaign against hunger and malnutrition any lessons that can help to obtain a significant public response to the plight of the ill-housed, rural poor.

Support legislation that establishes and funds adequate, low-income, rural housing programs.

The concept of a Rural Housing Coalition was developed at the First National Conference on Rural Housing. The Conference, held at Warrenton, Virginia, June 9 thru 12, 1969, included participants from rural-antipoverty organizations, minority groups, universities, and government agencies.

INITIAL 25 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ELECTED AT THE FIRST MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION OCTOBER 31, 1969¹

Ed Anderson, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Washington, D.C.

Paul Anthony, Southern Regional Council, Dan Bedell, United Auto Workers, Washington, D.C.

Jim Clyburn, South Carolina Commission for Farm Workers, Charleston, South Carolina.

Clay Cochran, Rural Housing Alliance, Washington, D.C.

Cushing Dolbeare, Housing Association of Delaware Valley, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Pat Gish, Eastern Kentucky Housing Development Corporation, Whitesburg, Kentucky.

Don Hadwiger, Washington Research Project, Washington, D.C.

¹ The bylaws of the Coalition provide that the Board of Directors may have up to 50 members.

Rev. Robert E. Johnson, United Presbyterian Church, New York, New York.

Bob Jones, Unitarian Universalist Ass'n, Washington, D.C.

Dave Knox, Vermont Poor Peoples Congress, Hinesburg, Vermont.

Rev. R. B. Lloyd, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Cipriano Manuel, Indian Community Action Program, Tempe, Arizona.

William Morris National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, New York.

Ben Neufeld, NCALL Research Fund, Washington, D.C.

Kermit Overby, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

Gerald Robinson, National Association for Community Development, Washington, D.C.

Harlan Severson, Mandan, North Dakota.

Fred Simonton, Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, Denver, Colorado.

Steve Kaplan, Richmond, Vermont.

Rev. Arthur Tennes, New York State Council of Churches, Syracuse, New York.

Harold Warstler, Macon Program for Progress, Franklin, North Carolina.

Ed Smith, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, North Dakota.

Carl Stuple, Natural Bridge, Virginia.

Frank Wright, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

NATIONAL RURAL HOUSING COALITION

HONORARY CO-CHAIRMEN

Representative John Conyers.

Senator Charles Goodell.

Senator George McGovern.

COMMITTEE OF SPONSORS¹

Robert A. Aleshire, Exec. Dir. National Association for Community Development, Washington, D.C.

Harry S. Ashmore, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.

H. M. Baggary, Editor, Tullia Herald, Tullia, Texas.

George Ballis, Fresno, California.

Dan Bedell, United Auto Workers, Washington, D.C.

Randolph Blackwell, Director Southern Rural Action, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

Tom Bonar, Brookfield, Colorado.

Marvin Caplan, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

Eric Carlson, United Nations, New York, New York.

E. Russell Carter, National Council of Churches, New York, New York.

Stephen Cary, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Ramiro Casso, McAllen, Texas.

Harry Caudill, Whitesburg, Kentucky.

Ethlyn Christensen, Denver, Colorado.

James Christiansen, American Baptist Home Mission Society, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

Bronson P. Clark, American Friends Service Committee, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Rep. Robert Clark, Lexington, Mississippi.

Jake Clayman, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert Coles, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Governor Kenneth M. Curtis, Augusta, Maine.

Marvin Davies, NAACP, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Tony Dechant, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colorado.

Paul Douglas, Washington, D.C.

Ronnie Dugger, Texas Observer, Austin, Texas.

Leslie W. Dunbar, Exec. Dir., The Field Foundation, New York, New York.

Marian W. Edelman, Director, Washington Research Project, Washington, D.C.

Peter Edelman, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial, Washington, D.C.

Rep. Bob Eckhardt (Texas), House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Mayor Charles Evers, Fayette, Mississippi.

John Henry Faulk, New York, New York.

Arthur Flemming, MacAlester College, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Herman Gallegos, Exec. Dir., Southwest Council of La Raza, San Francisco, California.

James L. Grahl, Basin Electric Cooperative, Bismarck, North Dakota.

David Granger, Washington, D.C.

LaDonna Harris, McLean, Virginia.

Ralph Helstein, President, United Packing House, Food and Allied Workers, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. Vivian Henderson, President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia.

Aaron Henry, President, NAACP, Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Tony Henry, National Tenants Rights Organization, Washington, D.C.

Sarah Herbin, Black Women's Community Development Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Father Theodore Hesburgh, President, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Gerald Hill, San Francisco, California.

Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, Washington, D.C.

M. Carl Holman, Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth G. Holum, Washington, D.C.

Cliff Ingram, Chairman, National Association for Community Development, Washington, D.C.

Loyal Jones, Council of Southern Mountains, Berea, Kentucky.

Everett Krackov, Visalia, California.

Frank Lapeyrolerie, Director, Southwest Louisiana Self-Help Housing Association, Inc., Reserve, Louisiana.

John Lewis, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Georgia.

Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. (New York).

Pepe Lucero, President, National Association for Community Development, Washington, D.C.

Henry McCanna, National Council of Churches, New York, New York.

Father A. J. McKnight, Director, Southern Consumers' Cooperative, Lafayette, Louisiana.

Charles Mahone, President, Peoples Organization of Montgomery County, Rockville, Maryland.

Alex Mercure, Home Education Livelihood Program, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Senator Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senate (Montana), Washington, D.C.

Senator Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senate (Minnesota), Washington, D.C.

Tom Moore, Organization for Medical Alternatives, San Mateo, California.

Dr. Kenneth G. Neigh, United Presbyterian Church, New York, New York.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, U.S. Senate (Wisconsin), Washington, D.C.

Helge Nygren, Mor-Gran-Sou Electric Cooperative, Inc., Flasher, North Dakota.

Msgr. Edward O'Rourke, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa.

James G. Patton, James G. Patton & Associates, Washington, D.C.

W. Nelson Peach, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

Bernard Rapoport, President, American Income Life Insurance Company, Waco, Texas.

Joseph L. Rauh, Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D.C.

John Paul Roblin, Pearl River Valley Corp., Columbia, Mississippi.

Metz Rollins, National Council of Black Churchmen, New York, New York.

Henry Santiestevan, United Auto Workers, Washington, D.C.

James Smith, Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

Philip Stern, Washington, D.C.

Adlai Stevenson, III, Mayer, Frelich, Spiss, Tiepney, Brown, & Blatt, Chicago, Illinois.

Ben Stong, Washington, D.C.

Charles Tillinghast, Boise-Cascade Industries, Boise, Idaho.

Jim Twomey, Urban America, Washington, D.C.

Rep. Morris Udall (Arizona), House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Norman Walters, Orinda, California.

Dr. Richard Wenner, Brooklyn, New York.

Dr. Raymond Wheeler, Chairman, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Georgia.

Glen Wilson, Cleveland, Ohio.

Florence Wykoff, Watsonville, California.

Senator Ralph Yarborough, U.S. Senate (Texas), Washington, D.C.

Julian Bond, Georgia State House of Representatives, Atlanta, Georgia.

WHY HANOI KEEPS ON FIGHTING

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Democratic Policy Council was reported in the Washington Post this morning as declaring that all U.S. troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam within 18 months.

Variations on this theme are heard almost daily in Congress.

Now, it is apparent to most Americans that President Nixon has done more to end the war in Vietnam in the last year than was done in the 4 previous years.

He is continuing to wind that war down in a way, and at a pace, that will allow the South Vietnamese people to build their own defense and choose their own way of life.

In this endeavor President Nixon deserves and has the support of most Americans.

Yet, there are those who not only seek to direct the course the President should take; they would even tie his efforts to a fixed timetable.

No one can expect that there will ever be unanimous agreement among all of our people concerning the Vietnam war. The debate should, and will, continue.

But I wonder if those who seek to impose a timetable on withdrawal of American forces have taken the trouble to ascertain what effect their proposals may have in Hanoi.

In this connection, Edmund A. Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, recently explained why Hanoi keeps on fighting.

Mr. President, I call his statement to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Also, the Reader's Digest for this month contains a series of remarks culled from the North Vietnamese radio, newspapers, and spokesmen that reflect their continuing attitude toward the demands from some Americans for peace at any price. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

¹ Organizations are listed for identification purposes only.