

August 9, 1966

A4184

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Lawrence Halprin, a landscape architect and leading freeway design consultant. "The great vivid skylines of the city can be seen . . . particularly at dusk when the tall buildings are silhouetted against the setting sun and the lights are beginning to flick on in random patterns against the black forms." Halprin, whose book, *Freeways*, will soon come off the press, agrees, however, that "the rural freeway, when it enters the city, must change its rules." This means, he says, that wide embankments with shrubbery, grass and plantings are out in built-up urban cores. "It must integrate into a traffic architecture whose nature is one of the great challenges of our time."

Halprin would change the rules "to maintain the fine grain of older sections of our cities" not only because of their often picturesque charm. "Neighborhoods," he says, "bring many of the virtues of the small town and village into the overwhelming scale of the metropolis . . ."

"Unfortunately, neighborhoods are easily disrupted and destroyed by ploughing through them, particularly if they are occupied by groups with no great ability to bring pressure on City Hall."

It will be well to remember this for instance, when our highway planners approach Takoma Park. As presently planned, the ten-lane North Central Freeway would split this proud, old, tightly-knit and unusually diverse community right in half.

Frequently then freeways must be tunneled, an approach the highway builders usually oppose not only because it is expensive, but also because driving through a tunnel is an unpleasant experience. Not necessarily so, says Halprin. Properly designed, they could have all the qualities of a handsome environment. The walls might be lined with bas-reliefs and other works of art to be seen in motion, as in the vaults of the Stockholm subway. Widths of tunnels can vary; light might be brought in from the top; and there might be vast underground plazas with shops and arcades, theaters and restaurants and, of course, parking places.

The proposed K Street tunnel, which will replace the North Leg of the Inner Loop, offers an excellent opportunity to do just that. It could become a model for other cities to follow—an example to the world, in fact, on how America, which first mass produced automobiles, now proposes to cope with them.

Many of the destructive effects of freeways can be avoided, says Halprin, if they follow the existing street pattern. The existing, local street can be preserved as a kind of shelf with the freeway depressed below it. This technique would seem especially applicable in Washington where streets and avenues are unusually wide. But to date it has been ignored because the highway builders design freeways for country speeds of 60 or 65 miles per hour. This requires wide lanes and enormous interchanges, using from 40 to 150 acres of urban land.

Halprin feels freeway building can be made an integral part of city building. This, in essence, is what the Pennsylvania Avenue plan proposes. It would not ban cars from the avenue altogether, but route the heavy traffic along a new, submerged expressway on E Street. Above that expressway (tunneled under the Ellipse) would be shelves for local traffic to feed into underground parking garages. Above them would rise new buildings to line the proposed National Square and an attractive "belvedere," a tree-shaded overlook with outdoor cafes and restaurants.

The idea of making transportation arteries an integral part of city building is not new. The ideal city in this respect is, of course, Venice, where the traffic moves quietly on canals, leaving people on foot undisturbed on quiet streets and piazzas of great grandeur and beauty.

Unfortunately, we cannot substitute cars and trucks for gondolas and barges. But we can separate people from vehicles and make the vehicular roads a part of the cityscape rather than a disruptive element.

As Halprin points out, there is, provided we really want them at all, no one solution to freeways in the city. But there can only be one aim: The city must come first—the city, not as a traffic problem to highway engineers—but as a good place to live and work. It must be a worthwhile place to go to and not merely to go through.

V
Vietnam's Free Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the marvels of southeast Asia is the union movement in Vietnam. Through all of the adversity of the past 25 years the Vietnamese Federation of Labor has never failed to carry out its functions and to assume its responsibilities.

The cooperation of the American labor movement with the Vietnamese Federation of Labor is another milestone in labor history.

Meyer Bernstein, director of the international affairs department of the United Steelworkers of America, tells the story in the following article from the July 1966 edition of the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News.

I commend the article to the attention of our colleagues:

SOLIDARITY WITH VIETNAM'S FREE
LABOR MOVEMENT

(By Meyer Bernstein)

Confusing as are the reports from Vietnam—even to the experts—there is one matter upon which loud and clear information is to be had for the asking. And that is with regard to existence of a free, democratic, effective labor movement.

The Vietnamese Federation of Labor—CVT in its French initials—is without question one of the most outstanding worker organizations in all of Southeast Asia. It has to be to have been able to survive a cold war, the Diem dictatorship and a succession of military governments.

Not only has the CVT to carry out the normal functions of collective bargaining, including striking—even in war time—and training its leadership, but the vicissitudes of the struggle for independence have compelled it to assume new duties such as the founding of communities for refugees from the Communists and Communist overrun areas, the distribution of food, the establishment and maintenance of primary schools for its destitute members and the like.

For the most part it has been doing all this on a shoestring budget. Wages are low in Vietnam—the new Esso agreement, which took three-quarters of a year to negotiate, provides a basic wage of only 80 cents a day. The dues are then comparatively low.

With the escalation of the war there has been an increase in American help. The AID program now provides for useful assistance which almost parallels that which the Marshall Plan gave to the German Federation of Labor when it was reestablished upon the ruins of Nazism. The American labor attachés and labor advisors in Germany in

the late 40's and early 50's helped get the German Federation of Labor back on its feet. This took several forms, many of which were related to the creation of a labor press. "Welt der Arbeit" is now one of the most useful labor newspapers in Europe. And it has long since become completely independent of outside support.

So it is in Vietnam. The U.S. AID program has donated a printing press to the CVT and helps in other ways.

Recently, however, both German and American unions, among others, have begun to set up solidarity programs of their own for the CVT. In late May the construction workers union of Germany (Industriegewerkschaft Bau, Steine, Erden) after consulting with the CVT to ascertain what was the most needed, purchased typewriters, motor hikes, an addressograph, a movie projector, and an automobile for shipment to Vietnam. Fortunately, just at this time, the German government's contribution of a hospital ship is leaving for Southeast Asia. So, the construction workers union's gifts will have free transportation.

The DGB (German Federation of Labor) has made a financial contribution to the Vietnamese labor unions.

The Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Germany, which is closely tied with the labor movement—its director comes from the DGB—has stepped up its interest in Vietnam. Up to now its activities have primarily been of an educational nature, inviting for example Vietnamese unionists to make study trips to Germany. A new and enlarged program is now being proposed.

The United Auto Workers Union has sent medicine from stocks available in Detroit. The United Steelworkers has a dual program: First, as a result of a visit to Vietnam it noticed the need for a midmorning snack at the schools maintained by the CVT for children of its members. These consist of one or two rooms in the 21 one or two-story social centers scattered through the country.

Several of these centers were built by the Germans with the help of Vietnamese union workers' volunteers. One of the newest and best is located in the dock area of Saigon. The children obviously don't have enough healthful food to eat. So, the Steelworkers proposed sending sterilized canned chocolate milk for distribution by the CVT to these children. The union made an appeal to its locals for funds. More than \$13,000 was collected.

The milk is being sent through CARE, which can get a rebate on shipping charges from our foreign aid program. The first shipment left in May and the rest will be made at regular intervals. In addition the union has turned over to the CVT 800 school kits consisting of pencils, notebooks, crayons, etc. which are in stock at CARE warehouses in Saigon.

The International Association of Machinists also has a Vietnam aid program, as does the International Union of Electrical Workers.

The International Longshoremen's Association program started on a different level. The vast increase in shipping to Vietnam caused an enormous tie-up in the docks of Saigon and lesser ports. Ships had to wait weeks before they could be unloaded. Union president Thomas W. Gleason went to Vietnam as a consultant to AID. He made a number of recommendations to ease the shipping crisis and he offered the services of half a dozen of his own staff people at his union's expense to help put his recommendations into effect.

Of necessity, then, his program affected dockworkers. The problem was to raise their productivity; but this could be done not only by setting up new processes but also by establishing new working rules and by associating the workers and their union more closely with the solution of dock problems.

August 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4183

The need is for all segments of our economy to combine their knowledge, their ideas and their imagination in a joint effort—and, at the same time, give each segment visibility for its own actions.

It has been alleged recently that there is something sinister designated as the traffic safety establishment. Actually, a basic problem has been the nonexistence of an establishment. We need one urgently. We need one that is made up of top people who have authority to speak and to make commitments for their organizations.

The President has acted to bring about the long overdue coordination of federal traffic safety activities. It's time that business coordinated its efforts in this field, too. And it's time for clear communication between the two.

Freeways Enter the City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, after the many disappointments experienced by District of Columbia planners striving for a solution to ever-growing traffic problems, all responsible officials and interested citizens should insist upon the most careful overall study of present and future needs before permitting a venture into further debacles such as the DuPont Circle underpass episode. In that notorious case pedestrian and vehicular traffic at one of Washington's busiest zones was disrupted for months that went into years in deference to construction of automobile and streetcar tunnels; lo and behold the streetcar was soon thereafter taken off the streets and its passageway under the circle was summarily discarded as valueless for routing traffic of any kind.

About a decade ago a Boston architectural firm was assigned the task of deciding upon a route to bring traffic into the Inner Loop from the Wisconsin Avenue corridor in the vicinity of Bethesda. The plan was designed to handle traffic requirements through 1980. We have since come almost halfway to that point in history and there is still a question about the logical way to make the connection. The parkway connection with the Beltway through Cabin John could at least ease the problem if it went anywhere in particular in Washington's direction, but its abrupt termination still leaves its value in doubt.

What if the final determination on the North Leg of the Inner Loop were now entirely settled and the matter of handling traffic no longer presented a problem through 1980? Washington is unlikely to stop growing at that point; meanwhile the annual output of cars and trucks already is exceeding 10 million units. What our planners are someday going to have to concede—and it may as well be at this time—is that there is just not enough open space in the District to continue forever building highways and freeways. Instead of trying to find new routes to bring more cars into the Dis-

trict, the logical approach would be to find ways to keep them out.

The first step would be to rule out once and forever the proposal to build parking lots at public expense, a plan which would only invite more trouble. The projected rapid transit system is a move in the right direction. Fringe parking and greater use of public transportation systems must be encouraged.

The Washington Post's Sunday supplement, Potomac, on July 31 contained a scholarly analysis of freeways and their effect upon a city's social, aesthetic, and economic life. Presented by Wolf Von Eckhardt, the newspaper's architectural critic, the article is required reading for everyone interested in the District's traffic problems. I might suggest parenthetically that if Mr. Von Eckhardt is not a member of one of the many planning commissions involved in District traffic problems, someone in command should certainly seek to obtain his services.

The article follows:

FREEWAYS ENTER THE CITY

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

AUTOS VERSUS PEOPLE?

A freeway is a road from four to twelve lanes wide constructed for the exclusive use of cars, trucks and buses. It has three essential characteristics. 1) The two opposing streams of traffic are separated by a strip of land or some other divider. 2) Access is limited to interchanges with special lanes to smooth entrance and exit of vehicles. 3) All intersecting roads are separated in different levels to eliminate the need for crossing or turning against the main stream of traffic.

The difference between a freeway and a parkway is—except for express buses—commercial vehicles, such as trucks, are excluded from the parkway which has been designed with greater attention to landscaping and blending into the topography.

In a recent meeting of the National Capital Planning Commission, the six ex-officio representatives of the Federal Government united to outvote the five representatives of the citizenry on a motion to proceed with a network of freeways within the city essentially as planned twenty years ago.

A few days earlier, the six federal men had, in the secret councils of a Presidential policy advisory committee on Washington's freeways, reached sudden agreement. It was prompted by three concessions on the part of the highway men:

To appease the Georgetown establishment, they agreed to spare the swanky, embassy studded area west of Dupont Circle. The northern leg of the inner loop is to be tunneled under K Street.

To win the needed swing vote of the National Park Service, they promised to replace whatever parkland they take either in kind or in cash and to do their share to realize the ambitious plans for a more magnificent Mall and Pennsylvania Avenue.

And to make the citizenry at large feel a little better about bulldozed homes and spoiled parks and views, they promised that Washington's new freeways are henceforth to be better designed than the ugly concrete ribbons we already have.

But what is good freeway design in the city?

"Whether sunken or raised or level, the positive design of wide roads in an urban environment is an almost virgin art," says the English architect Paul Ritter in his book *Planning for Man and Motor*.

We can be proud of some of our scenic freeways, designed for recreation on wheels. The first of them, the Bronx River Parkway in New York, designed in 1916, is still one of

the most attractive. Even our superb George Washington Parkway surpasses it only because of its breathtaking views of the Potomac.

Our ordinary, utilitarian freeways, however, built with 90 percent federal money under the Interstate and Defense Highway Act of 1956, are just that—utilitarian. Rarely do they respect the landscape with the grace of the German *Autobahn* and other highways in Europe. And when it comes to bridges and other freeway structures, our highway engineers usually make Neanderthal architecture look elegant by comparison.

And our urban freeways are terrible—for example, look at that maze of concrete spaghetti plunked on the north side of 14th Street Bridge.

People generally dress up when they go downtown. They acknowledge an affinity between civilization, civility and cities. Our highway engineers, however, seem to regard cities—with their intricate texture of buildings, streets, parks, plazas, waterfronts, gardens and cherished old neighborhoods—only as bothersome obstacles that must either be bulldozed or covered with as much concrete as possible.

As yet no one in this country has come up with a civilized, well-behaved urban freeway. There is no design for any American city that even attempts to make the freeway a part of the urban texture.

A growing number of architects and city planners fear that it can't be done. They don't propose to outlaw the automobile. It has given people an unprecedented freedom of movement which could never be taken away. But they do say that limited access freeways, while necessary to expedite motor travel between cities have no place within the city.

They take a hard-nosed, practical view. Within the city, they say, our efforts must be directed toward making travel by private automobile a luxury rather than a necessity.

Everyone seems agreed that the inner city must keep and if possible increase the number of people who live, work, do business, enjoy culture and pay taxes there. But, so runs the argument, if increasing numbers of downtown workers and shoppers mean more cars—these cars, moving on freeways and standing on parking lots and in garages, reduce rather than increase the space for people to live and work. In Los Angeles, for instance, 56 to 66 percent (claims vary) of valuable inner city space is already given over to the automobile, moving or standing.

Ergo: The more cars you bring into the city the more you hurt its chances for livability, viability and dynamic economic growth. The thing to do, these practical people assert, is to shift the massive effort now made to build inner city freeways to much less expensive and more efficient rapid transit and other public transportation. Meanwhile, stop the freeways at the city gates and distribute car traffic over a vastly improved network of existing streets—much as in the sensitive areas of the human body the blood is taken from arteries into capillaries.

Improvement of existing streets and roads within the city has been neglected in recent years because it is cheaper for cities to build new freeways with easily acquired federal money. But now, cities could create express streets with somewhat limited access such as have proven very successful in Berlin; computerized traffic regulation based on the heaviest demand—a system being tried in Toronto; and, ban street parking, a move that could be made possible by more off-street parking provisions and garages. This removal of parked cars on streets, of course, automatically provides additional traffic lanes.

Others, however, believe that good design can tame freeways in the city. "New vistas unfold because of the elevated freeway," says

August 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4185

This had led to many collective bargaining reforms and has improved the condition of dock labor.

These and similar efforts are all paying enormous dividends. But they represent only a fraction of what could and should be done. They in fact represent only a small fraction of the kind of aid which the American government and the American unions contributed towards the strengthening of the German and Japanese unions after World War II.

Proposal for Ownership and Operation of U.S. Satellite Earth Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. A. Gallagher, president of Western Union International, Inc., has written a very enlightening letter to the Honorable Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, concerning the ownership and operation of the proposed U.S. satellite earth stations. In brief, it suggests that the current controversy about who should own and operate the stations be resolved by establishing joint ownership by the authorized communications carriers and Comsat, with the managerial functions entrusted to Comsat.

The letter follows:

WESTERN UNION INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 7, 1966.

Hon. ROSEL H. HYDE,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: Notwithstanding the Commission's prompt, affirmative interim decision regarding the ownership and operation of the three initial satellite earth stations in the United States, questions regarding earth stations are still very much before the Commission.

The earth station controversy shows no signs of abatement and, indeed, appears to be increasing in intensity. It is in the nation's interest for its telecommunications industry to come forward with constructive, harmonious proposals for the Commission's consideration as an alternative to the mounting conflicting claims and applications.

The purpose of this letter is to recommend some middleground on which the entire industry can join in resolving the earth station controversy by a willingness to compromise individual corporate positions in order to advance United States telecommunications policies.

BACKGROUND

Since August 1964, more than 1,500 pages of pleadings and applications relating to the satellite earth station controversy have been filed with the Commission. Many thousands of dollars and untold hours of effort have been spent by the industry in advocacy, duplicate engineering analyses, surveying for station sites and countless other related tasks. It is questionable whether the resulting public benefits are commensurate with these expenditures. Conflicting applications for the fourth earth station in the southeastern United States and the fifth station in the Caribbean area are now before the Commission, with more yet to come.

Positions were taken before the Commis-

sion in its proceeding in Docket No. 15735 regarding the three initial earth stations by the following common carriers and an association of carriers: American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T), Communications Satellite Corporation (Comsat), Hawaiian Telephone Company (Hawaiian), ITT World Communications, Inc. (ITT), RCA Communications, Inc. (RCA), Western Union International, Inc. (WUI), and United States Independent Telephone Association (USITA). The initial positions of these organizations regarding earth stations are summarized as follows:

(a) Comsat—exclusive ownership and operation by it;

(b) WUI and RCA—joint carrier ownership;

(c) AT&T, Hawaiian, and USITA—joint Comsat-carrier ownership; and

(d) ITT—individual carrier ownership.

These capsule summaries are not intended to portray or detract from the complete position of each organization which is on record with the Commission. The initial position of each organization has remained basically unchanged, although certain variations have evolved: witness the ITT-RCA-WUI joint application for a fourth earth station in the southeastern United States.

On May 12, 1965, the Commission announced an interim two-year policy authorizing Comsat exclusively to own and operate the three initial satellite earth stations to be located in northeastern and northwestern parts of the continental United States and in Hawaii. The Commission's interim policy was expressly conditioned so as not to prejudice the position of any communications common carrier in the future involving final determination of earth station ownership and operation.

Following the Commission's interim decision regarding the three initial stations, these events occurred:

(a) Comsat requested exclusive authorization for a fourth earth station in the southeastern United States and a fifth station in the Caribbean area;

(b) ITT requested authority for its own Caribbean station, and indicated no objection to joint participation by the other international public service carriers; WUI and RCA each requested joint participation; and

(c) RCA, WUI and ITT filed a joint application for a station in the southeastern United States and invited participation by any other authorized international carrier, except Comsat.

The earth station controversy is flaring anew.

Comsat, The Western Union Telegraph Company (WUTCo) and AT&T have, for example, each petitioned to deny the joint southeastern application of ITT, WUI and RCA. AT&T's objection, basically technical, was accompanied by a request for participation in this joint station. AT&T and Comsat have each petitioned to deny ITT's application for a Caribbean earth station. On the other hand, RCA and WUI have requested participation in this Caribbean station.

Comsat's application for a Caribbean earth station has been met with separate petitions to deny filed by WUI, RCA, ITT and AT&T, respectively. Finally, AT&T, ITT, RCA, WUI and WUTCo, have each separately petitioned to deny Comsat's application for a southeastern station.

This complicated situation has become further muddled by separate applications by AT&T, ITT and WUI for authority to join in the laying of a transistorized, high-capacity submarine cable connecting the Caribbean area with Florida. Comsat has opposed these applications.

Adversary pleadings are mounting rapidly and voluminously in the Commission's files. Carriers formerly conceding some role to Comsat in earth station planning and opera-

tion have become more adamant against Comsat participation. Before there is any further hardening of opposing positions, WUI suggests a re-evaluation of the respective positions of all interested authorized communications carriers with the view toward compromising individual corporate viewpoints. This compromise would be in the public interest, in the interest of national defense and in the furtherance of sound United States telecommunications policies.

WUI'S PROPOSAL

The Communications Satellite Act provides the Commission with a choice of alternative methods of ownership and operation of earth stations. The Act has been paraphrased as follows:

Under the provisions of the Communications Satellite Act, Comsat alone, or one or more carriers, or Comsat and one or more carriers may be licensed as the sole owner and operator of earth stations.¹

"Comsat and one or more carriers" is the obvious middle ground on which the industry can unite in common purpose and joint pursuit of the statutory goals as declared by Congress in the Satellite Act.

The wisdom and foresight of the Congress in providing the Commission with the alternative guidelines for earth station ownership enable us to submit this compromise proposal.

Joint ownership of all satellite earth stations, within the Commission's jurisdiction, by Comsat and authorized communications carriers is the answer to the current controversy. The joint owners could designate Comsat as their managerial agent for the construction and operation of these stations in much the same fashion as the signatories to the August 1964 multi-nation communications satellite Agreement have appointed Comsat the manager of the space segment.

A consensus on this solution should be attainable in the public interest since it involves less compromise of previously advanced positions than any other solution that comes to mind. Comsat, with the assistance and guidance of the Department of State and the Commission, has already demonstrated the feasibility of multi-nation ownership and operation of the space segment. AT&T, Hawaiian, ITT, RCA, WUI and USITA have, at one time or another, suggested joint-carrier ownership, and in most instances, with some form of participation by Comsat.

Joint earth station ownership by the authorized communications carriers and Comsat, with the managerial functions entrusted to Comsat, will be both feasible and beneficial. Potential conflicts of interest will be obviated and concerted industry efforts will be channeled toward attainment of the national telecommunications policy.

This joint earth station ownership in the United States would obviate a possible proliferation of redundant stations by competitive interests and would also facilitate common earth station entry points in the United States for communications from abroad, with resulting operating efficiencies for overseas telecommunications entities.

Additionally, joint ownership would dispose of the problem of diverse ownership of different stations in the United States which could be disruptive of the system because the individual owner, be it Comsat or an authorized communications carrier, might be inclined to favor its own station without regard to overall system efficiency.

Multiple-carrier ownership of the earth stations in the United States will be consistent with the multiple-nation participation in the existing European earth stations. The success of the global satellite system is

¹ Asher H. Ende, Deputy Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, Address before IEEE International Communications Conference, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 15, 1966 (Emphasis added).

A4186

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 9, 1966

dependent not only upon the cooperation of the many participating sovereign nations but also upon the cooperation of the telecommunications industry in this country.

If cooperation cannot be attained at home, it cannot be expected abroad. Cooperation by entities with different interests is the touchstone for attainment of:

[T]he policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding. Communications Satellite Act, Section 102(a).

If the United States telecommunications industry will join together in a cooperative endeavor to attain "peace and understanding" on the earth station question, a meeting might be convened under the aegis of the Commission to work out the details for joint earth station ownership by Comsat and all eligible qualified carriers serving the public and Government, and for management of the stations by Comsat.

Pending possible resolution of this matter along the lines outlined herein, we have no choice but to pursue our present course of action in promoting the joint application for a southeastern station with our co-applicants and in opposing exclusive single-entity stations.

Copies of this letter are being sent to all organizations named herein together with those business and labor leaders concerned with overseas telecommunications named in the Report and Recommendations to Senate and House Commerce Committees of April 1966 by the Intragovernmental Committee on International Telecommunications (see Attachment). All interested organizations are respectfully requested to communicate their views to the Commission concerning the suggestions in this letter.

Very truly yours,

E. A. GALLAGHER.

Attachment.

ATTACHMENT

Mr. Joseph A. Belrne, President, Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Harold S. Genee, President, International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, 320 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Mr. Douglas S. Guild, President, Hawaiian Telephone Company, P.O. Box 2200, Honolulu, Hawaii 96805.

Mr. Elmer L. Hageman, President, Commercial Telegraphers Union, 1025 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Howard R. Hawkins, President, RCA Communications, Inc., 66 Broad Street, New York, New York 10004.

Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, Chairman, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, 195 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

Mr. James McCormack, Chairman, Communications Satellite Corporation, 1900 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. Russell W. McFall, President, The Western Union Telegraph Company, 60 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10013.

Mr. James R. McNitt, President, ITT World Communications Inc., 67 Broad Street, New York, New York 10004.

Mr. Peter A. Nenzel, President, United States Independent Telephone Association, 425 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.

General David Sarnoff, Chairman, Radio Corporation of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020.

Mr. Joseph P. Selly, President, American Communications Association, 18 John Street, New York, New York 10038.

Long Beach, Calif., Is Site of North American Aviation's Ocean Systems Research and Development Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today North American Aviation, Inc., and the city of Long Beach are announcing jointly the establishment of that corporation's ocean systems research and development center at Long Beach. This move highlights the city's hospitality not only to new industry, but also its ideal capabilities for support of both governmental and private enterprise activities in oceanography, oceanology and related endeavors.

The following news dispatch contains full details regarding the new center:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., August 9, 1966.—North American Aviation Inc., will establish the Nation's newest and most modern ocean systems research and development center on the waterfront here.

The announcement today followed a Long Beach City Council action to lease the former Navy landing and facility to North American Aviation and to modify the modern structure to provide 38,800 square feet of office, laboratory, and engineering space.

The facility will also serve as headquarters for ocean systems operations (OSO), the corporation's marine and undersea business arm.

Under terms of the proposed agreement, NAA will leave the facility, basin and parking area for a term of 5 years with options of 3 and 2 years.

Frank G. Compton, general manager of OSO, and a vice president of North American's autonetics division said the city-owned facility will house administrative, engineering, and scientific activity.

The landing, built in 1960 at the cost of more than \$5 million, has a 6-acre water area enclosed by two concrete moles.

North American Aviation recently announced it will build a submersible "work boat" with diver lockout features and capable of operation at depths to 2,000 feet, the first of a new generation of high-performance underwater vehicles.

The new boat is scheduled for launching late in 1967. It will be built at NAA's facilities in the Los Angeles area and tested, launched and based at the Long Beach facility.

City officials hailed the aerospace firm's decision to locate here as another significant step toward establishing Long Beach as a major oceanographic center.

"We are very pleased that North American Aviation has chosen Long Beach as the site for their ocean operations," said city manager John R. Mansel. "We are fully convinced, as is North American, and many other U.S. firms, that ocean exploration and the development of its vast resources is a new frontier with great promise."

Compton, whose administrative and engineering offices are temporarily located at North American's Santa Ana plant, said the Long Beach facility is ideally located for engineering and test activity. He emphasized that no manufacturing will be done at the Long Beach site.

"It is, in my opinion, the best location for marine research and development work in the Nation," Compton said. "The location is

in one of the great maritime cities of the country."

He pointed out that the facility is strategically located near deep water as well as the varied resources of the southern California metropolitan area.

Initially, the OSO facilities will be staffed by about 250 to 300 engineers, scientists, and supporting personnel.

"North American Aviation has been engaged in design and development of undersea equipment and study of techniques in all ocean science and engineering fields for several years, our emphasis at this time is on meeting AHD technological challenges and requirements common to the many established and emerging fields in underwater technology," Compton said.

"We are engaged in development of a variety of manned and unmanned projects and underwater work techniques for commercial, defense, and scientific undersea program. In fact, all of the company's experience and advanced technology, to which several of its operating divisions contribute, gives our ocean systems operations a complete research, development, and production capability," Compton added.

Occupancy of the Long Beach facility is planned for next March, when modifications to the building are completed.

The building's interior will require some remodeling to accommodate the OSO offices and laboratories. No changes are planned for the building's exterior and landing.

The landing is situated next to an area where the city is building a 114-acre addition to the downtown shore where it is to be developed into a Sylvania setting with a marine museum and other facilities.

Ridiculous Way To Fight a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Glendale, Calif., News-Press recently discussed the question of how successful the policy of building bridges to Communist nations has been.

The News-Press finds that the policy of trading with and aiding Communist nations is completely unsuccessful, as it titled in its August 1, 1966, editorial entitled "Ridiculous Way To Fight a War."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the editorial.

RIDICULOUS WAY TO FIGHT A WAR

It is proper to ask whether the current policy of the United States of America toward the enemy is "building bridges" or burning them behind us.

Neither the concept nor the results of the program are new. Nor has the theory that if we trade with and aid the enemy we will be rewarded with kindness and understanding, been successful in the areas where it now is applied.

The United States, for example, has given Poland \$600 million in aid, mostly food, since 1957 under this concept. Today the Polish government has cancelled athletic participation with the United States, woos North Viet Nam and says there is no use talking about "building bridges" unless we stop air strikes and withdraw from Viet Nam.

About a month ago, the President boasted of new cultural and educational exchanges