

But science, to serve its master, must be harnessed. Industry must take it and put it to practical use.

Last year the President signed into law a measure designed for this very purpose—the State Technical Services Act.

At that time, he declared that Americans would one day think of the act as the "sleepers" of the 89th Congress.

"It will do for the American businessman," Mr. Johnson added, "what the great Agricultural Extension Service has done for the American farmer."

He predicted the act will spark the creation of new industries and the expansion of old ones, that it will speed the development of cheaper and better consumer products and help diversify local industry.

The State Technical Services Act seeks especially to help smaller industry by supplying the technical know-how which it may lack.

Technical proficiency, with its resulting increase in productivity, not only means that business becomes more profitable. It also can pay better wages. It can offer more goods at lower prices. This translates into an increase of real consumer income and a rising standard of living.

In addition, it means more jobs as our increased competitive ability is used to penetrate expanding world markets.

One way to measure the application of science and technology is through the study of productivity in industry. Invariably the studies are highly revealing. The Department of Commerce is among the major organizations engaged in such surveys, basing its studies on the ratio of value added in manufacturing to persons employed.

We have found wide variations in the productivity rate of different plants. In fact, the studies show that only 10 percent of American industry is getting the full benefit from the science and technology we already possess. It has been estimated that if all technical information already in our possession were used effectively in the lagging 90 percent of the Nation's plants, the entire manufacturing productivity level would be increased threefold.

The Department of Commerce's Census of Manufactures shows that in New England, as in other major areas of the Nation, there is too much gray, along with brighter colors, in this productivity picture.

In the Boston area, for instance, the gain in productivity from 1958 to 1963 was an encouraging 26 percent—from \$8,050 per employee to \$10,150 per employee.

This 26-percent gain precisely matched that of the entire Nation. But the growth in specific manufacturing industries varied widely and in some cases fell far short of the growth in the national averages for these same industries.

Looking at the 10 industries with the largest factory employment in the Boston area—those with over 5,500 workers in 1963—we see changes in efficiency per worker, or value added per employee, ranging from a drop of 20 percent, in the production of rubber footwear, to gains of as high as 43 percent in mechanical measuring devices.

In only one of Boston's largest manufacturing industries did the area's growth in productivity exceed that for the Nation. The improved productivity in manufacturing women's outerwear garments in Boston—40 percent—topped national growth by about 10 percent.

These manufacturers are to be congratulated.

A recent inventory by a business publisher of metalworking machinery perhaps revealed one factor in this picture. It showed that 25 percent of the Boston area's machine tools were more than 20 years old. This compared with an average of 21 percent for the Nation. But if we take Los Angeles as an example only 9 percent of its machine tools averaged over 20 years old.

This would seem to indicate that while New England industry is generally moving forward, expanding and providing increased employment, some segments are driving with their brakes on.

They are held back when they try to improve and speed up because of out-of-date or inefficient machinery or processes.

This is a challenge to industry. But it is one, I am sincerely confident, which will be met with the same determined and vigorous spirit which has always characterized New England when a challenge arises.

I am certain you will have further questions to ask concerning the State Technical Services Act and other matters at 2 o'clock this afternoon. At that time Department of Commerce representatives from the Bureau of Standards, the Patent Office and the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information will be present at a science seminar.

Manufacturing is, of course, but one part of the New England business scene, as important and impressive as it is. Those Americans who see something of their lives and background in New England think of its sea coasts, its mountains, its lakes, and the many reminders of history within its beautiful towns and cities.

Many segments of the Northeast's economy are inextricably aligned with these elements, and some where the unemployment rate has been high, have needed help.

The Federal Government has recognized the need here, and is helping in various ways.

In addition to the State Technical Services Act, the President also signed another measure of significance for industry last fall—the Economic Development Act.

This act of far-reaching potential will aid communities, areas, and regions in the United States by providing financial and technical assistance for creation of new jobs.

The Economic Development Administration, an agency within the Department of Commerce, is administering earlier awards to New England industries and business totaling \$1,161,000. Thirty-nine individual projects are included in that total, covering widely diverse areas of business and industry. Among them are the scallop and flounder industry of New Bedford and recreation areas in Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

I was extremely pleased on March 2 to be able to designate the six New England States as an Economic Development Region under the Economic Development Act.

As the Nation has grown, its regions have tended to group into economic entities with their own special problems, as well as their great opportunities. It has become increasingly evident that to realize their own highest development and to make their full contribution to the Nation, the people of each region must work and plan together, aware of both their own resources and needs, and the country's.

That the U.S. Government has found a way to help in the attainment of new goals is a working example of dynamic federalism. At the same time, each participating State must play the major role in the regional commission which determines the area's needs.

Industry in all regions must continue to grow if our economy is to be maintained on a sound plane. To do so requires not only the utilization of the full spectrum of science and technology, but, as always, the dedication, the daring and the vision of the leaders of business, industry and the professions.

The Federal Government will, I know, continue to play a full and constructive role at industry's side. Indeed, Government and business have in recent years become increasingly aware of the need for mutual understanding and cooperation in the achievement of the broadest goals—in assuring the full utilization of not only our material resources but our national brainpower.

You have plenty of both in New England.

You have so much in your favor, including your great traditions. You have institutions of higher learning that are the envy of the Nation, splendid industrial locations, accessibility and land that Creator obviously smiled upon.

New England, long after the Minutemen, is aroused again. It is on the march. If you keep on at this pace, it may take two race tracks to house your future industrial shows.

The Government is betting on New England. Its faith, and my own, I know, will be rewarded many times over.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow, Congregation Beth El, Cedarhurst, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Creator of all men regardless of race, color, or creed, we pray unto Thee with sincere and humble hearts. We find the problems of life difficult and our own wisdom and knowledge insufficient. We need Thee, Almighty, to help us face the challenge of these troubled and mediocre days. Have mercy upon our restless world. Grant all men the vision to strive for human brotherhood, so that peace and

justice can be the normal experiences of our world. We pray for our youth, for their homes and schools so that they may be constantly awakened to the great ideas of faith and the worthy causes of our American way of life—the pursuit of liberty and human rights.

Give courage, O Lord, to the President and all the duly constituted authorities of our Nation. May we together press forward against the prejudices, the hatreds, the malices that still exist to the end that dignity, beauty, and love will be the lot of all men. May this be Thy will and let us say amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### PARTICIPATION SALES ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States is sending a message to the Congress calling for legislation which will establish participation pools of Government assets. This legislation, if enacted, would create a more efficient system to make proper use of Federal Government funds and assets.

I strongly favor such legislation in that it will enable the administration and the Congress to further achieve the goals as set forth in the President's Great Society program.

Your Banking and Currency Committee will hold full and extensive hearings on this important legislation. Hearings shall commence on Thursday, April 21, at which time the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, will present the administration's views on this matter, along with the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Budget.

#### PARTICIPATION SALES MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the President of the United States for recommending the legislation proposed in his participation sales message.

The participation sales technique is an efficient, flexible, and controlled method for channeling funds from the private credit market into Government lending programs. It is not new. The pooling of mortgages and loans held by Federal credit agencies and the sale of participations in the income and repayments from loans in the pool are techniques which have been used for several years by the Export-Import Bank, the Veterans' Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association.

What is new in the Sales Participation Act of 1966 is that President Johnson is recommending that we extend this loan pool technique to lending programs of additional Government agencies.

To those of us who are concerned that adequate congressional control over Government lending programs be maintained, it is important to note that this new legislation would do just that—it would not diminish congressional controls.

This legislation would extend the full participation technique to lending programs of the Farmers Home Administration, the lending programs for college housing, the lending programs for public facilities, and the lending programs of the Small Business Administration.

In order to coordinate the sale of participations, these operations would be centralized in a single agency, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or Fannie Mae as it is commonly called, which has already had substantial experience in participation sales in the mortgage pooling operations.

An important advantage of this program is that it would make possible the sale of participations in loans for which Congress has established an interest rate below the market rate. Yet it would do

so in such a way as to fully preserve congressional prerogatives.

This legislation provides that appropriation acts must authorize in advance the amounts of participations which could be sold against those assets carrying relatively low interest rates. That provision assures that the appropriations safeguards of the legislative process would be applied to participation sales.

With the authority provided by this legislation, as President Johnson told us in January, net Government expenditures in fiscal 1967 will be reduced by \$4.7 billion through asset sales. This will be four times the total sales of assets we achieved in fiscal 1964.

So far as I am concerned, this measure stacks up as a good bill—one deserving approval by Congress this year.

It extends the efficiency and flexibility already proven by existing sales participation programs.

It takes nothing away from the controls that Congress should properly exercise over the many programs Congress itself originally authorized.

In fact, the legislation adds a new safety catch—action by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate prior to the pooling of certain Government loans with below-market interest rates.

I urge its approval.

#### THE SALES PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1966 SHOULD BE ENACTED

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a primary objective of the Sales Participation Act of 1966, which President Johnson has transmitted to Congress, is to provide for both an orderly and economic "sell-off" of assets of some of our Federal credit programs in the private credit market.

This, of course, is not a new idea.

In fact, it is a tried and tested idea. The sale of participation certificates would be handled through the already established facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

We, in Congress, who are responsible for the creation of these Federal credit programs, now bear the responsibility for assuring the smooth flow of Federal credit loan paper into the private credit market.

This new legislation will, in my opinion, ease the problems which occur with the sales of assets. Otherwise, they could continue to grow and cause new headaches, not only for the competent debt management officials in the executive branch, but also, in time, for us in Congress.

Let me talk about just one of these problems:

We now have as many as half a dozen agencies selling their own paper, sometimes to a very limited market and often in competition with each other. These

agencies have greatly different degrees of experience and expertise in this field. Some are very well qualified to carry on these sales, some are less so. We have found that the sale of assets can conflict with the Treasury's debt management operations, and this can have disturbing consequences.

The best technique we have at hand to cope with these problems is to group assets consisting of loan paper into pools and sell shares of participations in the pools. This is proposed in the legislation which we have received from the President.

The pools would gain diversity from the grouping of various kinds of loans. The sales would be centralized, expertly handled, and coordinated with the Treasury. Further, the participations would constitute an excellent and sought-after investment which would command a broad market.

As I stated earlier, the technique is not new. The Export-Import Bank has used it, since 1962, to sell about \$1.7 billion of its direct loans which otherwise might not have been marketable. The Federal National Mortgage Association, acting under the Housing Acts of 1964 and 1965, has sold \$1.6 billion of participation certificates in its own mortgage holdings and those of the Veterans' Administration.

The basic provisions of the President's proposal are taken directly from the Housing Acts of 1964 and 1965. The earlier act authorized FNMA to act as trustee for the sale of participations in pools of first mortgages. The 1965 act extended this authority.

The President's proposal would further broaden use of the pooling technique by extending it to all agencies of the Federal Government which hold financial assets. Sales of participations would be coordinated by FNMA.

The cost of selling participations through FNMA, judging from past experience, might be about one-fourth of 1 percent more than direct Treasury borrowings for comparable maturities. In time, as the participation certificates gain wider acceptance and marketability, they may command rates closer in line with Treasury issues. And, of course, asset sales through participation certificates will command lower rates than would the direct sale of the underlying loans.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966—which President Johnson has just transmitted to Congress.

Explaining the need for this legislation, President Johnson says that direct Federal lending programs neither can nor should carry the entire burden of financing essential activities that otherwise would not get adequate financial support. I agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

And I also agree with the President's statement in his letter to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, in transmitting this legislation to Congress:

Under our system of free enterprise it is far better for the Government to mobilize private capital to these ends.

Further, I agree with the point made by the President that "it is far better for the Government to stimulate and supplement private lending rather than to substitute for it."

The proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966 is—and I would like to emphasize this point—procedural legislation, in all essential respects. It will not, and I repeat not, create a new set of subsidized Government loan programs.

President Johnson says that the substitution of private for public credit—and this is what this legislation is designed to do—means "sound financing for worthwhile projects with a minimum of Federal participation"—and that is convincing to me.

This legislation carries forward the process and policies laid down by three Presidents—Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson over the past 12 years or more. I urge approval of this legislation.

**Mr. ANNUNZIO.** Mr. Speaker, some of the Members on the other side of the aisle in recent weeks have made statements on the floor of this House and entered material in the RECORD impugning the motives behind the proposed Participation Sales Act which we received from the President today.

The two most frequently heard criticisms of this legislation that we have heard are that it is a piece of budget gimmickry and a means to back-door financing.

Mr. Speaker, this is a partisan charge. I hope when I have finished my remarks you will realize just how partisan it is.

First. The charge of budget gimmickry relates to the treatment of the figures reflecting the sales of assets in the budget. As all of us know, the sales of assets are treated in the budget as negative expenditures rather than as receipts. Those who made the charge of budget gimmickry should be reminded that the procedure is neither new with this bill nor with this administration. It is the conventional budget treatment given the entire program of asset sales since the administration of President Eisenhower in the midfifties.

Second. The charge of back-door financing relates to the supposed possibility of expanding programs and starting new ones without congressional approval or adequate congressional control, using the proceeds from asset sales. Anyone who has read the President's letter of transmittal or who has looked at the legislation or who has listened to the statements made here today by my colleagues knows that this charge has no foundation in fact.

Congressional control over Federal credit programs would be maintained under the provisions of the Participation Sales Act. In some cases—those being the programs in which interest rates to the alternate borrower are below credit market rates—congressional control would be augmented.

That is the fact of the matter—congressional control would be maintained or increased. Backdoor financing is an unfounded accusation.

To show you how partisan these unfounded charges are, let me read you two brief quotations:

Private capital will be gradually substituted for the Government investment until Government funds are fully repaid and the private owners take over responsibility for the program.

That is not a quotation from President Johnson. That is not a quotation relating to the Participation Sales Act of 1966.

That is a quotation from President Eisenhower's budget message issued in January 1955. It states the goal of his administration in this field, which was to mobilize private capital to the greatest extent feasible in the administration of Federal credit programs. The second quotation is this:

The administration also can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets.

That is not a statement from President Johnson's budget message or economic report. Nor is it from any statement by the majority of this Congress.

It is from the minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee Report of the 88th Congress, 1st session—May 1963—on H.R. 6009, which was to provide temporary increases in the public debt limit. It was signed by these Republican members of the committee, a number of whom are here today; Mr. BYRNES, Mr. Baker, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. Knox, Mr. UTT, Mr. BETTS, Mr. Alger, Mr. Derounian, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, and Mr. COLLIER.

The minority report expressed the view of the Republican members of the committee that the administration should not come to the Congress seeking an increase in the debt limit until it had made every effort to reduce its salable assets, both from its loan portfolio and from its stockpile of strategic materials.

This shows one of two things: Either the minority members of 3 years ago were completely in error, or there has been a remarkable change in their point of view since President Johnson decided to move further in the direction taken under President Eisenhower back in the 1950's.

**Mr. ASHLEY.** Mr. Speaker, the legislation now advocated by the White House, to facilitate the pooling of direct Government loans, made under a variety of programs previously authorized by Congress, has interesting antecedents.

Twelve years ago, Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower called in his budget message for action designed to encourage the substitution of private financing for Federal outlays in our housing programs which have contributed so much to the growth and well-being of the Nation.

Eleven years ago, President Eisenhower again espoused the gradual substitution of private capital for the Government investment in housing programs.

And this was done.

The Federal National Mortgage Association—known to many as Fannie

Mae—has over the past decade or more acquired vast experience in pooling Government loans, with these loans being channeled from the public financing sector to the private credit market through the type of participation pools that are now proposed by the administration for other Government credit programs as well.

There is little logic, Mr. Speaker, in the Federal Government going on and on to build up its portfolio of direct loan paper.

There is, however, a great deal of logic in making use of the experience already built up in the pooling of loans, for sale in the private credit market—to banks, insurance companies, pension plans, and, if it can be done without too great an administrative cost, to individual private investors as well.

This measure—labeled the "Participation Sales Act of 1966"—is good legislation; it is evolutionary legislation, broadening, and improving on what has gone before. I am confident the House Banking Committee will see great merit in this legislation. I hope it will pass.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

**Mr. REUSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Sales Participation Act of 1966, following the remarks on that subject.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. WHITTEN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 22, 1966, to file a privileged report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. RUMSFELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### NAVY DID A SPACE AGE JOB WITH STONE AGE TOOLS

**Mr. ROGERS of Florida.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. ROGERS of Florida.** Mr. Speaker, the Navy spent some 80 days to recover the H-bomb lost off the coast of Spain this January. The Navy also spent hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on this job. It was an expensive lesson, and if the Navy's undersea technology had been able to keep pace with our phenomenal progress in space technology that bomb

could have been recovered immediately and at considerable savings.

In less than 10 years, outer space exploration has produced space vehicles which know no horizon. However, the Navy does not yet produce deep-diving vehicles of the same degree of sophistication found in the space program vehicles.

The H-bomb recovery shows that the Navy was doing a space age job with stone age tools.

For the past 50 years the Navy has sporadically considered diving technology, starting in 1915 with its first lost submarine, and including the *Thresher* disaster in April 1963. Each incident showed that the Navy was unprepared to conduct deep-sea recovery operations. The H-bomb incident demonstrates that more progress is needed. At the present time, Navy programs plan development of undersea vehicles over a 5-year period on a basis amounting to roughly 10 percent of the NASA budget for 1 year alone.

It is clear that insufficient emphasis is being given within the Defense Department to the problem of developing Navy undersea exploration vehicles sufficient to maintain this Nation's defense posture. This situation must be corrected immediately.

#### GET BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, an article which appears in the current, April 25, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, being the full text of an address by the Honorable Charles E. Whittaker, of Kansas City, who in 1962 retired as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Previously, I have expressed regret that Justice Whittaker retired from the Supreme Court, at a time when there is a need for men of his caliber to serve. The advice given by Justice Whittaker when he points out the need to "get back to fundamentals—the Ten Commandments and old-fashioned respect for truth and honesty—before it is too late" is a warning that needs to be heeded. It is a real tragedy that more members of our High Court do not embrace the philosophy of Justice Whittaker, who in the address referred to, points out that "defiance of law, falsifying such terms as 'liberal,' 'conservative,' 'civil rights,' 'civil disobedience,' and so forth, are some of the things that are threatening America." Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we stop, look, and think, while there is still time to "return to simple honesty." Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, if you have not read the address delivered by Justice Whittaker on April 12 at the University of Kansas, you should read it in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, beginning on page 58.

#### FREE ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent agreement of the South Vietnamese Government and the Buddhist leaders to hold elections in August promises the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to deal with their country's problems by peaceful political means. The prospective elections provide an occasion for the establishment of a representative government in South Vietnam. From the beginning, the American commitment has been designed to assure the people of South Vietnam precisely this kind of opportunity. As the history of North Vietnam shows, without an American presence, the people of South Vietnam probably could not have found such means for self-expression. As President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have repeatedly stated, the conflict in Vietnam is both political and military. Therefore political as well as military means are required for its solution.

Now basic American ideals, and the stated aims of our policy in South Vietnam require that U.S. policy in the coming months be directed toward assuring that these elections be conducted in the most free and open manner possible. Our activities in South Vietnam in the coming months should, therefore, be designed to assure the widest possible participation in the entire election process by all elements of the population.

This is an essential precondition for any settlement of the conflict that reflects the interests of all the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States should actively encourage and facilitate this process in every possible way.

#### THE BOSTON CELTICS MAKE CIVIL RIGHTS AS WELL AS BASKETBALL HISTORY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to congratulate the world's champion Boston Celtics, who for 8 years have been the world's champions in basketball, for their activities in respect to civil rights. In 1950 the Boston Celtics were the first professional team in the National Basketball League ever to hire a Negro. In the year 1966 they were the first professional team that ever fielded as a starting lineup a complete Negro team.

Mr. Speaker, as of Monday this week the Boston Celtics appointed as their

coach their superstar big Bill Russell, the first Negro who has ever been appointed as manager and coach of a major basketball team, or of any major sporting team.

The Boston Celtics have acted the part of real champions in the way they have conducted themselves. I hope the pattern will be an example for all other sporting organizations.

My congratulations go to the Boston Celtics, the team, the players, and the management.

"Red" Auerbach is not only the world's greatest coach, but also its greatest sportsman.

#### BALLYHOO FOR THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of April the new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Latin America, Mr. Gordon, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in ballyhooing the foreign aid program.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I asked the gentleman to provide me with one example of a project which had been sponsored in Latin America, which had been successful. In fact, I said, not to limit it too much, "if you cannot find one in Latin America, find one anywhere in the world and tell me where it is; I would like to go look at it."

He assured me that he would not only find one, but would find one right away. Fifteen days have passed, and I have not heard from the gentleman. I would have thought that if he had a successful project he could have found out about it by this time.

#### FINO OPPOSES GOVERNMENTWIDE LOAN POOLS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the President's message today calling for a governmentwide loan pooling and refinancing program to be run through Fannie Mae represents an unparalleled power grab which strikes at the very root of our congressional process.

If we permit and allow Government agencies to circumvent full congressional scrutiny by refinancing their paper for funds, we will be creating not only a menace to the Congress but a serious threat to private credit. We will be creating an economic and political monster.

Let us make no mistake about it. Socialized lending is the inevitable end-product of a full-scale pooling program. Socialized credit will grow and grow with

the pools until most bankers become civil servants in title or fact.

Expansion of Government loan programs beyond complete congressional scrutiny is very attractive to a free-wheeling administration, because it presents a marvelous opportunity for budget gimmickry.

Under this program, the administration can sidestep any budget deficit by a white elephant sale of assets at an attractive rate. Agencies can go to Fannie Mae as indigents go to pawnbrokers and hockshops. Budget deficits can be overcome—on paper—by the sale of a few billion dollars worth of loan participations. The program proposed in this message can be used to make many a budget safe for waste and extravagance which could not otherwise survive the spotlight of a deficit budget.

I believe that this program is a fiscal and monetary monster. It could only have been unleashed by an administration dedicated to economic rule or ruin.

This program is a cruel paradox. It will cost the taxpayers most in high refinancing costs in just those years were inflationary budget deficits have stimulated participation sales budget gimmickry. It will inflate the volume of Government loans in just those budget deficit years where the Government is already spending too much on too many programs. The costs of refinancing in this program will add to the taxpayer's burden so that the Government may, through deceit, spend more tax dollars than otherwise.

This program makes no economic sense because it is a political program. No economist would seek it—only a power-hungry administration.

This message is the message of a would-be economic Caesar. Only a blank-check Congress in every sense of the word would betray future Congresses and generations of citizens and taxpayers by passing it.

I have heard arguments that refinancing of this sort is the private enterprise approach because it brings in private funds. This is hypocrisy, pure and simple. Many of the loans proposed to be pooled in the fiscal 1967 budget were originally made in unfair competition with private credit. The time to bring in private credit was before the Government loan was made, not at some later date as a budget trick. For example, the 1967 budget proposed Farmers' Home Administration loans for pooling and a January 1966 report of the General Accounting Office said that many such loans were made in competition with private credit.

If this program is enacted, Congress will be crippled, the economy will be twisted and the budget will be warped out of recognition. This program also sows the seeds of socialized banking. All this will be laid at the feet of an economic Caesar in the White House.

#### FEDERAL HOCKSHOP CAN FINANCE FOREIGN AID

**Mr. WIDNALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. WIDNALL.** Mr. Speaker, under the administration's proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966, the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—is to become a financing agency for other Government lending agencies. The budget for fiscal year 1967 special analyses states:

Legislation is being proposed to authorize a Government-wide program for sale of participations in outstanding direct loans.

In fact, this will make FNMA a Federal hockshop.

The budget estimates that at the close of June 30, 1966, there will be outstanding \$33.1 billion direct loans under various Federal credit programs. The largest and most rapidly growing—from the standpoint of dollar volume—of the Federal loan programs is that of the Department of State through its Agency for International Development. At the close of fiscal year 1965 the volume of direct loans outstanding made by this Agency was \$9 billion. At the close of fiscal year 1966 the estimated outstanding volume is \$10.5 billion. At the close of fiscal year 1967 the estimated outstanding volume is \$12 billion.

FNMA in its new role of Federal hockshop could sell participations in a pool of such loans. It makes no difference that these AID direct loans bear interest in some instances as low as three-fourths percent per year or that in some cases they have maturities as long as 40 years. The legislation proposed authorizes appropriations for any agency pooling its loans with FNMA in an amount sufficient to make up any deficiency between income received on the loans, and interest paid on participations sold on the pooling of such loans. FNMA thus will not suffer any loss so it is painless financing for FNMA.

Obviously these AID loans are nonsalable and participations in a pool of such loans likewise would be nonsalable if FNMA did not guarantee the payment of principal and interest on the participations sold and if that guarantee was not backed up by the unlimited draw of FNMA on the U.S. Treasury for any funds that might be needed to pay such principal and interest.

Clearly, FNMA is selling U.S. Government credit. It is pure fiction that FNMA is indirectly selling foreign aid loans.

Let us explore the budgetary possibilities of such a transaction. As noted above, AID holdings of foreign aid loans are expanding at a rate of \$1.5 billion per year. Under the present system, that is a \$1.5 billion charge per year against the administrative budget. Under the participation sales device, the only charge against the administrative budget would be the appropriation to make up the deficiency between the income received on the loans pooled and the interest cost of the participations sold. Assume such loss differential to be 3 percent, the budg-

et charge then would be 3 percent of \$1.5 billion or only \$45 million per year. Financing foreign aid becomes almost painless insofar as the budgetary impact is concerned.

Can the Congress perpetrate such a hoax on itself and the public?

#### SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE DOLLARS A MONTH TAX FREE FROM TWO FEDERAL POVERTY PROGRAMS

**Mr. COLLIER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. COLLIER.** Mr. Speaker, the case of the Michigan man who has been drawing \$698 a month tax free from two different Federal poverty programs is an example of the unwieldy overlapping operation of the mushrooming Federal bureaucracy.

Writes one of my constituents:

My wife and I just paid the balance of our income tax on my \$76 a week take-home pay the day before I read this article in the newspaper. My wife works part time for \$32.50 a week. This man gets \$146 more per week tax free from the public trough than we earn working a combined 62 hours a week.

How many more disgraceful cases like this are buried in the Great Society's costly and wasteful programs at the expense of those of us who are struggling to support our families and pay our taxes? He said:

Let me tell you Congressmen, I'm fed up.

To my constituent I can only say that so are millions of other Americans—and particularly many in my congressional district based upon what I heard back home over the Easter recess.

#### FEDERAL HOCKSHOP CAN FINANCE THE U.S. TREASURY

**Mr. BROCK.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. BROCK.** Mr. Speaker, the administration has submitted today its proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966. Under the proposal the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—would be authorized to sell beneficial interests or participations in loans pooled by Government agencies. The loans pooled would be subject to a trust of which FNMA would be trustee. FNMA would unconditionally guarantee principal and interest of the participations sold and that guarantee would be backed up by the unlimited right of FNMA to borrow funds from the U.S. Treasury in whatever amounts might be necessary to make good on FNMA's guarantee of principal and interest on participations sold.

The pooling arrangement with FNMA would apply to "any obligations in which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof may have a financial interest." Such broad language, of course, includes any departments of the Federal Government, including the Department of the Treasury itself. That leads to the ridiculous situation in which FNMA could sell participations in loans held by the U.S. Treasury while, at the same time, the only reason the participations are readily salable is the fact that they enjoy the unlimited indirect guarantee of the U.S. Treasury.

That FNMA could thus finance the U.S. Treasury is more than a hypothetical possibility. In 1945, the U.S. Treasury made a \$3 1/4 billion loan to the United Kingdom. The loan bears 2 percent interest and originally was repayable in 50 installments beginning December 31, 1951. In 1957, an amendment of the terms of the loan permitted the deferral of up to seven payments of principal and/or interest with any deferred principal payments to be added on at the final maturity of the loan. Principal and interest was deferred in the years 1957, 1964, and 1965. The final maturity of the loan is, therefore, 2004. As of the close of 1965 there remained outstanding \$3.15 billion of principal. If one were to guess at the market price of such a loan, a generous appraisal would be a price of 60—or 60 cents on the dollar.

Under the administration's proposal, the Treasury Department could pool that loan, subject it to the FNMA trust, and FNMA could sell \$2.5 billion of participations. While that would amount to but 80 percent of the face value of the loan, it actually would amount to 133 percent of the probable market value of the loan. Nevertheless, the participations would be readily salable in the market because of the FNMA guarantee which in turn is backed up by an unlimited draw on the U.S. Treasury.

Why might the Treasury want to do this? The reason would be the same as for any other Government agency for which FNMA would sell participations in a pool of loans. Proceeds of the participations sold go to the agency pooling the loans which in turn could use the receipts to make additional loans. The Treasury, the same as any other department or agency has need for funds. Treasury might want to make another British loan to bolster the British balance-of-payments position. Likewise, the Treasury Department might want to use such proceeds to extend billion dollar credits to Latin America or southeast Asia.

Low-interest rates on such new commitments would be no impediment, because the administration proposal would authorize appropriations to make up any difference principal and interest received on loans that were pooled and principal and interest paid on participations sold. The new loans would not even appear in the budget because proceeds from the participations sold would be used to offset such loans. In the absence of participation sales, such expenditures would appear in the budget as an item of expense.

Thus, interest rates paid by the taxpayer would be considerably higher than

current Federal debt costs, and the dollar budget figure would be lower. As a result, we the taxpayer are forced to finance our own delusion.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I trust that the gentleman will support this bill. This was originally inaugurated by President Eisenhower at the time rather than have direct appropriations.

Mr. BROCK. The gentleman is partially correct. The Eisenhower proposal was used to reduce the national debt.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I trust that the gentleman will support this legislation, which is very much needed.

#### OPENING OF NATIONAL AIRPORT TO SMALL AND MEDIUM JETS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the opening of National Airport to small and medium jets next Monday is of utmost importance to the citizens of Memphis and the Midsouth.

I would like to commend Gen. William McKee and the others of the Federal Aviation Agency for taking this progressive step in spite of criticism from some sources who take a strictly local view.

In fact, there is a certain irony when some critics loudly proclaim Washington is a national city and not entitled to home rule and then turn around and insist the convenience of travelers from throughout the Nation should not be considered by opening jets to National Airport.

Mr. William C. Mieher, president of the Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce, summed it up well:

Permission for small and medium jets to land at Washington National will make the transaction of business in Washington infinitely more convenient for Memphians and southerners whose duties lead them there. Neither Dulles nor Friendship Airport can be construed as convenient for our citizens who wish to travel by airline to Washington. Further, with National open to small and medium jets, we can expect more and better service to and from Washington. With propeller planes rapidly being phased out by our commercial airlines, the importance of this decision can readily be seen.

The people of Memphis will now be 20 to 30 minutes closer to the Nation's Capital when Braniff begins flying jets into National Airport. We have been assured by American Airlines that it will begin jet service at an early date.

This is a step forward, and I fully approve.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gen-

tleman's remarks. I think he is exactly correct, and I think it is important that the FAA took this position.

Mr. GRIDER. I thank the gentleman.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have not been informed that this has been cleared with the ranking minority member. The case was such in the other requests.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not ask for these requests unless they are cleared. The note which was sent to me indicated that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], had cleared this request.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Abbitt	Green, Oreg.	Reffel
Anderson, Ill.	Hanna	Rivers, Alaska
Ayres	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
Burleson	Harvey, Ind.	Roncalio
Casey	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Colmer	Kelly	Roudebush
Conyers	King, Calif.	Staggers
Corman	Laird	Stubblefield
Delaney	McDowell	Sweeney
Dent	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Mathias	Toll
Dwyer	Matthews	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Moeller	Utt
Feighan	Multer	Walker, Miss.
Flynt	Murray	Weiter
Fuqua	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Gialmo	Powell	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 777 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 777

*Resolved*, That, for the purposes of the studies and investigations specified in clause (1) and clause (7) of H. Res. 19, Eighty-ninth Congress, approved by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to send fifteen of its members and six of its employees, three from the majority staff and three from the minority staff, to be divided into three special subcommittees: to investigate refugee matters, to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and to attend the fifteenth session of the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and to attend the twenty-seventh session of the Executive Committee and the twenty-fifth session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operation of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. Each subcommittee is authorized to sit and act whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary: *Provided*, That the subcommittee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee

shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation, if furnished by public carrier; or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the travel resolutions, which is the ordinary and usual thing that the House grants to the Committee on the Judiciary in order to take such trips as may be necessary in the performance of their duties with respect to certain matters coming under their jurisdiction in connection with the foreign countries, such as immigration, and various and sundry matters.

It is the usual resolution.

Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to make any statement?

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

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, has explained, this is the standard procedure under the rules laid down by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 777 authorizes funds for the Judiciary Committee to "inspect, study, and observe" the overseas operations of three subjects which are within the committee's jurisdiction: refugee matters, European migration, and the Submerged Lands Act.

While it may be useful for the committee to investigate matters overseas, I think that we should consider the committee's obligation to investigate certain matters here at home.

I am referring, of course, to the operation of the Civil Rights Acts and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In the view of the Judiciary Committee, submerged lands have continued to warrant a special subcommittee. Are we to tell the people of the United States that the protection of their civil rights warrant less?

In the view of the Judiciary Committee, refugee matters, European migration, and the Submerged Lands Act warrant the expense and time of 3 over-

seas trips by 15 Members of Congress. Are we to tell the people of the United States that civil rights and voting rights warrant less time and expense?

My admiration for the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my friend and colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER], is immense. His leadership has been instrumental in the enactment of civil rights legislation.

Surely he, and the other distinguished members of his committee, must fully recognize the need to oversee the monumental legislation which they have passed.

The responsibility of this body to scrutinize the operation of the Voting Rights Act was emphasized time and again in the historic debate over the seating of the Mississippi congressional delegation last September. This point was emphasized both by those who supported the challenge and by those who opposed it. Indeed, it was even underlined in the report of the House Administration Committee. The committee report recommended that "the House should make every effort to scrutinize with great care all future elections."

Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts are not being fully enforced. Members who are concerned with the effective implementation of civil rights legislation often act on an ad hoc basis, as we did 2 weeks ago when members of the civil rights steering committee of the Democratic study group met with the Attorney General to discuss the progress of voter registration in Sunflower County, Miss. Such matters should be under investigation by a properly constituted committee of this House with subpoena power and a full staff.

In our meeting with the Attorney General, we brought certain salient facts to his attention, which raise questions which it will take a full-fledged committee investigation to attempt to answer.

For example, at the end of December there were Federal examiners in only 18 of Mississippi's 82 counties. Presumably these counties were the hard core of resistance and voter intimidation. Yet by the end of December a much higher percentage of Negroes were registered in those counties than in counties without Federal examiners.

Mr. Speaker, three-quarters of the counties in Mississippi remain untouched by Federal examiners. And in those counties—which will soon have primaries for the very Congressmen who were challenged in 1965—a very low percentage of the Negroes are registered to vote.

It is the responsibility of this body to understand the reasons for the tardy progress of the Voting Rights Act throughout most of Mississippi. The Attorney General maintains that civil rights groups should carry the burden of getting citizens registered in the South. If this is so, then a committee of this House should ascertain what plans they have and what obstacles they have encountered in voter registration drives.

The Attorney General further maintains that the Voting Rights Act has been mainly successful in urban areas of the South. He suggests that it may take

a long time for it to take full root in rural communities. If this is so, then a committee of this House should question citizens and officials of rural counties to find out what retards voter registration in those communities.

The need for a committee to oversee the operation of the Voting Rights Act is distressingly clear. It is no less important to investigate the implementation of other civil rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised these questions because I do not believe we should adopt this resolution on investigations abroad without discussing the needs for the Judiciary Committee to conduct investigations and hearings in civil rights in the South and other parts of this Nation. If there is any doubt about the power of the committee to do so, or if there is a need for further congressional authorization, I urge the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to take whatever action is necessary to establish a functioning subcommittee to deal with these matters.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 756, that the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution may continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN], and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 756, with Mr. HECHLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today House Resolution 756 to disapprove President Johnson's first reorganization plan of 1966. The President's plan and our procedure here are in accord with the Reorganization Act of 1949 which we have repeatedly extended and is now in effect until December 31, 1968. That act gives to the President the authority to submit reorganization plans to the Congress which take effect 60 days after submission unless either House in its wisdom passes a disapproval resolution. The purpose of this act was to expedite action on certain executive reorganizations which would have the following purposes:

First, to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business; second, to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government; third, to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable; fourth, to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes; fifth, to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 was transmitted to the Congress by President Johnson on February 10, and in accordance with the rules was referred to the Committees on Government Operations of both the House and Senate. Disapproval resolutions were subsequently filed—13 in the House and 1 in the Senate. Hearings were conducted on the plan and the resolutions and in due course the committees acted. In the Senate the committee supported the plan and its action was ratified after debate by the full Senate on April 6. The Committee on Government Operations in the House likewise supported the plan and recommends that the House uphold the President and not agree to the resolutions of disapproval.

The plan provides for the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice and all of its functions are to be transferred to the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service was created by title 10 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 "to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such

disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever, in its judgment, peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate State or local official or other interested person."

The Service was headed by former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, who served with distinction until he was appointed Under Secretary of Commerce. It was originally located in the Department of Commerce on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising in the area of public accommodations. According to the President, the need is not as great now due to the voluntary progress made by business organizations.

There are 67 persons presently employed by the Service and its fiscal 1966 appropriation is \$1 million. The Attorney General has announced that if the transfer is completed its personnel will be increased to 100 and its budget to \$2 million.

In his message submitting the plan the President stated that the transfer was "a further step for strengthening the operations and coordination of our civil rights programs." "The Justice Department," he said, "has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes." It will insure that "the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist." The President also pointed out:

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

The proposed transfer of the Community Relations Service had its genesis in a Government-wide reorganization of civil rights activities the President has undertaken. These changes were based on a study made for the President by Vice President HUMPHREY.

In an exchange of memorandums on September 24, 1965, the Vice President recommended and the President concurred in the transfer of the Community Relations Service from its present position in the Department of Commerce to its proposed position in the Department of Justice. To carry out this recommendation, the President transmitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 to the Congress on February 10, 1966.

In his message, the President recounted the steps taken on September 24, 1965. On that day he issued Executive Order No. 11246 which simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies. The order placed coordination responsibility in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors, and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

On that same day he issued Executive Order No. 11247, directing the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which title prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As the President also emphasized in his message of February 10, Congress had previously recognized and assigned to the Department of Justice a major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

At the subcommittee hearings, the Attorney General testified at length on the civil rights activities of the Department of Justice. He related that better than 50 percent of his personal time is spent on civil rights matters, making it clear that the nerve center of civil rights activity in the executive branch of the Government is in the Department of Justice. The Director of the Community Relations Service and a number of national civil rights organizations expressed their support for the reorganization plan.

An unbiased reading of the transcript of the subcommittee's hearings compels the conclusion that the transfer should be approved. In addition to the considerations I have previously mentioned, we must not forget that the principal Cabinet officer to whom the President, agencies of Government, and the public look for advice and judgment on civil rights issues is the Attorney General. We must not forget that the Attorney General represents the other Cabinet officers in litigation resulting from their activities and is therefore knowledgeable with respect to housing, employment, school, and other matters and in a position better than any other Cabinet officer to perform the coordinating functions which will be required following the transfer.

The principal objections to the proposed transfer are not persuasive.

Among them is the suggestion that the Community Relations Service should be made an independent agency in the Executive Office of the President or transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It appears to me, as it did to the majority of the Government Operations Committee, that independent status in the Executive Office of the President would not only continue an undesirable proliferation but would result in the Service having little direct access to the President, dealing primarily with Presidential assistants. Such fragmentation of the Federal civil rights efforts would be directly contrary to present-day thinking with respect to effective organizational structures.

As for transfer to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that Department is concerned primarily with housing problems; the interests and activities of the Service are much broader. They cover areas of direct concern not only to HUD but HEW, Labor, Agriculture, and others.

A second major objection is based on the requirement of section 1003(b) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that the activities of the Community Relations Service "shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall

hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held." My recollection of the events of 1964 and my review of the testimony adduced at the current hearings bring me to the conclusion that the proposed transfer is consistent with the statutory requirement of confidentiality. As the Attorney General testified, there is no agency of Government which has occasion to receive more confidential information or has a better reputation for maintaining confidences.

As for the argument that the functions of conciliation and law enforcement are incompatible, I can only say that the daily work of the Department of Justice always requires conciliation, mediation, and negotiation expertise. This is the nature of law work, as every attorney knows.

Further, as was pointed out in our hearings, in 28 States conciliation and enforcement functions in the civil rights field are now lodged in a single agency.

Note should also be taken that the substantive law which governs the Service, title X of the 1964 act, will remain unchanged and the Department of Justice will continue to operate pursuant to its provisions. The Congress has been assured that the Service will retain its separate identity, and will be accorded status equivalent to that of the major divisions of the Department, with the Director having access directly to the Attorney General.

There are no subtleties or hidden motives in this plan. It neither adds to nor detracts from the powers which Congress had already given to the Community Relations Service and to the Attorney General. It is an intensely practical means by which the President is providing more effective coordination for a vital Government program.

I urge the House to uphold President Johnson's Reorganization Plan No. 1 and defeat the disapproval resolution by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Wisconsin has hit upon an excellent point about which I would like to ask a question. In the States that the gentleman has mentioned which already have community relations facilities and commissions so that they already are trying to work out peacefully these community relations, none of them is in the prosecutor's office. These agencies on the State and local levels are all independent. So, at the State and community level we do not put this function in a prosecutor's office or attorney general's office generally.

The second point is this: If we should move the agency over to the Department of Justice, might we be emphasizing the disputes that occur in putting the questions in the civil rights areas of reference when as a matter of fact conciliation is

broader than that? The questions might be much broader than just the civil rights questions. Where everybody says the conciliation is being well done where it is in the U.S. Department of Commerce, why make the change?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman's inquiry represents two questions. I shall try to answer them in order.

The first point made is that in most States the enforcement activities of the civil rights agency are not centered in the State attorneys general. This is perfectly correct. But the point I make is this—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The point I make is that in each of those States the enforcement agency and the conciliation agency is in the same office. For instance, in my State of Wisconsin we have a State industrial commission which is the enforcement agency and which goes into court and obtains injunctions and other extraordinary processes in order to secure fair employment. Also, it is a conciliation agency. In other words, it wears two hats.

There should be not the slightest inconsistency between lodging the enforcement powers and the conciliation powers within the same agency.

The second point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that there is something somehow imperfect about lodging conciliation and enforcement functions in the same agency. This was an argument which the majority of the House Committee on Government Operations duly pondered, after listening to the testimony on this particular point. We came to the considered conclusion that far from being imperfect, it makes abundant administrative sense to lodge all civil rights activities in the same agency. The fact is that increasingly in recent years the Attorney General has found himself in the conciliation business, not just in civil rights actions, but in an entire variety of aspects of his business. We find that it is wholesome and healthy that they be lodged in the same agency.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge adoption of the pending resolution disproving Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly believe that at a time when the Congress should be considering pending legislation to provide additional needed reforms in the areas of civil rights—for example, bills pending which would help provide protection of the selection of juries and so forth—it is unfortunate that this action which is about to be taken here today in my opinion is a step backward insofar as the cause of civil rights is concerned.

The Community Relations Service established in 1964 must be an aid and an assistance to the communities and to individuals within communities in the

peaceful and voluntary settlement of racial differences and racial disputes.

Many racial disputes are either not subject to legal redress or cannot be resolved effectively through the force of law.

We need and we have in the existing Community Relations Service a voluntary conciliation and mediation agency which has the status to gain and to keep the respect and confidence of the individuals with whom it must deal.

Oftentimes, disputes and differences of this kind can be settled and tensions eased in a peaceful manner—but only if the people with whom the agency deals have this confidence and respect.

I would say on the basis of information that has come to my attention that the existing Community Relations Service has done a rather outstanding job in community after community. Conciliators of the Service have entered strife torn situations and have been able to get people together, talking as equals, and they have been successful in large measure in resolving some of the very difficult situations.

As it was first conceived, to be sure, the Community Relations Service was expected to engage primarily in problems relating to desegregation of places of public accommodation. Actually, the cause of civil rights and the problems in the civil rights area are much broader than that. The Service has been called upon to expand its areas of interest and has been active in a much broader respect.

It has been called upon to resolve disputes in some 205 cities in all parts of the Nation.

It has been required to deal and has dealt ably with the problems of public accommodations, school desegregation, public facilities, housing, law enforcement, and employment and voter registration.

But I should like to emphasize, there is no question that the availability and performance of the Service—and its ability to help safeguard the rights of individuals—has been predicated in large part upon its ability to gain and to keep the confidence of the individuals with whom it must deal.

In creating this Service in 1964, the Congress was convinced that effective conciliation could best be accomplished in an atmosphere free of coercion or even the possibility of fear of coercion.

It is my opinion this important principle will be eroded if the Service is transferred and made a part of the Department of Justice which also directs, for example, the work of the FBI.

The late President Kennedy urged that the functions of the prosecutor be kept separate from the functions of the conciliation service.

Many of the sponsors of the Service in this House and the other body made similar pleas at the time in 1964.

Nothing has occurred, in my opinion, which would justify us now to disregard the wise counsel which President Kennedy and Attorney General KENNEDY gave us with respect to this important principle.

It is argued that the Service should be transferred to the Department of Justice in order to assist better the Attorney General in coordinating civil rights activities within the Federal Government. However, the testimony of the Attorney General and the Director of the Community Relations Service before the committee indicated that effective coordination already exists and, in any event, such coordination as is needed can be accomplished through Executive orders, interagency agreements, or in other ways that do not jeopardize or sacrifice the independence of this Community Relations Service.

It is argued that the proposed transfer is necessary in order to eliminate duplication of duties performed by the Service and the Department of Justice. While it may be true that both agencies deal to some extent with the same general problems in the civil rights area, it ought to be abundantly clear that every one of the functions and the role of the Community Relations Service and the Department of Justice are altogether different in their nature.

The Community Relations Service seeks to achieve voluntary cooperation and agreement without the use or threat of legal coercion. On the other hand, the Department of Justice, no matter how much it might seek on a voluntary basis to conciliate, still has that overriding force of law and the threat of the enforcement power when it deals with individuals in this area. This difference in functions was expressed by the spokesman for the Community Relations Service itself in its first annual report, where it was stated:

The conciliator makes it clear to everyone with whom he speaks (a) his mandate is to help bring voluntary compliance with Federal laws pertaining to discrimination; (b) he has no power of legal coercion, only the tools of persuasion and reason; (c) he works in confidence as required by title 10.

The important reference in this report to confidentiality brings me to the final reason for opposing this transfer. The 1964 Civil Rights Act requires that information which is received in confidence by the Community Relations Service should be held in confidence, and that employees of the Service are not to engage in investigative or prosecutive functions. However, during the committee hearings there was testimony indicating that this important principle is already being eroded to some extent, and to the extent that this is the case, I think it is altogether unfortunate.

There is a parallel, I would suggest, between the situation we have here and the machinery which exists in the labor-management field for dealing with such disputes. We have the Mediation and Conciliation Service, which is an independent agency of the Government without enforcement powers, which deals on a confidential basis with parties that are involved in labor-management disputes.

When it comes to enforcement in this area, people look to the National Labor Relations Board, or if criminal sanctions are involved, to the Department of Justice. I think the principle has proved to be a sound one in labor-management af-

fairs, and I would suggest in this difficult and important area of civil rights that we should keep these functions separate, and I hope that today the House will not vote to take a step backward in this great cause of civil rights.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished and beloved Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to note that the Congress has entrusted to the Department of Justice a major responsibility for administration and enforcement of existing civil rights laws. We have reaffirmed our faith and confidence in the Department of Justice in each successive civil rights enactment. No convincing reason is suggested why, at this time, the jurisdiction of the Department should not be enlarged to encompass the Community Relations Service.

In addition, what do civil rights leaders who are sensitive to effective civil rights enforcement say about this transfer?

They have said publicly that this change is appropriate and proper. The AFL-CIO, who are very much interested in the civil rights movement, have likewise come forward and approved this change.

What is the history of the Community Relations Service? It was originally part of the administration's civil rights proposal in 1963. The Judiciary Committee struck it out.

The civil rights bill in 1964 came before this House without the provision therein. The gentleman from South Carolina, my very distinguished friend, BOB ASHMORE, offered a motion to put the Community Relations Service back into the bill. Both the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, and I agreed to accept the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina, because we believed that it would be appropriate. It became title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—Public Law 88-352—which established the Community Relations Service and placed it in the Department of Commerce. A basic assumption of the Congress was that the primary role of the service would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of title II of the act, dealing with public accommodations, such as hotels, motels, restaurants, and the like. It seemed good sense to utilize the good offices of the Department of Commerce headed at that time by the distinguished former Governor of North Carolina, Luther Hodges, to mobilize the business community and others in support of title II. The widespread acceptance of the public accommodations provisions by private businesses, however, exceeded many of the most optimistic predictions and substantially lessened the need for conciliation of disputes in that area. Thereupon, the Community Relations Service undertook a number of other productive efforts in the field of race relations.

The President and the Vice President of the United States, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and

the Director of the Community Relations Service, all are agreed that the transfer of the Service to the Department of Justice will improve administration and will "permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower."—President's message of February 10, 1966.

It is also highly significant and should be recognized that leaders of major civil rights groups support the transfer envisioned by the reorganization plan—AFL-CIO.

I need hardly remind my colleagues that changes in circumstances often require changes in the organization of our institutions. The transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice will enable the Federal Government more efficiently and effectively to focus on the pressing civil rights problems that require remedy. The transfer will accomplish the centralization of major Federal efforts aimed at voluntary and peaceful elimination of discriminatory practices. The transfer should thereby enlarge the capacities of both the Service and the Department of Justice to fulfill their present responsibilities in the area of civil rights.

Any fear that combining enforcement and conciliation within the same agency will inhibit public confidence or cast a prosecutorial shadow over the Service should be dispelled by the experience of 28 States that presently combine these functions in one agency.

Mr. Chairman, I support the reorganization plan submitted to the Congress and I urge my colleagues to support the report of the Committee on Government Operations disapproving a measure which would disapprove the plan.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, originally I opposed the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Department of Justice. My opinion was motivated to a large degree by the opinion of the then Attorney General of the United States, ROBERT KENNEDY, and what I understood to be the feelings of the responsible and accredited leaders of the civil rights movement in the United States.

I was certainly persuaded too, by the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as it related to the Community Relations Service which provided "no officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service."

It would seem to me, too, that conciliation is separate and a part from prosecution and that these two should as far as possible be separated in order to give freedom of discussion in the conciliating process. I find it difficult to believe that those involved in conciliation can discuss with the same freedom matters in dispute if they recognize that the same Department might at a later date act in the role as prosecutor. Very frankly, however, it does not seem to me vital as to which department of the Government

the Community Relations Service is assigned. The important matter is the way it works wherever it is located. The Community Relations Service can indeed perform a most useful service and is in my judgment vitally needed. I have had many dealings with the Department of Justice and have great confidence in the present Attorney General whom I have come to know on a personal basis. I, therefore, respect his opinion when he indicates that experience over the past 2 years is persuasive of the need to transfer the activities of this Service to Justice. I am, also, impressed by the feelings of respected and responsible civil rights leaders, such as Roy Wilkins, who now believe that the transfer will aid better implementation of the civil rights law. These are the people who have had direct contact and actual experience with the realities of the law. I would, however, point out the inherent danger in associating the conciliation service with that arm of the Government authorized to investigate and prosecute and urge upon all who are responsible full compliance with the law and the intent of the Congress in enacting the law.

Even though I have reservations, I shall support the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice and will, therefore, vote against the resolution.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should start with consideration of the history of the Community Relations Service.

The Community Relations Service was created a mere 2 years ago as part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It has been indicated here that there may have been some question at the time as to whether to house it in one agency or in another, but I submit, although I was not a Member of this body at that time, after an examination of the record, it is clear an early determination was made that the Community Relations Service did not belong in the Department of Justice. Then the question was, where should it be housed?

There was some consideration given to putting it in the Executive Office of the President. Also, consideration was given to placing it in the Department of Commerce, because of the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill.

I find myself here today supporting the position of our late beloved President, John Kennedy, and of his brother, ROBERT KENNEDY, who was Attorney General at the time.

I should like to quote their statements concerning the placing of the Community Relations Service, or any similar agency, in the Department of Justice.

President Kennedy, in his message of June 1963, said:

In some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from department functions of investigation or litigation.

In other words, that is a clear rejection of the idea of housing the Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice.

The then Attorney General, ROBERT KENNEDY, in testifying on this section of the bill, stated:

But our [Department of Justice's] responsibility really is the enforcement of the law and to see the statutes enforced. We have gotten into this [conciliation] because there has not been any other group to do it. I think it would be better if that responsibility was taken from us and put over into another department.

Clearly he was saying at that time they were engaged in some conciliatory process, but he thought this was the wrong place for this process to be carried on, and urged the Congress at that time to place this in a separate agency apart from the Department of Justice.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is the gentleman aware that the present Senator from New York, the then Attorney General, voted in support of this reorganization plan in the Senate only a short time ago?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Frankly, I had not taken a reading as to who voted in what fashion there, but I am happy to try to place the former Attorney General, now a Senator, in a position of maintaining consistency, if I can.

In addition, the Department of Justice shortly after the passage of the bill in the House issued an analysis of the bill. I should like to quote from that. The Department of Justice at that time indicated its position, in answer to the question:

Why not leave these duties (those of the Community Relations Service) up to the Justice Department?

This is the answer given by the Department of Justice:

Answer. The Department has, in individual cases, attempted to work along this line, as necessary on an emergency basis. But a mediating agency, separate from the Department of Justice, whose duties are chiefly investigation and litigation, would be preferable.

Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Chairman, this is what we are saying today—exactly what the President and the then Attorney General of the Department of Justice said 2 years ago. In 2 years, a short time, I am not certain there has been anything in the history of the Community Relations Service to prove their judgment wrong.

Now, how about the history of this Reorganization Plan No. 1? The distinguished chairman of the committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER] stated that this reorganization plan is supported by the civil rights groups. He said, who better to make a determination of where this could best be housed or served? Now, let me call your attention to the fact that there was no demand or request made by any civil rights group for this transfer prior to the proposed reorganization plan. Secondly, when the reorganization plan was filed, the immediate reaction of the civil rights groups was opposed to it and not in favor of it. In the hearings the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], put in the RECORD an article from, I believe, the

Washington Star for February 10, 1966, and I quote this article from the RECORD:

Opponents of the reorganization plan, including some civil rights organizations, have expressed concern that the agency would lose much of its effectiveness by being placed in the prosecuting arm of the Justice Department. Wilkins' appointment is believed to have diluted much of the original opposition to the shift.

So the fact is that most of the civil rights groups were opposed until the announcement was made, subsequent to the filing of the reorganization plan, that Mr. Roger Wilkins would be appointed the head of this and made Assistant Attorney General.

At that time the civil rights groups did not switch to being in favor of the plan but merely became silent and acquiescent. Further, when these hearings were held there was not one civil rights group to come before the committee and testify in opposition to our resolution of disapproval. Not one civil rights group came before our subcommittee and testified in favor of the President's reorganization plan. It was interesting, however, that there was one civil rights group that testified in favor of the resolution of disapproval. This was the organization composed of the officers and the employees and the people who work within in civil rights groups and community relations groups and so forth. With this lack of support from the civil rights groups, it was interesting, however, some 3 days later that there was a meeting at the White House attended by some of the leaders of these groups and that very night and the next morning telegrams were received by our committee and telegrams were inserted in the RECORD making statements favorable to the President's position on the reorganization plan. So we now find the civil rights groups not on two sides of this question but on three—opposed, neutral, and now in favor.

In the hearings before our committee it was distressing to many of us to learn the interpretation that has been put on the Civil Rights Act as far as the question of confidentiality of the information received by conciliators in the performance of their duties. I submit that had this Congress known at the time the 1964 Civil Rights Act was adopted, the interpretation that would be put upon this section relating to confidentiality, they would not have enacted this section and would not have approved the Community Relations Service.

The present Director of the Community Relations Service, Mr. Wilkins, at my request put into the record the opinion of the chief counsel of that service interpreting the question of confidentiality as set forth in the 1964 act. Here is what they have interpreted this to mean:

Information acquired in the regular performance of the agency's duties, and conciliation activities of the agency in general may be revealed in confidence to members of other Federal agencies, where such disclosure will serve the purpose of coordination with such agencies to accomplish the mission of CRS. The same is true, but with greater necessity

for caution, in dealing with State agencies and with private associations.

I submit that under this interpretation the individual who may be a member of a civil rights group, who is engaged in a conciliation procedure, would have a proper fear, if he revealed he was not quite so strong in his feelings for the civil rights movement, that the Community Relations Service could under this interpretation in confidence reveal this to the civil rights group that he belonged to, because the counsel of the Community Relations Service has said that this information, though received in confidence and to be treated as in confidence, may be turned over not only to Federal and State agencies but to private associations.

So, we are not just talking about businessmen who may fear this lack of confidentiality.

Mr. Chairman, anyone dealing with the Community Relations Service, upon reading this interpretation, should have a real fear of revealing anything to the Community Relations Service.

Mr. Chairman, I believe they have done a great deal of harm to the cause of civil rights in seeking and ultimately acquiring an opinion of this sort.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, it might be the so-called red-necked sheriff who is given this information. As a member of the local or State agency who could be given the information acquired by the Community Relations Service, how would a member of a civil rights group or minority group involved in the civil rights movement feel, if he knew any information he revealed to the Community Relations Service could be turned over to the red-necked sheriff who has been wielding the bludgeon in opposition to his fight for civil rights?

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this could be said to be only speculation. But I submit the opinion sought and acquired by the Community Relations Service and the fact that they now presently turn this information over to the Federal agency, has the result of causing the real fear that these other situations could occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, one of the phoniest arguments that has been advanced in support of this transfer to the Department of Justice is that there are some 28 States that already have agencies dealing with the conciliation and the enforcement processes.

Mr. Chairman, at first blush, this represents a pretty good argument. It makes it appear that we are going along with the majority of the States in this reorganization plan.

However, upon examination of those who used this quotation in our hearings, we find that they are not talking about community relations groups within the community, they are not talking about the Governor's commission on human relations, they are not talking about the sort of community relations groups about which President Kennedy talked in the same message in which he recommended the creation of the Community Relations

Service to cooperate with the State and local agencies; they, instead, when one goes deeper into this, are talking about fair employment practices commissions. They are talking about fair housing commissions, official commissions of the States and local communities which are charged by law with enforcement of a particular statute.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the purpose of the Community Relations Service. Thus, what we are seeking to accomplish is to keep them divorced from one another so that a comparison between an FEPC and a fair housing commission charged by law, is not a fair comparison with the Community Relations Service. Let us compare it with those other commissions; they are those which President Kennedy said should be working with the citizens groups trying to create good will among groups within their community.

However, we find that none of these are charged with enforcement; none of them are housed within any enforcement agency.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], used this argument and will probably agree that the community relations group in Milwaukee, for instance, is not housed within the Attorney General's office or the State's attorney's office. But, perhaps, the Fair Employment Practices Commission does have enforcement procedures. However, this is not a fair comparison.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, we believe, we who have introduced the resolution of disapproval, that the Service would not have been established in 1964 were it to have been located in the Department of Justice, had that proposal been in the bill at that time.

Congress recognized at that time that many problems involving racial disputes were not subject to legal redress and were too subtle and intangible to be handled by legal action.

Congress also recognized in many cases more effective results could be obtained if disputes were settled on a voluntary basis.

In order to accomplish these results, mutual respect and trust must be developed among the races. This cannot be done at the point of a gun. This feeling between the races and between minority groups cannot be accomplished at the point of a gun or by a subpoena or with the filing of a legal action.

The Congress believed that an independent conciliation service divorced from law enforcement agencies would have the greatest success in encouraging the races to resolve these problems by voluntary means.

We also believe the Congress would not have established the Service if it thought that all information obtained by the service would be made available to law enforcement agencies or private groups.

The only restraint practiced by the Community Relations Service today in their cases is that they are not published by any newspaper. That is the only restraint they impose upon themselves.

These decisions as to who should get it are not even made by the head of the

department, or by the Secretary of Commerce. They are not made by the head of the agency, Mr. Wilkins. They are made at a lower level as Mr. Wilkins testified before our committee.

By undermining its influence and effectiveness, we sadly predict that some day in the future we are going to have the majority party coming back here with a proposal to create another agency like the Community Relations Service independent of the law enforcement agency. We predict this is going to destroy whatever effectiveness the Community Relations Service has left, and we are going to have to seek another agency of like kind divorced from the Department of Justice some time in the future.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

**MR. REUSS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 2 minutes.

**MR. PUCINSKI.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 and in opposition to the motion which would disapprove it.

I would like to congratulate and commend the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the dean of the Illinois delegation for bringing this reorganization plan to the House.

This plan is so completely logical that I am at a complete loss to understand why anybody would oppose it.

The gentleman speaking earlier had made mention of statements made by President Kennedy and others when this agency was created, which would indicate the agency should remain in Commerce. I think an answer has been adequately made by the committee report where on page 9, it clearly states "the need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because voluntary progress has been made by businessmen and business organizations."

Placing this agency under the Department of Justice is logical. The department now is charged with responsibility of enforcing all of title VI of the civil rights act and various other provisions of the act. In proposing this transfer to Justice, the committee says it will result in considerable savings to the Government. What greater incentive do we need to support this transfer to Justice?

Mr. Chairman, I said I wanted to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the dean of the Illinois delegation, for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. This is another milestone in Congressman Dawson's long and illustrious record of fighting for the dignity of man.

In his quiet but persuasive manner, BILL DAWSON has played a greater role in giving living meaning to the great promise of America—the promise that every American is entitled to equality—than perhaps any other Member of the Congress of the United States.

In every single step we have made in the great revolution of the sixties to give all Americans equal opportunities and

human dignity. Congressman DAWSON has played a major and key role.

I believe this legislation reflects again his deep concern to make sure that every single American has an opportunity to share in the great promise of our land.

This legislation will give greater meaning to the work and the service that has been done so far, and because of this, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the House should approve this reorganization plan.

I am sure that when history passionately records the great progress made in the 1960's in bringing human dignity and respect to all Americans, the name of BILL DAWSON will be indelibly inscribed on those history pages for the great work and the great effort he has made in the field of civil rights. He has won the respect of the entire Congress on both sides of the aisle because of his deep and abiding dedication to the principle of human freedom and dignity. He has given the entire Congress a new sense of direction and urgency in breaking down bigotry and discrimination. Yes, Mr. Chairman, Congressman DAWSON has written his name in indelible letters across the pages of American history in his stubborn defense of civil rights. Time will record BILL DAWSON's magnificent contribution as one of the landmarks of democracy's struggle toward the fulfillment of our dreams as free Americans. BILL DAWSON's epitaph shall read: He has charted the freedom and equality of man.

**MR. ERLENBORN.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

**MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.** Mr. Chairman, the relocation of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice will be a sharp step backward in the cause of human rights. I respectfully urge my colleagues not to permit the President to take that step. I urge you to vote "aye" on the resolution of disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

In the past dozen years since the historic decision by our Nation's chief legal body, much progress has been made in the extension of civil rights to all Americans—although slowly and often painfully. The conscience of the Nation has been stirred and a large body of law has been passed which is being implemented—also more slowly and painfully than many of us like to see.

The Department of Justice has properly pressed for the enforcement of these new laws and suggested other laws which may be helpful in stimulating progress in the civil rights field. Wisely, it has frequently chosen to negotiate with violators of civil rights laws to bring about voluntary compliance in order to avoid expensive, slow, and bitter legal action. Such voluntary compliance often makes a resister into an advocate. As in other fields of human relations, converts frequently become more militant advocates than birthright believers.

The opportunity for the Justice Department to negotiate law violations in civil rights disputes has in no way been limited by the current separation of the Community Relations Service from Jus-

tice, and Justice's ability to enforce civil rights laws will in no way be enhanced by this proposed transfer. On the contrary, the work done so effectively in the past by the Community Relations Service stands to be adversely affected and the opportunities for it to act and make breakthroughs in the future will be severely reduced, if not eliminated entirely.

The civil rights law enforcement division of the Department of Justice can now negotiate a matter of law before the ultimate legal steps are taken. So can the Community Relations Service.

But, the Community Relations Service can now conciliate nonillegal violations of human rights in the areas of personal relationship and human understanding in ways in which the Department of Justice never can.

The Community Relations Service can now deal with matters of human rights, subtle discrimination, nonillegal denial of civil or human rights and the many other aspects of this deep-rooted human problem which are not covered by law and which no law Congress can write may ever be able to reach.

The voluntary associations and groups in our Nation which have been leaders in the civil or human rights movement in recent years were quick to recognize this subtle but important distinction when the move of Community Relations Service out of Commerce and into Justice was initially proposed, and they quickly argued against it. One by one, these voices of opposition to the President's proposal have been stilled, however. Many individual civil rights leaders still oppose it privately, even after the administration has used its most eloquent and telling arguments to win them to its view.

One reason for my opposition to the move of the Community Relations Service from Commerce to Justice lies in concern over the provision for confidentiality which was written into title 10 of the original law establishing the Community Relations Service. This provision allowed that information gathered by Community Relations Service conciliators should not, could not, and would not be revealed to the public or to other agencies, and thus could not form the basis for future legal actions by the Department of Justice or recriminations from elsewhere in the community.

Thus, a civil rights worker and an opponent of civil rights could each feel free to talk to the Community Relations Service conciliator without fear of some future legal or extra-legal retribution at the hands of Government or any other agency. The Community Relations Service was to be a friend, an understanding listener, a father-confessor to both sides. Each side of a dispute over illegal or nonillegal denials of human rights could feel free to tell all to the Community Relations Service worker in confidence—and confidently in confidence—knowing that this free and open discussion of their deepest feelings and most secret actions would not be revealed either to the public or to some public prosecutor.

And from this base of mutual confidence in the Community Relations Service worker, that worker and the two antagonists could start building some kind of mutual understanding and confidence which would see the hate, or mistrust, or disagreement, or confusion ultimately rooted out, and mutually satisfactory progress made toward an ultimate solution.

If you were a civil rights militant who had broken some Federal law in the process of relieving your frustrations, would you feel free in telling all to some representative of the Department of Justice—the very agency charged with the prosecution of Federal crimes? Not if you had read pages 102 to 105 of the hearings of this proposed transfer, you would not. Or if you were an opponent of progress in the civil rights field and thought you might be violating an existing law, would you feel confident in discussing your feelings and actions freely with a Community Relations Service worker whose boss was the Attorney General of the United States? Not if you had heard the testimony of the new Director of the Community Relations Service, you would not. He said:

Where we were given information about the commission of a crime, or the prospective commission of a crime, what our duty would be, as officers of the Government, would be pretty clear \*\*\* to disclose such information to the Attorney General of the United States.

If we dispose of the Community Relations Service by submerging it in the Justice Department, how can nonillegal violations of human rights be resolved in the future? Is there any Federal agency which can resolve the problems of both sides in such nonillegal disputes with the complete confidence of both sides, such as the Community Relations Service operating in the Department of Commerce is now designed to do?

And what of another very important area—progress in the field of economic opportunity? The prospect for making progress in this area by a Community Relations Service operating in the Department where business and industry feel most comfortable is self-evident. And this economic area, vital as it is to the progress of members of the minority groups in the field of human rights, is not the only area where the Community Relations Service can encourage giant strides in nonillegal violations of human rights. Just by encouraging recognition of the vast accomplishments of persons in minority groups much progress can be made in the destruction of old biases. There is a great undeveloped potential in this area—a potential which will never be brought about by enforcement of any law.

There are many areas where civil rights or human rights can be denied by subtleties of many different kinds. Real progress in the civil rights or human rights field can be made if minority groups can make progress in economic, social, and other fields of public recognition. These are the very areas where rights can be easily denied with greatest subtlety. They are also areas where it is most difficult to legislate ef-

fectively. There are tremendous possibilities on the horizon in such areas for an expanded Community Relations Service if it is not inhibited by the onus of the billy club of a Federal enforcer.

In the past few years we have as a nation taken many legislative steps toward assuring civil rights to all our citizens by legal means, but we still face many areas which are untouched by legal methods and which could forever defy solution by purely legal action. Anyone who has had any interest in the problems of minority groups in the human rights field is aware that it is not always or only a matter of legal action or even negotiation in the light of potential legal action. There are many areas where civil rights can be denied by subtleties of many different kinds. It is these very areas to which a Community Relations Service outside the Department of Justice can be, and should be, the most effective.

The late President Kennedy and others apparently foresaw this when they called for the establishment of the Community Relations Service outside of the Justice Department. Instead of speaking to the past, he spoke to the future where minority groups might still be denied their human rights after all legal means had been exhausted. Even the present Attorney General alluded to this likelihood during our hearings on this reorganization plan. This is the point which concerns many of us on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives today and many members of the Senate with impeccable records of support for civil rights progress. It concerns both Republicans and Democrats—Americans here in Congress and across the country. What we have heard on the proposal to remove the Community Relations Service from Commerce and put it under the Justice Department is a clear and essentially sincere difference of opinion over how civil rights or human rights problems can best be resolved in our Nation. To keep the Community Relations Service in Commerce and out of Justice in no way weakens the opportunity for the Justice Department to do the job within its area of responsibility. The Community Relations Service under Commerce gives the Federal Government an additional arm to approach this problem. Civil rights and human rights in our Nation can be advanced through Federal interest—not without legal means, not in preference to legal means, not in spite of legal means, but in addition to legal means.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote to maintain the Community Relations Service as a separate agency from the law-enforcement agencies of the Department of Justice and vote "aye" on the resolution of disapproval so that the present separate and unique Community Relations Service can be kept in the Department of Commerce where it belongs.

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be associated with the remarks of the gentleman from the

Seventh Congressional District of Ohio. If his father were in the gallery today, he would be pleased and proud, indeed, of his able son.

The gentleman's father was a leader in the field of civil rights legislation, going far back, into the 1940's. But for the actions of his father, it is well known there probably would have been no rule in the matter of civil rights legislation, as there was in 1957, in 1960, in 1964, and in 1965.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio on what I believe is one of his first speeches. I regret that he happens to be on the wrong side in his first major effort.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 and in opposition to the pending resolution. I am convinced Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 should be approved and I urge my colleagues to vote nay on the pending resolution of disapproval.

As I see it, after listening to the debate and after reading the President's message of February 10, the plan, the hearings, and the committee report, the case for the transfer has been made overwhelmingly while only conjecture is offered by the opposition.

The President has centered the responsibility for civil rights matters in the Attorney General. I understand the Attorney General, in carrying out this responsibility, spends better than half of his working time on civil rights matters. He is the Cabinet officer to whom the President, the other agencies of Government, and the people of the United States turn for advice and action on civil rights matters. The Attorney General's responsibilities cross many such areas—schools, public facilities, housing, employment, and a host of others. The conciliation responsibilities of the Service cover these same areas.

The transfer has been recommended by the President, the Vice President, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Community Relations Service and various civil rights organizations. In the light of such support and in the light of the accomplishments of the administration in the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts of the last several years, I believe the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice is right and proper. In its new home the Community Relations Service will play an expanded role, a more vital and a more effective role.

I urge that we show our overwhelming support of the plan by defeating the resolution on which we are about to vote.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee is considering a resolution recommending disapproval of a Presidential reorganization plan. I supported

the Civil Rights Act that created the Community Relations Service, as I have supported all other civil rights legislation since coming to the Congress. The measure before us, however, it seems to me, is a step backward, rather than a step forward. This Service was established in 1964 to assist individuals within communities in resolving racial differences and disputes in a peaceful and voluntary manner. Congress believed that effective conciliation could be hindered if the Service were to be attached to the chief prosecution arm of Government. The late President Kennedy, then Attorney General KENNEDY, and the present Vice President at that time testified that it should be in the Department of Commerce and should definitely not be a part of the Department of Justice. This is the important issue, I think, to be considered.

My good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], who opened the discussion on this important matter, gave three reasons favoring the transfer. He emphasized the importance of coordination within Justice of the activities in civil rights. The question, of course, could come up, why not merge the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and why not merge the Civil Rights Commission with the Department of Justice? Certainly he gave nothing in the way of reasons to offset the compelling arguments against placing the Conciliation Service in the prosecution arm of the Government.

The second point which he raised was the possibility that the Conciliation Service would be considered an orphan in the Department of Commerce. I think this is really no argument at all. Even if it is true—and there is no evidence that this is the case—I think it is better to have it an orphan in the Department of Commerce than to have it merged with the legal arm of the Government.

He also talked about the upgrading of the Conciliation Service. I would suggest that it might better be called a downgrading. Clearly it can be increased in its staff regardless of whether it remains in the Department of Commerce or is placed in the Department of Justice. The size of the staff anticipated has no bearing, I do not believe, on where it will be located. I, too, favor the increase in staff.

I have a great deal of respect for my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and I know if it were possible to make a case for this transfer, he would clearly be the man who could have made it. That the case has not been made I think testifies to the fact that it cannot be made.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] mentioned a meeting at the White House, which I think is significant.

Mr. Chairman, I have an article from the New York Times of Thursday, March 24, 1966, which reports on a meeting at the White House between some civil rights leaders and the President, stating that after a general discussion of matters relating to the civil rights question the group was standing preparatory to leaving when the President brought up the Community Relations Service and

asked for help in bringing about the transfer. The article states:

After a general discussion on matters relating to civil rights, the group was standing to leave when the President brought up the Community Relations Service and asked for help in effecting the transfer. One source said the civil rights leaders had been somewhat surprised at the request, but all had agreed to back the administration.

Civil rights organizations were against the transfer when it was proposed last fall, but active opposition faded after the President appointed Roger W. Wilkins, a Negro, as Director of the Service in December.

Mr. Chairman, I was not at the civil rights meeting at the White House. But, after reading this report, I certainly do not feel that this article gives any clue as to the reasons why these civil rights leaders favor this transfer.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the fact that a relative of a prominent civil rights leader is appointed to head up the Commission is certainly no argument favoring the transfer, and, certainly so, in view of the report of the way in which it was handled at the White House, and the manner in which the civil rights leadership has flip-flopped their position, first in opposition, then a neutral position, and then to a position of support for the transfer.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the lack of argument favoring the transfer, I believe there are some compelling arguments against such transfer.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from Dean Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard University Law School. He is also a Commissioner of the Commission on Civil Rights of the U.S. Government.

In the letter he sets forth his support for civil rights. He sets forth his respect for the Attorney General. But he goes on to say clearly that he opposes it not as a Commissioner, but simply as a citizen concerned with the problems of civil rights and human relations in this country.

He states:

The difficulty is that the Department of Justice is, and rightly so, an investigating, enforcement, and prosecuting agency.

Dean Griswold further states:

In many ways, though, it is a task which is inconsistent with the approach through conciliation, negotiations, and adjustment which has been the function of the Community Relations Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, Dean Griswold goes on to say:

But, we need an agency, too, which can help to keep the fires from starting, and which can take steps which will prevent heated, smoldering situation from bursting into flames. Such an activity requires quiet work behind the scenes. It also requires extensive negotiation under conditions where people can speak freely, and where they will have no thought of eventual prosecution or court proceedings.

Then, Mr. Chairman, Dean Griswold states:

If the Community Relations Service is transferred to the Department of Justice, its

effectiveness will be impaired, not because of any lack of interest or capacity on the part of the Department of Justice, but because the work which the Community Relations Service should be doing is inherently inconsistent with the impression which is bound to be created on people when they deal with the Department of Justice.

Dean Griswold further states:

Lawyers deal with the Department of Justice on a basis of understanding. They know its functions, and they are familiar with the way its people talk. But the Community Relations Service should be dealing largely with people who are not lawyers. Many of them will be apprehensive and restrained if they are asked to deal with an agency in the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, Dean Griswold concludes by saying:

My own thought would be that the Community Relations Service could perform its function better if it were not transferred to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, this letter is dated April 14, 1966.

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I notice the gentleman in reading the letter from Dean Griswold stated in Dean Griswold's words that he was quoting that he was making this statement as an individual and he was not committing the Commission on Civil Rights of which he was a member. Obviously, this is proper because there is no action by the Civil Rights Commission and he was not speaking for them.

I notice that the news article that the gentleman read quoted men who are heads of civil rights organizations. Was there any indication that they made a like disclaimer of speaking for their organizations without formal action; or was there any indication that in these news articles these civil rights leaders did go to their organizational groups to get authority to speak for their organizations?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I know of no indication that the individual civil rights leaders who have expressed support of the transfer have in fact gone through the process of seeking the advice and counsel of their members. I have no knowledge whether they have or have not.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The fact is, if they did not go through that process, then their statements should be considered no more than the statement of an individual who is involved in the civil rights movement; is that not correct?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would certainly think that is an accurate statement.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, the gentleman from Wisconsin attempted to wave away the very difficult questions involved in combining legal and conciliation activities by an anecdote about an Aunt Mabel and something about what a first-year law student ought or ought not to know. I think the anecdote is interesting. I certainly see the point of it in the specific framework in which it was told. But I do not think it is quite this easy. I think there is a more important question here than simply that.

Had there not been an important question, I question whether President Kennedy in his message of June 1963 would have said that:

In some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from department functions of investigation or litigation.

Who else referred to this problem of combining them?

Attorney General KENNEDY did.

So did Vice President HUMPHREY when he said, as a Senator:

It would preserve the confidentiality of information it receives, as such, in the course of its duties.

I question whether the anecdote or the arguments given here by those opposing the resolution sufficiently offset the combined knowledge and background of the people who set the stage for raising this question concerning combining the conciliation and legal activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to oppose the transfer by supporting the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the disapproval resolution and in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, on February 10, 1966, the President transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, which transfers the Community Relations Service, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, from the Commerce Department to the Justice Department. A number of disapproval resolutions have been filed in the House of Representatives which seek to prevent this plan from becoming effective.

Recognizing that the changing times demand invention and innovation, the Congress, in the Reorganization Act of 1946, directed the President to examine, periodically, the organization of all agencies of government so that efficiency might be increased and to reduce the number of executive agencies when necessary "by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head." Recently, I joined a majority of the members of the House Committee on Government Operations in voting to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1, thereby giving effect not only to the objectives of the Reorganization Act but to the basic objective of the Government Operations Committee, which is to oversee the efficiency of Government operations at all levels.

Reorganization Plan No. 1, which provides for the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice, does have the effect of consolidating "under a single head," the Attorney General of the United States, two Government agencies "having similar functions": The establishment of compliance with the civil rights laws of the United States.

There is an adage among lawyers that the true success of an attorney is measured not by the number of courtrooms he can victoriously walk out of, but rather, by how many courtrooms he can keep

his client from walking into. Similarly, the true success of the Department of Justice in the field of civil rights is measured not by the number of court actions won, but by the number of hearts and minds won.

The Department of Justice now has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters. Minority groups and the public look to the Attorney General for legal assistance and moral support.

The Attorney General now has responsibility and great experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Under Executive Order 11247, he coordinates the governmentwide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily upon the achievement of compliance through persuasion and negotiation. As the President has said:

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

The Community Relations Service was placed in the Department of Commerce in 1964 because it was believed, at that time, that it would deal primarily with problems of public accommodations and that being in the Commerce Department it would be in a better position to conciliate with the public on this matter. This expectation is not now being realized. Since there has been far better compliance on public accommodations than had been anticipated, this function has not been the major concern of the Service. Instead, the Service has been spending a great deal more time on other civil rights matters—matters of concern to and within the special knowledge of the Justice Department, such as racial tensions, voting problems, school problems, and other forms of discrimination.

Far from weakening the purposes of the Community Relations Service and confusing the functions of the Department of Justice, the transfer will strengthen immeasurably the resources of the Service and enrich the conciliation efforts of Justice's Civil Rights Division. It is anticipated that the number of personnel in the Service will be increased from about 67 to 100 and the budget raised from \$1.3 million to \$2 million. Moreover, the Attorney General has announced that when the transfer is accomplished the Service will be afforded a status equal to any other branch of the Department of Justice with the Director having the title of Assistant Attorney General, reporting directly to the President's chief adviser and confidant on civil rights matters—the Attorney General.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, to those opponents of the plan who contend that the public will neither trust nor conciliate with a Community Relations Service that is part of a law enforcement agency, I make two points: First, that 28 States have agencies dealing with civil rights in which the enforcement and conciliations functions are combined; second, that the arrows in one talon of the eagle of the United States have never prevented the

peaceloving people of the world from respecting the sincerity of and embracing the other talon which holds the olive branch.

The reorganization plan is a tool which Congress gave the Executive—a managerial tool under a recommendation of independent studies carried out by some of the most eminent Americans of our time, some of whom from both sides of this aisle served on the Hoover Commission.

The minority argument impresses me by its confusion. It has been suggested that there should be an independent agency in the Executive Office of the President.

It has been suggested that maybe the Community Relations Service ought to be transferred to the Housing and Urban Development. Thus some of the minority concede that the CRS ought to be transferred from the Department of Commerce.

Some of the minority are of the opinion that the CRS should not be transferred.

Others in the minority have reservations and doubts about effectiveness of the CRS if it is transferred.

If there is any doubt, it seems to me, in the implementation of the managerial tool which the Congress by law has given to the administration, that doubt should be resolved in favor of the Executive who has requested the use of that tool. Otherwise the work of the Hoover Commission would be meaningless and the words of the Reorganization Act of 1946 would have little meaning when it provided that the President should examine periodically the organization of all agencies of Government so that efficiency may be increased and to reduce the number of executive agencies when necessary "by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head."

It is admitted even by some of the minority that these two Government agencies, the CRS and the Department of Justice, do have similar functions. Basically and fundamentally, the function of both Government departments is the establishment of compliance with the civil rights laws of the United States.

So I reiterate that in order to carry out the objectives of the Hoover Commission reports and the Reorganization Act of 1946, that if there is any doubt in anyone's mind, it ought to be resolved in favor of the Executive who is requesting the use of the managerial tool. The statutory duty of each agency remains unchanged.

It may be interesting from the standpoint of history, to report the feelings, the actions, the deeds, the facts and the basis for acting several years ago by the Executive, President Kennedy. The fact is that we are acting on what is the situation today, and the situation today is that which has been presented by this administration, and President Johnson

Those of the minority who are opposed to transfer of the CRS from the Department of Commerce attempt to rebut the Presidential request for better administration and efficiency in carrying out the fundamental responsibilities under civil rights laws, and maintain that present

procedures are adequate. I quote now from page 33 of the committee report:

From the testimony presented, however, it appeared that effective coordination already existed and any needed improvements could be accomplished by Executive orders, inter-agency agreements, or memorandums of understanding.

This kind of management chaos is exactly what the Hoover Commission in one of its principal recommendations was opposed to; the very reason why the Reorganization Act was enacted; the very reason why we have reorganization plans; and the very reason why we in the Congress have acted on so many of them—to get away from this kind of interagency action, especially where we have the reasonable opportunity to consolidate a fundamental function within a department, and the Chief Executive charged with responsibility for the administration of both agencies makes the request of the Congress, and where there is no change in the substantive law.

So what happened 2 years ago is fine, but I am more concerned with the request that is pending today.

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

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman makes the point that from those on this side of the aisle there have come various suggestions as to where this agency should be housed. But will the gentleman admit that that same question was before the Congress at the time of the adoption of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and at that time—and this time there seems to be unanimity on this side of the aisle—but in 1964 there was unanimity on both sides of the aisle that the function did not belong in the Department of Justice, and that is the question that is before us today, and not where to house it.

Mr. FASCELL. I will agree that the issue today is whether or not the reorganization plan should take effect and whether the Community Relations Service should be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. The only fact I pointed out is the difference of opinion that exists on the minority side with respect to what should be done today.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. The gentleman cites the Hoover Commission Reorganization Plan for the executive branch of the Government in 1946 as a reason for the Congress supinely acquiescing in the President's request to place the Community Relations Service concerning civil rights in the Department of Justice. Will the gentleman advise me what the status of civil rights in this country was in 1946?

Mr. FASCELL. The only point I was attempting to make is with respect to good management practices; the whole purpose of the Hoover Commission report and the Reorganization Act was to ask the President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress from time to time if he thought it was necessary

to improve administration of laws. And we are not being supine today. You are certainly not being supine; and I am not. We are both evaluating this request and will independently act on it.

With respect to confidentiality, I believe the point has been made that the present law has not been changed by the reorganization plan. If anyone has any question about the administration of the confidentiality section of the present law, I would ask him to submit an appropriate legislative act to change that law. But the evidence is clear that there has been no abuse under the present law. So I leave it to anyone's judgment.

On June 4, 1964, when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was being debated, then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, acting as floor manager of the legislation, referred to the confidentiality provision, section 1003(b), as "a prohibition on publicizing and not on such disclosure as is necessary to discharge the obligations of the Service. What is forbidden in general is the public disclosure of confidential information and disclosure of other information for reasons other than the furtherance of the work of the Service."

In the message with which the President transmitted Reorganization Plan No 1 to the Congress on February 10, he stated that the functions of the Service would continue to be carried out with full regard to this confidentiality provision. Since the plan cannot and does not alter the 1964 act, section 1003(b) will continue in effect in the same manner and to the same degree as it has since its enactment.

The extensive hearings conducted by the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee elicited information from the Attorney General and the Director of the Community Relations Service on how this provision has been implemented in the past and will be in the future.

Both of these officials made it clear that, as Vice President HUMPHREY said in 1964, this provision of law was never meant to preclude communication between the Community Relations Service and other agencies of Government having reason to know on a confidential basis what the Community Relations Service was doing.

The Attorney General expressed the view that section 1003(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had been a suggestion of his and that it was never intended to preclude the passage of information from the Community Relations Service about law violations. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General expressed the view that it would be contrary to other provisions of the Criminal Code to act otherwise.

I might point out that there was introduced in our hearings an intra-Community Relations Service memorandum dated March 2, 1965—a year before the transfer was proposed by the President—in which the staff of the Community Relations Service was advised at length with respect to the confidentiality provision here in question. That memorandum, printed at pages 91 to 95 of the hearings, stated explicitly that disclosure of con-

fidential information is permitted whenever such disclosure would aid in the accomplishment of the agency's mission. In no uncertain terms the memorandum expressed the view that the greatest latitude should be exercised in communicating with other Federal agencies with whom the Community Relations Service is collaborating to achieve compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The memorandum continued, the "need to know" principle should be followed. The memorandum made clear the interpretation of the Service that the prohibition of section 1003(b) was directed against making information public.

I should also point out that the Director of the Community Relations Service testified that the confidentiality restriction is applied to only that information which is received in confidence and an extremely limited amount of the total information which comes to the attention of the Community Relations Service does so in confidence.

With relation to the question as to whether conciliation and enforcement can be in the same agency, I am from one of the districts in the country that had to deal with the problem of civil rights and the enforcement of civil rights under the Department of Justice. I am here to testify from personal knowledge that the Department of Justice acted wisely, well, with full confidentiality, and did an amazingly fine job in the field of conciliation, negotiation, and in carrying out what was their duty and their primary function under the law with respect to enforcement of civil rights. I have no doubt of their continuing ability to act, and I ask the Congress to give them the full responsibility for that portion of the Civil Rights Act represented by the CRS now in the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield for a brief comment in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will yield for a brief comment, Mr. Chairman; the time is limited.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The point, I think, is not whether the Department of Justice, as the gentleman from Florida suggested, is going to try to exercise its authority responsibly and thoughtfully. The question is whether or not, as Dean Griswold suggested, there would be a basic reluctance on the part of others to deal with the Community Relations Service and enter into conciliation if it became meshed and merged with the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will yield, if the time will come from the other side. Our time is very limited.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half of 1 minute.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is a hard negotiator. I accept.

The only point is that from experience we had in my own district, I must say there was no lack of willingness on the part of the people to submit themselves to the conciliation and negotiations carried on by the Department of Justice. They did it willingly, knowingly. They welcomed the opportunity to sit down with the law enforcement agency of this country to work out in conciliation and negotiation a very difficult problem in race relations. That problem was worked out without any legal action or court action.

I am confident that this kind of experience could be corroborated from all parts of our country.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I support the resolution of disapproval. At the time—1963-64—the Committee on the Judiciary worked on the omnibus civil rights legislation there was general agreement as to the design of and the role the Community Relations Service would play in the great national effort to secure freedom, to all of our citizens, from discrimination on account of race or color or national origin.

The late, great President Kennedy—as we heard before, today—proposed the Service, as an expression of the Federal preference for conciliation over litigation. The then Attorney General made the same recommendation that conciliatory services outside the prosecuting arm of the Federal Government would automatically be more readily accessible and effective. When title X became a part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it was abundantly clear that its design was to enlist and encourage good faith compliance at the local level. It was a Federal Government service which could be freely called upon by either—or both—sides of a community racial dispute, without adding a third party to the controversy. The basic difference between its conciliatory services and those of the Justice Department was contemplated as the difference between calling in a neutral arbitrator and calling in the law enforcement authorities, which could and would later represent an adversary party on the issue. Nowhere is this intent more clear than in title II where it is provided that a district court may refer a civil action—in which the Justice Department may be a party or become one—to the Service to achieve voluntary compliance.

Now, after only a year and a half, we are told by the President that the transfer is “a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs.”

In other words, the change is designed to help the Department of Justice enforce existing civil rights programs. This is a worthy goal. Most of us have strongly supported the Attorney General in enforcing these laws. My objection to the proposed reorganization is that more effective enforcement need not be

done at the expense of what we contemplated as independent efforts to assist communities in working out their own problems without active Federal intervention, or the threat of it. The Community Relations Service was put into the Department of Commerce as much to keep it separate from the Department of Justice as to assist in implementing the public accommodations law.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my disappointment is understandable, at the argument advanced in support of the reorganization plan that the Attorney General is already relying on information he secures from the Service. He testified he wishes to make increased use of the Service to supply information he does not now have and apparently has some trouble in securing by means presently available—minority views, page 22. This was not the concept of the Service that was such an enlightened part of the 1964 legislation when I voted for it, and it is not the concept I would wish for it now.

In this connection, I must say I am further disappointed in the position belatedly and suddenly taken by the leader of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and by the NAACP. I can well understand the pressures brought to bear upon them, though their position in the matter is very considerably weakened, in my judgment, by the manner and the time in which they chose to make their views known.

In his message to the Congress this year, President Johnson forecast several new civil rights measures that unfortunately have not yet come to the Congress. Since I regard Reorganization Plan No. 1 as an abandonment of the concept for the Community Relations Service which was intended by the legislation enacted by the Congress, I would have preferred that the President incorporate the changes in his omnibus legislative proposals, rather than approach the matter piecemeal in asking for what I consider to be a basic change in the philosophy of Federal civil rights law.

Because I prefer conciliation to litigation, and because I hope the Federal Government never turns its back or closes the door on individual compliance efforts, I will this afternoon vote to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House of Representatives today is whether the Community Relations Service shall remain a frail orphan within the Department of Commerce or whether it shall be adopted by the Department of Justice where, through utilization of that Department's resources of coordination it can fulfill the functions now required of it. It is my view that the functions of the Community Relations Service should be transferred to that Department of Government which now exercises primary responsibility in the civil rights field and whose head is primarily responsible for the peaceful resolution of civil rights disputes. Accordingly, I rise in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966.

Those who opposed this plan are of the mistaken belief that the objectives of the Service and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and the means for achieving those objectives, are somehow incompatible. Nothing could be further from the truth. The principal objective of the Community Relations Service and the Department of Justice in the civil rights field is to establish compliance with the civil rights laws. What the Justice Department seeks through effective prosecution, the Community Relations Service seeks through persuasion. We want these approaches to be complementary. And we want our civil rights activities to be coordinated and systematic. Those who have a legal responsibility to bring about compliance with the civil rights laws, and a moral obligation to “bind up the Nation's wounds,” understand that conciliation must precede and supplement prosecution and that voluntary community acceptance is superior to court action.

Accordingly a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote against a more effective use of mediation and moderation by that agency of Government primarily responsible for the peaceful resolution of civil rights disputes. A vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote to strengthen the rule of reason and conciliation in a department which already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Let us not force the Department of Justice into the role of prosecutor only.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are concerned about social justice and racial harmony. But it should be noted that those who are daily concerned with promoting justice and harmony, and those who have most to gain or lose by the transfer envisaged by this plan—the civil rights groups themselves—have endorsed Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I submit that those champions of civil rights in the administration—the President, who has been the most active and creative 20th century Chief Executive in this field, the Vice President, the Attorney General, and the Director of Community Relations Service—would not propose, and those civil rights leaders would not support, a plan which did not serve well all Americans and America.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. To my knowledge only some civil rights leaders have taken a position, not their organizations. Has a single civil rights group endorsed the reorganization plan, or have the leaders endorsed it? Has there been a single indication to that effect here today or anywhere in the testimony? Not one organization you are referring to as endorsing it came before the Government Operations Subcommittee considering it to submit to cross-examination and give their reasons. There has been some casual reference and maybe some private communications but certainly no organization, to my knowledge, has it been

demonstrated, has had a vote by the members as a whole. The members have not had a chance to express themselves—just a few leaders.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me say in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois that where the President acts in a managerial role he is solely responsible to make the kind of decisions necessary in the day-to-day operations of the Federal Government. Equally so, I think the leaders of the civil rights groups cannot and probably should not put to a referendum of their groups decisions as to which agencies of the Government should be responsible within jurisdictional areas that the President has the sole responsibility for.

All of the leaders of the major civil rights groups support the plan and they have not only indicated that they look with approval upon the plan, but most importantly, they look with approval to a plan of our President in exercising his constitutional responsibility.

I do not believe it would be appropriate to submit such a matter to the membership of individual groups.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] brings up a challenge of a sort. Of course, the gentleman cannot produce any civil rights organization of any moment at all which has appeared to contest the plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, no civil rights organization has appeared to contest this plan, and they had ample opportunity to do so. No organization on civil rights has come forward and endorsed the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that the civil rights organizations were timid. If they had any strong feelings upon this matter and if they wanted to provide this particular department of service, like the Commerce Department, certainly they had access to our committee to state their position against this transfer, and they did not.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's argument is of no importance.

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

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, since my name was mentioned, it is my understanding that the gentleman from California is incorrect; that, in fact, there was an organization, according to the testimony of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN], who served on the subcommittee, which appeared in opposition to this transfer. And at least one civil rights

group testified against it in the Senate hearings. I know of no civil rights group which testified before the House subcommittee in favor of the transfer.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, if I yield the gentleman from New York an additional minute, would the gentleman yield to me so that I might answer this question within the context of the present debate?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to do so, in view of the gentleman's usual generosity.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to answer at this time so that this could be put in context.

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Intergroup Relations officials testified before our subcommittee.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Would the gentleman repeat the name of that organization? I did not get it. Would the gentleman repeat the name of the organization slowly?

Mr. ERLENBORN. The National Association of Intergroup Relations officials appeared before our committee in the person of Mr. Fred Routh.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is it not a fact that they are the only organization?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Is this to be taken from my time or your time?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It is to be taken from the time of both of us.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would like the opportunity to complete this answer.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is it not a fact that it is the only organization which testified in opposition to this plan? Furthermore, I understand that they appeared as a representative of involved employees and did not direct their testimony to the principles involved.

Mr. ERLENBORN. This one group did testify before our subcommittee. Its membership is composed of staff members of governmental and private agencies, at Federal and State and local governmental levels, national and private groups, the Urban League, the American Jewish organization, the national Catholic group, the Southern Regional Conference, and so on. This group and its members met in convention and passed a resolution in opposition to this transfer.

This is the only civil rights organization to take action among its members. This group is opposed to this transfer and in effect favors the resolution of disapproval which I think is contrary to what the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] stated.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Had the gentleman from Illinois ever heard of that group prior to their testifying before our committee? This does not suggest that they are not important. Had the gentleman ever heard of them?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Frankly, I personally had not, but the counsel of the committee had.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the committee to vote "no" on the disapproval resolution.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and concur in the view that he has been a staunch supporter of civil rights legislation in the course of his service here in the House of Representatives. I have been proud to support the civil rights legislation of which he has been a principal proponent. I had the privilege of serving on the House Government Operations Committee of which he is chairman during the last session of the Congress.

But I want to suggest to my colleagues that perhaps we are doing a disservice to the cause of civil rights by the proposal that we have before us now. In the first place, I find a great many stalwart supporters of civil rights legislation who have been consistent in their support of civil rights measures in this body in the past who now find themselves on the other side of the issue. I think this is extremely unfortunate. We should work to get our civil rights proponents to stand together in implementing and enforcing the program that we now have. When we find the divergence of views that we have encountered today, I think it is a disservice to the cause of civil rights and a setback for the cause of civil rights.

I agree that we must have coercion in any meaningful civil rights legislation. As one who sponsored equal opportunity legislation in the State legislature of the State of Illinois, I supported the enforcement provisions of that bill because coercion is a necessary part of the process of bringing education and reason to the community and to the Nation in trying to secure equal opportunity to people of all races and colors and creeds. But I think it is unfortunate to put the coercion and the enforcement and the prosecutor right in the same department and in the same agency as the conciliatory department or agency such as the Community Relations Service.

I think we have to approach this civil rights problem in many ways. The Community Relations Service is one approach which we ought to retain. We ought to retain it independent of the enforcement provisions. It seems to me the proposal that we now are considering goes in the opposite direction and I think it is unfortunate.

Now you have a great many people who volunteer to do this type of service. There are people in the business community who volunteer. They are doing this kind of job voluntarily as public service, but do they want to be in partnership with the law enforcement agencies, the police, and with prosecuting officers of the civil rights movement? I do not think so. I think we are going to find that there will be an unwillingness on their part to participate as actively as they have in the past.

I find and I understand that the Community Relations Service has been doing a pretty good job. They are entitled to a great deal of credit for the work they have done. We can see from their own

report and by the testimony before this committee and by arguments made in the other body about the fine work they have done.

On the other hand, I hear and I understand that so far as the enforcement of civil rights violations are concerned, there is a lot to be asked for. There are a great many cases which are not receiving adequate attention, and a great many opportunities for prosecution and enforcement where such prosecution and enforcement is not being carried out. Is this reorganization proposal offered as an excuse? Or is this a way to avoid the responsibility that we have in the enforcement of this act? The proposal we have before us now seems to me to be a pretty poor way of trying to cover up for the lack of enforcement of such an important measure as the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It was suggested by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that this reorganization proposal is a management responsibility and that the 1946 Reorganization Act vested authority for this kind of interagency transfer in the President and that we should recognize that. But I say to the gentleman that we have not abandoned our responsibilities as a legislative body and I hope and I expect that we will continue to assume our responsibilities to review and to disagree, where we do disagree, with some action that the Executive may choose to take under this extraordinary authority which was granted to him.

I think the pending proposal goes not only to the form of the problem—I think this gets to the very substance of civil rights and we should consider it in that respect and in that light. We should recognize that we are here considering an important aspect of civil rights legislation whereby individuals throughout the Nation may give effect and meaning to the provisions of the law which we have enacted. I think it is going to take a lot of determination and a lot of understanding and a lot of patience. We are not going to find any shortcuts to achieving this goal and this ideal which I hope all of us are seeking. Indeed, although this proposal may be supported by good intentions, it seems to me we are taking a backward step in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this resolution of disapproval be supported by the Members of the House of Representatives and that this House refuse to concur in this proposed transfer. I urge the House to exercise its veto, which is all we have in this type of a legislative proposal—and to disapprove the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department.

**Mr. REUSS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

**Mr. RYAN.** Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to predict the effect of this reorganization plan. I do not believe that either the hearings or the committee report are particularly helpful in anticipating how this will work out.

Our purpose should be to make the Community Relations Service as effective a force as possible in our struggle to cast off the last chains of racial discrimination. The purpose is more than to bring about compliance with civil rights laws. There is a much broader responsibility to anticipate situations which give rise to racial tensions, to help communities to deal with all aspects of civil rights—jobs, housing, education, the antipoverty program—and to work with the communities of our Nation is achieving racial justice for all of our citizens.

There are some caveats which have been raised about this plan which do trouble me. They concern the advantages of having an independent agency and the disadvantages of mixing conciliators and mediators with litigators and law enforcers.

The first point relates to confidence. Will the aura of impartiality be affected if the Service is under the Department of Justice?

The second point relates to the question of the confidential nature of the process of mediation and conciliation. It is only logical that people may be less frank and as open with an agency which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice rather than independent.

The officials of the Community Relations Service believe that neither of these points are valid. They assure us that the shift will not impair the effectiveness of the Service. They are satisfied that under the Department of Justice their jurisdiction will be expanded. As far as confidentiality is concerned, they say that they rarely gather information which would incriminate their sources and that they would not release or turn over any more information to the Department of Justice than they do now.

There is also another point which is raised, and that is whether or not it is possible to conciliate parties while litigation is in process. Here the officials of the Community Relations Service maintain that only rarely would the Service attempt conciliation while litigation is in progress.

The administration argues that this plan will focus greater attention on civil rights activity and coordinate it under the Attorney General. Since the Attorney General is the President's closest advisor on civil rights, it is said the Service will be strengthened by being in the Justice Department. However, there may be an advantage in having the Community Relations Service be an independent agency.

In my judgment, the Attorney General could have been much more effective in enforcing civil rights laws which are on the books. Today we know that there are counties in Mississippi—for instance, Sunflower County—where no Federal examiners have been appointed by the Attorney General, and where the registration of Negro citizens has not been what we hoped it would be after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I believe very strongly that a great deal more must be done on the part of

the Attorney General if we are to have an effective registration drive in the South. This requires the Attorney General to use the power which he now has under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to assign examiners in those counties in the South where registration is still dismally low. In Sunflower County, Miss., only 14 percent of the Negro population is registered, while some 83 percent of the white population is registered. This is important for us to remember when we talk about moving this agency over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are serious questions about the efficacy of keeping this under the Commerce Department. It might well have been placed under the Civil Rights Commission or perhaps, as has been suggested by a number of people, including Calvin Kytle, former Acting Director of the Community Relations Service, under the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. There the Service would have an opportunity to expand with a new and expanding governmental department. It would have an opportunity to deal with many of the urban problems which will come more and more before the Community Relations Service.

According to the New York Times of October 17, 1965, Calvin Kytle, who was then Acting Director of the CRS, "would have liked the Service to be a part of the new Department of Urban Affairs." The article goes on to explain that this idea was "rejected as premature." Nevertheless, if it was a good idea for the future, it might have been a good reason not to make any transfer at all this year. Once located in the Department of Justice, it is not likely to change homes soon again.

Foggy as the issues seem, there are some rays of hope. The administration has promised that it will encourage the expansion and optimum use of the Service. It was on this basis that civil rights groups agreed to support the transfer.

"We are further advised that the administration hopes to expand the staff and duties that the Service is called upon to perform," Clarence Mitchell, of the NAACP, wrote to the Government Operations Committee of the House, "Therefore we respectfully urge that your committee give a favorable report." In a similar statement, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., told the committee that "it is our hope that this effectiveness will be enhanced by the transfer."

I am impressed with the fact that the administration has said it will extend the operations of this agency, if this reorganization plan goes through. I am impressed with the fact that it will increase the budget from \$1 to \$2 million, and the staff from 62 persons to 108 persons.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to rely on the good faith of the administration, on its promises to expand and to enlarge the jurisdiction of this agency and to make it more effective. If we are to do so, I earnestly urge the Attorney General to make sure that the Community Re-

lations Service is an effective instrument, and to act as its accelerator, not as its brake.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as is remaining to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman and Members, I think we have a significant question before us today.

The first point, which I do not think has been clearly touched on, is the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and proposals prior thereto. It was entirely clear at that time that President Kennedy believed that the functions of conciliation and mediation should be placed in an entity separate and apart from the Department of Justice. Lest there be any doubt on this point, permit me to quote the late President Kennedy, whose commitment to civil rights was clear beyond question. He said in his message of June 1963:

The problem has grown beyond the time and energies which a few otherwise burdened officials can make available—and, in some areas, the confidence of all will be greater in an intermediary whose duties are completely separated from departmental functions of investigation or litigation.

Then, just to buttress the point, he went on as follows:

It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service.

The then Attorney General, and now Senator KENNEDY, also was quite clear on this point. He urged the formation of an independent entity in the Executive Office of the White House. He said:

The administration's efforts will continue. But they cannot adequately substitute for the work of a regularly constituted organization which could devote its full energies to mediation in seriously troubled areas.

He has also said, and I believe it is still his view, that the responsibility of the Department of Justice really is the enforcement of the law and to see that the statutes are enforced. He said in testimony before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in June 1963:

We have gotten into this (conciliation) because there has not been any other group to do it. I think it would be better if that responsibility was taken from us and put over into another department.

While it is true that he has not publicly opposed this reorganization plan, I think those who know him would say he has some serious doubts about it.

I would like to ask the ranking and distinguished minority member of the Judiciary Committee whether the legislative history at the time of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not crystal clear that the Community Relations Service should be an independent mediation and conciliation service, and, further, that both President Kennedy and the Attorney General were entirely clear in that view?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I think the legislative history is very clear

in the affirmative, in reply to that question.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague [Mr. McCULLOCH], whether he was called down to the White House on this point, in the light of the distinguished contribution he made to the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I was, on both occasions, both in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. REID of New York. But was the gentleman called down on this reorganization plan?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I was not called down there, and was therefore not consulted.

Mr. REID of New York. I think that is unfortunate, because this legislation deserves the broadest bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, what is at issue here is the future of the Community Relations Service. The Service must be strengthened to aid it in carrying out its task of voluntary mediation and conciliation.

In my judgment there are serious doubts as to the wisdom of transferring the Service to the Department of Justice. The Service was created and designed to deal in communities with patterns of conflict, not with individual cases of law violation. The latter is the primary function of the Justice Department, within its manifold responsibilities of investigation and prosecution.

Increasingly in the future, the Service will be working in northern cities, where the multiplying problems of urban life have already created areas of conflict. I can see no particular expertise in the Department of Justice for dealing with problems of substandard housing, job training and placement, and inferior education. These are matters which involve far more than enforcement of the law.

More important, I question whether many individuals in the South and in the tragic ghettos of the North will feel free to seek the aid of the Service if it is an integral component of the Department of Justice. The Service must inspire confidence in its own neutrality among those it seeks to serve. That this confidence would be difficult even to establish is made clear by the Attorney General's own testimony this March before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Senator JAVITS asked him as follows:

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Attorney General, if you were a business executive and a man sent his card in and said, "I am from the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice. Tell me everything you know in confidence," how would you feel about it?

Attorney General KATZENBACH. I would think they had employed an idiot in that Service. I would think anybody that came in and said, "Tell me everything you know in confidence" would not be a very sensible way to approach it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of principle and priorities. In my judgment, the Community Relations Service, with its broad functions of conciliation and

mediation, would best be served—and would best serve the Nation—as an agency independent of the Department of Justice. I am not persuaded that the Justice Department offers the best opportunity for strengthening the Service and coordinating its activities with other Government programs in the field of civil rights. In the Executive Office of the President, with Roger Wilkins, whom we are fortunate to have as Director of the Service, in direct—and if need be daily—contact with the President, the Service I believe would gain the greatest possible stature and strength which it needs. The White House should be on the frontline of civil-rights activities, coordinating all programs including that of the Service. The Service deserves the highest Presidential priority.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 because I am convinced that to transfer the Community Relations Service to the Justice Department would jeopardize, to a significant degree, the effectuation of our civil rights laws.

Our civil rights laws have issued from the moral consensus of the vast majority of the American people. At the same time, our civil rights laws require of all Americans an unusual degree of moral perception and response. The Community Relations Service, as a conciliation agency forbidden by law to perform any investigative or prosecuting functions in furtherance of any legal prosecution by the Federal Government, is best able to elicit such a response in communities throughout the country.

It is especially true of our civil rights laws that they will bear most enduring effect only if the rights which they guarantee are morally recognized. Members of minority groups which have suffered discrimination will never receive the respect and equal opportunities owed them unless others in the community comply with our civil rights laws not because of fear of legal penalties but because they recognize what belongs to every person as a person.

The Community Relations Service can appeal most effectively to people's reason and conscience and to their desire for the peace and prosperity of their communities because its services are divorced from the prosecuting functions of the Justice Department.

It was in order to insure that the Service would not be used as an investigative agency to further the prosecution of cases that section 1003(b) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires that the Service keep confidential any information which it obtains in the process of conciliation if that information was volunteered on the understanding that it would be so kept.

The appeal to reason and conscience which the Service is best capable of making means persuasion. Persuasion can be most effective only if others are willing to confide in Federal conciliators.

Nothing could destroy such confidence more swiftly than fear that any information given to conciliators might be used as evidence by a Federal prosecuting attorney.

We learned from the Attorney General's testimony before the Government Operations Committee that the Justice Department interprets section 1003(b) to mean only that the Service will not give information obtained in the conciliation process to the public. In the Justice Department's view, the conciliator is not only free to transmit information about law violations to the Justice Department, but has the duty to do so.

Section 1003(b) may seem to refer only to the public in the minds of Justice Department lawyers. But I believe it means much more than that to people who volunteer information to the Service. To them it means that such information will never be cast back at them in court.

It appears that the Service has been transmitting confidential information to the Justice Department already. Should the Service be made part of the Justice Department, such communication would probably become a more established practice.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the whole purpose of section 1003(b) is to encourage confidence in our Federal conciliators so that their attempt to bring about voluntary compliance by means of persuasion will be more effective.

It is easy enough to see why a determined segregationist would be unwilling to disclose self-incriminating information to a Federal conciliator if he feared that this information would reach the Justice Department. But the civil rights leader also might fear that any violations of local law which he mentioned would be transmitted through the Justice Department to State and local authorities. And the representative of a State or local government, knowing that the Justice Department is to enforce nondiscrimination in programs of Federal assistance, might fear a cutting off of Federal funds by consequence of candid disclosures to Federal conciliators.

If such transmittal of confidential information should become an established practice by consequence of transfer of the Service to the Justice Department, the confidence in the Service of parties to civil rights disputes would surely be weakened. The whole attempt to achieve voluntary compliance by persuasion would be to some degree, at least, frustrated. Indeed, this practice would mean that conciliators of the Service would actually be performing an investigative function in furtherance of prosecution by the Justice Department, so that the very purpose of section 1003(b) would be disregarded.

I should like to propose, Mr. Chairman, that the Community Relations Service be transferred instead to the Executive Office of the President. Located there, the Service would be clearly separated

from the enforcement duties of the Justice Department. At the same time, it would be invested with the tremendous moral authority of the President of the United States. The principle of government by consent in preference to government by force of threatened penalties would be institutionalized in a unique and admirable way if conciliation services were offered to communities throughout the country in the name of the President.

Moreover, transfer of the Service to the White House Office would remove any alleged difficulties in contacting the Service because of interdepartmental channels of authority. No other Federal department or agency would have to make its way inside the Commerce Department or the Justice Department in order to get help from the Service. The Service would be accessible to all departments and agencies and in a position to intervene where it is most needed with the fewest and the least of bureaucratic complications.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my very respected colleague, the ranking minority member on our committee pointed out a while ago that the President is analogous to a quarterback and that there would be a tendency for people on the team to follow the quarterback. I certainly concur in that analogy.

I suggest that if we review the fight which the President of the United States has made for racial justice in this country since the day he assumed that great office, we will all decide he is a fine quarterback to follow—and I hope the majority of the House will do that today.

In looking at the team Members, I am struck by the fact that Martin Luther King supports the transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Justice Department, but the Honorable WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama, is opposed to the transfer. I believe that is somewhat persuasive.

Beyond that I would suggest that the Attorney General has done a magnificent job in tearing down barriers which have faced the Negro throughout this country. The President wants to give the Attorney General an additional tool to carry on this extremely complex and difficult undertaking. I sincerely urge that the resolution be defeated and that the transfer go forward.

Mr. Chairman, when Congress established the Community Relations Service by means of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we were especially concerned with the problem of discrimination in public accommodations throughout the South.

The administration had had some earlier success in working with business leaders to ease racial tensions. You may remember, for example, that Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall had been able to moderate tensions in Birmingham by bringing business groups of that city into the work of conciliation.

The administration believed it would be desirable to approach and mobilize businessmen on a systematic basis and

believed that this task could be carried out best through the Commerce Department. Congress agreed and established the Community Relations Service in that Department.

Once the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, however, the situation changed. A great number of places of public accommodation quickly proved willing to abandon discriminatory practices and to meet the requirements of the new law. Voluntary compliance fortunately has gone far beyond anything expected when the act came into effect. As a result, the function of the Community Relations Service as a catalyst in the business community of the South has never reached the level of importance originally anticipated, and less and less of the work of the Service is related to the main interests of the Commerce Department. Since that Department has only incidental responsibilities in the civil rights field, there seems to me to be no persuasive reason for keeping the Service under the Secretary of Commerce.

The main work of the Service is now related to discrimination in voting, employment, education, and publicly owned facilities and to the betterment of law enforcement in connection with civil rights. These are all areas in which the Department of Justice is heavily engaged.

As we all know, the Department of Justice has the main responsibility among the departments and agencies for shaping the Government's efforts to bring an end to racial discrimination in the Nation. That Department through the years has gained a degree of experience and knowledge in the civil rights field which is unequalled anywhere else in the Government.

It seems to me natural that the Community Relations Service should work closely with the Department of Justice. They have the same goals and frequently are involved in the very same matters. The Department of Justice, like any sound practitioner of the law, is interested in arriving at fair settlements of disputes, and disputes arising out of civil rights statutes are no exception.

I believe therefore that the functions of the Community Relations Service should be directly joined with those of the Department. I feel strongly that the experience and know-how of the Service can best be utilized under the direction of the Attorney General, with substantial benefit to the Government's programs against discrimination.

I urge the rejection of the pending resolution.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of concluding the debate I yield the remainder of time allotted to this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as I look around this vast chamber, which is sometimes crowded with Members, I express the hope that my weighty words of logic will cause many Members to change their minds and vote "nay" on this disapproval resolution.

This is one of those resolutions, of course, which is in the negative, and

those who favor the President's Plan of Reorganization, No. 1, must vote "nay" in order to approve the plan. This is sometimes confusing, so I thought I would bring the matter up.

A few minutes ago there was a colloquy which rested, at least, upon something I had said. I believe if those who commented on my remarks will consult the RECORD they will see I said "no important" organization on civil rights appeared to contest this particular reorganization plan.

I note the reference to the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials. Frankly, I had never heard of the group, when they appeared before us. I asked the gentleman who testified, Mr. Routh, if he had testified on the civil rights bill when it was before the various committees of the Congress, and he said, "No." I supposed, if he were not interested enough to testify on the civil rights bill, that probably he was not too much interested in the civil rights problem.

I would note that there was an article in the Washington Post of March 19, in which there was a reference to a meeting of the civil rights leaders who are prominent civil rights leaders and who are recognized by all in this chamber as being civil rights leaders, at the White House.

The following people were present: Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP; Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League; Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality; John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; Dorothy Height, president of the National Council of Negro Women; A. Philip Randolph, vice president of the AFL-CIO; Andrew Beemiller, AFL-CIO legislative director; Joseph Rauh, Washington lawyer; Clarence Mitchell, Washington director of NAACP; and David Brodie, Washington director of the Anti-Defamation League.

A paragraph of that news release says:

An informant said the group unanimously approved the administration proposal to transfer the Community Relations Service from Commerce to the Justice Department.

However, I do not hang my case upon that particular occasion, as important as it may be. It certainly shows that these leaders, who have never been timid in their assertion of the civil rights of their members, were in favor of this plan. I would like to reason for a moment on this matter. I want to say this much: This is not a matter of who is for civil rights or who is against civil rights. I would not want to bring that question into it. There is no man in this House that I have any more respect for in this field than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] who in my opinion is one of the great lawyers of this House. I will never forget his contribution to the civil rights acts that we passed in this House.

Now let us turn to the Community Relations Service. This Service was created by title 10 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to do what? "To provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discrim-

inatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever, in its judgment, peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate State or local official or other interested person."

Now, let me make this point real clear. This is a transfer of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice from the Department of Commerce. It does not affect the statutory duties and responsibilities of the Community Relations Service. They are going to be the same, exactly the same, as they were in the Department of Commerce. They are going to be the same in the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice, we all know, under the Civil Rights Acts we have passed, has been given the responsibility and the duty of enforcing the civil rights laws. Under the Hoover Commission's recommendations, which were to bring related services together under one head, and not scattered throughout the agencies and departments of the Government but to bring them together, we are in perfect harmony with the Hoover Commission's recommendation in doing this, because the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce was an isolated agency in respect to the other functions in that agency.

The Secretary of the Department of Commerce was not primarily concerned with the whole civil rights field. We put it there from the standpoint of convenience at that time and because we were resting it at that time upon the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. Now conditions have changed.

We have had quotations from President Kennedy and from others today. I do not know what President Kennedy would do if he were here today and occupying the position of the Presidency. Mr. Johnson succeeded to his responsibilities and duties, and he is the man under our Constitution who is charged with implementing the laws which the Congress passes. I assume he would do the same thing, although that assumption is merely a personal assumption. But perhaps more to the point, if we are going to quote people, what was the action of the then Attorney General, now the junior Senator from New York? He voted to approve this reorganization plan, as did his brother, when it was passed in the Senate a few days ago by a vote of 42 to 32.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that they would have voted in that manner if they felt they were violating the principles which their brother, President Kennedy, approved.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case here. We are not quoting people. We are saying that the President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General, the Director of Community Rela-

tions Service, are charged directly under the statutes involved, with the implementation of a civil rights program in our Nation, and to insure justice for all, when they come before us and ask us for a proper tool, something which they believe will help them do their job, I say that the burden of the responsibility which rests upon them is very weighty, in my eyes.

Mr. Chairman, if they ask for the tool to do the job, and if it violates no statute, and it does not even change the statutes involved, why should we say that they are doing the wrong thing? Is it because we suspect them of bad faith? Of course not. We differ with them in judgment, and we have a right to differ with them in judgment. But, certainly, they are charged with the responsibility and they ask that the tool be placed in the Department of Justice in order that they can do the job.

Mr. Chairman, this is an independent agency within the Department of Justice, because its Director—the young man who has been asked to be the Director—testified before our committee that he would to the best of his ability use the statutes that now exist in the same way that he uses them now.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone that the Department of Justice stands very high among the departments, Cabinet-level departments, of our Government. Certainly there is more dignity and prestige to that Department in the field of the liberties of citizens than there is in the Department of Commerce, which is interested mostly in business matters.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I ask the gentleman from Missouri not to interrupt my statement. I shall yield later to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Certainly they are the Department charged with this responsibility. The independent function of the Community Relations Service will remain the same. There will be an Assistant Attorney General put in charge of it, which responsibility will give him a level higher in the hierarchy of Government than the present Director of the small agency.

Mr. Chairman, we know that conciliation and mediation and discussion precede any litigation, and this would represent no more power to litigate than it has at the present time. If a problem arises at the point of litigation, that will be handled by the enforcement arm of our Government, which is the Department of Justice, and it would have been handled by them if the Community Relations Service agency remained in the Department of Commerce.

So, Mr. Chairman, about what are we talking here today? Frankly, I am surprised that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle have taken a party policy position on this matter. I grant them, the complete right to do so, but I cannot understand why they took a party position on a matter of this kind. Certainly in my humble opinion there has been no argument raised of any

importance. There have been fears, there has been concern and apprehension, but the people who are responsible for the implementation of this act asked us for this tool.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will give it to them and vote "no" on this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, transferring the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice, should be approved by the House. The pending resolution of disapproval should be voted down.

The most persuasive reason, to my mind, to support this reorganization plan is that it puts the Community Relations Service on a higher plane of Government endeavor in working for equality and justice for all Americans. It moves the service from the Commerce Department to the Justice Department, and those department names alone signify an ascent from the concerns of the marketplace to the concerns of human dignity and justice.

When the Community Relations Service was first established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 there was, as the testimony before our committee shows, a certain rationale for putting it in the Commerce Department. A major issue at the outset was the constitutional justification for civil rights legislation in the commerce clause and the expectation that the largest initial gains in civil rights progress were to be made in public accommodations, in enterprises serving the public in interstate travel and commerce, and in the good will and cooperation of business owners of hotels and inns and restaurants opening their doors to all who sought service.

We have made good progress in that phase of civil rights, and now we must prepare ourselves for the longer run and the more difficult and continuing problems which arise in so complex and sensitive a field of human relationships. It is fitting, therefore, that we look to the Attorney General as the chief legal officer of the Federal Government and to the great historic Department of Justice to carry on the difficult and continuing tasks of insuring civil rights to all, and that we give to the Attorney General every reasonable and effective resource that the Congress can devise in enabling him to carry out his awesome responsibilities and duties.

The Attorney General, as the chief law officer, speaks for the whole Government and stands in the eyes of the general public as the symbol of justice for all. In this respect, the Attorney General has decided advantages in discharging civil rights responsibilities as compared with other heads of Government departments or agencies. He is not so narrowly mission-oriented as, say, the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs, and he has stature and influence which would outweigh that of the administrator of an independent agency.

There are those who see some rationale for transferring the Community Relations Service to the Department of Urban and Housing Affairs or to an in-

dependent agency, but it is hardly necessary to say that those alternatives are not before us today in this reorganization plan. The only alternative before us is to let the Community Relations Service "stay put" by disapproving the plan or to enable it to "go forward" by approving its transfer to the Department of Justice.

To permit it to go forward—and on a higher plane as I have said—will demonstrate our serious concern for civil rights and our wish to make progress in that field. For the Department of Justice is the best organizational setting for growth potential in civil rights. The Department of Commerce offers no growth potential, only a dead end, for civil rights. The Attorney General spends more working hours personally on civil rights than any other single department or agency head, and the dimensions of this task promise no let-up in the need for his personal attention and energies. The Community Relations Service is an important resource in doing the civil rights job and we should make it available to the Attorney General.

When the Community Relations Service was created, it was provided in the enabling act that officers and employees of the Service, in doing their work of conciliation and other assistance, should avoid publicity, maintain the confidence of information received, and refrain from engaging in investigative or prosecuting functions. There are those who say that transferring of the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice will vitiate these statutory requirements. That will not be the case. The statutory obligations and responsibilities of officers and employees of the Service will not be changed by this reorganization plan. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1949 as amended, which is the basic enabling legislation for all reorganization plans carefully circumscribes their limits.

Several other points should be made here. One is that in many State jurisdictions—some 28 I believe—enforcement and conciliation are combined in the same commission, agency or bureau. Therefore, the fact that the Attorney General will have both conciliation and enforcement responsibilities in civil rights by this transfer is not something unprecedented or unworkable. However, these functions will be organizationally distinct and separate within the Department of Justice. The Civil Rights Division which now is responsible for civil rights litigation will not absorb the Community Relations Service. The Attorney General, by overseeing both, will give them the necessary coordination and impetus to carry out their respective responsibilities under the law.

Of course, discussion and negotiation is a feature associated with all litigation, and issues can be compromised or suits settled before getting into court. These pretrial kinds of activities will remain with the Civil Rights Division. The Community Relations Service, by helping to adjust difficult community situations, to conciliate conflicts and controversies, and to give assistance to all

affected parties in the community, works farther afield from litigation. Its work is not an adjunct of litigation but systematic and directed effort to dampen the fires of civil discord, to get civic leaders to meet and cooperate in solving common problems—in short, to bring about those conditions which minimize the need for litigation and formal law enforcement.

The officers and employees of the service will not engage in litigation or prosecution, and the law enjoins them from doing so. This is not to say that in rare instances, when information of law violation comes to their notice they are to refrain from reporting to the proper authorities. Every citizen has this obligation, and Congress did not intend, in requiring confidence in its activities, that the service close its eyes to violations of the laws that Congress enacted.

We will get perspective on this problem, I believe, by considering that the Department of Justice is not exclusively a law enforcement agency. It has many duties and responsibilities and performs many functions which cannot be identified with law enforcement as such. Many of its legal activities are in the nature of advisory opinions to Government agencies, the President and the Cabinet, the preparation of executive orders and proclamations, liaison work in the Council of State Governments, and the coordination of agency activities with respect to administrative procedures. Indeed, a large part of its litigation work cannot be characterized as enforcement activity. The Civil Division of the Department, the Lands Division, the Office of Alien Property, and other units have many legal and administrative responsibilities which cannot properly be characterized as enforcement.

Perhaps one recent illustration should be added to make the point. The past session of Congress enacted the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. That act set up a grant program to provide assistance in the training of State and local personnel to improve their capabilities, techniques, and practices in the prevention of crime. Although it may sound anomalous, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act functions performed by the Department are not enforcement functions. Rather, they involve working with people on the State and local level to arrive at programs of the greatest national impact which warrant an allocation of the limited funds available for functions within the scope of the statute.

As we move toward a vote on this important reorganization plan, I believe we should bear in mind finally that the basic theory and law of Congress under which the plan is presented places in the Chief Executive the initiative and responsibility for proper organization of the executive branch. This plan has been carefully drafted, following a recommendation by Vice President HUMPHREY which was endorsed by President Johnson. The Attorney General and the Budget Bureau Director support this plan. Testifying in its favor also was the Director of the Community Relations Service. Unless there is some great and compelling reason why we should oppose the plan, we must give the President the reorga-

nization opportunity contemplated by the law and the benefit of the doubt, if any of us have reservations on one point or another. Having listened to the testimony, having reflected upon the issues, I wholeheartedly favor the plan, and I urge the Members to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 by voting against the disapproving resolution.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the President's plan to transfer the Community Relations Service to the Department of Justice.

I hasten to add that my view does not reflect any lack of confidence in the Community Relations Service or in the record it has made. I am impressed by the accomplishments of the Service in the less than 2 years that have passed since its establishment. It has opened lines of communications in racially troubled communities where none existed. It has dealt fairly with the representatives of both races in those communities. It has done a great deal to make it easier for people of good will to act reasonably and to comply with the requirements of the law.

However, I believe that the work of the Service can be carried on more effectively within the Department of Justice. The Attorney General is charged by law with the enforcement of civil rights legislation and the President has further charged him with coordinating the civil rights activities of the executive branch. This centralization of responsibility is plainly desirable to prevent a diffusion of effort.

Placing the Service in the Department of Justice will further increase the effectiveness of the Government in the civil rights field by combining under common leadership the experience and resources of the two agencies best able to bring about the settlement of racial disputes.

I am aware of the concern on the part of some Members of Congress that the statutory requirements of confidentiality that are applicable to the Service might be compromised if it becomes an agency in the Department of Justice. As a matter of law, of course, those requirements will not be changed in the slightest degree by the reorganization plan. Similarly, the plan will not weaken the statutory provisions that prevent employees of the Service from carrying on "investigative or prosecuting functions."

I have no doubt, furthermore, that the Attorney General will do whatever is necessary to insure that these requirements of the law are met. And I am sure that everyone in the Congress agrees he will do so.

I suppose, therefore, that the question being asked is not really whether the Department of Justice will be unprincipled in the use of the information obtained by the Community Relations Service in the course of its conciliation activities but, rather, whether the public will believe that the Department is acting unscrupulously. I am convinced that the people of the country will not take that view and that they will not be inhibited from dealing frankly and honestly with the Service.

Public confidence in a governmental unit with mediation functions in the

area of civil rights is not necessarily destroyed by the existence of powers of enforcement in the same agency. Twenty-eight States have antidiscrimination laws of one kind or another which are administered by an agency charged with both conciliation and enforcement responsibilities. Some of these laws, moreover, do not contain the prohibitions against publicity and disclosure of information that are imposed on the Community Relations Service. The experience of so many States is strong evidence that there is no inherent improbity or obstacle to joining conciliation and enforcement functions in one organization.

In my opinion whether the public will continue to place its trust in the Community Relations Service will depend not upon the location of the Service in the Government but upon the way the Service honors that trust.

I have every confidence that it will be as faithfully observed in the Department of Justice as in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of President Johnson's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 which would transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. I urge that House Resolution 756, which would put this House on record as disapproving the plan, be defeated.

Two weeks ago the reorganization plan was approved in the other body when a similar disapproval resolution was defeated. The final decision is squarely up to us here today.

The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations heard all witnesses who wished to testify both for and against the plan; the full committee also heard extensive arguments pro and con. Both the subcommittee and the full committee voted to recommend to the House that the plan be allowed to go into effect and that the disapproval resolution be defeated. As chairman of the committee, I have reported our recommendation to the House. I strongly support the committee's considered recommendation and I believe that the House will serve the country best by adopting the committee's view.

The committee believes that the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department, an agency primarily concerned with promoting business interests, to the Department of Justice, the agency given the primary responsibility for achieving the ideal of equal treatment of all our citizens will bring about a more effective administration of the Federal Government's programs for securing such true equality. The President has given the Attorney General the major responsibility in this field. Having this responsibility he needs the tools of conciliation as well as law enforcement to bring about the objectives of our legislation. The Community Relations Service will be stronger under the Attorney General and he will be stronger with it.

As I reviewed the testimony and the arguments for and against the plan in the committee's record, I was struck by the fact that almost all the arguments against the plan, and, for that matter, some of those for the plan, are based upon abstract, theoretical considerations. For example, would placing the Service in the Justice Department inhibit people from dealing with the Community Relations Service or would it encourage them to do so? Should a conciliation function be placed in an agency which also has law enforcement functions? Many States have combined these functions but some people argue that there is something vaguely wrong about this.

It is extremely important in my view that those Federal officials who must deal with the hard practical day-to-day problems of bringing about a true recognition of the rights of all our citizens unanimously recommend that this plan be adopted. No one in our Government is more dedicated to achieving full recognition of our basic rights and true equality in the treatment of all our citizens than are President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, Attorney General Katzenbach, and the Director of the Community Relations Service, Roger Wilkins. After heading up this program under the President's direction, Vice President HUMPHREY recommended this transfer and President Johnson, after considering all the facts, approved this recommendation. The Attorney General and the Director of the Service who have dealt daily and continually with the practical aspects of the problems involved, strongly support the move. Leaders of organizations which are also deeply involved, support the change.

We certainly should not ignore the considered judgment and the collective experience of these men who are thoroughly dedicated to achieving the ideals of true equality and who have first-hand experience with the problems involved.

I urge, therefore, that we give these men the organization which they sincerely believe will serve the country best. Let us cut through theoretical abstractions and instead let us deal with practical reality. Let us support the President by upholding the plan and defeating the disapproval resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 756

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HECHLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of

the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the resolution (H.Res. 756) expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1966, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it not be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 756

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 220, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—163

		NAYS—220
Abernethy	Erlenborn	Martin, Nebr.
Adair	Everett	May
Andrews, George W.	Findley	Michel
Andrews, Glenn	Fisher	Mills
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fountain	Mize
Arends	Ford, Gerald R.	Minshall
Ashbrook	Fulton, Pa.	Moore
Ashmore	Gathings	Morton
Baring	Gettys	Mosher
Bates	Gilligan	Nelsen
Beischer	Goodell	O'Neal, Ga.
Berry	Gross	Ottenger
Betts	Grover	Passman
Bolton	Gubser	Pelly
Brown, Clar- ence J., Jr.	Gurney	Pirnie
Bryohill, N.C.	Hagan, Ga.	Poif
Bryohill, Va.	Haley	Pool
Brock	Hall	Quie
Brown, Clar- ence J., Jr.	Halleck	Quillen
Bryohill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Randall
Bryohill, Va.	Hardy	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Harsha	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Harvey, Mich.	Reinecke
Byrnes, Wis.	Hebert	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cabell	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Callaway	Horton	Robison
Carter	Hosmer	Rumsfeld
Cederberg	Hungate	Satterfield
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Clancy	Ichord	Scott
Clausen,	Jarman	Selden
Don H.	Jennings	Shriver
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Skubitz
Conable	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
Cooley	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Corbett	Kastenmeier	Smith, Va.
Cramer	Keith	Springer
Curtin	King, N.Y.	Stafford
Curtis	Kornegay	Stanton
Dague	Landrum	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Langen	Talcott
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Taylor
Derwinski	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Devine	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wis.
Dickinson	Long, La.	Trimble
Dole	McClory	Tuck
Dorn	McCulloch	Tuten
Downing	McEwen	Watkins
Duncan, Tenn.	McMillan	Whalley
Edwards, Ala.	MacGregor	Whitten
Edwards, La.	Mailliard	Wilcox, Bob
Ellsworth	Marsh	Wyatt
	Martin, Ala.	Wyder
	Martin, Mass.	Younger
		NOT VOTING—49
	Abbitt	Green, Oreg.
	Anderson, III.	Griffin
	Ashley	Harvey, Ind.
	Ayers	Herlong
	Battin	Sweeney
	Burleson	Kelly
	Casey	Teague, Tex.
	Colmer	King, Calif.
	Dent	Laird
	Dingell	Laud
	Dowdy	Mathias
	Dwyer	Morse
	Edwards, Calif.	Matthews
	Feighan	Steed
	Flynt	Stubblefield
	Fuqua	Sweeney
		Teague, Tex.
		Ullman
		Wright
		Yates
		Zablocki

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Waggoner for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Abbott for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Toll against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Casey.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Burleson.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Fuqua with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with House Resolution 756.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WHY WE SHOULD ENACT LEGISLATION TO POOL LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American economy benefits immensely from the fruitful partnership between public and private initiative. Nowhere is this more evident than in the varied Federal programs to assist and stimulate the flow of private credit.

The home mortgage insurance and guarantee programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, the many programs of agricultural credit assistance, the lending assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration, and more recently the credit aids embodied in the college housing program and the student loan program—all these bear witness to our Nation's success in blending public and private efforts to achieve common goals.

Frequently, in this partnership, we start out with a program that is relatively dependent on Federal lending. Then in time, the program evolves into a form in which the private sector gradually takes up more of the burden.

Over the years, we have devised means to use the great resources of the private credit market to accomplish the same necessary and highly desirable social

purposes which we originally set out to accomplish through direct Government lending. When private capital takes up part or all of the burden of a lending program, the resources of the public sector are freed to turn to other equally worthwhile purposes.

Broadly speaking, this process has been operating ever since we turned to guaranteed and insured loans in place of some of the direct lending programs. We might single out home ownership, which is not only almost a universal individual American aspiration but also one of our most widely accepted social goals. We could never have achieved our high degree of home ownership without using the resources of the private market under guaranty and insurance arrangements. This is true for at least three reasons:

First. The capital resources of the private market are far greater than those of the Government;

Second. We could not have increased the Federal budget and, indeed, few if any of us would have wanted to increase the Federal budget to the degree required to provide the necessary funds through Government loans; and,

Third. While Government assistance was required to get the necessary programs underway, we needed the flexibility and ingenuity of the private market to carry them out successfully.

Federal credit programs, working through the private market, help to make the market stronger, more competitive, and better able to serve the economy's needs over the long term.

The substitution of private for public credit has received great impetus since the mid-1950's under a program of asset sales. This consists of selling loans—selling the loan paper—which is generated under various Federal lending programs.

The policy of asset sales, begun under the administration of President Eisenhower, has been endorsed by the distinguished private Commission on Money and Credit, of which Secretary of the Treasury Fowler was a member and which issued its authoritative report in 1961, and President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, of which former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was Chairman.

Despite major efforts to draw on private credit, the volume of direct Federal loans outstanding has increased in recent years. The total outstanding was \$25.1 billion on June 30, 1961, and \$33.1 billion June 30, 1965.

These loans have direct consequences on the Federal budget—and, thus, on the policies followed by any administration. Money for lending programs must be budgeted, even though it will be repaid with little or no ultimate net costs to the Federal Treasury.

This means that it must be matched by tax revenue or by additional Treasury debt—or else that it must take the place of some other program, which then must be postponed or dropped. It should not require much soul searching to decide which is preferable—higher taxes, a larger deficit, postponement or elimination of some other Government activity, or greater involvement of private capital in the public lending programs.

Therefore, I strongly favor the enactment this year of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 which President Johnson has proposed, to broaden and make available on a Government-wide basis the authority for the sale of participations in pools of financial assets now owned by Federal credit agencies.

#### ARE THERE DEFICIENCIES IN CLOTHING AND MILITARY SUPPLIES IN VIETNAM?

**Mr. SAYLOR.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. SAYLOR.** Mr. Speaker, for all the sudden prominence given the bomb shortage, it would seem excusable for the Pentagon to attempt to cover up any such matter of military significance. What is not clear is how the Nation's supply of ammunition was allowed to deteriorate while U.S. forces were being plunged deeper and deeper into military involvement and conflict, but this and other related matters will hopefully be resolved as soon as possible if only to preclude recurrences of this serious nature.

If there is justification for withholding information on lack of ammunition necessary to lend full support to the military effort, similar restrictions would hardly hold true so far as any deficiencies in clothing or other material affecting the comfort of U.S. fighting personnel are concerned. On the contrary, shortages of such equipment should be publicized as widely as possible if only to give all America an opportunity to join in overcoming the deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, if full gear is not available to all servicemen stationed in combat areas, manufacturing capacity not now engaged in military production should be turned forthwith to getting out whatever is needed on the frontlines. Letters to parents in Pennsylvania's 22d District from men in Vietnam appeal for such items as combat boots and fatigue clothes. While these cases may be isolated and not indicative of the Defense Department's general supply situation, it is a national duty to assure full equipment to every serviceman. If the Pentagon lacks the necessary gear, our people should be so informed immediately so that all hands can turn to in every way we know how to meet the demand.

Another matter which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues comes from a hospital corpsman who urged that his family provide him with a pistol as soon as possible. A Navy man assigned to the Marines, he makes frequent rescue missions into territory infested with Vietcong and is in need of a weapon small enough to be accessible on a moment's notice in the event of enemy attack. Thus far he has not been able to obtain a pistol of any sort from military officials, and there is suspicion that not enough are available for all the men who must expose themselves to jungle sorties. His parents purchased

one for his use, however, the Post Office Department has refused to mail it. If there are not enough side arms for men who need them, then I see no reason why the postal rules cannot be relaxed to provide our military men in the front lines with adequate equipment.

For weeks it was an open secret that Defense Department agents were scouring Europe in search of bombs at whatever price they could get them, yet the shortage was continually denied here at home.

If indeed firearms essential to the protection of our fighting men are in short supply, I am confident that a call to manufacturers, dealers, and individuals would quickly close the gap—even without having to pay premium prices.

Everyone wants to help in every way possible to make certain that combat forces have the finest equipment possible, but maximum effort will not be attained unless we are given the full truth about the supply story.

#### WELCOMES INVESTIGATION OF LEFTIST STUDENT GROUP

**Mr. WAGGONNER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. WAGGONNER.** Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, I introduced a House resolution calling for an investigation of the Students for a Democratic Society, a motley collection of unbathed leftwing students, heavily infiltrated and guided by Communist elements.

I was pleased to read in yesterday's New York Times that the national secretary of the society is squirming in protest over probes into their activities by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I welcome the FBI into the picture for I have every confidence in that agency. I have equal confidence that they will find that this collection of human garbage calling themselves a "society" is made up of more than just SWINE, as Cartoonist Al Capp calls them, but of blood-red Communist provocateurs. It is one thing to be a SWINE, students wildly indignant about nearly everything; it is another to be a dupe of Communist agents and their tool in their efforts to undermine our opposition to the hammer and sickle in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Freedom of speech is not at stake here, despite what the ivory tower professors would have us believe. Again, freedom of speech and association are one thing; giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war is quite another. No one has that right, not while American servicemen are dying on battlefields to preserve that right of free speech and association.

This investigation is long overdue and I hope there will be no foot dragging until it is concluded.

The Times story makes interesting reading and I insert it here in the RECORD for all to see.

FBI SAID TO BE INVESTIGATING STUDENT GROUP  
OPPOSED TO WAR—ORGANIZATION SAYS  
CHAPTERS AT YALE AND WESLEYAN ARE UN-  
DER SCRUTINY

(By Peter Kihss)

The national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society asserted yesterday that there "seems to be a national investigation" of his group by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Paul Booth, the 22-year-old secretary, said the 4-year-old organization had attacked the U.S. role in the Vietnam war and had sold 15,000 copies since September of a guide on how to claim conscientious objector status in the draft.

The only places Mr. Booth would identify as areas in which inquiries had been made were Wesleyan College in Middletown, Conn., and Yale University. He said the organization, with a "democratic radical program," had 175 to 200 chapters and 5,000 members, up from 3,000 last fall. Most of the members are college students, he said, but some are in high schools and young adult groups.

At Wesleyan, Stanley Idzerda, dean of the college, said an FBI agent had asked him about 2 weeks ago for names of all students in the college's Students for a Democratic Society chapter, and had been refused such data.

Mr. Idzerda said the college kept no such lists, and "we consider the student's activity his own affair."

#### DANGERS CITED

"It's unfortunate," he added, "that a climate of suspicion can be created by such activities that might lead some students to be more circumspect than the situation requires. Things like this can be a danger to a free and open community if men change their behavior because of it."

The college's semiweekly newspaper, the Wesleyan Argus, headlined the incident last Friday, and Mr. Idzerda said he then received another FBI visit Saturday. That time, he said, an agent contended there had been a "misunderstanding," and asserted there was no investigation of the society, but rather an inquiry into "possible infiltration of the SDS chapter by Communist influence."

A spokesman for the FBI office at New Haven said last night that the Bureau "makes inquiries every day on campuses throughout the country—we investigate 175 types of violations, security as well as criminal."

The spokesman said FBI files were "confidential," but, he added, "with respect to the statement that we questioned roommates of SDS members at Yale, this is not true."

#### METHODS ASSAILED

Eight members of the society's Wesleyan chapter had decried such alleged questioning at Yale in an article in the Argus. The article asserted that if the FBI wished information about member's beliefs, "it should have its agents directly question the individuals concerned."

Reached at the society's national office in Chicago, Mr. Booth, who has been the organization's full-time secretary since Nicholas deB. Katzenbach had told a Chicago news conference last October that the society was among groups figuring in a Justice Department inquiry into the antidraft movement.

Mr. Booth asserted, however, that his group's activity had been legal—"counseling and giving information on conscientious objection"—and there was apparently no investigation at that time.

He suggested that the FBI inquiries began last month partly because of some "totally false statements" about the society. Also, he said, individual chapters took part in demonstrations against the Vietnam war last month, including fasts at Wesleyan and other places.

Sarah Murphy, 20-year-old coordinator of the society's New York region, said last night that she knew of no member or school official involved with 28 to 30 chapters who had been directly contacted by the FBI about society activities.

#### CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY PRAISES REPRESENTATIVE MOSS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution by the California State Legislature regarding Mr. JOHN E. MOSS, of California.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the California State Assembly recently adopted a resolution, coauthored by 57 assemblymen, commanding our colleague, JOHN MOSS, for his "continuous battle to keep open the channels of information for free access by the public and the press."

The resolution, which was approved unanimously, states that JOHN MOSS is "regarded nationwide by members of the press corps as the country's most active official exponent of the people's right to know about their Government."

I commend this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

#### H. RES. 136

"Resolution relative to Representative JOHN E. MOSS by Assemblyman Z'Berg, March 22, 1966

"Whereas Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, of the House of Representatives from California's Third Congressional District, a former member of the California State Assembly, has been untiring in his role as a guardian of the people's right to free access of information and to know about their Government; and

"Whereas Representative JOHN E. MOSS has been chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Government Information since its creation on June 9, 1955; and

"Whereas Representative MOSS has stated that 'information is a major resource in a democracy, for government by the people must rest upon the premise that the people and their elected representatives are well informed about the activities of their government'; and

"Whereas Representative MOSS maintains a long active record in behalf of an open-door policy for news media and against restrictions on press freedom, and is regarded nationwide by members of the press corps as the country's most active official exponent of the people's right to know about their Government; and

"Whereas Representative MOSS is dedicated to the principle that freedom of the press is a foundation stone of American liberty, and he believes 'the rights to information are inherent in the rights of speech and press'; and

"Whereas Representative MOSS has a deep conviction that the public has a right to be informed about government inaction, a right to have maximum information about government officials' stewardship of the public trust; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members commend Representative JOHN E. MOSS for his continuous battle to keep open the channels of information for free access by the public and the press; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Representative JOHN E. MOSS."

#### REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Z'berg was granted unanimous consent to take up House Resolution 136 without reference to committee or file.

Resolution read.

#### MEMBERS MADE COAUTHORS OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 136

Mr. Z'berg was granted unanimous consent that all members so desiring be placed upon House Resolution 136 as coauthors.

#### ROLLCALL

The following members indicated a desire to become coauthors: Assemblymen Allen, Alquist, Ashcraft, Badham, Barnes, Bee, Beilenson, Biddle, Burgener, Burton, Carrell, Chapel, Collier, Conrad, Cusanovich, Danielson, Dannemeyer, Davis, Deukmejian, Dills, Dymally, Elliott, Fenton, Flournoy, Foran, Garrigus, Gonsalves, Greene, Harvey Johnson, Ray E. Johnson, Kennick, Knox, Lanterman, McMillan, Meyers, Mills, Monagan, Moretti, Pattee, Porter, Quimby, Ryan, Shoemaker, Soto, Stanton, Stevens, Thomas, Unruh, Veneman, Veysey, Waldie, Warren, Whetmore, Williamson, Winton, and Young.

Resolution read, as amended, and adopted unanimously.

#### WELDON JAMES RESIGNS POSITION AS ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF LOUISVILLE, KY., COURIER-JOURNAL, TO ENTER MARINE CORPS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, one newspaperman has let us know where he stands on Vietnam. Weldon James, associate editor of the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal, has resigned his job to enter the Marine Corps to show his support for our policy in southeast Asia. In doing so he has written a remarkable farewell address, one that bears reading by all Americans, regardless of their feeling on our policy.

The article, published April 14, 1966, is preceded by a note from Mr. James' editor, Barry Bingham.

The note and article follow:

#### NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

Weldon James, in the statement which appears below, is clearly acting on principle in a cause which commands his deep conviction.

He is one of the fortunate people who can see the issue of Vietnam in clear, sharp outlines of black and white. I share with millions of Americans the unhappy necessity of viewing it in infinitely varying shades of gray.

I cannot in good conscience support every aspect of the official American position. I cannot, on the other hand, find the release of condemning our whole policy and demanding American withdrawal.

The man who is owner and editor of a newspaper must shoulder the burden of editorial policy decisions. I listen to my valued associates, such as Weldon James, with respect as well as affection. But the final responsibility for the editorial page cannot be

divided. I can only act on my conscience, as Weldon James is acting on his.

—BARRY BINGHAM.

**STATEMENT BY WELDON JAMES**

This is one editorial only a great newspaper could invite anyone to write and to sign.

I quit. I resign as an associate editor of the Courier-Journal. I am going on active duty in the Marine Corps to testify to my belief that U.S. policy in Vietnam is right—and that the quicker more newspapers and more people give the President solid support, the shorter and less dangerously complicated the war there will be.

The Courier-Journal, as its readers know, is no appeaser on Vietnam, no advocate of U.S. withdrawal. But it does not speak with the sharpness I believe the continuing crisis demands.

I believe that the United States was right about Vietnam in 1954, right when President Kennedy increased our involvement, right when President Johnson did likewise, and right to commit, in the President's words, "whatever it takes" to deny the Communists a military triumph there.

I believe Lyndon Johnson is as right as Roosevelt, as timely as Truman, as cautiously correct as Kennedy, and as entitled to Eisenhower's and the Nation's support as the Courier-Journal used to say in editorials I wrote.

But the Courier-Journal, like some other great newspapers, no longer takes a forthright stand on this paramount issue. I respect the conscientiousness of its reasoning, but I am not convinced.

**NO TIME TO PLAY HAMLET**

This is no time for the press of a great nation to play Hamlet—or Lippmann. Walter Lippmann's gloom about the Truman doctrine was 100 percent wrong. That doctrine played a decisive role in converting the Soviet Union to a belief in peaceful coexistence. Its great dividend is the historic rift between Peking and Moscow today.

Mr. Lippmann's China-doorstep arguments about southeast Asia today are identical with his Russia-doorstep arguments about Greece and Turkey in 1947—and I believe identically fallacious about what the United States should do and can do.

The Courier-Journal has not endorsed the Lippmann line, nor has it been guilty of the vacillation or the silence or the yes-butts of a good part of the American press that have misled both Hanoi and Peking. But in recent months it has been something less than decisive. And all this across the Nation has nurtured honest confusion of the minority in this country—and unintentionally encouraged the sit-ins, the draft-card burners, the neoisolationist belief that if only the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia (or any other trouble spot), the world would have instant peace.

No one can deny that the issues in southeast Asia are terribly complex, or contend that we have not made mistakes there. It would be a miracle if we had not. And I fully respect the honest doubts and anxieties of some of my colleagues and of other thoughtful Americans who differ with my views. But I believe it is past time they resolved them and invoked positive support for the President. This could, in my emphatic belief, keep the war limited—and help to shorten it.

Diversity of critical opinion is not only a right but the great strength of a democracy, and no American I know would limit it. But there is enough evidence at hand for the American jury to reach a verdict on Vietnam. The evidence is not just two decades of history but the exposition of that history and of the facts today by the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, Averell Harriman, McGeorge Bundy, and a host of others.

At moments in history when their declarations had a powerful and useful impact on public opinion, the Courier-Journal's Henry Watterson said "to hell with the Hohenzollerns" and Mark Ethridge and Barry Bingham said in effect "to hell with Hitler"—and Bingham went into the Navy before Pearl Harbor to show where he stood. I hold it is past time to say to hell with Ho—and to speed him toward that destination until he sees the virtues of the conference table.

That solution manifestly is impossible as long as Ho believes that the American people will indeed, as he long ago boasted, weary, waver, and withdraw.

If we don't get the message to Ho now, the need to get it to Mao Tse-tung will be upon us in time. He's told us what he plans. It is as foolish to laugh at his boasts and Red China's "weakness" now as it was to laugh at "that clown Hitler" and Nazi Germany's "weakness" in the 1930's.

Some of my good but regrettably misinformed friends have attributed the positivity of my views to my long ties with the Marine Corps, instead of to reason, logic, and a lifelong study of history.

This is nonsense, of course. The Marine Corps has no foreign policy. It has no politics. Sound out six marine sergeants—or six marine generals, for that matter—and you'll find as many differing "experts" on foreign affairs and politics as you'll find in the corner tavern.

The Marine Corps, as a long succession of its Commandants have made plain, has but one job. That is, to obey the orders of the civilian Commander in Chief, the President.

But the Marine Corps does teach the uses of disciplined rage and the application of "measured strength"—exactly what the United States is employing in Vietnam today. And it has been asking for Reserves to volunteer. I am proud it believes I can be of some use to it now, thanks in great part to the generosity with which the Courier-Journal over the years has enabled me to advance my training in Marine Corps schools, the National War College, and with Navy and Marine forces on the job in Europe and the Orient.

A few comments on the national scene: It is well-nigh incredible to me that some self-styled liberal Democrats should be ignoring the posthumous revelation by his son of Adlai Stevenson's true position on Vietnam (the Courier-Journal, of course, took sensible editorial notice of this). It is even more shocking that they should be seeking to explain away Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's vigorous and persuasive support of the President's policies as the calculated insincerity of "a White House captive." They owe it to their label—and to the country—to go back and ponder what John F. Kennedy said and did about Vietnam.

**DE GAULLE'S ABSURD EQUATION**

I believe that the worst bit of mischief-making about southeast Asia has been perpetrated by the President of France. NATO aside, it is appalling that De Gaulle can induce anyone anywhere to accept his absurd equation of U.S. aid to South Vietnam with France's vain attempt, against Anglo-American advice and warning to hold on to her colonial empire in Indochina after World War II. But when I discussed Vietnam with some hundreds of the Nation's college student editors in New York recently, I discovered that some—a thin minority, fortunately—have indeed accepted this absurdity as "fact."

The Courier-Journal, to its credit, has not encouraged the absurdities of the super-liberal Democrats or the French equationists. But it has not yet attacked them with the vigor I think they demand.

To longtime readers of the Courier-Journal I must observe that I came to Louisville some 17 years ago on handsome prom-

ises, handsomely kept—that I would have time for foreign travel and lecturing and other writing, and would wear no man's collar, and be paid to argue and to criticize the newspaper from front page to back, and be expected to write nothing if I "lost the argument."

Well, I have lost the big one now, and so I am leaving. But the grief is purely professional. I leave with regret for my lack of persuasiveness, and with my high regard and liking for my editorial colleagues intact.

That goes especially for Molly Clowes—no difference of opinion could ever diminish the professional admiration and the deep affection I have for her—and for Barry Bingham, a comrade in arms in Europe and the Pacific, a close friend since 1942, whose example of 1941 I am now following.

**ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE MEMBER CHARGES DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WITH EVASION—REPRESENTATIVE DURWARD HALL SAYS BOMB PURCHASE CONTRADICTS "POLICY"**

MR. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MR. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the continued mismanagement of our Defense Establishment by Secretary McNamara gives me great worry and concern as a member of this body's Committee on Armed Services. Within the past few days, we have learned of a large acquisition of 750 pound bombs from a West German firm, and the Republic. According to the news reports, our Government paid almost 15 times the amount the bombs were sold for.

MR. Speaker, in January of this year, I initiated an inquiry with the Department of Defense concerning our policy in regard to reacquisition of various categories of ammunition from European sources.

I want to quote from a reply I received dated March 31, and signed by Assistant Secretary of Defense, John McNaughton, referring to shells and bombs being reacquired from the Federal Republic of Germany.

The letter says, in part:

The price of this material cannot be given precisely at this time. Some of it was given originally as grant-in-aid, and some of it was sold to Germany. The guiding principle on reacquisition is, of course, that we will pay no more for the material than was paid to us when it was sold.

NOW, MR. Speaker, I realize that this administration has never been too bothered by principles, or at least there are some strong differences as to what constitutes principle. But when the Department of Defense says on March 31 that the guiding principle on reacquisition is that we will pay no more for the material than was paid to us when it was sold, something is wrong, not in Denmark, but right here in Washington, right down at the Pentagon, and right in the office of

the Secretary of Defense. Who can the American people believe? What can they believe? How much more mismanagement of our Defense organization can we stand?

Who, I ask, is stretching the "credibility gap"?

I realize that the Secretary has left a small loophole by making no direct reference in his letter to me, about reacquisition from private firms, rather than from the West German Republic. But the nature of my inquiry was such that it covered all possibilities.

Indeed, my initial inquiry states as follows:

I would like to know if there has been a sizable purchase of small arms ammunition by the United States from any West German or other foreign firm.

The Secretary specifically referred to bombs and shells, so it is obvious his answer covered more than just small arms ammunition.

Furthermore, in an earlier reply dated January 28, 1965, Mr. McNaughton said:

It should be noted that no private firm is involved; this is a transaction between governments.

In answer to my second letter of inquiry, much was evaded and left unanswered as perusal of the correspondence would reveal.

It now becomes clear that the Department of Defense was evasive in their reply to my inquiry, and furthermore that, when they did provide additional information, they not only ignored the acquisition of bombs at a much higher price than we sold them for originally, but that they also pretended to be following a firm policy, which events now prove to have been nonexistent.

Just how far does the right to lie have to be extended to protect the image of Secretary McNamara?

#### PRESERVING THE POLITICAL INDEPENDENT STATUS OF OUR FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

**MR. NELSEN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

**MR. NELSEN.** Mr. Speaker, I rise once again, as I often have in the past, to bring to the attention of this House a matter of concern to those of us who are interested in preserving the political independent status of our Federal civil service system. Time after time I have addressed myself to such transgressions as fund solicitations from employees in the classified service, political arm twisting, and lax enforcement of the Corrupt Practices Act.

The incident to which I have reference today, however, can possibly be of greater significance to the degradation of the civil service than any to which I have discussed before. This has to do with the appearance of the Chairman

of the Civil Service Commission itself as the principal speaker at a \$50-a-plate campaign fund raising affair on Monday night of this week. Truly this must be a case of the fox being the guard of the chickens.

In his "Federal Spotlight" column of the Washington Star this Monday, Joseph Young observes:

It is the first time in memory that a member of the Civil Service Commission, which is supposed to stay completely out of political matters, has spoken at a political fund-raising affair.

Now we find that the Chairman himself, who in the past has also played the role of a political lobbyist for the administration, incidentally, has gone a step further by violating the unwritten law and tradition which guided those before him assigned as protectors of the almost century-old civil service system.

The enactment of the Pendleton Act in 1883 grew out of the fetid, sordid spoils system of the post-Civil War period which culminated in the assassination of President Garfield by a disappointed office seeker. Are we to return to the old spoils system with John Macy leading the retreat?

What did Mr. Macy have to say about his indulging in an evening of partisan political activity at a fundraising dinner? He is reported to have seen no wrong in his being the star attraction at this political affair since his speech would be nonpolitical.

I daresay the tragedy of all this is compounded by the Chairman's apparently not realizing the significance of his action. He—of all people—should be the first to recognize the rank impropriety of his action. If the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has no greater appreciation for the responsibilities of his position than this would indicate, then he certainly by his own admission disqualifies himself from further service on the Commission.

Mr. Young's article is as follows:

[From Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 19, 1966]  
CAMPAIGN DINNER SPEECH TONIGHT NOT A BIT POLITICAL, MACY SAYS

(By Joseph Young)

A lot of eyebrows are being raised over the fact that Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy is going to be the principal speaker tonight at the \$50 a plate campaign fund-raising dinner for Representative CLARENCE LONG, Democrat, of Maryland.

It is the first time in memory that a member of the Civil Service Commission, which is supposed to stay completely out of political matters, has spoken at a political fund-raising affair. Maryland's two Democratic Senators—DANIEL BREWSTER and JOSEPH TYDINGS—will also attend, BREWSTER as the toastmaster and TYDINGS as official greeter.

Macy says his speech will be completely nonpolitical, that it will deal with the Government's manpower problems. He says that Long is a longtime friend and was one of his teachers at Wesleyan University.

"There is nothing in my speech that can be interpreted in any way as a political endorsement," Macy said.

However, the speech recalls the uproar among Republicans in Congress last year when Macy acted as a congressional liaison man for President Johnson in trying to line up support for several key administration

bills not in the least connected with civil service.

#### MORE ABOUT NATO

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

**MR. HALPERN.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand somewhat on my earlier remarks of April 6 relative to the evolving NATO dilemma.

While I am not privy to the inner deliberations of our Government, and so must depend upon traditional news sources and transcripts, these do not in truth give me much confidence that the United States is handling this problem maturely and realistically.

Certainly, along with most Americans, I profoundly regret the recent decisions of the French nation, our historic ally. In my view her withdrawal from the NATO command structure, as distinct from the alliance, is not in the best military and political interests of either France or the other allies.

Much of the soul searching which is now going on, however helpful in restoring some emotional balance, is irrelevant. To be sure, we are not blameless; American attitudes and policies have in several instances crystallized De Gaulle's suspicions of American motives, and thus have emboldened him. Perhaps this was inevitable, given the realization that our diplomatic instincts on the world scene, as a global power, are necessarily different from and maybe irreconcilable with those of General de Gaulle. The French decisions may have come regardless of any past American endeavors to attune our policy more closely with French interests.

However, what concerns me most is our official approach to this unalterable fact of French disengagement. Are the 14 members, spurred on by the United States, to adopt an attitude of complete intransigence? Are we to consume our mental faculties in a restless search for wordy, meaningless communiques in order to cement a wall against French policy? Does our interest lie in an attempt, however unrewarding and illusory, to punish the mutineer? To isolate him through outraged opinion?

Such posturing, self-defeating and narrow in terms of long-range American interests, is being espoused by well-meaning but embittered people. Struggling daily with unseemly events they cannot control, aggravated by the widening gap between their dreams and unpleasant facts, many of our Atlanticists, in and out of the State Department, are propelling policy in a deliberate anti-French direction. High officials of our Government imply that the United States simply cannot accept the immoral, childish behavior of this ungrateful upstart, tearing agreements to pieces, placing demands, disrupting what are thought to be essential security arrangements.

The tenor of the American response thus far indicates that we may be prepared to totally ignore France in recasting the NATO structure. It would be a

serious error, in reshaping the organization, if the 14 allies resurrected their military relationship in such a way that the French Government could not give some practical application to the mutual defense pledge.

Instead, there seems to be an inclination on the part of the United States to handle the French Government as if it were a renegade.

Recent pronouncements and actions by our Government give cause for the greatest anxiety. We have engaged in hasty attempts to mobilize European opinion against French policy, showing an utter lack of diplomatic tact and perspective. In addition to giving voice to hurt feelings, we have reiterated in dreary fashion our traditional belief in integration, amounting to a sort of Monday morning rehash of spent ideas, unimpressive because it all comes too late.

The bankruptcy of this initial position may succeed eventually in dividing Europe against itself. Indeed, we have already contributed measurably toward undermining that crucial Franco-German rapprochement which is elementary to the future peace of Europe.

As far as France is concerned, we are assured that in wartime the French forces will necessarily be united with our own in any common conflict. The Foreign Minister has reaffirmed the NATO pledge, to the effect that if any member is subject to an unprovoked attack, then all the members are bound to go to its defense. He has denied, publicly, that France will in the future withdraw from the alliance. Furthermore, I believe the French Government is receptive to discussing with its allies the assumption of some prearrangements which are essential to give effect to the NATO commitment.

French policy distinguishes between the integrated organization and the alliance as such. And second, it rejects the possibility of a European ground war without recourse to nuclear weapons, which remain under national control. Hence the British, the Russians, and the Americans have a unilateral option here, and it may come into play on French soil without French say-so.

If, as the French believe, any European conflict is to be resolved on the basis of nuclear weaponry, under other than French control, then I would admit that France lacks leverage over her own ultimate preservation. Objectively, this is not disadvantageous to France; our nuclear umbrella is credible; but this dependence, which causes the French Government discomfort, should be comprehensible if not wholly valid.

It is possible that President de Gaulle wishes to open the way toward a singular political rapprochement with Soviet Russia, thereby freeing the French Government to play in central Europe a predominant role in the settlement of all outstanding continental problems. These relate not only to Germany but to the evolution of the East European satellites. At the same time, this prescription would effectively remove French fears that America could itself deal bi-

laterally with Russia, without consultation with France on issues which affect her status and security in Europe.

While not discounting this eventuality, it is incumbent upon the United States to move tactfully and calmly at this point to reformulate this NATO organization as I suggested on April 6. It must be done in a fashion which suits our allies and accommodates the special relationship which France insists upon for herself. Differences have already emerged among the allies as to how this alliance is to be sustained. The United States could lose everything by enforcing the adoption of unpopular methods, or by simply redressing tired and doctrinaire policies.

I hope very much that we will have the good sense to cast hypocrisy and pretense aside, and mutually effect a system which is both practicable and takes account of the existing realities.

#### NOW WE ARE APOLOGIZING FOR FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

**MR. WAGGONNER.** Mr. Speaker, in recent months, as the doves and the chickens have continued to flutter around Washington urging on the President a policy of retreat, negotiation, and appeasement in Vietnam, it seems to me that the administration has had to spend unnecessary time assuring the people of this country and the enemy as well, that we are in Vietnam to stay and to win.

If anyone within the administration has any wonder why the people are uncertain of our intentions, confused about our aims or unconvinced about our determination, they need look no further than the front page of the Washington Post. In a story in yesterday's Post, the headline stated that "U.S. Denies Escalating Vietnam War." An unidentified Pentagon spokesman went to great pains to apologize for our strikes against two antiaircraft missile sites on the outskirts of Hanoi and to assure everyone, friend and enemy alike, that these strikes were defensive in nature only.

Instead of speaking positively and firmly about our efforts to win that dreadful war, we are now apologizing for our strikes.

What a ludicrous position this puts us in. On the one hand, we are trying to convince the Communists that we are not going to turn tail from our commitment and on the other we go out of the way to assure the doves and the appeasers that we are not really escalating or going all out.

As dreadful as it is, it is apparent to me that statements such as this are the source of the juice the administration has to stew in when they wonder why the people are not convinced that ours is a dedicated effort.

The story from the Post, as appalling as it is, needs to be read by every Member and I would like to insert it here in the RECORD.

#### UNITED STATES DENIES ESCALATING VIETNAM WAR

(By John G. Norris)

Pentagon spokesmen denied yesterday that American bomb strikes against two antiaircraft missile sites on the outskirts of Hanoi represented any planned escalation of the war, as claimed by North Vietnam.

The U.S. officials said the destruction of the missile bases 15 and 17 miles from Hanoi—closer to the North Vietnam capital than U.S. aircraft ever had struck previously—was defensive in nature.

The SAM surface-to-air missile sites were not on Sunday's target list, it was said, and their destruction did not represent any change in longstanding Washington restrictions on bombing in the north.

Rather, the Air Force F-100 and F-105 fighter bombers which blasted the missile bases were flying "CAP"—combat air patrol—over other U.S. planes attacking a targeted strategic bridge 33 miles south of Hanoi, when they sighted the SAM sites. One fired at the U.S. planes and the American fighters then attacked them.

American pilots have standing orders to attack any North Vietnam missile site they sight, if it could interfere with their mission.

But while this particular attack does not represent any deliberate escalation of the war ordered by Washington, there is growing belief at the Pentagon that such orders may come soon.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that American planes knock out North Vietnam's major petroleum reserves, located in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, as a more effective means of slowing down the movement of troops and supplies to the Vietcong from North Vietnam via the Ho Chi Minh trail.

The bridge 33 miles south of Hanoi hit by American planes Sunday was described here as "knocked out of service" but as none of the spans were actually severed it may be soon repaired.

Sunday's attack also put out of action a highway bridge at Haiphong, on the main road between Hanoi and Haiphong, about 21 miles from Hanoi. It was bombed last fall but repaired since then.

U.S. Navy carrier pilots also reported the probable destruction of another missile site 160 miles south of Hanoi. The attacks bring to seven the total of SAM installations reported destroyed since July 27. Eight or nine others have been damaged.

Aircraft from the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* also struck Sunday at other points around Vinh, the major junction on the Communist supply line south. The Associated Press in Saigon said the Navy planes apparently hit liquid fuel used in the SAM missiles and most likely destroyed the site.

Russia is believed to have shipped 86 SAM installations—some mobile and some fixed—to North Vietnam. Some 160 missiles have been fired at U.S. planes, downing 10 planes.

American spokesmen in Saigon said no American plane was lost in the attacks near Hanoi. But five aircraft were knocked down by antiaircraft guns Saturday through Monday. Two airmen are listed as missing, the others were rescued.

There were few reports of ground action yesterday. However, a Vietcong suicide squad attacked U.S. Marine positions 375 miles north of Saigon Monday behind a barrage of Communist mortar shells. The marines lowered the barrels of their 155-millimeter, self-propelled guns and blasted the mortars. Then as the Vietcong attacked, the marines hit them with small arms fire. The action was 7 miles from Da Nang.

News services reported from Saigon that Vietcong terror continued against pro-government officials. A marine patrol found the

mutilated body of a village chief of Kyxuan Island, near Chulai. It was reported that two young Vietnamese girls had lured the young man into a house where he was killed by Vietcong agents.

#### PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

**MR. MOORHEAD.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

**MR. MOORHEAD.** Mr. Speaker, I support the Participation Sales Act of 1966 because I am sure it is sound legislation, it is in the interests of the people of the United States, and it will contribute to the more realistic sensible financing of Federal Government programs.

This legislation is nothing more than a proposal to authorize the pooling of certain Government loans for sale on the private market. This pooling technique has been proved highly effective in the last several years. It was pioneered by the Export-Import Bank and since then other agencies including the Veterans' Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association have used this technique with excellent results.

All this legislation proposes to do is to extend this technique to other Federal credit programs, such as those of the Office of Education, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Small Business Administration.

Substituting private for public credit is not a new idea—in fact, it has been a cardinal principle of Federal financing for more than 10 years.

It carries the wholehearted endorsement of such groups as the Commission on Money and Credit—a blue-ribbon panel of economic and financial experts set up by the Committee on Economic Development to study our national needs; the Committee on Federal Credit Programs—set up by President Kennedy to examine principles of Federal financing and many other outstanding groups and individuals on both sides of the political fence.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, was a member of the Commission on Money and Credit. He supports the policy of substituting private for public credit today as he did in 1961 when the Commission handed in its report. In that report the Commission said, and I quote:

Where it can be effective, a loan guarantee type of program should take preference over the direct lending type of program.

President Kennedy's Committee was headed by then Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and among the members were David Bell, Walter Heller, and William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. That Committee had this to say about the substitution of private for public credit and I quote:

The Committee believes that Federal credit programs should, in the main and whenever consistent with essential program goals, encourage and supplement, rather than displace private credit.

Let me give you one final sample of the bipartisan support which this important policy has had in the past and which it deserves now. I quote from a minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee report on legislation to provide temporary increases in the public debt limit. This report, delivered in May 1963 had this to say on the subject:

The administration also can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets.

The point I am trying to make is simple. The point is that this is a sound measure for Government finance, that the policy under which it was framed has the clear and unequivocal support of both parties, of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and many, many others who have had an opportunity to deal at first hand with the realities of Federal finance.

The proposed legislation in no way dilutes the authority or control of the Congress over Federal spending or lending programs.

For all these reasons, I am proud to number myself among the many distinguished leaders who have supported this policy. On that basis, I now support this legislation.

#### A CITIZEN'S EFFORT CHANGES BOSTON RENEWAL PROJECT

**MR. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**MR. WIDNALL.** Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1965, I related to this Chamber the efforts by the Boston Redevelopment Authority to oust low- and moderate-income families from their homes to make way for a high-rise, high-income apartment project which nobody except the developers apparently wanted. A month later, on September 21, I spoke to this body on the North Harvard Street project, as it is called, indicating that the Federal urban renewal authorities had made only a cursory study of the matter after appeals from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEIL] and the State's two Senators had halted activity at the project site.

I am happy to report, at this time, that despite the indifference of Federal regional officials, the hard fight by the residents of the North Harvard Street area to maintain their homes and work through rehabilitation rather than clearance has apparently achieved a reasonable solution. A blue-ribbon panel of citizens appointed by Boston's Mayor Collins has gone beyond the mayor's directives and, as I suggested when it was formed, has worked out a plan in conjunction with the residents of the area. Boston Redevelopment Authority Administrator, Edward Logue, has proved very cooperative in this regard.

As the attorney for the residents, William P. Homans, Jr., has observed it will take tact and understanding on both

sides to work out the individual details of rehabilitation and compliance to standards, but I am sure that both sides are willing to work together toward a solution that is responsive to human needs. The rehabilitation loan program provided in the 1964 and 1965 Housing Acts at the request of the Republican minority on the House Banking and Currency Committee should prove very helpful if Federal officials will now cooperate.

The following newspaper articles and letter from Mr. Logue detail the story:

[From the Boston Herald, Dec. 17, 1965]

#### PANEL PLAN SAVES 16 HOMES: ALLSTON RESIDENTS VICTORS OVER BRA

(By Stanley Eames)

Embattled residents of the Boston Redevelopment Authority's North Harvard Street, Allston, renewal project, have won the battle to save their homes, the Herald learned last night.

A blue-ribbon panel chosen last September by Mayor Collins to determine the kind of development to be erected by the BRA is preparing to submit to them a plan which would save the 16 buildings which can be rehabilitated. A meeting with the residents is expected to be held Sunday.

The plan, drawn up by the BRA at the panel's request, provides that seven of the homes be relocated near their present sites, and that the other nine be rehabilitated.

They would be blended into a 200-unit project over which a 14-story apartment building would tower, and which would include 78 four-story walk-up apartment units and 1 two-story single family units.

Although nothing of an official nature has occurred, or will occur when residents meet to discuss the plan, the blue-ribbon panel headed by Gilbert Hood, Jr., president of H. P. Hood & Sons Co., is expected to recommend it to the BRA and Mayor Collins if the North Harvard Street area residents approve it.

\* \* \* \* \*

Most of the 90-odd families originally affected have moved away, and much of the 6½-acre triangle has been razed by BRA bulldozers. The handful remaining have resisted to the last the BRA's attempts to move them out and level their homes, which were slated to make way for a luxury apartment complex.

No cost or engineering details have been provided the panel by the BRA, and the price of rehabilitation to the remaining residents remains unknown at present.

#### DEMANDED PLAN

It was understood that if the North Harvard Street residents do not favor the plan—although it would appear extremely unlikely, since this is what they have been battling for over many months—the panel will drop it. Agreement on the broad principle of the proposition would be an initial step toward bringing it to pass.

The BRA, when the panel asked for various plans which could be used in the triangle, did not submit one calling for rehabilitation. Mayor Collins and BRA Chief Edward Logue made it clear publicly that they considered none of the structures existing there susceptible to repair in the shadow of a spanking new development.

The panel demanded the present plan on its own initiative, and it was produced, after some delay, by the BRA.

\* \* \* \* \*

The development occurred at a time when legislation filed by Senator Beryl Cohen, Democrat, Brookline, to save existing buildings in the area had bogged down in the legislative process, through the efforts of solons friendly to Mayor Collins.

**WILL PICK DEVELOPER**

The panel is not scheduled to meet again until after Christmas, and at that time the decisive vote may be taken. Mayor Collins threw the whole issue in the panel's lap when he named its members, in effect abrogating his and Logue's powers in the matter.

The panel also is charged with the selection of a developer when a plan is agreed upon.

The proposed renewal project would have its 14-story apartment tower at the corner of North Harvard Street and Western Avenue. The structures which would need to be moved are located principally now in that corner. They would be scattered along North Harvard Street, Stadium, Harvium, and Hefner Places.

The existing structures to be moved or rehabilitated on-site would be clustered, in general, along North Harvard Street.

The 10 two-story single family units, and the 78-unit, four-story walk-up apartments would be built to front on Western Avenue.

There would be malls, walks, and tot-lots, and adequate parking space. At the apartment tower, it would be under a single-level deck.

**FIVE-YEAR FIGHT**

But all of this is of less importance to the people of the area than the fact that their homes—mostly small, wooden structures in need of some repair—may be saved.

Seldom in the stormy history of urban renewal have so few fought so tenaciously, almost obsessively, to keep their houses.

The fight has lasted for 5 years, for those who stayed to the end.

They refused to pay rent on houses taken from them by eminent domain by the BRA. Last summer, when the agency began evicting families, there were violent demonstrations, with babes in arms caught up in the middle of melees, and residents hauled away in the arms of policemen.

Last August, householders took a bus to Washington to demand relief from U.S. Urban Renewal Commissioner William Slayton, and from Massachusetts congressional delegation. Federal housing officials sidestepped the problem, terming it a purely local matter.

**U.S. Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL**, Republican, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Housing, scored Mayor Collins' nomination of the blue-ribbon panel as a cruel obituary of the hopes and desires of low- and moderate-income citizens.

The controversy was particularly bitter because it had been proposed early in 1960, not by BRA planners, but by the P & P Realty Co., and it received speedy and favorable action by the administration.

The first public hearing, held on June 27, 1962, brought a wild eruption of fury from the residents, the first sign of the long and emotional battle to come. They hired William Homans, Jr., as their counsel, and Homans has pursued the matter vigorously.

Logue, who did not personally favor the project from the outset—and who inherited it—nevertheless stood his ground, once committed to it. He condemned the residents' resistance as "mob rule."

Meanwhile, the plight of North Harvard Street attracted sympathy and support from some segments of the Harvard community nearby, from private architects who believed existing buildings could be saved, and from a group of Cambridge residents.

Eventually, the pressures grew so great, with the 1966 election season approaching, that the mayor tossed the ball to the panel.

The BRA's report to the panel on the potential for rehabilitation agreed largely with another submitted in October to representatives of the Allston group.

**INSPECTS AREA**

John A. DeLoria of Boston, a veteran architect, inspected the project area and found "the majority of these structures to be structurally sound with perfectly plumb walls and no sign of settling in either the framing of the buildings or their foundations \* \* \* some are in excellent condition, requiring no work, while others are in a condition of deferred maintenance for reasons which are understandable."

In most cases, DeLoria found, rehabilitation could be done without excessive cost.

"Certainly," he said, "a house that is in need of general cleaning and repair should not be abandoned as unfit for human habitation."

"On the contrary, it is my opinion that 90 percent of the 35 structures in the area can and should be rehabilitated, or their owners given the opportunity to rehabilitate."

A BRA report to Logue from his engineers, along with the new plan, said that 14 buildings containing 18 dwelling units had been identified in BRA surveys as in "fair" or "good" condition, and "to be considered for rehabilitation." One building owned by a leader in the battle to keep the homes was found in "poor" condition, but the engineers recommended it be saved because the owner was so determined to remain.

**SEVEN ABSENTEE OWNERS**

The report said it could be anticipated that a large percentage of the 16 buildings considered salvageable "will not \* \* \* be rehabilitated. Seven of the 16 were in absentee ownership at the time of taking (by the BRA). Payment has been refused on only 4 of the 16."

Acceptance of the plan presumably would result in the buildings being reconveyed to their owners by the BRA, probably with a stipulation that they be improved. The legal implications to urban renewal, not only locally but nationally, remain to be seen.

But one fact emerged last night as the plan was being readied for presentation to the Allston holdouts:

The people of North Harvard Street are giant killers.

**BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,  
Boston, Mass., March 4, 1966.**

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: It was a pleasure to see you and chat with you briefly at the hearings the other day.

For your interest, I am enclosing the latest story on the Allston project.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority Board today accepted the report in principle, and I hope this will lead to a satisfactory, peaceful conclusion to this problem.

I hope to have the opportunity to review with you the demonstration cities program which might apply to New York in the relatively near future.

Sincerely,

EDWARD LOGUE,  
*Redevelopment Administrator.*

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 3, 1966]

**PANEL FAVORS OWNERS KEEP ALLSTON HOMES**  
(By Michael J. Bennett)

After years of fighting with the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the residents of North Harvard Street, Allston, have got a favorable decision from a blue ribbon panel, but no one has any immediate plans for a victory celebration.

The panel headed by industrialist Gilbert H. Hood, has recommended almost every inhabited home on the street be returned to their owners and rehabilitated.

In addition, the panel has turned thumbs down on a BRA proposal to construct a 14-story high rise apartment at the apex of the triangle of land formed by North Harvard Street, Western Avenue and New Smith Street.

The luxury high rise eventually may be built, but if the panel has its way it will go up at the back of the lot near the Harvard Business School.

The final decision must be made by Mayor Collins, however, and an aid said Monday, "That's one of a whole bundle of things he's got to do. I don't know when he'll make an announcement."

Although members of the panel are basically confident their plan will be accepted, North Harvard Street residents kept their hopes under careful guard Monday.

**WAITS FOR DEED**

"I won't feel secure until I've got the deed back safe in my hands," said Mrs. Marjorie Redgate, a resolute leader of her determined neighbors. "We still have to see what kind of rehabilitation agreements can be worked out. They might be too much for us, too expensive."

Attorney William P. Homans, Jr., who has acted as a negotiator for the 17 families in the neighborhood, noted Monday the panel had gone beyond its mandate from Mayor Collins.

He quoted a statement made by the mayor when he established the panel in August 1965, after tenants and homeowners had been evicted amid violent demonstrations:

"I would like to make it clear," Homans quoted Collins as saying, "that if this blue ribbon panel is to do an effective job, it must be free of the controversy which now surrounds the project, and I would therefore propose that they not begin their work until substantially all of the site occupants have been relocated and most of the buildings demolished."

A member of the panel said, "there had been a fear that the panel would start from a patch of dirt and forget the people."

"But if this was meant to be a whitewash, that's not what it turned out to be," added Joseph Smith, a local representative on the panel as the chairman of the Allston Civic Association.

**PRAISES LOGUE**

Smith also had some kind words for Edward J. Logue, BRA administrator and the target for most of the verbal brickbats hurled by the residents and their supporters.

"If Ed Logue is against those people out there, he didn't show it," Smith said. "He cooperated 100 percent, was more than cooperative, more than you could expect."

The panel considered several choices before settling on the final proposal. In December, the Herald exclusively revealed the plans for the high rise at the junction of North Harvard Street and Western Avenue. The scheme also envisioned moving 7 of the 16 houses on North Harvard Street.

The proposal was immediately denounced, with Mrs. Redgate saying "it would squeeze us out and put us in a corner." Householders contended it would be far too expensive to move the houses and several are too worn with age to stand the trip.

**TICKLISH PROBLEM**

The plan now on Collins' desk would keep the houses on their foundations, and also give preference to former residents who want to move into the new apartments to be built on the site.

Assuming Collins approves the proposal, Homans foresees only one possible problem, and that could be ticklish.

"There'll have to be individual negotiations with each homeowner and tenant," he said. "Many of the tenants want to buy, and all will have to agree to rehabilitate their homes

to conform with the established city health and building codes.

"If they don't, the BRA can take the land again," he said. "So, it's going to take tact and understanding on both sides to work it all out."

#### U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION SCORES CLEVELAND ON URBAN RENEWAL

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. WIDNALL.** Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper reports that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission had found Cleveland's urban renewal programs a major cause of the breakdown in code enforcement and the decay in Cleveland's Negro ghettos seem to have surprised a number of people, including Federal officials. Having outlined the failures of the Cleveland urban renewal program, and detailed the code enforcement and delay in the Hough area as far back as April 23, 1964, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am not surprised at all.

The remarks of the Federal urban renewal director from Chicago, Dean Swartzell, however, do come as a surprise. In fact, I find them incredible. Mr. Swartzell, according to the Washington Post story of April 5, 1966, says that he would have taken action against Cleveland had he known about the conditions prevailing in Cleveland. Where in the world have Mr. Swartzell and his staff been the last 3 years?

The Hough area is part of a long-delayed urban renewal project in Cleveland known as University-Euclid. As long ago as the fall of 1963 it was the scene of a major rent strike by low-income tenants against the conditions they were forced to live in. In my own remarks in April of 1964, I included a list of citizen demands published in the Ohio Forum, a newspaper serving the Negro community of Cleveland. The citizens stated:

1. All city codes (including the housing code) should be enforced throughout the entire Hough area. Additional inspectors should be hired to do the job. A record of progress should be available to the public.

\* \* \*

3. We understand that both staff and money are available to do the job in University-Euclid. Why isn't it being speeded up? What are the standards for rehabilitation? How are the staff trained? We understand that only 17 buildings in the past year are completed in phase I. Only 2 of these are multiple dwellings.

In February of 1965, the Cleveland Plain Dealer ran a series of articles on the University-Euclid area. One was entitled "University-Euclid Job Is Renewal at Its Worst." In another, pictures showed the reason for the caption, "Urban Renewal in Reverse." A Cleveland city councilman, Leo A. Jackson, was quoted as saying that the urban renewal program in the Hough area was causing mass migration into other areas of the

city, creating new slums elsewhere. "We have to stop somewhere," he said, "or the whole city will be in urban renewal projects." The Cleveland Press ran a similar series of articles entitled "Crisis in Hough," ending with suggestions for positive steps to stop further decay, including code inspection.

Another article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer dated February 15, 1965, indicates that the Federal regional office in Chicago knew quite well what was happening in the Hough area. It states that a survey of the project by an outside firm early last year was the result of Federal prodding when it was realized that Cleveland's urban renewal forces simply could not cope with the situation. Among other suggestions, the outside consultants recommended rehabilitation of 2,200, mostly in the Hough area, to bring them up to code standards. I am proud to say that the outside consultant pointed specifically to the new rehabilitation loan program of the 1964 Housing Act which I authored as a means to accomplish this goal.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission hearings in Cleveland brought out the fact that the city had deliberately failed to enforce its housing code in the Hough area. This is not a practice confined to Cleveland. It should not be news to the Chicago regional office of the Federal Urban Renewal Agency. A story in the Cleveland Press of August 30, 1965, detailed a suit against the city of Cleveland on the grounds that the city was deliberately letting the University-Euclid urban renewal project, containing the Hough area, deteriorate in order to lower the land values for acquisition in the future.

Last fall, there were so many stories on Cleveland's housing problems in the papers it is unbelievable that the Chicago Federal Urban Renewal regional office could have missed it. A prominent Negro politician ran as an independent Democrat against the incumbent mayor, with the problems in the Hough area playing an important role in the campaign, and nearly beat the incumbent.

Nor have these stories stopped flowing. When the mayor of Cleveland appeared before our Housing Subcommittee earlier this year, I called his attention to a series of articles in the Cleveland Press on urban renewal, one of which was entitled "Circle, Hough Area Renewal Failing." I asked the mayor what had been accomplished. The mayor could only point to the Longwood project, which started with planning in 1950, and the Garden Valley project, which after a number of false starts since 1955, has finally come around.

The mayor also mentioned Erieview, but when I asked how many low- and middle-income housing units that project involved he had to admit that none were planned for it. When I said that I had heard that the University-Euclid project containing the Hough area had deteriorated to a point where an outside consultant had to be called in, the mayor replied that things were not really that bad, but he did not offer to talk about it. A few weeks later, a U.S. Civil Rights

Commission member, the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, remarked:

I'd like to say for the record, based on what I saw in the Hough area, I've seen better pigs.

Not only has the Chicago office of the Federal Urban Renewal Agency been derelict in its duties, not only is the explanation that no one knew what was going on unacceptable, but the Chicago office apparently does not even know what the law and the intent of Congress is regarding code enforcement. One of the seven elements of the workable program requirement, which I authored in 1954, deals with adequate code enforcement. It has been completely ignored by the Chicago office, apparently, because the mayor of Cleveland told me in testimony before our Housing Subcommittee that the city's workable program had never been disapproved or even held up for approval by the Chicago office.

Now the Chicago regional office head, Mr. Swartzell, is quoted as telling Father Hesburgh that:

We are not entertaining any more projects for Cleveland but we are not going to cut off. We've got to go ahead.

Go ahead to what? Another 5 years of delay in Hough while industrial projects and high rise commercial and apartment projects are pushed to completion? Is the Chicago regional office really expected by Congress to go ahead under any conditions, even the worst possible? At least part of the answer can be found in the House Banking and Currency Committee report of August 5, 1964 on the Housing Act of 1964, a bill passed with the widest bipartisan support of any major housing bill in recent years.

A new provision, which I authored, provides that no community's workable program can be recertified, beginning 3 years after the date of the enactment of the 1964 act, unless the locality is carrying out an effective program of enforcement to achieve compliance with the code. After citing new assistance to localities for code enforcement, provisions which were expanded in the 1965 act to include areas of intensive code enforcement rather than only regular urban renewal projects, the House Banking and Currency Committee went on to state:

On the other hand, in the case of a community which has an established workable program, the committee expects that each time that community applies for recertification of its workable program, the Administrator must be satisfied that effective progress has been made during that year toward the goal of achieving compliance with the housing code.

It is understood that some communities would be denied recertification until such time as the Administrator is satisfied that the community has fully complied with the new requirements for the workable program.

The committee wishes to emphasize that these new provisions are in addition to existing requirements relating to housing codes and code enforcement. The committee expects that the additional assistance for code enforcement activities made possible by this section will permit the Administrator to require immediately more effective implementation of the workable program requirements.

If, therefore, the urban renewal program in Cleveland "has done only harm," as U.S. Civil Rights Commission member Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School put it, then Federal urban renewal officials must share the blame. In fairness to Cleveland, it should be noted that Mayor Locher testified in answer to my questioning that the city is exploring the use of the new code enforcement and rehabilitation tools in the recent housing acts. Whether this effort follows through or not will depend in large part on the willingness of Federal officials to act instead of talk.

Nor can we in Congress simply dismiss this as another bureaucratic failure. The Housing Subcommittee is specially set up to investigate and study the housing and urban renewal programs. For the past 3 years we have sat in Washington passing housing legislation and considering important housing legislation bills without ever looking at the slum areas themselves to see what is needed and what is being done or left undone. I have called for such investigations, particularly in Cleveland, for years. The time has never been more appropriate than now.

I include at this point the press articles I have mentioned:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1966]  
URBAN RENEWAL PLANS SCORED AS CAUSE OF DECAY: U.S. RIGHTS PANEL CHARGES PROGRAMS IMPOUND SLUMS—ADMINISTRATION OF LAW SEEN AS "IMMORAL" BY HESBURGH

(By John Herbers)

CLEVELAND, April 4.—Members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights charged today that urban renewal and other Federal programs were major causes of the despondency and decay that exist in acute form in Hough, a Cleveland ghetto.

One member, Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, said all Federal rebuilding programs as administered here and in other cities were immoral.

The commissioner spoke out after questioning State and Federal officials who conceded that combined rebuilding efforts could have contributed to impounding the ghetto.

#### FOCUSING ON HOUGH

The commission, an independent research and advisory agency, is conducting 5 days of public hearings here to find out how Negroes and other minority groups are faring in northern slums.

One purpose is to gage the effectiveness of Federal laws on the lives of slum dwellers.

The chief area under investigation is Hough, a rat-infested neighborhood of almost 60,000 in the center of the city.

In 1962, the worst part of Hough was placed in an urban renewal program, whereby the Federal Government was to provide most of the funds for buying rundown property, clearing it and making it available for new developments.

In the last 3 years Hough has undergone steady decline. Its streets and alleys are littered with garbage and debris. Most of the buildings are in poor repair and many are vacant and foreboding.

Stores have gone out of business. Gangs roam through the abandoned property and use the great empty houses as vantage points for rape and robbery.

Many of the vacant buildings reflect the signs of urban renewal. Some have been torn down but there is no sign of new development.

As to the remaining buildings, a series of witnesses painted for the commission a pic-

ture of falling plaster, broken plumbing, basements filled with sewage, inadequate wiring, rats, and roaches.

Charles Sheboy, housing commissioner for the city of Cleveland, testified that complaints of violation of the city code were turned over to the Department of Urban Renewal, when they come under that agency's jurisdiction.

"Urban renewal then will work with the property owners," Mr. Sheboy said.

However, James P. Friedman, commissioner of urban renewal, testified that his agency had made no effort to enforce the code because of a policy that had been established in city hall before he assumed the job.

Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School and a commission member, asked if the purpose of this was "to keep down the costs" of property later to be bought by urban renewal.

Mr. Friedman replied that he was not clear as to the purpose of the policy but he said costs were involved. He added that the policy had recently been changed and said the code would be enforced.

The commissioners were indignant at what they called official neglect of people living in the area.

Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, said apartment dwellers had "been kept in a limbo" between the city and the urban renewal agency.

"So far urban renewal has done only harm," Mr. Griswold said.

Testimony indicated that persons relocated by urban renewal and highway programs were frequently moved to worse surroundings. The commission study also showed that a great majority of Negroes were relocated in Negro areas.

"In these Federal programs to rebuild the cities," Father Hesburgh said, "what has happened is that people in the worst condition find their houses bulldozed from under them. The total program is immoral."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1966]  
HOUSING CODE FAILURE ADMITTED IN CLEVELAND

CLEVELAND, April 4.—City officials admitted to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission today that housing codes were not enforced in a Negro slum area and that public housing followed a "separate but equal" racial policy.

The disclosures came during the second day of a 5-day hearing scheduled here by the Commission to study racial problems in the Nation's big cities.

City Housing Commissioner Charles Sheboy said a city hall policy ignoring code enforcement was in effect in the High area of Negro slums before he was appointed to office.

Notices of violations went to the city's urban renewal division, rather than to landlords, Sheboy said. If that division judged landlords recalcitrant, he said, violation notices were not sent out.

Sheboy said landlords were fined \$9,605 for violations last year but the city collected only \$6,030.

Remarked the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, Civil Rights Commission member: "I'd like to say for the record, based on what I saw in the Hough area, I've seen better pig pens."

James P. Friedman, the city's urban renewal commissioner, said the no-enforcement policy existed to avoid a rise in land acquisition costs if property were improved.

And Dean Swartzell of Chicago, regional director of the Federal urban renewal program, said he would have taken action against the Cleveland no-enforcement policy if he had known about it.

Father Hesburgh asked if Swartzell will cut off Federal funds because of the Cleveland policy. Replied Swartzell: "We are not entertaining any more projects for Cleveland

but we are not going to cut off. We've got to go ahead."

Ernest Bohn, director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, denied that he operated segregated public housing projects in the city. Instead, he said, he followed "the Federal Government's equal-but-separate policy."

[From the Cleveland Press, Apr. 5, 1966]

#### SHAMEFUL, SOMBER FACTS

Some somber facts are emerging from the sessions of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission here. They are shameful and disconcerting; they make it clear that hearings by the Commission serve a valid community purpose.

Facts such as this: testimony by the city housing commissioner that he can't remember ever closing up a rental unit solely on the ground that it is no longer fit for human habitation.

Facts such as this: that housing code enforcement in University-Euclid has been stopped—so the city wouldn't have to pay for high-priced buildings in urban renewal acquisitions. Cynical, eh?

Facts such as this: testimony by a U.S. public health official who counted the rats here in 1961 and again last February—and found the situation "seriously deteriorating."

Facts such as this: that one commission member finds "things down at city hall seem to just get shuffled from one division to another, from one public official to another."

All these facts point up the distressing lack of—and urgent need for—a determined, continued city hall effort to clean up Cleveland's ghetto.

It means better garbage collection. It means attacks on rats. It means building code enforcement, complete with arrests, fines, and jail sentences.

The Civil Rights Commission just may awaken the conscience—and the muscle—of the city.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 6, 1965]

#### JACKSON CHARGES RENEWAL HURTS MORE STABLE AREAS

(By Donald Sabath)

Urban renewal in the Hough area is creating a "crowded" and "undesirable" housing condition in the Glenville area, Councilman Leo A. Jackson, Democrat, ward 24, charged yesterday.

Unless some action is taken by city officials, said Jackson, chairman of city council's urban renewal committee, he would be forced to call a halt to further land purchases in the University-Euclid urban renewal area.

Jackson said urban renewal in Hough, in effect, is just shifting Hough problems to the Glenville area.

"Urban renewal is causing extreme problems both for police and school officials in my area," said Jackson. "The crowded housing conditions will produce a jam of students in the new Lakeview school next week."

The councilman said relay classes would have to be continued even after the new Glenville area schools were occupied.

"When you jam people together in single-family homes, you create problems, and this jamming is commonplace in Glenville," he asserted. "This summer you sometimes thought the children were sprouting out of the ground."

Jackson said he has talked with Council President James V. Stanton and Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister, and both are "extremely concerned."

He added that a top-level meeting would be held as soon as council reconvenes to discuss the problem.

Some changes in the housing code may be needed to stop the mass migration from

Hough or any other urban renewal area to stable communities, Jackson said.

"This is not just a problem for East Side wards. It could develop in all the wards in the city," he said.

As an example, Jackson told of four families, all related, who had moved into a single-family home in his ward.

Jackson asked the city housing division to check the home on Elgin Avenue NE., after he received numerous complaints from neighbors.

The home is occupied by a husband and wife; a daughter and her 5 children; a sister-in-law and 3 children and 3 grandchildren whose parents reside in Hough.

"This is a fantastic example of jamming families into one home," the councilman said. "And for all we know, this may be occurring all over Glenville."

Jackson blamed absentee landlords for creating the new problem. He said they have received money from homes purchased for urban renewal in Hough and now use it to purchase homes in Glenville.

"What the city is approving is the creation of new slums in another area of Cleveland," Jackson went on. "We have to stop somewhere, or the whole city will be in urban renewal projects."

The same new crowded situations exist in wards 27 and 25 and a part of ward 21, Jackson added.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 15, 1965]

#### STAFF IS LACKING: UNIVERSITY-EUCLID RENEWAL IS SLOW

(By Donald Sabath)

Almost a year ago, Cleveland's urban renewal department realized that its staff could never handle the growing complexity of the University-Euclid urban renewal project.

The realization became apparent after numerous warnings from the U.S. Urban Renewal Administration and from area Congressmen.

The program is moving too slowly, they said. Unless something was done soon to expedite the program, Federal funds might be cut off.

It was determined that Cleveland simply did not have the staff even to scratch the surface of the proposed \$16.6 million face lifting of a large portion of the city's East Side.

The plan to redevelop the 837-acre area was greeted with high hopes in February 1962, when the Federal grant was announced.

Anthony J. Celebrezze, then the mayor, said: "This is a great thing for the city and the local urban renewal agency will take immediate steps to put the program into the action stage."

Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister announced the city would immediately set up a project office, begin neighborhood rehabilitation and start appraising property in the clearance areas.

In the 3-year period since the announcement, a project office was set up at Crawford Road and Hough Avenue NE. and a slight beginning was made on rehabilitation.

There has not been much progress in clearing land or renovating homes that are to stay.

Under Federal prodding, Lister determined the best way to get the job done was to hire outside consultants. With approval of city council, the firm of Walker Murray & Associates, Inc., of Philadelphia was hired last year for an 18-month period. The cost: \$170,000.

With the help of the consultants, Lister views the following as priority areas of phase 1 in the project:

Rehabilitation of the 2,200 homes in the area, mostly in the Hough section.

Development of a 65-acre tract at Fairhill and Stearns Road SE. for a research park.

Eventually the park will total \$100 million in new construction.

A high-rise apartment for faculty and students at the various University Circle institutions, to be located at Mayfield Road and Euclid Avenue.

High-rise public housing at Crawford Road and Wade Park Avenue NE.

Expansion of Mount Sinai Hospital to the west from its present site at East 105th Street.

Expansion of play areas and parks around Daniel E. Morgan, Hough, Mary B. Martin, and Charles Orr elementary schools, Addison Junior High School and East High School.

Continued progress of the University Circle Development Foundation in its \$174 million construction program.

Work should continue in the University Circle area without too much assistance from the city's urban renewal department. This is an expansion of major medical and educational facilities.

Since the project began, no Federal renewal funds have been used by the foundation, said Lister, to purchase property for institutional expansion.

But the city has spent nearly \$2 million for additions to parking lots and for street expansion.

Private money used for construction by the foundation and money spent by the city in site improvements are then used as "credits," or matching funds, to pay the city's share of the renewal projects. The Federal Government pays two-thirds of the project's costs. The city pays the rest.

The big job is rehabilitation.

Moving in sections, during the past 2 months, the city has purchased almost 70 abandoned homes. They will be coming down soon as part of a \$141,000 demolition contract awarded late in December.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 15, 1965]

#### UNIVERSITY-EUCLID RENEWAL IS SHOWING SLOW PROGRESS

The big questions for the city and its consultants, then, is what to do with the 2,200 homes set for rehabilitation.

Neal S. Bellos, a former welfare worker here and now a representative of Walker Murray, said a specific plan of attack would be announced by the firm in 2 weeks.

Since last October, the consultant's task force has been compiling information which should have been collected by the city during the past 36 months.

The consultants have had a firsthand view of exteriors of all the homes in the project. They know now which homes can be saved and which must come down.

A survey has also been completed concerning the residents of the homes in the project. All the information is being placed on data processing cards.

But, according to Bellos, preliminary data reveals there will be a need for greater acquisition of homes than first planned by the city.

"These homes are vacant and are vandalized," said Bellos. "This is a cancer and must be removed."

Original plans called for 632 homes to be acquired for demolition. At present the city has purchased 265 pieces of property at a cost of \$5.1 million.

Bellos said preliminary results showed the city may have to purchase some of the 2,200 homes set for rehabilitation and then fix them up and offer them for sale. He said the homes could also be sold to developers, who would repair them and bring them back to housing code standards.

David Walker, former national head of the Urban Renewal Administration, heads the consulting firm.

When Walker arrived here last fall he brought no magic wand with him. Maybe

one would have helped. But he did promise action.

"Rehabilitation of the kind in University-Euclid has not been tried anywhere else in the Nation," he explained. "We don't know if it will work. We hope it does. If it does, Cleveland will then be a model for this type of urban renewal."

Walker explained that under rehabilitation, people, an almost forgotten commodity in urban renewal, will not be forced to move into any other section of the city.

"We will propose a pilot project to move residents out of the homes for a short period of time, then we will repair them," Walker told a city hall meeting recently. "Then the residents can move back to the homes."

"You can build all the playgrounds you want—but until kids have decent homes, you can't accomplish a decent job," said Walker.

The Cleveland lending institutions must play a vital part in the program in lending homeowners money for repairs, Walker explained. His associates have had many conferences with banks, and savings and loan institutions.

Low-cost government loans were approved for rehabilitation last year by Congress. No funds, however, were allocated for the loans. Walker believes Congress this session will provide the funds.

Because of the scope of the project, the Walker firm probably will recommend starting a "model" rehabilitation area where financing is available and residents are willing to go into debt with home loans.

Federal officials have suggested a block-by-block "attack" to overcome the creeping urban decay. Walker agrees with this plan.

Lister reported that appraisal prices on 515 structures needed in the project, from the 632 scheduled for demolition, have been approved by the regional office of urban renewal in Chicago.

All the homes needed for the project, should be purchased before council adjourns this summer, Lister predicted.

This then is the timetable for University-Euclid. The original 5-year completion date must be scrapped.

Phase 1 may now take 10 years. And there are three other phases in the plan.

Some say University-Euclid is too large. Some say the city should bring in the bulldozers and do a "complete" job. Some say rehabilitation will not work. Only the months ahead will tell.

Councilman Leo A. Jackson, D-24, says the success in University-Euclid will stop the spread of slums into the Glenville area, which is part of his ward, and into other sections of the city.

"With adequate housing inspections, police protection and adequate city services, we can stop this spread of urban decay," he said. "With help from the administration, we won't need urban renewal in Glenville."

But he warned: "We must start to be realistic with urban renewal. We are now one large region. Erileview is not the whole city. It takes more than a few new buildings to make a city \* \* \* it needs people."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 14, 1965]

#### UNIVERSITY-EUCLID JOB IS RENEWAL AT ITS WORST

(By Donald Sabath)

Only 4 short miles from Erileview Plaza, Cleveland's newest skyscraper, stands a perfect example of urban renewal at its worst. Its name is University-Euclid.

It is the name given to the plan to convert an 837-acre area of the East Side into a model community with wide, tree-shaded streets, green park land near schools, new multifamily homes, and restoration of old homes to fit into the new, pretty picture.

But a drive through this section today reveals deserted cars, some jacked up on blocks, littered and dirty streets and yards and deteriorating buildings and homes. Urban decay is its name.

University-Euclid is the nightmare of Cleveland's multimillion-dollar urban renewal program.

After 3 years and more than \$6 million spent in University-Euclid what has been accomplished? The city has:

Purchased or has options on 265 pieces of property ready for demolition. This is 42 percent of the total of 632 homes needed.

Cleared 124 parcels.

Rehabilitated 137 homes, or 6 percent of the total of 2,020 homes set for rehabilitation.

One resident called sections of the area a ghost town.

The streets could be cleaner. The trash could be carted away from the yards and the cars could be towed to junkyards. But the houses offer more resistance.

A stranger gets the feeling that the area has nothing to offer anyone. So why stay?

And people have left.

By the thousands they have moved into the Mount Pleasant and Glenville areas, creating overcrowded conditions there in schools and in homes.

Left behind is an incubating process which breeds all sorts of crime and violence.

In recent days roving gangs of thugs, with no respect for the law or the age of victims, have run wild. The gangs have terrorized children and golden agers, for no reason at all, or for a small sum of money or for the thrill.

The victims are those who must for financial reasons or others, stay behind the migration.

The trouble lies in the Hough area, which is in the core of the University-Euclid urban renewal area.

It has been 3 years since Cleveland received a \$16 million Federal grant to begin the 5-year renewal project.

In this period, the city has spent \$5,170,000 for land and property acquisition and nearly \$1 million more for planning, site improvement, salaries, and a token rehabilitation program.

A drive through the Hough area reveals monumental work must be done even to begin approaching what the planners envisioned in January 1961, when the city planning commission approved the plan.

Part of the blame must fall on Cleveland's urban renewal department. Some on the inhabitants of the area. Some on the community as a whole.

The University-Euclid plan, one of the largest ever approved by Federal authorities, is broken up into four phases.

The first section to be redeveloped, or phase 1 in planning jargon, include the vast University Circle where new medical, educational and cultural buildings are going up, which like downtown Erieview, is a growing success.

The north boundary is Wade Park and Superior Avenue NE. On the west is East 86th Street. Chestnut Avenue NE., is the southern boundary.

Phase 2 will include the area bounded by East 89th Street, Chester Avenue NE., Stearns Road SE., and Carnegie and Cedar Avenues SE. This section will include the East 105th Street and Euclid Avenue business complex.

Later stages will expand phase one to East 79th Street on the west and to Carnegie Avenue SE. on the south. The last phase will include all land bounded by Chester Avenue, westward to East 55th Street and the extension of Carnegie Avenue SE.

There is talk in the city's urban renewal department that the project is just "too damn large."

But the city has designated the boundaries. "We are now stuck with it," said one official.

Being stuck is one excuse for the apparent lack of progress, even though \$6.6 million has been spent.

The big problem the city must tackle is the Hough area and what to do with it.

When you mention Hough in any conversation you immediately think of slums. This is a far cry from the 1930's, when the neighborhood saw its brightest days as residential area for white-collar workers.

During the 1950's, the Hough area attracted Appalachian whites and an ever-increasing number of Negroes.

As congestion grew, the housing market opened in other areas and the residents began to move out. Now "For Rent" signs blossoms on every street and in every apartment house.

City hall records show that more than 70 percent of the present day Hough inhabitants are Negro. Most of the remainder are Appalachian whites. The average family consists of 4.2 persons.

About 25 percent of the people receive some sort of welfare aid. The others have annual incomes of \$3,500 to \$3,800.

The 632 properties still to be acquired are almost entirely in the Hough area, an area of 70 acres. In all, 2,200 homes in this same area will be rehabilitated.

The city knows that rehabilitation will be the main project problem. The problem will be to obtain financing for families with low incomes, so that they can make the necessary repairs to bring homes back to housing code standards.

An additional problem results because much of the property is owned by absentee landlords. Many refuse to put any additional money into their wornout buildings.

And the city has also determined that 25 percent of the homeowners are buying homes in University-Euclid under land contracts. This percentage is much higher than in other cities in the Nation working on rehabilitation in urban renewal.

Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister has described University-Euclid as "simply a problem of financing."

Lister denies that the city has been slow in University-Euclid.

"I think we are on time there," he explained. "We are acquiring homes and clearing sites and providing the open spaces needed for parks and playground expansion. This all takes time."

But the lack of any significant progress can be told in the street after street of abandoned homes.

Some are boarded up. Some have had fires in them, started by vagrants trying to keep warm at night. Others are used for playspots by youngsters.

"We know where the homes are and we can give anyone a list of them," said Councilman M. Morris Jackson, D-20. "We just want some action. We want them down."

Lister said some of the abandoned homes were not originally set for demolition. But tenants moved out and the vandals moved in, stripping the homes to the walls.

In some cases, all that remains are shells.

"We realize it is a shame to leave these homes up right between two other, well-kept homes," said Lister. "But we are now trying to move as fast as we can get them down."

Two months ago, at the urging of Representative CHARLES A. VANIK, D-21, William L. Slayton, Federal Urban Renewal Administrator, came to Cleveland to look at University-Euclid.

And he did not like what he saw.

"I know Cleveland has had problems, but work on University-Euclid has taken longer than it should have," said Slayton.

Slayton gave the city permission to tear down some abandoned homes, waiting later to acquire the titles to them.

"The Federal Government must move to protect the investments of the residents remaining in any urban renewal area," said Slayton.

Meanwhile, the children have left the streets and use the abandoned homes as playgrounds. Members of street clubs complain. Area councilmen complain.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 15, 1965]

Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister has, according to the Plain Dealer, spent \$5,170,000 in the University-Euclid project on 265 real estate parcels. That's an average of \$19,509 per parcel. He has also spent \$1,430,000 on planning, site improvement, and token rehabilitation. The visible results are 124 parcels cleared and 137 structures rehabilitated at an average cost of \$5,480 per parcel.

Few, if any, property owners actually received \$19,509 for their titles, and no single clearing or rehabilitation jobs actually cost \$5,480 in public funds. The extra money, a large sum indeed, simply went into the pockets of Lister and members of his urban renewal organization in the form of salaries, and to their consultants in fees. In effect, these public funds were paid out for delaying as long, and doing as little, as the recipients could get away with over a period of 3 years. During the next 2 years, Lister will have \$9,400,000 in Federal funds alone to spend.

In any other major city in the world, Lister's performance, tolerated by the mayor and council year after year, would be worthy of eventual punishment—but not in Cleveland. Lister continues as a civic leader and Cleveland's authority on urban renewal. He is believed and headed as if he were a competent public official by everybody who counts.

Lister will quite likely expend the next \$9,400,000 chiefly on organizational salaries and fees. He may retire, years hence, laden with honors, like Alfred A. Benesch. Depriving generations of Cleveland schoolchildren an adequate public education was worse than anything Lister has done to date, but Lister could match the Benesch public school board performance before he's through.

Incompetence in Cleveland public life is safe, profitable, and honored. It is good that the Plain Dealer is exposing incompetent officials in the Locher administration, but not enough. Incompetence must be rendered unsafe, unprofitable, and permanently dishonorable. Only Clevelanders themselves can do that. They can do it with long memories, fresh candidates, and short shrift for major incumbents at election times. The Plain Dealer could help then, too, and I hope it will.

JOHN BARDEEN.

CLEVELAND.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 18, 1965]  
CRISIS IN HOUGH: POSITIVE STEPS MUST BE TAKEN TO STOP FURTHER DECAY IN AREA

(By Paul Lilley)

(Last of a series)

Solutions to the Hough area's persistent troubles, both human and physical, will not come easily or quickly.

In fact, solutions will not come at all, in the opinion of many who have been closest to the area's problems, unless:

The city takes positive steps immediately to halt further human and physical decay of the deteriorated neighborhood.

These steps are programs that could be started while the city administration is waiting for the report from experts who are forming a master plan of action. The report is due later this month.

Following are suggestions from councilmen in the area and in neighboring wards,

from social workers, and from staff members of various assistance projects in Hough:

Additional police, including experts on juvenile crime, should be stationed in the area to make streets safe.

More inspectors should make regular checks of occupied houses and buildings and compel strict building code compliance.

City health officials should start an immediate sanitation campaign against rats, vermin, filth, garbage and rubbish that plague and overflow congested backyards.

Street sweepers and flushers of the service department should visit the area regularly. Retail store owners should be made to sweep sidewalks in front of their establishments.

A mass attack should be leveled at the area's welfare problems and all agencies, private and public, should be asked to pool their efforts and talents for an intensified people renewal program. A start on this has been made in the Community Action for Youth Program.

Board of zoning appeals should halt further building variances unless such proposals are in conformity with the overall renewal plan.

Municipal court judges should be more severe with violators and end long periods of legal delay.

Relief payments for rent might be paid directly to the landlord, instead of the recipient. This would assure the owner of some income for maintenance of his property.

Only last week Councilman George L. Forbes, a court-appointed receiver, asked the court's permission to board windows and close a 28-suite apartment building on the East Side because the tenants, all on relief, were behind in rent payments.

He said the income from the property was not enough to meet current tax, heat, and water bills.

These are but some of the general house-keeping steps that could be taken now to lend hope and encouragement in an area that needs more than promises.

demolish 11 properties which had been scheduled for rehabilitation.

When he was unable to say how many more structures, intended for rehabilitation, must now be destroyed because of rapid deterioration, the committee withheld action on his request until the review meeting.

Friedman said he hopes the meeting can be held next week.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 18, 1965]

#### URBAN RENEWAL IS A MESS

(By Philip W. Porter)

One of these days, not far off either, the phrase "urban renewal," which sounded so bright, beautiful and hopeful, is going to be a dirty word. Nationally, there are growing doubts about it. Here in Cleveland—let's face it—it's a mess.

It's a mess because the energy of the city urban renewal office has been directed primarily on Erieview, a downtown showplace whose urgent necessity was in doubt, and hence neglected the much more socially urgent University-Euclid project.

After 3 years, University-Euclid is now still only 42 percent cleared, and property supposed to be rehabilitated is only 6 percent done. The Hough area, a big part of it, has deteriorated so fast that it's doubtful even full speed ahead can catch it before it becomes as bad a slum as the worst of Harlem. It's already a disgrace.

"Slum clearance" is a fine phrase and represents a desirable objective. But "slum manufacture" better describes what incompetent and dopey urban renewal has done to the Hough area, which 30 years ago was one of the finest residential sections of Cleveland. Today it's a grim wasteland of abandoned houses, gradually being torn down for firewood, lived in by bums and played in by kids with no better place to play. The streets are littered with junk and abandoned autos.

Owners who wish to rehabilitate their property hesitate, because the decay next door becomes contagious.

I hope you've been reading Reporter Don Sabath's articles about how urban renewal hasn't got to first base in the Hough area. The University Circle part of the area is beginning to come along, although it, too, has been dragging. Recently, outside consultants and expenditures were brought in to do what Jim Lister's office should have done 2 years ago.

Hough has been deteriorating so fast in recent weeks that roving gangs of tough kids have been robbing elderly residents who are too ill or too poor to move. At night, no one in his right mind would walk through there, and increasingly, driving through there at night without locked doors is hazardous.

If full speed ahead had bought up the property and cleaned out the fast growing decay, perhaps some developer of apartment housing would have come along to take advantage of the deal whereby Government funds are used to confiscate private property, then offer it to others to be built on privately. It should have been full speed ahead, instead it's been a slow crawl.

The first target date to improve this God-forsaken area was 5 years. Don't bet that it will get done in 15. By that time, Hough will have become a political issue, and when the roof falls in, the mayor and the urban renewal director of that day are going to catch it in the neck. Maybe even sooner.

University-Euclid is today one of the worst flops in the whole national program. But there are others around the country. People are beginning to question why the program, which sounded so good, turned out so sour. Congressmen are reading "The Federal Bulldozer" a plain-speaking book by Martin Anderson, a young Columbia professor. They're wondering if the idea is

really good, or just a disastrous waste of money.

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 30, 1965]  
SUIT SAYS STALLING CUTS UNIVERSITY-EUCLID VALUES

(By Julian Krawcheck)

A suit filed in common pleas court today charged the city with deliberately stalling University-Euclid urban renewal in order to lower property values before acquisition by the city.

The suit, asking damages of \$2,060,000, was filed by Milt Schulman, attorney for and president of Doan Properties Inc., in the form of a cross-petition to a foreclosure action brought against Doan and other defendants a year ago.

That action was instituted by Leonard J. Cowan and DeWitt Harvey, trustees for a group of mortgagees. Today's petition alleges that the city's policies have so reduced Doan's income that it cannot meet its mortgage obligations.

As a result, the suit states Doan faces loss of its equity in a group of properties in the Euclid Avenue-East 105th Street area including the Alhambra Theater, Euclid-105th Street market, a bowling lane, apartment house, parking lot, and several stores.

The value of these properties has dropped from \$1,400,000 to \$600,000 and the gross annual income from \$225,000 to \$160,000 by reason of the city's tactics, it is alleged.

Schulman's suit, which names Mayor Locher, Urban Renewal Director James M. Lister, and all members of city council as co-defendants, noted that 5 years have passed since inception of Phase 1 of University Euclid, and says:

"It does not appear that the city of Cleveland intends to complete Phase 1 within a reasonably determinable future date. Furthermore, the city is as far from initiating phase 2, phase 3, and phase 4 as it was when the first general neighborhood renewal plan project was made."

The city \*\*\* announced to the public that the area in question was and is a blighted area; that certain properties (including Doan's) would be purchased by the city and demolished immediately \*\*\* thereby making same totally undesirable to sound, existing tenants and causing them to seek other quarters \*\*\* all of which has greatly accelerated the decline in value of the property."

Schulman's petition says the Federal Government has provided means by which municipalities can acquire funds for early land acquisition in urban redevelopment areas and states:

The refusal of the city to acquire the property now is due to the fact that they have full knowledge that all properties affected are losing value by reason of their acts of omission and commission, and that the longer they delay purchasing the property the more it will decline in value, enabling the city to purchase at a value far less than the properties were worth prior to the announcement of the University-Euclid plan."

The suit seeks \$800,000 for alleged depreciation of value of the property, \$260,000 for alleged loss of rental income and \$1,000,000 punitive damages.

Commenting on his legal action, Schulman said:

"This is the pattern Lister has practiced all through his acquisition of land for urban renewal—destroying land values by delaying the program and then buying up at a lower value."

"It happened in the Gladstone, St. Vincent and Woodland-East 79th Street areas, and it is a fraud."

The irony of the thing is that the city did not have to announce its plans, to declare the area blighted, in order to obtain Federal money for land acquisition.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 18, 1965]

#### LOCHER ORDERS ATTACK ON FILTH, VANDALIZED BUILDINGS IN HOUGH

Mayor Locher today ordered an immediate attack on filth and vandalized buildings in the Hough area to restore residents' confidence that the city wants to better that community.

In a morning-long session with urban renewal and other city officials, Locher generally reviewed the deterioration in Hough.

He ordered Urban Renewal Director James Lister to proceed rapidly with demolition of abandoned, vandalized buildings that pock-mark the area.

He ordered Safety Director John McCormick to increase police in Hough and to use sanitary police to attack the accumulations of refuse in backyards.

And he ordered Service Director Louis Drasler to clean up the area with street-sweepers and, if necessary, to recruit relief clients and arm them with shovels to do the job.

Urban Renewal Commissioner James Friedman, meantime, promised a full review of the city's slum clearance program especially the Hough and University-Euclid projects—would be held soon by council's urban renewal committee.

Committee members told Friedman they are concerned because the same blighting conditions that have inundated the Hough area are now starting to show in their congested wards.

They demanded to know what steps were being taken by the city administration to expedite the Hough renewal program and what is being done to prevent the spread of blight.

The plea for a review of the program followed Friedman's request for authority to

"The Housing Act authorizes temporary and provisional loans to municipalities regardless of the stage of development of urban renewal plans and before or after the approval of such plans. The city used this procedure for land acquisitions in Erieview 2."

[From the Cleveland Press, Mar. 2, 1966]  
CLEVELAND'S GROWING PAINS: CIRCLE, HOUGH AREA RENEWAL FAILING  
(By Paul Lilley)

The East Side's trouble-riddled Hough and University-Euclid renewal project has shattered the hopes of the city's most ardent slum clearance supporters.

It is here in these 850 acres of misery—bounded by Chester and Superior Avenues, east of East 86th Street—that the city's 12-year slum clearance fight is at the cross-road.

It is here on this testing ground that the city's entire \$57 million slum clearance program will be declared a success—or a bust.

The project (which to date has cost \$14,500,000) is a failure in the view of unbiased observers.

Residents of the area know it. The Federal Government which is sharing in two-thirds of the cost, knows it. Some city officials reluctantly admit.

The project was started almost 4 years ago as the biggest and boldest neighborhood rehabilitation program in the country. It was to have spearheaded the rehabilitation of thousands of decaying dwelling units.

A handful of small property owners have fixed up their properties. The big job has not got off the ground. Even the city has not been able to show the area's residents what must be done.

Lending institutions have walked away. Fire insurance protection has been canceled. Property owners have abandoned their homes to vandals and the elements. Crime, filth, dilapidation and poverty haunt the area. Hundreds of stable homeowners have fled.

Last fall the city installed new street lighting, trees, sodded tree lawns and curbs on 11 demonstration streets to offer some hope to the area. Another 33 streets will get the same treatment this year. Construction of a 12-acre playfield at Crawford Road and Hough Avenue will start this spring.

But the big job—the thing that is needed the most—replacement housing for hundreds of large, low-income families is at a standstill.

Now, it is believed, rent subsidies with Uncle Sam paying the bill, would encourage the return of lending institutions and start the long-awaited housing rehabilitation program. Everyone seems to be marking time—waiting for Congress to act.

University-Euclid is the most glaring example of unresolved problems. There are other minuses in Cleveland's urban renewal story.

Gladstone—wracked by city hall indecision for more than a dozen years—is still rotting away while the city attempts to determine its final use.

More than \$4 million has been spent to acquire and demolish 245 tumbling structures. Hundreds of families have been displaced. More than 145 others are awaiting city acquisition of their properties.

The frustrations of the area are summed up by Mrs. Josie Davis, a 68-year-old widow, who lives alone in her hovel at 4305 Mason Court. Her only friends and neighbors are stray mongrels left to roam the rat-infested wasteland.

She said: "Back in 1953 the city told us to do nothing to fix up our houses, that they were going to be purchased. I've waited. Nothing has happened. Looks like the city is waiting until my house falls down so it can be had for nothing."

East Woodland—started 7 years ago for residential rehabilitation and changed last year to industrial reuse. Council now is considering another switch—back to residential.

All but 60 of its homes have been acquired by the city. More than \$2,308,000 has been spent. Nothing but demolition has been accomplished.

The 12-year, \$57 million result:

More than 4,200 dwelling units have been demolished but only 1,912 new ones constructed.

Hundreds of property owners claim they have watched their life investment rot away and their neighborhood decay while awaiting promised help.

Scores of small businessmen complain their businesses have either failed or have been hopelessly crippled by long delays and broken promises.

Lawsuits are being filed, almost weekly, contesting the city's right to wreck neighborhoods, destroy property values and deprive owners of rightful income.

Irate councilmen, increasing in numbers, suggest calling a halt to the entire program arguing new slums are being created faster than old ones can be eliminated.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,

Mar. 16, 1966]

LOCHER SAYS CITY NEEDS \$1 BILLION U.S. HOUSING AID

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—Mayor Ralph S. Locher said yesterday Cleveland would need about \$1 billion in Federal funds to become an effective "demonstration city" for the Nation.

Locher reluctantly gave this "very rough guess" at a hearing of the House Subcommittee on Housing, which is considering President Johnson's proposal to spark a rebuilding of cities.

The mayor said he was in accord with the President. But Locher doubted the \$2.3 billion provided in the bill would be enough for the seven "demonstration cities" yet to be named.

Locher said Cleveland required \$1 billion because Detroit had said it would need \$2.5 billion. Until guidelines are established, no better estimate can be made, the mayor said.

Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, asked Locher whether the Government should proceed with so expensive a program at a time of war in Vietnam. The mayor replied that both efforts were important.

"We're about to shoot a man to the moon," Locher said at one point, "but we'll be standing ankle-deep in sewage when we do it."

He ducked FINO's next question, which was: "Would you still favor this bill if it increased your income tax?"

Locher got into a heated exchange with Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican of New Jersey, whose study of urban renewal in Cleveland has convinced him that it benefits business more than it benefits people.

The mayor denied that Cleveland's housing needs have been subordinated to the Erieview project. He cited the Longwood and Garden Valley projects, even East Ninth Street, as examples of "human renewal" in Cleveland.

But, he agreed with WIDNALL later that the city needs more new housing for slum residents.

Action by Vice President HUMPHREY and Thomas Vail, the publisher and editor of the Plain Dealer, has given Cleveland a headstart, Locher said.

He explained to the Congressmen that Vail had suggested a Federal official be designated in Cleveland to coordinate Federal programs in the city. HUMPHREY gave this assignment to John W. Lehman of the Labor Department in Cleveland.

At the same time, the mayor appointed Irwin L. Silbert to a new post as city hall representative in Washington.

[From the Cleveland Press, Apr. 2, 1966]

#### RENEW THINKING ON URBAN RENEWAL

The front page article in the Press of March 24 on low-rent housing is the first article I have read which seemed to indicate that Cleveland is finally approaching seriously the long-neglected problem of the acute housing needs of her low-income residents, and especially of those living in her most blighted area, Hough.

With Bart Clausen in the driver's seat of urban renewal, there is belief that this will turn out to be more than just more unfulfilled hopes.

While we are suddenly concentrating our attention on the housing crises in our city's Negro ghettos, let us stop to ponder one of the very things which has caused it: urban renewal, better known to some as Negro removal, which has shunted the Negro from one area to another already overcrowded area, without his being allowed to remain or return to the "renewed" area.

Two such areas are the Wade-Springbrook and the Riverview Terrace public housing projects. Both stand on land that most recently was occupied predominantly by Negro residents. Both now are occupied predominantly by white families and white golden agers.

If we are going to renew our city, we first need to renew our thinking. And we can begin by making Wade-Springbrook and Riverview Terrace more equitably available to those living in blighted ever-bulging Negro ghettos.

MITSUKO MARSH.

#### NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

MR. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MR. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to establish a national cemeteries site selection advisory board to govern further development of the national cemetery system.

The Johnson administration has adopted the policy that there will be no further expansion of existing cemeteries at any location in the United States.

The Johnson administration takes the position that burial benefits such as those now payable by the Veterans' Administration and the social security system are preferable to the furnishing of burial facilities by the Government because the burial allowance programs are more equally available to all eligible persons. The Johnson administration estimates that some 40 million persons would be eligible for burial in national cemeteries under present regulations and the administration considers that the cost would be exorbitant.

I concur with the action taken by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans in calling for immediate steps to provide adequate Government cemeteries to meet current needs and make

provision to increase cemetery space as the demand requires.

I applaud the action of those who insist upon Government action to care for the deceased veterans who have served their country in time of war. The cost projections submitted by the Government agencies have been distorted and do not represent a true picture insofar as veteran burials are concerned. Statistics show that only about 40 percent of those eligible for burial in national cemeteries take advantage of the privilege, thereby lowering to a considerable degree the projection costs that have been made by Government officials.

Veterans are concerned, and justly so, over the fact that our national cemeteries have practically reached the saturation point and in a very few years there will be no areas where veterans can be buried in national cemeteries. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will insist upon passage of my joint resolution to carry on the time-honored custom of allowing veterans who have fought side by side to be interred side by side.

The text of my joint resolution is as follows:

**H.J. RES. 1080**

Joint resolution to establish a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to govern further development of the national cemetery system.

Whereas it is the policy and intent of Congress that a grateful Government of the United States in recognition of the loyalty, patriotism, and zeal of American servicemen in war and peace, maintain, enlarge, and expand a system of national cemeteries and continue the historic tradition, honor, and privilege of interment in a part of our beloved country so specifically dedicated; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Cemeteries Act of 1966."*

Sec. 2. No new national cemetery shall be established, and no existing national cemetery shall be enlarged, except in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board, the members of which shall be two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members appointed by the President of the United States. Of the members appointed by the President, at least one member must be a veteran (as that status is defined in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code) who is active in veterans affairs, and, at any one time, not more than two members may be officers or employees of an executive department or agency of the Federal Government.

(b) Members of the Board appointed by the President who are officers or employees of an executive department or agency of the Federal Government shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. The other members of the Board appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of five years, except that the President shall designate shorter terms of office for such other members first appointed so that no more than one term of office will terminate in the same year.

(c) Five members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The members of the Board shall elect a Chairman from among their number and employ an Executive Secretary whose salary shall be such amount (but not to exceed the

maximum rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended) as may be fixed by the Board. The Board may employ such other persons as it finds necessary for the conduct of its business and procure contract services in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

(e) Each member of the Board appointed by the President who is not an officer or employee of an executive department or agency of the United States shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Board. All other members of the Board shall serve without compensation in addition to that received from their services in the executive branch of the Federal Government or as Members of Congress, as the case may be. Each member of the Board while engaged away from his home or regular place of business in the performance of the duties vested in the Board may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(f) The Secretary of the Army shall assign, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, such personnel of the Department of the Army to assist the Board, and shall aid it in such other manner, as the Board requests and as is compatible with the other duties of such Department.

Sec. 4. (a) The Board shall advise and report to the Congress on the suitability of any site proposed for use as a national cemetery. In so doing, it shall make an estimate of the cost of establishing or enlarging, as the case may be, the national cemetery, and it shall take into account the location of the proposed site, the number of people residing within a convenient distance from the proposed site who are eligible for burial in a national cemetery, the proximity and accessibility of other national cemeteries, the need for the establishment of additional national cemeteries or the enlargement of existing ones, and other pertinent factors.

(b) A copy of the Board's report on each proposal for the establishment or enlargement of a national cemetery shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Army. The Board shall not recommend the establishment or enlargement of a national cemetery if the estimated cost to the United States for land acquisition and development is more than \$1,000,000. If the Board's report recommends the establishment or enlargement of a national cemetery, the Secretary of the Army shall report to the Congress his concurrence or nonconcurrence in the Board's recommendations within sixty days of his receipt of the Board's report. If the Secretary reports nonconcurrence in the recommendations of the Board, he shall state his reasons therefor.

(c) If the Secretary of the Army concurs in the recommendations of the Board, he may acquire the site and proceed with its development as a national cemetery, as soon as the necessary funds become available for that purpose.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Army may accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land and of funds for the development, operation, and maintenance of national cemeteries, in accordance with this Act, expend such funds for the purposes for which they are donated, and return unexpended and uncommitted portions thereof to the donors if those purposes cannot be carried out. He may also accept transfers of jurisdiction over land (including public land) owned by the United States and useful for national cemetery purposes, and the head of any executive department or agency of the Federal Government having jurisdiction over such land is authorized to transfer it to the Secretary of the Army for this purpose.

(b) The Secretary of the Army shall, whenever an offer of donation of land or of money for the purchase of land for a national cemetery is made to him, or whenever land owned by the United States becomes available for this purpose, notify the National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board.

Sec. 6. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed: Sections 4870, 4871, and 4872 of the Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 271, 272, 273); the Act of June 29, 1938 (24 U.S.C. 271a); the Act of August 4, 1947 (24 U.S.C. 281a-c); the Act of March 10, 1950 (24 U.S.C. 281d-f); and the Act of August 10, 1950 (24 U.S.C. 281g).

Sec. 7. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect the development of lands which were acquired or designated for national cemetery purposes before the date of enactment of this Act.

#### TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AT PUBLIC HEARINGS

**MR. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**MR. ELLSWORTH.** Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Department of Commerce, slapping export controls on cattle hides, is of continuing concern to me. I include, as part of my remarks, testimony before the Secretary of Commerce at public hearings on April 19.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT ELLSWORTH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM KANSAS, AT A PUBLIC HEARING TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, APRIL 19, 1966**

I command the Secretary of Commerce for scheduling public hearings today, to give all interested parties an opportunity to present their views on the critically important matter of export controls of cattle hides. My statement is very brief, and to the point:

1. The control program has not been effective in fighting inflation—3 weeks after the export quotas were imposed, manufacturers participating in the National Shoe Fair announced increases that will add an estimated \$1 to \$2 a pair to the retail prices of men's and women's shoes.

2. While shoe prices increase, hide prices (and cattle prices) have fallen at home and at the same time gone up in the overseas markets that rely on American exports.

3. The export control program cuts down U.S. exports and adds unmistakably to the deterioration of our balance of payments—this at a time when the prestige and strength of the dollar as the free world's key currency are of crucial importance.

To sum up:

1. Shoe manufacturers are profiting by the export control order.

2. Domestic cattle producers are suffering.

3. Our Nation's balance of payments has been given an unnecessary kick in the teeth.

I urge the Secretary of Commerce to reconsider and remove export controls on cattle hides.

#### COMPLETE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT NEEDED NOW: A BILL FOR A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN MANPOWER AND NATIONAL SECURITY

**MR. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the system used by the United States to obtain manpower for its armed services is inequitable and undemocratic, a patchwork of special exemptions and requirements which neither serve the best interest and needs of the Nation's Armed Forces nor the best overall usage of our human resources.

Responsible congressional committees have consistently ignored their obligation to review the Selective Service System in terms of its impact on the Nation's resources of skilled manpower as well as in terms of supplying the military with able men and women. But this has not been the fault of Republicans, who have urged such a review periodically during the last few years.

On April 21, 1964, 15 Republican Members took the floor of the House to demand a full investigation and review of the military manpower procurement system based on the draft. These Congressmen were Messrs. GERALD R. FORD, Lindsay, BRAY, Ostertag, FINDLEY, MORSE, HALPERN, QUIE, Taft, ELLSWORTH, Schwengel, WILSON of California, CLEVELAND, DEL CLAWSON, and myself. At the same time I introduced a bill to create a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security. This committee would have been composed of 12 Members, 6 from the House and 6 from the Senate. The Members would have been chosen from the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and the House Labor and Education Committee and Senate Labor and Public Works Committee.

It is important to note that the emphasis of this proposal for a joint committee is that the problem of military manpower is intimately linked with problems of manpower training and availability in the private sector.

Catching wind of this Republican initiative in the House, President Johnson on April 18, 1964, called a sudden press conference to announce that he had "today drafted and approved the plans for a very comprehensive study of the draft system and of related manpower policies submitted to me by the Secretary of Defense. This study will consider alternatives to the present draft selection system." From his comments the President clearly understood that the need for a draft was being criticized, and that proposals among others for an alternative system, such as a professional army, were being formulated and discussed.

The President ordered at his April 18, 1964, press conference that the review of the draft "be completed in 1 year." This study is now fully a year overdue.

In March 1965, Jack Raymond, reporter for the New York Times, wrote that the study had been completed. It is reported that it has been shown confidentially to the chairmen of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees,

Congressman RIVERS and Senator RUSSELL. But the Secretary of Defense has refused to make his study public, as I and others have requested.

On March 2, 1966, 30 Republican Members of the House, myself included, urged the Armed Services Committee to move ahead quickly to fulfill its promise that it would hold public hearings to examine into the draft. As an April 8 editorial in the New York Herald Tribune stated:

Republicans very generously offered to withhold demands for a full-scale investigation of the draft until General Hershey had had a chance to testify before the Rivers committee. But so far there has not even been an appearance by General Hershey. The Republicans and other critics, and the public, are waiting.

It is time to stop waiting and to act. The Universal Military Training Act, which is the nondescriptive label for what is essentially a draft law, pure and simple, is neither universal, military, nor training. There is little question that the high incidence of personnel turnover in the Military Establishment results in higher costs and inferior personnel quality. It has been clear for some time that the inequities in the present law and the great increase in the draft age population, plus technological changes in the Armed Forces, require a major reexamination of how to select, recruit, and retain the numbers of men that are needed annually.

It may be argued that the Vietnam war has so changed circumstances since April 1964, that the United States is bound to adhere to the present draft system unchanged. Certainly the options for change have been somewhat narrowed. It is foolhardy that successive administrations have refused to repair the leaks in the barn roof during sunny weather. Now, the storms of war are claimed to prevent real action to mend the wrongs, and a psychology of standpat has taken hold in official minds.

I argue that the exigencies of war and the continually growing demand for able manpower both for war and domestic production is even greater reason for a review of the present system now.

The practice of giving deferments from service based on scholastic ability is just as undemocratic as allowing deferments based on an individual's wealth. It would be far more equitable to use a lottery system of choice, as was done in World War I. At least under that system every man had an equal chance. An editorial in the April 15 Forbes magazine argues that lottery system is still the "only one truly fair way to select those eligible." With consent a copy of this editorial follows my remarks. The present system is not only undemocratic and discriminatory but it denies to the armed services our most able men—the men whose abilities we need most in any war effort. The present system creates other obvious distortions—such as promoting early marriage, and giving an incentive for couples to have children in order to evade the draft. The evasion mentality takes deep root in such circumstances.

Thus, today, I am reintroducing with some changes my bill introduced in the 88th Congress to create a Joint Congres-

sional Committee on American Manpower and National Security.

Such Joint Committee is instructed by the bill to "make a comprehensive study and investigation of the present and future importance of American manpower to national security and the American Military Establishment," including the following:

First. The number of skills of persons in the United States qualified for gainful employment, in relation to the Nation's military and civilian manpower needs.

Second. Present methods of military manpower procurement, their administration, and the equitability of their application to the youth of the Nation, and possible alternative methods of military manpower procurement for the Nation.

Third. The cost of present and alternative methods of procurement, training, and employment of members of the Military Establishment, and the amount, nature and effectiveness of training now offered by the armed services.

Fourth. The contribution, if any, made by the present system of military manpower procurement and by the present utilization of human resources within the Military Establishment to the growth of practices to evade military service among the Nation's youth. This provision would be an effort to assess the psychological impact of the present selective system on youths.

Fifth. The use of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to impose sanctions on individuals, without the protections of the judicial process. This provision would insure that the serious problem of the use of the selective service system to punish at will those who defy it by reclassification would be examined into by the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee would be bipartisan, composed of 12 members appointed equally from the House and Senate by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. Two members from both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, two members from the House Education and Labor Committee, and two members from the Senate Labor and Public Works Committee would be appointed. The remaining four members would be appointed, two from each House.

The problem of the theory and operation of the Selective Service System is of urgent national concern. It must be examined with the greatest intensity. For too long inequities in the present system have been allowed to exist. In peacetime there was less pressure to re-examine the system because servicemen were not dying. Today large numbers of men are required daily to risk their lives for their country. There can be no discrimination among those with greater or less scholastic ability when it comes to an obligation to risk life. All able Americans should be called on equally to share this burden and equally to take this risk.

[From the Forbes magazine, Apr. 15, 1966]

#### Do It By Lot

Young men in college today are under intense scholastic pressure without having more, totally iniquitous heat from the Selective Service System.

I quite agree that in a democratic society it is unfair to exempt from the draft those who can afford college.

But I think it is as unfair as it is inhuman to take into the service only those collegians who are in the lower half or quarter of their class. Do we as a Nation really think that only the less bright should serve in uniform and safeguard our country?

Of course not.

Yet that is exactly what the present plan for expanding the draft to include collegians implies.

There is only one truly fair way to select those eligible physically and mentally—by lot.

The luck of the draw—and not a young man's luck in the apportioning of brains and means—should determine who gets drafted.

#### CEREMONY AT PARIS NATIONAL SHRINE

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I received, today, a cable from Jacques Chastenet and Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, president and former president respectively of the France-America Committee in Paris, stating they will seek a meeting with Pierre Messmer, French Minister of the Armies, in order to urge reconsideration of the French Government decision to bar from Les Invalides, a French national shrine, ceremonies honoring the memory of Sgt. Russell Kelly, of Altoona, Pa., the first American fatally wounded in the liberation of Paris.

In a cable a few days before to M. Giscard d'Estaing, I had urged the France-America Committee to use its influence to persuade the French Government to reconsider its reported decision to bar this ceremony. Expressing great concern with the rising tide of anti-French feelings in this country and being aware of the impact of today's press, radio, and TV, I noted that the good will between France and America built up over centuries could be destroyed very quickly. I suggested that by reversing this decision France could set a tone of magnanimity and friendship which hopefully will inspire our Government to follow suit.

Here is a translation of the cable received today:

We are asking a meeting with Mr. Messmer, Minister of the Armies, in order to urge the action you advocate.

JACQUES CHASTENET,

President.

EDMOND GISCARD D'ESTAING,  
Former President, France-America  
Committee.

At this same ceremony last year I had helped to place at the Kelly Memorial in Paris a wreath presented by the Paris-American Legion Post No. 1. I was in Paris as chairman of the four-member factfinding mission sent by the Republican conference of the U.S. House of Representatives to study NATO problems

and the reasons for the widening rift between France and the United States.

The mission was entertained by the 50-year-old France-America Committee at a luncheon in Paris and also had a lengthy cordial and helpful conference with Mr. Messmer.

#### COMMUNISM IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. ASHBROOK.** Mr. Speaker, Allan C. Brownfeld has written an excellent article which appears in Christian Economics. It deals with the Communist efforts to infiltrate the peace movement.

It is distressing to see the propaganda barrage of those like Staughton Lynd who profess to the "new left" in American politics. There is nothing new about him. His parents were at the front of the pro-Communist ranks in the past decades and their son is nothing more than a second generation of the old radical pro-Communist left.

Mr. Brownfeld puts this matter in proper perspective and I call this article to the attention of all Members of this body. The article follows:

#### COMMUNISM IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The peace movement, one critic stated, has become little more than an institutionalized defense of Communist aims in Asia.

The spokesman was not a Senate investigator or an employee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It was, instead, Philip Altbach, a Ford Foundation Fellow at the University of Chicago, and president from 1959 to 1964 of the Student Peace Union, a pacifist group.

Writing in the New America, official publication of the Socialist Party, Altbach stated: " \* \* \* while the protest movement has succeeded in attracting fairly substantial support, much of its success has been gained by appealing to the minuscule left, while ignoring rather strong dissenting trends in the liberal community \* \* \* there is a strong undercurrent in the protest movement which tends to view a Vietcong victory as a positive aim. There has been little criticism of the terror of the Vietcong and very few have pointed out that the National Liberation Front imposes high taxes on the peasants and despite substantial popular support it is by no means a democratic movement. The strident chorus of anti-Americanism has had the effect of presenting a one-sided view of the situation \* \* \* a substantial part of the Vietnam protest movement is not a peace movement at all, but rather supports the Communist side in the conflict."

This assessment marks the beginning of a realization by old-line pacifists that the current antiwar movement is not one which opposes force, but is one which merely opposes the use of force against communism. The new pro-Communist groups came to the leadership of the antiwar movement with the march on Washington on April 17, 1965, and ever since then Communists have been welcomed and included in their ranks of opposition.

The Students for a Democratic Society, largest of the protest groups, included in their Port Huron statement of 1962 a denunciation of "colonialism, communism, and anticomunism." This past summer SDS, meeting in convention, eliminated from its constitution clauses barring "advocates and apologists of totalitarianism" and opposing "authoritarianism both of communism and of the domestic right" because they felt that such provisions were "negative and exclusionary" and smacked of "Red baiting." Thus, SDS, which claims a membership of 3,000 in 90 chapters around the country, and a national staff of 12 people with an annual budget of \$80,000, welcomes Communists as members and participants.

Paul Booth, the group's national secretary, makes clear the view of SDS with regard to communism: "It's not very descriptive to say that the Vietcong are Communists and therefore we have to kill them. The Communist nations are not a threat to us. The United States is more of a threat to the sovereignty of the peoples of the world than Communist China."

The pre-April 1965 peace movement is as much a subject of attacks as are those who support the administration's policy in Vietnam. Such groups have been labeled " \* \* \* organizations whose peace activities are confined within the bounds of cold war policies and anticomunism, and who have been trying for years to convince various sections of the power structure and the administration that the best way to fight the holy war for U.S. hegemony in the world is with a little less blood and nuclear danger. That is the line which dominated the old peace movement for years \* \* \* ." This statement appeared in an article by Fred Halstead in the pro-Communist newspaper, the Militant. It marks a clear admission that the current dominating forces in the antiwar coalition are joined together not by a love for peace, and moral objection to force, but by an affirmative belief that the triumph of communism is a worthy goal.

Many leading liberals who are not pacifists, but who respect a genuine pacifism which condemns all who use force equally, have risen to attack those who parade as lovers of peace while at the same time refraining from any call for peace from world communism.

Such an individual is Prof. John Roche of Brandeis University, a former national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. Attacking what he termed "part-time pacifism" Professor Roche stated: "What particularly disturbs me is the growth of part-time pacifism, or liberal isolationism. Fine liberals, who would storm Congress to aid a beleaguered Israel, suddenly shift gears when Asia is involved and start talking about 'the inevitability of Chinese domination' and the 'immorality' of bombing North Vietnam. Let me make it perfectly clear that a pacifist can on principle argue that the use of force in international affairs is immoral. Though I do not hold this position, I recognize its principled foundation. But a pacifist is thus forbidden by his moral imperatives from having any favorite wars."

A special interview with President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam by British correspondent James Cameron evidenced the fact that Communist leaders feel that the American peace movement is representative of majority sentiment in this country. The North Vietnamese leader said: " \* \* \* The whole democratic-thinking faction of the Western World is behind us. There is Norman Morrison, who burned himself to death for us. There is Bertrand Russell. How can you deny these people?" Cameron points out that the immolation of Morrison, the young Quaker who burned himself to death in front of the Pentagon November 2 in a protest against the war, was so electrifying

to the North Vietnamese that even weeks after his death demonstrations were being held in his honor.

Despite the clear fact that the overwhelming majority of Americans do support the policy of resistance to aggression, many have been given the impression that opposition is widespread, and that the protesters represent a large number of citizens. In addition, many honest citizens who desire peace have mistakenly associated themselves with organizations which do not seek peace but which, by their own admission, support the efforts of the Vietcong to assume power in South Vietnam.

#### TROUBLES OF THE OEO

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. DERWINSKI.** Mr. Speaker, there is not a program which is subject to more controversy than the so-called war on poverty or, as it is officially known, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In south Cook County, Ill., the area basically within my congressional district, the poverty program has been especially ineffective. However, it is not my purpose to offer personal criticism of the program but merely to report to the House the comments of knowledgeable observers. I therefore submit for the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Saturday, April 9, edition of the Suburban Eagle, a newspaper substantially devoted to the Negro residents of south suburban Cook County:

#### TROUBLES OF THE OEO

The manner south Cook County's Office of Economic Opportunity is losing its directors brings to mind the method rats use to save their worthless hides when the ship they're riding on begins to sink.

This paper has exhausted its resources in an attempt to arouse the indigent and to bring focus on the discouraging manner a group of power-seeking, middle-class do-gooders have completely frustrated the poor people seeking opportunity to participate in the community action program.

The present condition of the Harvey office of south Cook County's OEO is a clear indication of Mr. Frederick McClendon's inability as executive director.

While it is not our intent to indicate how the Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity should conduct its business, the people of this area are wondering if the south Cook County Office is really necessary.

We have observed proposals ripped apart at the regional level—proposals that were drawn up and processed by staff directors of Cook County of Economic Opportunity adhering to guidelines of that Office, which at the regional level don't mean a hill of beans.

Mr. McClendon is not entirely to blame for "fiddling while Rome burns." The directors he so carefully handpicked, share equally. Mr. John Rakauskas, director of research, a young lad in his twenties, was first fiddler, Ted Fleming, community developer, who plays the bull fiddle, Alonzo Davis, coordinator, who replaced our own dear Mary Inger who came back to south Cook to do the job free that she felt she couldn't do when on south Cook's payroll.

The whole situation of Mr. McClendon's Office is a joke—the governing board, the executive board, the steering committee, and the task force—all who seem to care little for the well-being of the people they serve—or whether or not this community is receiving its money's worth.

These matters are important and we are anxiously awaiting some explanation of the nature of the activities of South Cook's office.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, there is other editorial comment worthy of attention which is somewhat different but equally penetrating in its observations. I submit for the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared on Sunday, April 17, in the Harvey Tribune, one of the major suburban newspapers in south Cook County, having extensive circulation in numerous communities where the poverty program has been floundering:

#### NO ONE IS WINNING THE WAR ON POVERTY

No one is winning the war on poverty and no one knows that better than the poor. Over a hundred representatives of poverty neighborhoods crowded into a borrowed office next door to the South Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity in Harvey Wednesday morning to complain to the poverty generators on that very point.

The top general, Executive Director Frederick E. McClendon, admitted to the angry group that his aids weren't doing their job and that there were many things going wrong with the war. He admitted that no attacks had been made on poverty fronts and stated that he needed a bigger staff to help turn the tide against poverty.

There are several reasons behind the lack of accomplishment in this battle and most of them were revealed by the publication of a report last Tuesday by a private consulting firm.

The report contended that the country's antipoverty office has developed no effective programs, that its operations are rife with internal confusion and floundering, and that there is a lack of leadership both within the staff and in the policymaking citizen's governing board.

It appears to us that OEO is conducting a war on poverty without two essential ingredients for winning any battle: foot soldiers and a knowledge of the enemy.

Any military leader will tell you that it is impossible to conquer an enemy without foot soldiers and the first subject the Army teaches its recruits is know the enemy.

According to the critical report and McClendon's admissions at the Wednesday meeting, the OEO is conducting its war with a lot of highly-salaried generals from a Chicago command post full of proposals, battle plans and maps. Yet, nothing shows out in the poverty areas.

Many of the reasons for this failure cannot be found in a written report. They must be lived with to be understood.

The problems that the OEO faces in ridng the south suburban area of poverty are almost insurmountable and it may well be that the entire program is too idealistic to work. It may be impossible to eradicate the conditions which have existed for so long with a program of this type.

There are entire areas in Cook County without adequate water, sewage, and electrical facilities. There are 2-room apartments with 10 people living in them. Disease, drug addiction, ignorance, and low moral standards are prevalent.

The people in these areas are angry, skeptical, and discouraged. They have heard about others in similar situations receiving benefits and they want their share. It may even be stated that they want more than their share, or to put it another way they want everything they can get without charge.

As one woman put it: "I don't want your proposals or your ideas or your big words—I want your money." And that is a large part of the problem. Who is to say that if they get this money, it won't be floundered away and wasted?

There are many people who advocate turning the war on poverty funds over to the poor for management. We wonder what sort of reasoning has been used to arrive at this philosophy because we find it hard to believe that these people are capable of handling this money any more than they have handled their own budgets.

It is true that they know what they need better than the generals downtown, but if they are capable of assuming posts on poverty councils set up to align funds, they should also be capable of pulling themselves out of their own poverty situation.

The war on poverty program needs professional leadership if it is going to succeed and that leadership is needed in the field, not in an office in downtown Chicago.

You can't win a war unless you send foot soldiers into the territory who know the enemy.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I submit an article for inclusion in the RECORD as part of my remarks which was included in the Harvey Tribune on April 17 and which was based on a report ordered by the Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity and made by A. L. Nellum & Associates of Chicago:

#### NELLUM REPORT: THE OEO HISTORY IN SOUTH COOK SUBURBS

The Cook County antipoverty program was created by Cook County board president, Seymour Simon, in January 1965. Prior to that time, starting in the fall of 1964, a number of meetings had been held, mainly through the initiative of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago and interested citizen groups and individuals from south Cook County who saw the need for an antipoverty program in suburban Cook County.

The welfare council felt that a countywide metropolitan program covering both Chicago and the suburban areas would be most advantageous. However, following discussions with city officials, it was decided that it would be too difficult to coordinate the Chicago program with that of the suburbs. The creation of the Cook County economic opportunity program established a unified suburban program to operate outside of Chicago.

Because of the wide variety and large geographical area, it was felt that suburban Cook County could not be planned for as a single community, and that the south, west, and north represented three distinct geographic areas for planning purposes. South Cook, with the greatest concentration of obvious poverty, was viewed as the place to start the antipoverty program. In addition, most of the planning for the suburban antipoverty efforts had taken place in south Cook, and this region led the rest of the county in the development of a program.

Beginning January 1965, Seymour Simon appointed Patrick O'Block interim director of the countywide program. O'Block was mayor of south suburban Hazel Crest and also civil defense director for the county. Mrs. Mary Inger, a former president of the Migrant Workers Council in southern Cook County and former staff assistant to State Representative Anthony Scarlano, was also appointed as coordinator of the south Cook office. Mrs. Inger's appointment was made at the recommendation of the welfare council.

In March 1965, the county board of commissioners officially established the Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity. The March resolution provided for a 15-member

April 20, 1966

governing board and three steering committees, one in the south, north and west. Three members of the governing board were to be appointed by the county board president and four to be appointed by each of the three steering committees. (The establishment of steering committees in the north and west was not to be undertaken without the approval of the county commissioners.)

In order, to start the program, a planning and development grant was requested from the Federal Government to cover 6 months of operation. The Washington grant was approved May 25, 1965.

The receipt of funds was delayed, however, until a legal opinion could be obtained from the State's attorney's office as to the legality of the creation of the Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity. The decision establishing the legality of the office was not rendered until September 1965. The actual letter of credit for the issuance of funds was not established until October 1965.

In all, Washington supplied \$111,351 in Federal funds; and the Cook County board appropriated \$15,000 for matching funds.

The grant provided for a planning staff to work initially in south Cook County, with the provision that such staff would be freed to work countywide as the needs developed in north and west. The planning staff consisted of the following positions:

One educational services planning director.  
One employment services planning director.

One community services director.  
One social services planning director.

One research director.

Additional staff positions included a coordinator, 4 community service workers, 16 part-time neighborhood workers, and clerical and maintenance staff for the south Cook office.

Included in the original application was a program component for the recruitment of volunteers to assist in antipoverty programs in south Cook County. This program, known as Vision, was under the auspices of the South Cook County Human Relations Council.

A press release from the Washington OEO office announcing the grant on May 13, 1965, said in part: "a development grant under the community action program can be used to hire, if necessary, a director and minimum staff to survey a community's problems and needs; to study existing programs affecting the poor, to form a community action group if one does not exist, to develop programs that meet the most pressing needs first, to involve the poor as active planners and advisers, and to survey local resources that might finance poverty projects."

The original notion of beginning work in south Cook County before planning for the other two regions was a realistic one. However, antipoverty councils and local community groups had already been formed in the north and west to determine poverty needs in their areas. Thus, developments in the north and west crystallized before staff was hired and put to work in south Cook.

The newly organized north steering committee formally petitioned the county commissioners for recognition and approval in August 1965. A similar citizen development took place in west Cook County, and the temporary steering committee for the west Cook petitioned for recognition at the same time.

The county board of commissioners formally recognized the west Cook and north Cook steering committees in September 1965.

In the meantime, Patrick O'Block resigned as interim director of the program and Frederick McClendon, former assistant chief of the civil division in the U.S. attorney's office in Chicago, was hired as executive director in July 1965.

In effect, the new executive director inherited a situation which included:

(1) A funded planning grant with none of the funds having been released through the county controller's office;

(2) A structure which he did not create, including:

(a) A governing board with three public representatives and four members appointed from the south Cook steering committee;

(b) A steering committee, four task force groups, and antipoverty councils in south Cook;

(c) Temporary steering committees and antipoverty councils and local groups in the north and west; and

(3) A summer Headstart program, processed directly through the OEO regional office, which was operating in several communities throughout the county.

Although the planning grant provided for six professional staff members, the only position filled at the time that the new director was hired was that of the coordinator of south Cook.

The executive director subsequently hired two professional persons to fill the positions of educational services planning director and research director.

There was much floundering and confusion on the part of staff. The coordinator resigned in November 1965, citing as her reasons the lack of activity and accomplishments in the program. The educational services planning director was dismissed in January 1966 for unsatisfactory job performance.

Although a community director was hired in December 1965, the research director was the only professional person who had been on the job more than 3 months during the time of the investigation.

The executive director requested an extension of the original program development grant to February 28. With virtually no programs developed and with an approaching deadline for the application of a conduct and administration grant for the Cook County OEO office; and in the face of mounting complaints and criticism, the Midwest regional office of OEO suggested that the executive director hire an independent consulting firm to make an objective appraisal of the structure, planning, program priorities, and planning process of the agency.

Under the terms of a contract signed on January 28, 1966, with the Cook County Office of Economic Opportunity, A. L. Nellum and Associates agreed to make such an analysis, including recommendations which would strengthen the organizational structure and facilitate planning. The Nellum report will be presented in the next edition of the Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues serving on the Education and Labor Committee have repeatedly asked the chairman for a thorough, objective review of the poverty program throughout the country. From this brief commentary I have supplied you on the situation in south suburban Cook County, if it is at all typical of the nationwide situation, a thorough review of the program and a housecleaning of the agency appears in order.

#### HIS EMINENCE, JOSEPH CARDINAL BERAN, S.T.D., ARCHBISHOP OF PRAGUE

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Beran, Archbishop of Prague, is currently touring the United States. Cardinal Beran is, in effect, exiled from his native country by the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. His visit to the United States has special significance in that the freedom of speech and freedom of religion that have been denied his flock in Czechoslovakia are available here in our land where the Americans of Czech and Slovak descent courageously fight for the traditions of their homeland against its present Communist tyrants. I submit as part of my remarks a biographic sketch of Cardinal Beran which contains additional information concerning his career as well as his present visit in the United States:

HIS EMINENCE, JOSEPH CARDINAL BERAN,  
S.T.D., ARCHBISHOP OF PRAGUE

Joseph Beran, son of a teacher, was born in Pilsen (western Bohemia), Czechoslovakia on December 29, 1888. He spent his youth in Pilsen, and was an ardent Sokol (a gymnastic organization). In his school and college years he showed great admiration for art, music, and song. His seminary years were spent in Rome and on March 10, 1911, was ordained to the priesthood. One year later, in Rome, he received his doctor's degree in theology. After World War I, as a professor of theology, he taught at various schools at Prague. In the year of 1929, he became an assistant professor and in 1939 he became professor of theology at the Charles University of Prague. In 1932 he was appointed rector of the Archdiocesan Seminary of Prague, which position he held until he was elevated as archbishop.

During World War II, as an opposer of Nazism, he was arrested by the Gestapo June 6, 1942, and was imprisoned for 8 months at Fort Terezin (Theresienstadt) and then was transferred to the famous concentration camp of Dachau, Bavaria. On April 29, 1945, he was liberated by the American Army. Garbed in prison clothes, he received an old uniform from an American GI, in which he returned to Prague and immediately reopened his seminary.

On November 5, 1946, Pope Pius XII elevated Joseph Beran as archbishop of Prague. The Archepiscopate of Prague is over 600 years old. Joseph Beran is the 33d archbishop of Prague and 50th descendant of the See of St. Adalbert; a Czech bishop and great apostle of the Hungarians and Poles. (The Episcopate of Prague had been established over 1,000 years ago.)

Edward Benes, President of the Czechoslovak Republic, decorated Archbishop Beran on November 14, 1946, with the highest orders of the Republic (Cross of War and Military Medal, 1st class)—as a merit for his struggles for liberty and national independence.

On December 8, 1946, at the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague, the Papal Nuncio Saverio Ritter consecrated Joseph Beran as archbishop. Archbishop Beran has taken for his motto "Eucharistia et Labor." The new archbishop became a very popular and beloved person in Czechoslovakia. He was a pioneer of ecumenism and two decades before the opening of the Second Vatican Council, he practiced some of the ideas of the council.

During the Communist coup d'état in February of 1948 in Czechoslovakia, Archbishop Beran was the only important person who publicly warned the people of future events.

On February 25, 1948, the archbishop delivered a proclamation; "Archbishop, do not remain silent," in which he reminded the people of the terrible consequences by the liquidation of democracy and oppression of liberty. He pleaded with the people not to destroy the works of the president, liberator, T. G. Masaryk and President Benes, founders of the Czechoslovak Republic.

But to no avail \* \* \* the Iron Curtain came down over Czechoslovakia. In May of 1948, due to illness, President Benes abdicated and the following September in Sezimovo Usti, Archbishop Beran with Joseph Hlouch, bishop of Budejovice, laid President Benes to his final rest.

Communists increased in their persecution of the Catholic Church and meddled in the church affairs. They also introduced new laws in order to curtail the rights of the bishops, and attempted to separate the Catholics of Czechoslovakia from the Holy See. Archbishop Beran as the head and speaker of the Czechoslovakia hierarchy tried to avoid the conflict with the new regime as long as it would not interfere with the principles and rights of the church, but the good will of the archbishop was in vain. Within a year these controversies have changed into a fearful fight in which the Communists used the worst tactics of terror against priests and laymen. June 1949, Archbishop Beran and all the bishops of Czechoslovakia were summoned to swear loyalty to the Communist regime and put the church under control of the administration of the state, but the bishops refused. June 14, 1949, the police occupied the residence and the office of Archbishop Beran and seized the archiepiscopate seal.

June 18, 1949, the archbishop preached to his flock for the last time at the ancient monastery Strahov. In his sermon he stated: I solemnly proclaim before God and the nation that I will never underwrite anything that would violate the liberty and rights of the church. No matter what happens, and what ever they tell you, do not believe that I have capitulated. After the sermon, the people of Prague, resisting the police, gave him an enormous ovation. The following day (Sunday) the Communists commanded hordes, and with the support of the police forced their way into St. Vitus Cathedral during his services, with jeers, stamping their feet, and using amplifiers to drown out the sermon of Archbishop Beran. In spite of the jeering and horrible chaos, Beran's words were heard: I will never sign anything that will violate the rights of the church and the basic human rights. The congregation sang the national anthem and the Medieval Choral of St. Wenceslaus (patron of the Czech nation) \* \* \* Archbishop Beran on returning to his residence was surrounded by the police. At that moment, the people of Prague have seen their archbishop for the last time \* \* \* and for the last time were shouting with tears in their eyes: Long live our hero shepherd. We believe in you. We love you. We will never betray you.

Then the following events could be called the Calvary of the Czechoslovak Catholics. The archbishop was held in custody at his residence and all contacts with the outside world were abolished. The bishop's chanceries of all dioceses in Czechoslovakia were occupied by the police and government commissars, ousting all the bishops and taking over the duties of the diocesan administration. More than one-third of the priests were gradually imprisoned, all the monasteries were liquidated and all the monks were confined into jails and concentration camps. The nuns were ousted from the schools, orphanages, and hospitals and sent to farms, factories, quarries, and brickyards.

Important priests and representatives of religious orders were sentenced at the monster trials as the worst criminals. The Communists expected that under this pressure Archbishop Beran would capitulate. After a

year and a half of fruitless waiting the Communist Government ousted Archbishop Beran from Prague on March 10, 1951, to an unknown place. The other bishops were also transported by force and interned.

The Communists held Beran captive for 14 years, transferring him from place to place. They never ventured to put this national hero before the tribunal. Between the years of 1960 and 1962 there were rumors of his death in prison.

John F. Kennedy, the late President of the United States emphatically intervened in favor of Archbishop Beran to Khrushchev, and as a result in the year of 1963, Moscow ordered the government of Prague to release the archbishop. "Release" was as follows: He was brought to a cottage near Prague, which was surrounded by a fence, where he was not allowed to leave the premises. The people in crowds pilgrimed to get a glimpse of their shepherd, so the Communists transferred him in 1964 to a remote spot to cut off all contacts. On January 25, 1965, His Holiness Pope Paul VI elevated Archbishop Beran to the College of Cardinals.

For the Communists, the case of Cardinal Beran became unbearable, because the foreign journalists and tourists wanted to visit and speak to the legendary cardinal.

In February of last year, the Holy Father invited the new cardinal to Rome and it was not known to the last day whether he would be permitted to undertake this trip. The government finally approved and Cardinal Beran thought he would return in a few weeks to his homeland, even if it meant another prison. After being seated in the airplane, a government official entered the plane and announced to the cardinal that he cannot return to his beloved Czechoslovakia for which he sacrificed so much, and where all the good people loved and venerated him.

In the fall of last year, the name of Cardinal Beran appeared in the headlines of newspapers of the whole world who brought information of his declaration at the Second Vatican Council in favor of religious freedom.

The late Cardinal Meyer of Chicago was also one of the leading supporters of religious freedom.

His Eminence Cardinal Beran visited some countries of Western Europe. He was welcomed by his compatriots; the people of all nations, and also greeted by the Catholic bishops and dignitaries of other Christian churches. In the near future, the cardinal will visit the United States. He is a great historical person who belongs to the great four defenders of the faith, in central Europe: Beran, Wyszyński, Mindszenty, Stepinac.

His Eminence will arrive in Chicago on April 23, 1966. The public will be able to hear and see him Sunday, April 24, at the testimonial dinner at the Conrad Hilton Hotel at 6:30 p.m., given by the Alliance of Czech Catholics; Monday, April 25, at 7:30 p.m., at the Morton West Auditorium at 2400 South Home Avenue, Berwyn, Ill., where His Eminence will honor us with his presence at the Czch Passion Play given in his honor by "Club Domov," and on Tuesday, April 26, at 7:30 p.m., at the Blessed Agnes Auditorium, 27th and Central Park Avenue, Chicago.

Loyola University of Chicago and St. Procopius College of Lisle, Ill., will present the cardinal with an honorary doctor's degree.

#### REGULATION OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. BELL.** Mr. Speaker, I supported the passage of the Highway Beautification Act during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Although I felt that States should have a good deal more discretion in determining their own zoning regulations, I concurred with a purpose of the legislation to effect a policy of reason control in the highway advertising industry.

On January 28, 1966, the Department of Commerce issued so-called draft standards for the regulation of outdoor advertising under the act. Much consternation was aroused when the guidelines were published in the Federal Register and took on the aura of final standards by which the industry would be guided. Certain concerned Members of Congress who were most familiar with the legislation immediately and validly reacted to the seeming encroachment by the Commerce Department when the legislative intent was so clearly contrary to such action. I was happy to find that the Department only intends these guidelines as a working draft of regulations that will inevitably be altered as thorough and comprehensive hearings are carried out by the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau will conduct hearings throughout the country with the draft standards merely serving as a focus for the study.

I regret to say that the fears of many in the outdoor advertising industry have not been alleviated by this explanation. I continue to receive correspondence from respected leaders in the advertising field who are deeply disturbed by the action of the Department of Commerce.

It is my purpose here today to emphasize that Congress never intended the Department of Commerce to have arbitrary authority in setting down regulations to bind each advertiser in every State uniformly.

Not only is it unfounded to have the Department of Commerce finalize regulations under the act, but it seems to me impossible to conceive that it could, at this early stage, formulate regulations governing outdoor advertising uniformly in every State. Clearly, each State has its own unique set of circumstances regarding advertising and to think that a single body of inflexible regulations would equitably apply to all circumstances, is simply not realistic.

From my conversations with those closest to this problem, it is my understanding that the Department of Commerce will act with caution in this matter and report its revised regulations recommendation after hearings are conducted among the States. Congress will then have an opportunity to review them for further modification. I concur with this approach and will follow with great interest the progress that is made.

#### ENTRANCE FEES FOR PUBLIC ACCESS TO FEDERAL LAKES AND RESERVOIRS

**Mr. EDWARDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULLTON] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1964 the Corps of Engineers will soon be collecting entrance fees for public access on some 95 Federal lakes and reservoirs.

Included in this number are four in my State of Tennessee, Old Hickory Reservoir, Cheatham dam and lock, and Dale Hollow Reservoir.

These fees are designed to provide funds for the land and water conservation trust fund which is, in turn, designed to meet the growing need to provide adequate outdoor recreation facilities in the future.

The purpose of the act is commendable. But the method of financing is unacceptable because it is contrary to the long-established understanding between this Government and our people that lands taken by the Federal Government for impounding waters would be freely accessible to the public without Federal interference.

Under the fee system to be administered by the corps a variety of charges have been established. They include:

A \$7 annual permit for one vehicle and all occupants.

A \$3 30-day permit for one vehicle and all occupants.

A \$1.50 30-day permit for one individual with or without vehicle.

A \$1 1-day permit for vehicle and all occupants.

A 50 cent 1-day individual permit with or without vehicle.

These access fees, as I understand it, are to go into effect on Memorial Day, May 30, 1966. The \$7 annual permit sticker was to have gone on sale on April 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to this fee system. I opposed it when the bill was before the House and nothing has transpired in the interim to alter my opinion that this is not the way to raise the revenues required by this very necessary act.

Therefore I am joining today with my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], in offering a bill which would repeal the authority to charge Federal entrance and admission fees at virtually all Federal lakes and reservoirs. I think we made a mistake 2 years ago but it is not too late to correct the error.

#### THE WOMEN'S JOB CORPS CENTER IN CHARLESTON, W. VA.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 of this year, in connection with the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va., I reported information pertaining to a number of figures which were in dispute at the hearings on the war on poverty. Additional information has

come to my attention regarding the matter.

During the hearings on the war on poverty, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, was one of three OEO officials questioned about the feasibility study of the Kanawha Hotel. Mr. Boutin replied:

Survey for this was done by GSA for us. The facilities that were carefully looked at were the Ruffner Hotel, the Holley Hotel, the hotel in question, the Daniel Boone Hotel and the Holiday Inn Hotel.

Dr. Benetta B. Washington, of OEO's Women's Job Corps Division, was asked who had conducted the study. She said it was OEO's own engineers. I asked Milton Fogelman, contracting officer, Office of Economic Opportunity, who had conducted the feasibility study and he said it was Consolidated American Services.

In order to determine what, if any, alternatives were considered for the location of the Charleston Women's Job Corps Center, I had the minority investigator of the ad hoc subcommittee make a check with the following results:

On March 28, 1966, Mrs. Mary Lee Crowley, owner of the Holley Hotel on Quarrier Street in Charleston, said that at no time did she consider leasing the Holley Hotel to the Office of Economic Opportunity or its contractor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. She recalled that early in 1965 a representative of Packard Bell called on her and asked if she would be interested in leasing the hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center. Mrs. Crowley told this man that she was interested in selling the hotel, but not in leasing it. She remembered that his manner was abrupt and her conversation with him was less than 5 minutes. To her knowledge, no surveys or studies of the Holley Hotel were made by Packard Bell, OEO, or General Services Administration, which Boutin claimed made some studies for the OEO program.

Also on March 28, 1966, Mr. Joe Reiser, assistant manager of the Daniel Boone Hotel at Washington and Capitol Streets in Charleston, said that to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the Daniel Boone Hotel were made by Packard Bell, GSA, or OEO in contemplation of a Women's Job Corps site. He said no approach or offer had been made to the Daniel Boone management by any representative of these organizations. On April 6, 1966, Mr. Reiser said he had been in contact with Mr. Roger S. Creel, general manager of the Daniel Boone, who had been vacationing in Miami, Fla. Mr. Creel confirmed that at no time was any offer made to the Daniel Boone management regarding the Women's Job Corps Center and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the hotel had been made for that purpose.

On April 6, 1966, Mr. Lyman Stanton, president and general manager of the Holiday Inn Hotel on Kanawha Boulevard in Charleston, told the same story. He said that no approach or offer had been made in regard to the Women's Job Corps Center site and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of that facility had been made.

On March 30, 1966, Mr. Vincent Chaney, Charleston attorney who had represented the Ruffner Hotel for years prior to the sale of the building on February 1, 1966, said that to his knowledge no action had been taken in any way by Packard Bell or OEO in consideration of the Ruffner Hotel as a Job Corps site. His statement was affirmed by Mr. R. G. Lilly, Sr., Charleston attorney and principal stockholder of the family-owned Ruffner Hotel prior to its sale.

Mr. Lilly said, however, that in 1965, when he learned that a Women's Job Corps Center had been planned for Charleston, he was interested but was never approached.

Had he been approached, Mr. Lilly said, he would have been very interested in leasing the Ruffner Hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center for much less than the \$94,800 annual rental on the Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. Lilly described the Ruffner Hotel as a six-story building with basement and penthouse which includes about 170 bedrooms. He said the hotel has been leased to the Milner Co. of Detroit, Mich., during the past 3 years under an arrangement where the hotel owners receive 17 percent of the gross income. This resulted in the following approximate incomes to the hotel: 1965, \$21,000; 1964, \$18,000; and 1963, \$14,000. Under the terms of the lease, the Ruffner Hotel paid taxes and insurance on the building and its furniture.

Under the Kanawha Hotel-Packard Bell lease, the Office of Economic Opportunity pays taxes and insurance on the hotel and its furniture, as well as furniture storage.

It seems apparent from these figures that Mr. Lilly would have been glad, as he has said, to lease the Ruffner Hotel for much less than \$94,800 a year. Based on information furnished by responsible Charleston hotel representatives, it is apparent to me that Kanawha Hotel was the only site considered.

This is in addition to the errors I pointed out previously in Mr. Boutin's testimony before the ad hoc subcommittee. As far as I am concerned, so many errors of such a basic and grave nature are enough to discredit Mr. Boutin's entire testimony. This is another example of the chaotic and make it up as you go administration that seems to be so much a part of everyday operations at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROVIDES PROFITS TO DEMOCRATIC OFFICEHOLDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the hearings recently held on the proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act:

Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you \* \* \* were inaccurate.

Thus, in testimony on March 23, Bernard L. Boutin, of the Office of Economic Opportunity, began a point-by-

point denial of facts presented by ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican of Minnesota, 4 days earlier with reference to the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center. The same day Congressman SAM GIBBONS, of Florida, took the floor defending OEO and declaring that Congressman QUIE, inadvertently, was wrong.

Further investigation in Charleston not only showed that Congressman QUIE was right but that he conservatively understated the established facts that add up to scandalous poverty profits to a leading Democrat officeholder in West Virginia. Congressman QUIE said the Hotel Kanawha was owned by a corporation whose president was Angus Peyton, a prominent Democrat and the present commerce commissioner in West Virginia. This is undenied. Congressman QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel lease provides for payment of \$94,800 a year net profit, after the Federal Government reimburses for taxes, insurance, utilities, and repairs. Mr. Boutin said the rent was \$90,000. The fact is that the rent is \$94,800 and the Federal Government pays, in addition, \$4,800 a year for the storage of old hotel property.

Congressman QUIE said assessments in West Virginia were by law 50 percent of market value. Mr. Boutin said they were 40 percent. Chapter 18, article 9(a), section 4 of the West Virginia Code provides that assessed valuation shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of appraised valuation.

Mr. QUIE said that the Federal Government has spent at least \$225,000 renovating the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Mr. Boutin said they have spent only \$187,000. The fact is the Federal Government has spent \$345,000 to renovate the hotel into a Job Corps Center. This includes \$290,026.60 spent on repairs and installation of equipment, \$24,936.77 for electric, heating and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and \$30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics' liens.

Mr. QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel was worth about \$250,000 at the time it was chosen for a Job Corps Center. Mr. Boutin claimed it was worth \$438,000 in 1965 and \$508,250 in 1966—perhaps slyly including in its value \$345,000 worth of renovations at taxpayers' expense. The fact is that reliable real estate brokers in Charleston indicated the Hotel Kanawha was worth about \$250,000 prior to renovation. A somewhat older but comparable hotel in Charleston, the Milner-Ruffner, with more land and a more valuable location, sold on February 1 this year for \$200,000.

Mr. Boutin defended the Kanawha Hotel expenditures with the claim that annual square foot rental cost is less than \$1. The figure must have been computed by dividing the erroneous \$90,000 per year rental by 100,000 square feet. This becomes an entirely meaningless computation when it is understood that it ignores \$4,800 being paid annually for storage of the old hotel furniture, \$7,500 paid annually for taxes—including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable—\$5,740 paid annually for insurance and \$4,800 paid annually for rent in addition to the \$90,000 reported by OEO. Certainly a mean-

ingful annual square-foot cost figure should include all annual expenditures, not to mention \$16,000 to settle leases of former tenants and some annual amortizing of the \$345,549.51 renovations. Who does Mr. Boutin think he fools by citing such glib and misleading figures?

In summary, the poverty program has spent \$345,549.51 renovating a rundown hotel worth about \$250,000. A corporation, whose then president is a leading West Virginia Democrat, receives \$94,800 per year profit on property worth \$250,000. That is a poverty profit of 38 percent a year. An OEO official described the Charleston Women's Job Corps arrangement as "the very best deal that could be gotten." The taxpayers might be justified in asking "the best deal for whom?"

#### PRESS AND PEOPLE ARE NOT FOOLED BY L.B.J.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that the American press and the American people are not going to be taken in by the phony "inflation fighting" of the Johnson administration. Everyone in fields of business and labor as well as the housewife are blamed, cautioned, cajoled, and intimidated but the real culprit, Federal spending, is overlooked. The Wall Street Journal, a national organ, said in a recent editorial:

Hard-working Americans don't deserve to be slapped with a tax boost just because their Government refuses to prune its political extravagances.

At the local level, one of the 17th District's leading newspapers, the Mansfield News-Journal, carried an editorial entitled "It's Not Soap Flakes That Cause Inflation." The editor summed up the situation by saying:

If you want to root out inflation, right in Washington is the place to start digging.

One of our fine weekly newspapers, the Loudonville Times, hit the same theme in an editorial letter by writing "Dear Mr. President" and saying among other things:

We are tired of supporting the professional bum or "job dodger" and we are fed up with the flood of money (ours) that you are pouring into other countries with glee. Many times, these countries are Communist controlled and after they receive our money they say "Yankee, go home," or burn down our embassies.

This spirit is reflected everywhere. After 10 days with the people back home, I can tell you Mr. President, that the old Lincoln statement of "you can fool some of the people some of the time" and so forth, is beginning to apply. Few were fooled by the L.B.J. request that the housewife buy cheaper food items. None were fooled by his statement that more people are employed than ever before in peacetime. People are restless. They sense the drift, the indecision, the terrible price they are going to have to pay for

low-priority political programs like rent supplements and the Job Corps. Time to take stock, Mr. President, the people are catching on.

The three editorials referred to are inserted at this point, Mr. Speaker, and I commend them to the Members of this body as a good example of thought at the national, city, and village level: [From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 30, 1966]

#### THE UNCUTTABLE GROWTH

It is symptomatic of today's economic sickness that politicians should even be arguing whether to treat inflation with higher taxes or reduced Government spending; common-sense plainly calls for the latter.

As it is, though, the administration would almost certainly increase taxes before it cut domestic outlays. To the credit of the Republicans in Congress, and especially those on the Joint Economic Committee, they are challenging that ill-considered approach.

The minority members warn that present economic policy is bringing inflation in 1966 and risks recession in 1967. The aim of policy should be a Federal budget surplus in fiscal 1967, instead of the projected \$1.8 billion deficit—a smaller batch of red ink, it should be emphasized, than is likely to emerge in the event.

"If the administration is unwilling to reduce spending," the GOP committee report says, "an increase in taxes will be necessary, which would cause economic damage itself. Increasing taxes is a less desirable way to moderate the boom than by deferring expenditures."

To which we would add that it is not only less desirable but also not sure to be effective in countering inflation. As we have had occasion to remark previously, raising taxes may merely mean the Government will spend more; in that case the budget deficit is not necessarily wiped out, nor is total demand necessarily reduced. Conversely, Federal spending cutbacks are bound to lessen the inflationary pressures of demand.

So what is thought to be so terrible about taking the sensible course?

In the first place, it's a question of attitude. This administration is carrying the political handout obsession to truly impressive lengths. A dazzling assortment of domestic programs has been inaugurated or proposed, and for most of them the initial cost is practically nothing compared with what will come.

According to one estimate, outlays for so-called Great Society programs—in health, education, welfare, manpower training, area and regional development and the rest—will be five times bigger in fiscal 1970 than they were in 1965. Although Vietnam has deterred the Federal officials from asking for as much domestic money in the new budget as they would have liked, they evidently suffer from an almost congenital incapacity for actual retrenchment.

And, sure enough, there is a school of thought, if that is the word, which contends that any serious curtailment of Federal expenditures is politically impossible. Once you start something like the antipoverty campaign, it's suggested, so many politicians and administrators (if not the poor themselves) get involved that the whole thing quickly becomes an enormous uncuttable octopus.

We would certainly not deny the political pressures, but it is a pretty frightening day for this country if it is really true that literally nothing can be done about the Federal Government's extreme bout of obesity, and we don't believe it is true. It would mean, at the very best, more and more of these incredibly mismanaged and wasteful undertakings like the poverty business and urban renewal that customarily destroys without renewing.

In addition, an endless proliferation of projects would promise continuing inflationary pressure, making what the Republicans regard as the risk of an ensuing recession all the more acute. Not to mention that a central government growing by such leaps must press uncomfortably close on traditional political liberties.

For all these reasons, we find the case for lowering spending instead of raising taxes an eminently sound one; it would be the healthier choice, and in more than economic ways. As for its alleged impossibility, all that is required is a modicum of political courage in Congress.

Hard-working Americans don't deserve to be slapped with a tax boost just because their Government refuses to prune its political extravagance. But whatever the upshot, the GOP is doing a public service by exposing the diseased state of official policy.

[From the Mansfield (Ohio) News Journal, Apr. 3, 1966]

#### IT'S NOT SOAP FLAKES THAT CAUSE INFLATION

Now that President Johnson has taken it upon himself to advise American housewives to buy lower priced soap flakes to help fight inflation, perhaps it would not be amiss for the President to hear some fiscal advice from ordinary citizens.

There is a shortage of food in many countries, Mr. President. Americans can sell all the excess food they produce on the world market.

Why not put an end to the farm subsidy program and save many millions of dollars?

There is a manpower shortage in the United States. Why not release from Federal employment the many thousands of people employed in the agricultural control program?

The free market will now take care of prices, provide profit to the farmers, and dictate how much acreage to plant.

If the housewife should save a few cents on soap flakes, Mr. President, why shouldn't you save a few millions by ending an obsolete farm program?

Also, Mr. President, the United States is now paying about 40 percent of the total cost of the United Nations.

Why not cut down our expenditures there to match our voting strength. The 120 United Nations all have equal voting power, why shouldn't they have equal paying responsibility?

Of course, the U.N. budget would have to be reduced but wouldn't that be good? Most of the money is spent in the United States and, as you have explained, there is too much money around to buy what is available.

The State Department and a lot of other executive departments are overstaffed. Employees spend much of their time postponing decisions so they will have something to do later.

Why not cut the budgets of these departments and release some of the employees into the cramped labor market, Mr. President? That would surely help as much as buying cheaper soap flakes.

Then there is foreign aid. How much this year, Mr. Johnson? About \$6 billion? Why not cut that back to about \$3 billion, which is all we have been able to spend in 1 year's foreign aid anyhow, and apply the balance on the national debt.

That will not only cut our spending, it will reduce our interest payments which feed inflation.

Soap flakes, Mr. Johnson? Some of them might be used to wash out the dirty financial linen in the antipoverty boondoggle.

If you want to root out inflation, right in Washington is the place to start digging.

[From the Loudonville (Ohio) Times]

#### TAKE IT EASY

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We all know that you are trying to produce a "prosperous America,"

and we know that you give this idea serious thought as you barbecue those filet mignons at your Texas ranch.

However, try to let us prosper in a more economic way—please.

At the present time, you have so many anti-this and anti-that programs going, that it would require a 500-page book to list them all. We certainly want our fellow man to prosper—but not on our hard-earned dollars.

You and your administration are spending money like it is going out of style (our money)—be assured that it will go "out of style" if you continue along the present lines.

We are tired of supporting the professional bum or "job dodger," and we are fed up with the flood of money (ours) that you are pouring into other countries with glee. Many times these countries are Communist-controlled, and after they receive our money they say, "Yankee go home," or burn down our embassies.

In short, Mr. President, residents of Loudonville, Ohio, are "up to here" with your flagrant misuse of our tax dollars both in this country and abroad.

A suggestion to Ladybird: Start packing—your hubby will never make it again.

#### THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY AND OUR AMERICAN YOUTH

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, time and time again the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has warned of the concerted effort being made by the Communist Party, USA, and other subversive groups to entice and commit uninformed American youth to their programs of sedition. It is indeed unfortunate that every one of the more than 3 million full-time college students in the United States cannot read and ponder Mr. Hoover's message in the February issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for this year. Now more than ever the allegiance of this Nation's younger citizens is prized by alien designing forces.

To help give Mr. Hoover's words the widest possible dissemination, I have requested that his message be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,  
February 1, 1966.

*To All Law Enforcement Officials:*

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "New Left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense.

Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hardcore fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the

anarchistic and seditious ring of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, U.S.A. as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the Communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flare-ups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the New Left are part of the 100,000 "state of mind" members Gus Hall, the party's general secretary, refers to when he talks of party strength. He recently stated the party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "1,000 to 2,000" increase in membership in the last year.

For the first time since 1959, the party plans a national convention this spring. We can be sure that high on the agenda will be strategy and plans to win the New Left and other new members. A Communist student, writing in an official party organ, recently stated. "There is no question but that the New Left will be won."

Thus, the Communists' intentions are abundantly clear. We have already seen the effects of some of their stepped-up activities, and I firmly believe a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies. One recourse is to support and encourage the millions of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogues make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,  
Director.

#### SPECIAL SALUTE TO PADRE THORNING—PRIEST, AUTHOR, AND DIPLOMAT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [MR. BLATNIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, in my 20 years in Congress, countless credentials cross my desk but few match those of my cherished citizen-clergyman friend, Rev. Dr. Joseph Thorning. The good doctor of the cloth has accolades that include such honors as being the first priest ever to be appointed by the White House and the State Department to serve on special diplomatic missions in South America. The New York Times Book Review heralded Dr. Thorning's book, "Miranda: World Citizen" as "one of the outstanding books of 1952." This priest author is hailed by both Americas affectionately as Padre Thorning. No man has done more to promote good will be-

tween the Americas than this most thoughtful, gracious, and scholarly priest diplomat.

We, in Congress, are indeed proud of the rich and full record that Father Thorning has produced as he celebrates his golden anniversary as a priest of God. Certainly, his is an example that all of us need emulate as we daily face the lack of good will and neighborliness. As a special tribute to the good will that Padre Thorning has fostered over the years, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has invited him to offer the prayer to open Congress for the last 22 consecutive years on Pan American Day. My wish and prayer today is that Padre Thorning is with us for many more Pan American Days, that we continue to be the beneficiaries of his scholarly pen and that we can long count on his wise counsel.

#### STOP THE MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been an ominous speedup in the arms race taking place in the Middle East. Some of the most sophisticated weapons of modern warfare are flowing into that troubled area. These new weapons could easily combine with the ancient enmities and modern day frictions that exist in that part of the world to touch off a war, perhaps even a world war involving nuclear holocaust.

Saudi Arabia announced in February that it was acquiring a \$400 million air defense system, including Mark-53 Lightning fighter planes from Britain, and Hawk missiles from the United States.

Earlier, Egypt concluded a \$300 million arms deal with the Soviet Union. Egypt and her ally, Syria, already have about 30 squadrons of Soviet-built Mig jets armed with air-to-air missiles.

Jordan has purchased between 50 and 100 M-48 Patton tanks from the United States, as well as 2 squadrons of F-104 jets. Lebanon has contracted with France for modern fighter-bomber planes of the Mystere type.

The Arabs are building up their arms according to a definite timetable, and under a unified military command established within the last 18 months. The buildup is planned, coordinated, and well financed. At the last summit meeting of Arab leaders, the arms budget was raised, according to Cairo, from \$420 to \$560 million.

In response to these moves on the part of the Arab nations, which still consider themselves in a state of war with Israel,

that nation has also increased her supply of modern military hardware. She has purchased Patton tanks from the United States, and is now receiving from France medium range ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

It is very probable that the Middle East arms race may soon take on a nuclear aspect. Both Israel and Egypt have been hard at work developing a nuclear capability—Israel on her own, Egypt with the help of former Nazi scientists and material from the Soviet Union.

Israel will probably be able to explode an atomic device within 6 months. She could have nuclear missiles in a few years. Egypt is now soliciting bids on an atomic reactor. While Egypt is behind Israel in its nuclear timetable, it is quite possible, based on the way the arms race has worked recently, that if Israel began to produce nuclear weapons, a Communist country would then supply them to Egypt to "redress" the arms imbalance. The Communists have been trying to promote tension and increase their influence in the Middle East for many years, and this would be a way to continue that effort.

A nuclear confrontation between the Arab States and Israel would pose a serious threat to world peace. We must make every effort to avoid such a confrontation and in this respect I would make the following proposals:

First. The United States should immediately take steps to call a conference which would bring together the leaders of Israel and the Arab States to discuss steps to end the arms race. The Soviet Union should be invited to participate in such a conference.

Second. We should bring strong pressure to bear on both Egypt and Israel to permit international inspection of their nuclear plants under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Third. We should also instruct our disarmament negotiators in Geneva to press ahead with a treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, by which the nuclear powers agree not to transfer nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, or the know-how for manufacturing such weapons to any other nation. These proposals could prevent the next degree of escalation in the Middle East before it begins.

If we take the initiative to bring the adversaries together, and if we ourselves avoid increasing the tempo of the arms race, we could lead the way not just to a moderation of the military buildup but to a more peaceful and productive climate of relations between these countries. The Middle East needs water, not war. It needs bread more than bombs. It needs tractors more than tanks.

I think both Israel and the Arab nations would benefit greatly if all agreed to let their neighbors live in peace and diverted the vast sums now spent on arms to economic development for the betterment of all the people of the area. With enlightened and patient leadership exerted on our part, there is still a chance this can be done.

#### A MESSAGE OF PEACE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have been privileged to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding work which is being done by the Peace Corps in the world's developing nations. I have also had the honor to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn to be Director of the Peace Corps.

It is now my pleasure to present one of Mr. Vaughn's first speeches as the Corps' director. But this is more than just a speech designed to stimulate interest among college students—it reflects Jack Vaughn's basic philosophy on the work of the Corps and its future goals. In a sense, this speech, delivered at the University of California at Los Angeles, is Jack Vaughn himself, as it is based on his many years of service overseas. It clearly demonstrates his deep and profound understanding of the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the great role which he envisions for the United States in, as it has been termed by President Johnson, "the revolution of peaceful change."

Mr. Speaker, I now present to this distinguished body the text of Mr. Vaughn's speech—"To Peace, With Love."

#### TO PEACE, WITH LOVE

(An address by Peace Corps Director Jack Vaughn, at the Student Union, University of California at Los Angeles, March 15, 1966)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here.

When I accepted the suggestion that I speak with you today, I did so with more than just a passing glance at the calendar. I knew that by this date, I might have a few things on my mind, generated by my own understanding of the Peace Corps, heightened by reflection during our fifth anniversary this month, and sharpened during my first 2 weeks as the new boy on the block.

Moreover, I knew that by the time I reached you, I would have flown some 20,000 miles, seeing students elsewhere; meeting old Peace Corps friends, many of them returned volunteers; meeting many friends of the Peace Corps; speaking; listening; and thinking.

One thing I've rediscovered is that airplane rides are great times to collect one's thoughts—although I've noticed that the rougher the ride, the deeper the philosophy.

Thoughts about the Peace Corps really ought to come easily here in California—and they do.

This State leads all others in numbers of Peace Corps volunteers. Nearly 2,700 Californians are either in training, or in service

overseas, or at home after completing their Peace Corps service.

Two hundred eighty-two volunteers have entered the Peace Corps from this campus, ranking the university high among the hundreds of schools and colleges from which volunteers have come. Moreover, UCLA is second in the Nation, in terms of the number of volunteers trained on campus, and since so many of those volunteers who have passed through the leading campus—Hawaii—did so en route from other training sites, I really score it as a moral victory for Los Angeles.

So I feel very much at home here, and I'm grateful for this chance to share with you some of my thoughts about where we go from here.

For me, this noon meeting with you marks the end of the beginning. I consider myself as having been in training since Vice President HUMPHREY swore me in just 2 weeks ago—almost to the hour. Less than a week from now I shall be overseas attending meetings in Kenya. In Peace Corps terms, you might say I've passed final selection, and am on the way—although one member of the Selection Board certainly had his doubts.

So I shall begin my summing up with a confession: After 2 weeks, I still feel "grossly incompetent." I've come all this way, and I still haven't figured out what a Uniroyal is.

And as if my own incompetence were not enough of a burden, I follow in the shoes of a truly remarkable leader. No more exciting man ever drove an organization into being with deeper devotion, greater selfless conviction, more generous understanding of his own fallibility, more mature compassion for anyone willing to work half as hard as he.

Following Sarge Shriver around the Peace Corps was bracing. Following him as its leader is a bit shattering. Worse—judging from our looks, you might say it's like being Robin all alone, with Batman gone from Gotham.

Yet I feel today as I did when we began 5 years ago—anxious to begin work in earnest. In the spirit which surrounds the Peace Corps, and which has been preserved in its entirety through the first 5 years, there is a feeling of confidence in a worthwhile job to be done.

Some words of the late President Kennedy speak best my own feelings at this hour. I have always thought he meant them to be shared by all who would become part of the New Frontier. He said,

"I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

I tell you now that the task from which this hour is the working start is not a task of administration in a bureaucracy.

Nor is it a major experiment in education, nor a novel phase in international relations, nor even a special kind of foreign aid.

It is not nursing, nor community development, nor agricultural development, nor a host of other services to which Peace Corps volunteers turn when they arrive overseas.

All of the energy, the faith, the devotion which we in the Peace Corps bring to our service, serves a single cause. That cause is peace.

Yet if you hear any note of triumph and beauty in that word—peace—then open your eyes and listen again, for you shall hear of a few things we are beginning to understand about peace. They are not very pleasant. But I think we had better begin to examine thoroughly what we have learned—and do so right now—lest significant opportunity

for lasting peace go on escaping us into the future, as tragically as it has in the past.

We have paid a bitter tuition—in death, in the destruction of property, and worse, in the denigration of the human spirit. The price has been high enough to entitle us to some clear thinking, and to a glimpse at remedies, if remedies exist, for if mankind has already thought its way clear of gravity, certainly we can begin to think our way clear of untimely graves.

I believe it was Rochefoucauld who said that "peace is war conducted by other means."

Cynical? Perhaps. Cynicism is a crisis of intellect, no less than despair is a crisis of the spirit. Yet who is to deny that there is crisis enough about us to excuse both cynicism and despair of peace.

You who are 21 this year—what is your understanding of peace? You were born when World War II came to an end. Let's examine some of the meaning of peace in the time your generation has come of age:

In your time of peace, nation has battled nation in Haiti, India, Israel, Korea, Malaysia, Panama, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syria, Tibet, and the United Arab Republic.

In your time of peace, people have slain foreign nationals during colonial uprisings in Algeria, Angola, Burma, Cameroon, the Congo, Indonesia, Kashmir, and the Malagasy Republic.

In your time of peace, neighbor has slaughtered neighbor, and brother fought brother, in Burma, China, Colombia, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Malaya, Nigeria, the Philippines, Portuguese Guinea, South Africa, the Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zanzibar, and the United States of America.

In your time of peace, the lands I know best, in Latin America, have witnessed nearly 2,000 riots, demonstrations, and assassinations; and men have tried no less than 80 times, sometimes successfully, sometimes not, to come to power by other than constitutional means.

In your time of peace, the equivalent of all the student bodies of the University of California—some 60,000 Americans, have died in battle; the toll of lives in other lands numbers in the millions.

"War," said Clemenceau, "is too serious a matter to be left entirely in the hands of the generals." Surely then, peace has proven too dangerous a matter to be left entirely in the hands of the diplomats.

Let's take a sterner look at what has been palmed off as peace in your time. We seem able to spot "phony war" fast enough. What about "phony peace?"

I think we might start by admitting that peace can indeed be war conducted by other means—that peace can be a weapon. It is a weapon when it is just a state of mind which is an alternative to war—a kind of "no-man's years between the wars"; a cessation of violence; a significant pause. In such case peace is a method, part of an arsenal, and instrument of war.

We tend to safeguard such peace.

Yet I submit that to safeguard peace is to admit its peril.

Peace needs no safeguard when it needs no spokesmen. Real peace needs little vigil. Moreover, I suggest that peace has no lasting value, little promise, and hardly any unity, if it attracts any attention at all.

I believe that real peace is the freedom to be totally unconcerned about war. Peace should encourage genuine freedom of action: freedom to be restless without fear; freedom to be adventurous, to take risks, to grow, to stir, to match wits with nature and with our fellow man; freedom, if you will, to become civilized.

What tragedy, then, when the politics of peace bring violence itself, for when the

dead are buried, the living have gained nothing.

What irony, moreover, when even without violence, peace bears bitter fruit—when a mass of people find they have no alternatives to better their lives; nor any hope of security from their own government, while they learn enough of self-improvement to create new alternatives; when a small, entrenched class clings to every advantage.

What larceny, finally, when people resign the struggle, to follow the man with the system, neatly buttoned up and ready to go with a new order—even though that order steals freedom in freedom's name.

For people who cannot share abundance, peace has no value—no utility.

Not for the peasant and the slum dweller locked out of wealth, society or mobility, in Latin America;

Not for the men and women freshly come to new freedom all too easily turned to anarchism for want of trained leadership, in Africa;

Not for the peasant and the worker striving to produce more than the bare subsistence, in the Far East;

For such people there is no note of triumph or of beauty in that word—"Peace."

Make no mistake—those people are independent. Yet they guard their Nation's freedom with deeper conviction than they guard their own.

They have learned all about sovereignty, and nationalism, and even chauvinism. They have learned all the slogans of national power. But they have learned nearly nothing of personal liberty—and hence, of freedom.

Peace has concerned them as nations. It has given them nothing as human beings.

Then what has been the record of peace in these times?

It has been illusion.

Peace has served war, by breeding war afresh.

Peace has served diplomacy, by affording pause to maneuver.

But peace has not served man.

Seven million Indians have lived in the mountains and jungles of Peru, hardly moving out of the 18th century—in times of peace.

Millions of human beings of so-called lower caste have starved to death or died of dread disease in India and Pakistan—in times of peace.

Nine hundred million adult men and women alive today will pass through this life, never having written or read a word in their own or any other tongue—in times of peace.

And how many countless millions will not so much as lift a finger to change their lot, because they have no comprehension of even the gentlest revolution—in times of peace?

I have said that in the Peace Corps we serve a single cause—the cause of peace.

Yet now surely you must see that there is a modern dilemma inherent in our service. For we have been brought up, you and I, taught to believe that peace is virtuous in itself—and that because it is virtuous, it deserves guardians.

I suggest that peace, in and of itself, is anything but virtuous; and the most profound demand of this day and age is the service of men and women who will lend virtue to peace itself.

Truly made virtuous—it will need less guardians.

Yet when the first shots ring out—how quickly we spend ink, wind, and shoe-leather, bemoaning injustice done to peace—as in the Dominican Republic, that tragic caricature of a society choked off from freedom—whose first dictator was Christopher Columbus, and whose last dictator called all the shots, including those which ended 30,000 lives in his ugly reign of terror. When Trujillo died, power passed so swiftly that the seething hate of 30 years never had a

chance to explode upon the surface—until a later time which found me on the spot. I tell you here and now that I am proud to have had a hand in stopping a bloody massacre among the Dominican people—for I have known and served those people far longer than the instant experts have known either the Dominican Republic or Jack Vaughn's politics. I stood against the bloodletting then, and I would do so again today.

But I am prouder still to have sent the first Peace Corps volunteers to the Dominican people—for they, and they alone, went between the lines and among the wounded on both sides, trusted, believed in, respected and loved by those who came near them during battle, just as they were trusted and respected by those whom they came near before the battle ever started.

Peace Corps volunteers served the Dominican people when President Bosch was in office; they served when he was deposed; they served during military rule and civilian juntas; they are still serving on the job; and they will stay on the job whatever the outcome of the free elections to be held this June.

For as with Peace Corps volunteers everywhere, their concern has precious little to do with politics and power. They are concerned with serving people—not as guardians of peace, but by imparting utility and virtue to peace itself.

And the peace they serve without illusion is the peace of which President Kennedy spoke when he said,

"Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace—the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—and the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time, but peace in all time."

You ask our policy, then? I will say: It is to wage peace, by dedicating ourselves to the task of lending virtue to peace for years to come.

You ask, What is our aim? I can answer in one word: Survival. Nobody could dare predict a winner in an arms race. Nobody could care to be winner in World War III.

You ask, What is our enemy? I would answer: Illusion. The mighty issues which raise the placards, print the pamphlets and bring men to the barricades are illusions themselves, for we have learned in Ghana, in the Dominican Republic, and a dozen Vietnams that progress for mankind can never really be measured in causes and coups, but in precious inches of human understanding and enlightenment, scantly noticed, grudgingly surrendered from indifference and despair, toiled after, lost, missed, and sought after again.

These are the unseen battles and the silent victories of peace.

They are won by quiet heroes whose politics is people, whose nationality is mankind.

These are the men and women who serve the cause of peace by grappling at the very level where results count: where people live and must survive.

These are the Peace Corps volunteers.

No better description of their service can be found, than in words President Johnson spoke last month at Freedom House: Indeed, I commend them to the attention of every Peace Corps volunteer now in service, to men and women thinking of Peace Corps service and to every person and organization associated with us now and in the years ahead. The President said:

"You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies, will change them.

"Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that

freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

"They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms.

"To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

"To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

"To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being."

Such has been the essence and object of Peace Corps service during the last 5 years. I pledge here and now that it will continue to be so, for the next 5 years—and I am convinced that it will continue to be so, for many, many years to come.

The remarkable people who are the Peace Corps volunteers are our best assurance that such will be the case. Indeed, our faith in them has shifted more and more leadership into their hands. There are more than 320 returned volunteers on the Peace Corps staff right now. It is no secret that I want my own successor to be among them.

Right from the outset—it was they who led us.

We thought we would be building some kind of junior foreign service. They taught us their business was human service.

We thought we had to defer our judgment to all sorts of experts in deciding who should serve overseas. They taught us to pay less attention to the heartbeat, and more to the offbeat.

We thought we had to teach them of politics and history. They taught us that they would be writing their own history, thank you, and although politics was of passing interest from the point of view of national development, they were far more concerned with human development.

We thought we had to train them to a fair-thee-well in their professional skills. They taught us, as one volunteer said recently, that "their skill was their attitude."

Eighteen thousand men and women have served in the Peace Corps. Twelve thousand are overseas right now. They have served in 46 different lands—and with the addition of Chad and Bechuanaland announced this week, the number soon will be 48. They have brought over 325 different arts and skills to the people of those lands—and they have served those people in 60 different languages.

Yet however diverse their station or their service, Peace Corps volunteers have discovered that their worst enemies were everywhere the same: Not ignorance, but indifference; not poverty, but apathy; not hunger, but despair.

I pride myself on having visited more Peace Corps volunteers at their jobs overseas than any other man alive. I believe I have seen almost 3,500 volunteers at work. I have shared their floor mats and their dysentery in almost 500 villages and towns in Latin America. I think I can offer some observations:

Volunteers have learned that above all their other arts, they have had to practice and master the art of the possible. For as Aristotle said, "They can, because they think they can."

Moreover, volunteers have learned that they are becoming involved in useful social reform—for successful volunteers cannot help but teach that change is possible, and what is more, that change is not a fearsome unknown, but a responsibility to be shared and encouraged by the governments of lands in which they serve.

Thus volunteers are surely spreading the word—whether by design, accident, or example—that peace invites adventure, mobility, and self-expression.

In our time, such is the highest possible service to true social revolution.

In any time, it is the highest possible service to the cause of lasting peace.

But responsibility for such service cannot be lightly given, nor should it be summarily withdrawn. Peace Corps volunteers deal in terms of critical human values. They must enjoy the broadest possible leeway in judgment and in personal communication. We impose upon them neither political nor policy guidelines. A volunteer is on his own, and we won't have it any other way. He is not an instrument of American foreign policy. Rather he is a living token of the human aspirations and good wishes of the American people. What we are about in the Peace Corps is not to assure the future, our way; it is to assure a future, any way at all.

Thus we have tried to choose our volunteers with utmost care. As a result, today the Peace Corps is America's most selective service.

And I pledge that it will continue to be so. We shall persist in seeking people who are not afraid of what they are, yet who are curious about what they will become. And we shall not fear to invite "protesters," for what is the Peace Corps idea, if not a form of serviceable protest in behalf of human beings for whom protest has yet to be of any service at all.

I want to add, however, that I am not very excited about what I believe to be the momentary issue of the draft. If we begin to see Peace Corps service as nothing but a substitute for military service, we may well lose sight of the idea that in time the Peace Corps should become a substitute for all military service.

Thus, for the moment, we shall have to risk the inroads which the draft may cause, acknowledging the paradox that could we but have at any single time, the number of young men who have to serve in battle, we would surely be a long way home toward an end to all battles.

For that very reason it will be my purpose in the coming years to multiply by many times, the number of volunteers in service overseas. We should never fear to see the Peace Corps grow. Back in Washington, we have at times sought to attach the label, "numbers game" to the idea of growth in the Peace Corps.

I think that's a "red herring" and a vanity. It is not for us to say, in the long run, how great the number—for it should not be for us to judge how great the need. The people we serve will make that decision for us. Perhaps it might indeed be a numbers game, were we to "hypo" the figures at home.

But it is no game—in fact, it is a deadly serious matter—when numbers must grow to meet desperate need abroad. As far as I'm concerned, we must be willing to do anything in our power, move anything in our way, rise to any challenge, demand any assistance, to get the job done.

Life ought to be more than a fatal ailment. For two-thirds of the people of this planet, it is barely more than that.

So long as such is the case, this earth is not at peace.

You say, peace at any price? I say, peace has no price.

In terms that ought to have any meaning for all of us, the cost of peace is no more than the cost of love itself.

And here and now, I suppose, is as good a time as any to break down some embarrassments and inhibitions and give this game a name—for of what have we been speaking—toward what have we been groping, if not toward love? I shall not quarrel if it is your style to mask that word with others, like "understanding," or "giving," or "generosity," or even that half-way mystery, "enlightened self-interest."

But if our task is serving the cause of lasting peace, then we are trying to deliver a coded message without the key—unless we admit that the key is love, and the message

is man's belief that he can make himself and every other man, higher than the animals.

In Kenya, where I am going soon, anthropologists are learning that man may not be quite so nobly born as he has thought—that man's ancestor came out of the trees with a bludgeon in his hand, a killer not only for survival, but for territory as well.

I think they are trying to tell us that we are not programmed in innocence.

If that is so, I think we ought to welcome the news. It might offer some explanation of where we have been.

But no excuse.

Better still, it is the kind of understandable warning with which this generation has come to grips—for better or for worse—far more readily than when they are written in the mysteries of philosophy or the parables of religion.

If we are not programmed in innocence, that is a fact to be reckoned with.

But man has love. That is another fact to be reckoned with.

So let us learn in full of our guilt.

In terms of the dialectic, we shall at least know the fullest extent of the pressure which, consciously or unconsciously, dissuades us from lasting peace.

In terms even I can understand—we are fighters, but we are lovers just the same. And knowing we are fighters makes our love the stronger, for it is our love which we must nourish and enrich, if peace is to withstand the onslaught of our nature.

This is a challenge worth the taking, and I command it to you as earnestly as I dedicate myself to it today.

Come join us—and we shall finish the words Robert Frost struggled so hard to repeat that bright, shining day 5 years ago:

"It makes the prophet in us all presage  
The glory of a next Augustan age  
Of a power leading from its strength and  
pride,  
Of young ambition eager to be tried,  
Firm in our free beliefs without dismay,  
In any game the nations want to play.  
A golden age of poetry and power  
Of which this noonday's the beginning  
hour."

Thank you.

#### SOUND APPROACH

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Newsday of Long Island is one of the countless newspapers which favors the reply President Johnson made to General de Gaulle's plan to banish NATO from French soil.

The paper declares:

The President's approach was sound, tactful, and sensible. NATO, as he carefully pointed out, is here to stay.

Because this editorial is indicative of many I have seen, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Long Island Newsday, Mar. 25, 1966]

#### NATO: HERE TO STAY

President Johnson, with overwhelming backing from 13 of the 15 NATO allies, has made it politely clear that the alliance is going to continue even without the participation of France. He may not have known,

at the time of his speech, that Portugal might also pull back from its formerly cooperative role. But he did speak with a good deal of muscle behind his remarks—the muscle of the United States, which founded NATO and remains its most powerful partner; the support of Great Britain, the Low Countries, West Germany, and virtually all the others who joined in an association that forestalled a Russian takeover of France and Western Europe.

The President's talk to foreign service officers of the State Department was a marvel of control and subtlety—including a quotation from Robert Schuman, France's foreign minister in 1949, who used the phrase, "Liberation is not enough." What was meant, as the President pointed out, was that Europe needed not only help in resisting attack but in preventing attack. Subsequently, President de Gaulle has dreamed great dreams for France, and takes great pleasure in frustrating NATO. He proposes not only to pull out French troops but also to banish NATO from French soil.

That, in view of the united attitude of other West European countries, means expense and inconvenience for NATO but not extinction. If Premier Salazar of Portugal—angry because of our lack of support for his colonial policy—chooses also to pull out of NATO, or to deny us bases on Portuguese soil—well, too bad. Where's he to go for allies? Portugal traditionally has relied upon Britain, a prime member of NATO. With Salazar as with De Gaulle, our attitude should be a long-range one. Both gentlemen won't hold office forever. The President's approach was sound, tactful and sensible. NATO, as he carefully pointed out, is here to stay.

#### RÉSUMÉ OF THE 1964 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN FLORIDA

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the résumé of the 1964 agricultural conservation program in Florida, and a résumé of the program in my congressional district—the Eighth District of Florida—for the same year.

The President's budget calls for a reduction in the money to be appropriated for the agricultural conservation program. I am opposed to this reduction and have requested our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations to provide the same amount we had last year for soil conservation programs. Every American has a stake in soil conservation, and I am opposed to taking from this program to embark on new Federal spending ventures. This "robbing Peter to pay Paul" policy is unwise and unsound.

The résumés of the programs follow:

#### THE 1964 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN FLORIDA

Under the 1966 agricultural conservation program, 11,086 farmers in Florida have earned \$3,148,056 for installing conservation practices. This program which effectively

increases the application of needed conservation work on the land has been used by 21,449 farmers in the State in the past 5 years.

Since the beginning of the agricultural conservation program in 1936, farmers have been contributing their time and money toward the achievement of conservation goals for their farms, but the economic situation of many farmers has not permitted the desired rate of progress and much work remains. However, the combined results of many years of conservation activity under the Agricultural Conservation Program have provided immense benefits to both urban and rural population in terms of protected and increased water supplies, recreational areas, assured soil resources, and new and improved wildlife habitat.

A wide variety of conservation practices is performed under the agricultural conservation program. Among the principal measures performed in the State under the 1964 agricultural conservation program, are the following:

#### CONSERVATION PRACTICE

Livestock water dams to improve grassland management: 25 structures.

Dams for irrigation water: 45 structures.

Ponds for wildlife: 100 structures.

Tree planting for forestry or erosion control: 10,300 acres.

Improvement of a stand of forest trees: 3,000 acres.

Sod waterways to dispose of excess runoff: 100 miles.

Structural protection of outlets or inlets to control erosion: 300 structures.

Permanent cover for erosion control or needed land-use adjustment: 65,000 acres.

Improvement of established cover for soil or watershed protection: 73,000 acres.

Interim cover and green manure crops for erosion control and land-use adjustment: 172,000 acres.

Permanent cover for wildlife feed or habitat: 70 acres.

Annual cover for wildlife feed or habitat: 400 acres.

Shallow water areas for wildlife habitat: 75 acres.

Control of competitive shrubs on range or pasture to permit growth of adequate desirable cover: 3,700 acres.

Wells for livestock water to improve grassland management: 80 wells.

Firelanes or firebreaks to protect woodland cover: 330 miles.

Drainage of farmland normally devoted to crops to permit conservation farming: 17,000 acres drained.

Leveling irrigable land to control erosion and conserve irrigation water: 950 acres.

Flooding organic land to reduce soil loss by oxidation: 4,400 acres.

Application of liming materials to permit the use of conserving crops: 192,000 acres.

#### THE 1964 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

In the Eighth District 1,785 farmers have earned \$490,100 for installing conservation practices under the 1964 agricultural conservation program. This program which effectively increases the application of needed conservation work on the land has been used by 3,210 farmers in this district in the past 5 years.

Since the beginning of the agricultural conservation program in 1936, farmers have been contributing their time and money toward the achievement of conservation goals for their farms, but the economic situation of many farmers has not permitted the desired rate of progress and much work remains. However, the combined results of many years of conservation activity under the agricultural conservation program have provided immense benefits to both urban and rural population in terms of protected and increased water supplies, recreational areas, assured soil resources, and new and improved wildlife habitat.

increased water supplies, recreational areas, assured soil resources, and new and improved wildlife habitat.

A wide variety of conservation practices is performed under the agricultural conservation program. Among the principal measures performed in this district under the 1964 agricultural conservation program, are the following:

#### CONSERVATION PRACTICE

Tree planting for forestry erosion control: 1,900 acres.

Permanent cover for erosion control or needed land-use adjustment: 13,000 acres.

Improvement of established cover for soil or watershed protection: 10,000 acres.

Interim cover and green manure crops for erosion control and land-use adjustment: 44,000 acres.

Application of liming materials to permit the use of conserving crops: 29,000 acres.

#### TRI-CONTINENTAL CONFERENCE AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions in addresses to this House of the Congress, I have stressed the use by the World Revolutionary Movement of Castro's Cuba as a base for the training of activists to be sent to other countries of Latin America to overthrow their governments through the processes of infiltration and subversion, and force and violence. As should be well understood by those who have read my addresses, these subversive activities include the Republic of Panama.

During January 3-15, 1966, in Havana, there was held what was designated as the "First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America" of some 600 delegates and observers from 82 countries in 3 continents, popularly known as the "Tri-Continental Conference." One of the main purposes of this Conference was to accelerate the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America, which program has grave implications for those charged with heavy responsibilities in the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would invite the attention of the Congress to the action of the House of Representatives, on September 20, 1965, when it adopted, after the fullest consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and considerable debate, House Resolution No. 560 by a vote of 312 to 52.

This measure, originally introduced by myself and sponsored by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America [Mr. SELDEN], was in the interest of reaffirming and extending the Monroe Doctrine to meet the latest dangers to hemispheric security.

In order that the Congress and all other agencies of our Government may have the benefit of an extensive account

of the Tri-Continental Conference by Paul D. Bethel as reprinted from the Reporter, of March 24, 1966, in the April 4, 1966, issue of Latin America Report and the sense of the House of Representatives as to the responsibility of the United States and other signatories to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, I include the indicated article and accompanying editorial notes, together with the text of the September 20, 1965, Monroe Doctrine resolution as part of my remarks:

[From the Latin America Report, Apr. 4, 1966]

#### THE HAVANA CONFERENCE

(By Paul D. Bethel)

During the first 2 weeks of January while President Johnson was still conducting his "peace offensive," a tricontinental Communist conference was in progress in Havana whose overriding purpose was to organize worldwide subversion against the United States. With Fidel Castro as host and officially designated as the First Conference of the Solidarity of Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the assembly brought together some 600 delegates and observers from 82 countries in the three continents. From January 3 to January 15, the delegates debated, plotted, harangued, and egged each other on to even greater militancy against the United States and its "imperialist stooges." Hanoi and the Vietcong were duly represented. So were China and the Soviet Union, with large delegations whose rivalry—and eventual adjustment—provided one of the high spots of the conference. More immediately important was the high-pitched determination, repeated in scores of speeches and resolutions, to step up the pace of terror and subversion in Latin America.

Although the Havana Conference received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers, it was followed closely in Europe, where Le Monde of Paris, for example, published a series of detailed articles. In Latin America it caused profound dismay and was promptly denounced by an extraordinary session of the Organization of American States. Ambassador Ilmar Penna Marinho of Brazil, chairman of the OAS Council, said of the Havana Conference that, "Except for the placing of nuclear weapons in Cuba in October 1962, no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent."

Penna's alarm was echoed by most other members of the OAS Council and by the Latin American press generally. In Panama, a commentator of Radio MIA, noting the huge U.S. effort to contain communism in Vietnam, observed that "communism exists next door to Florida, and there they do nothing. \* \* \* It may be that they are afraid of it, or are keeping promises made to the Russians, while that insane bearded man raves daily about invading Latin America." El Universo in Ecuador underscored the importance which the Soviet leaders attach to the conference, and that "while the Russians continue to seek compromises with the United States, they are not disposed to pay any price" to this end.

#### THE SOVIET HAND

There was not much question that Moscow was the chief planner as well as omnipresent manager of the conference. Last December 9, a month before the delegates gathered in Havana, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko rose in the chambers of the Supreme Soviet and briefed its members on the tricontinental conference. "The Soviet Union," Tass quoted him, "in taking part in the Havana Conference \* \* \* will do everything to help consolidate the front of struggle against imperialist aggression." On January 2, the two Soviet supreme leaders,

Leonid I. Brezhnev and Alexei N. Kosygin, followed up with a message of greeting to the conference. As reported by Tass, the message read in part: "Today, Havana attracts the attention of all fighters against the forces of imperialist aggression and colonialism, and for the national and social liberation of peoples. \* \* \* The U.S. imperialists are challenging all progressive forces."

The head of the 34-man Soviet delegation was Sharaf R. Rashidov, a candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and First Secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee of Uzbekistan. Speaking before the Conference in Havana on January 6, he paid lip-service to Russia's avowed struggle for peace. But, foreshadowing one of the final resolutions of the Conference, he made a sharp and significant qualification "We believe," he said, "that relations among sovereign states with different public systems should be based on peaceful coexistence \* \* \* it is clear that there is not, nor can there be, any peaceful coexistence between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors."

Rashidov then told the Conference what was expected of it. "The Soviet delegation," he said, according to the Tass dispatch, "came to this Conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism, headed by the U.S. capitalists." Specifically, he pledged "fraternal solidarity with the armed struggle being waged by the Venezuelan, Peruvian, Colombian, and Guatemalan patriots for freedom against the stooges of imperialism."

The day-to-day work of the Conference was carried out by numerous committees on social, political, and economic affairs, as well as a special Tricontinental Committee To Aid Vietnam. These provided the temporary machinery of the Conference. What emerged by way of a permanent setup is more to the point. According to the chief of the Venezuelan delegation, Pedro Medina, "Only two organizations came out of the Conference and they will rule—a general secretariat which will receive all information concerning the three continents, make plans on the basis of the needs of each continent, and deliver its recommendations to an executive organ \* \* \* named the Committee of Assistance and Aid for the Peoples Fighting for Their Liberation." This committee, which emerged as the central policy and strategy body for wars of subversion, included Soviet, Chinese, and Cuban members along with representatives of nine other participating nations. As for the General Secretariat, Havana was designated its headquarters, for the next 2 years at least, and Capt. Osmany Cienfuegos, the chairman of Cuba's three-man Foreign Relations Committee, was named Secretary General. The question of its permanent headquarters was scheduled to be reviewed at the Second Tricontinental Conference, to be held in 1968 in Cairo at the invitation of President Nasser.

The 12-nation Secretariat also has equal representation from the three continents. Asia is represented by South Vietnam (Vietcong), North Korea, Syria, and Pakistan; Africa is represented by the United Arab Republic, Guinea, one member to be chosen from the Portuguese colonies, which the delegates have decided are to be "freed," and the Léopoldville Congo; Latin America by Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Chile. One of the jobs of the Secretariat, as laid down at Havana, is to establish in each continent an action group to carry out the resolutions of the conference. The first of these was established 4 days after the conference adjourned, when the Secretariat announced the creation of a

Latin-American Solidarity Organization, with Havana as its permanent headquarters. It immediately began to issue calls to action.

#### THE NEW BREED

One of the major Soviet aims of the Havana Conference was to give direct support to guerrilla leaders rather than to the established Communist Parties of their countries. This became clear with the list of delegates, many of whom were little known or had never been heard of before. Absent was Fabricio Ojeda of Venezuela; in his place came Pedro Medina, leader of the Venezuelan National Liberation Front. Luis Corvalán, Secretary General of the Chilean Communist Party, and many other old-line Communist politicos were also missing. Senator Salvador Allende, the defeated Marxist candidate in Chile's presidential elections of 1964, headed the Chilean delegation, but he played only a minor role.

"The real stars," according to the correspondent of *Le Monde*, "were the lean, bronzed men who had arrived, after so many detours, from the guerrilla camps of the four fighting zones of the hemisphere: Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. \* \* \* Népszabadság of Budapest also commented on the makeup of the delegations, emphasizing that the conference was not in the "hands of catastrophic politicians," but in the firm grip of Castro-type revolutionaries. The reason why Moscow had chosen at Havana to throw its weight behind the guerrillas, rather than the Communist parties, was underscored by *Le Monde*'s conclusion that the conference was clearly aimed at obtaining results "in direct action, and more precisely in armed action." It observed correctly that "with the exception of those in Venezuela and Colombia, the orthodox Communist parties in Latin America up to now have shown no great enthusiasm for guerrilla wars."

The special publicity given to guerrilla spokesmen obviously reflected Soviet determination to capture control of the conference by giving the lie to China's familiar hard-line attack against Moscow's appeasement of the United States and its failure to lend all-out support to militant "wars of liberation." Throughout the conference, the Chinese delegates, as reported by Radio Peking, kept up a drumfire of criticism on this well-worn theme. In the end, the apparent contradiction between Russia's avowed policy of peaceful coexistence and the support it gave at Havana to the principle of "armed struggle" was resolved by typical Soviet logic. A special resolution on "Peaceful Coexistence" which was passed at the closing session of the conference on January 15 declared: "Peaceful coexistence applies only to relations between states with different social and political systems. It cannot apply to relations between social classes, between the exploited and the exploiters within separate countries, or between the oppressed peoples and their oppressors." This simply restated the Soviet line put forward a few days earlier by Rashidov.

The final declaration of the conference fully endorsed the thesis of "armed struggle." According to Tass, it "calls for expressions of militant, active, dynamic solidarity \* \* \* for intensifying the anti-imperialist nature of the national liberation movements." The Chinese, it would seem, had reason to be satisfied. Even Castro's public and bitter denunciation of Peking the day before the conference opened, for backing down on its sugar-for-rice deal with Cuba, did not discourage them. On January 19, after the close of the conference, the New China News Agency reported: "The Tricontinental Peoples' Solidarity Movement ran into various difficulties at the outset. However, in accordance with the will of the people of the three continents, the movement is sweeping forward with irresistible momentum. \* \* \*"

To many observers, however, the most substantial success of the Chinese at Havana—and probably their major reason for being present—was to prevent the Russians and their Cuban allies from gaining exclusive control not only of the movement in Latin America but above all of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization. This group grew out of the Bandung Conference of 1955 and the Chinese have long regarded it as their own special charge, even to the point of attempting to exclude the Soviets from membership. Although the point was left somewhat cloudy, it appeared that AAPSO, while participating fully in the new tricontinental organization, would maintain its separate identity. For example, it was announced at Havana that AAPSO will hold its own conference next year in Peking.

#### THE JOBS TO BE DONE

The final declaration of the Havana Conference is global indeed. The most significant of its general resolutions "proclaims the peoples' inalienable right to complete independence and the use of every form of struggle necessary, including armed battle, to win that right." It hailed the Vietnam war as "an inspiring example for the national liberation movement of the peoples of three continents." It urged a concerted campaign directed at the "governments of all peace-loving countries to recognize, de facto and de jure, the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam as the sole genuine and legal representative of the South Vietnamese people." It urged "the most powerful support" for American Negroes and the civil rights movement, and stated that "In the uprisings in Watts Los Angeles and Chicago, the Afro-Americans openly declared that they were fighting against racism and U.S. imperialism in a common cause with their Vietnamese brothers."

As to Latin America, it called for maximum militancy by those "who are fighting with arms in their hands against the forces of domestic oligarchy which are in the service of the United States, as in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Guatemala, or are being subjected to brutal persecution under military tyranny, as in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other countries."

"Latin America," the document said, "is the rear of the most powerful and barbarous imperialism in the world and the mainstay of colonialism and neocolonialism." It went on to map efforts to sabotage U.S. investments abroad: "Every blow dealt the United States and domestic oppressors by the Latin-American peoples has decisive effect in weakening U.S. imperialism." There are sections that deal with the "liberation" of Puerto Rico, which it classified as "under U.S. occupation," and the Dominican Republic, which, it said, has "set a valiant example of resistance to U.S. aggression." Puerto Rico's chief delegate, Norman Pietri, in addressing the conference on January 10, cited "the imperative need to win national independence in order to promote \* \* \* total eradication of yankee military installations in Puerto Rico and the threat they pose to the rest of Latin America."

Finally, the inspirational theme was summarized with a peroration: "Faced with the criminal alliance of the reactionary forces, the people of various countries in the three continents have reacted with active, vigorous, and militant solidarity, and with their readiness to reply to every act of imperialist aggression by revolutionary action, carrying on this battle until the complete liquidation of all forms of imperialist, colonial, and neocolonial oppression."

As already noted, the Latin-American Solidarity Organization, created on January 19, was the first of the three continental action groups to emerge from the Havana Conference. According to Agence France-

Presse, the 27 Latin-American delegations met with Fidel Castro and Pedro Medina of Venezuela. Cuban President Osvaldo Dóritos, the Cuban chiefs of staff of the army, and the principal Communist leaders were also present. In the course of the meeting it was decided that the organization would be permanently established in Cuba and that it would include representatives from all the Latin-American countries, as well as Puerto Rico and Trinidad-Tobago. With Medina as its Secretary General, it will presumably come under the general control of Captain Cienfuegos and his tricontinental secretariat.

Its operations are already underway. On February 12, the Latin-American Solidary Organization backed a call to action by the Tricontinental Committee To Aid Vietnam, another permanent organization that emerged from the conference. This appeal urged the recently departed delegates to launch "a wave of sabotage against Yankee interests throughout the world." It also called for "demonstrations, sitins, protests, meetings, and denunciations in front of U.S. embassies all over the world." A call also went out from Havana to "boycott production and refuse to load ships, or to transport arms or any kind of war material bound for North American troops."

Once again Puerto Rico came in for special attention. On February 10, according to *El Imparcial*, Puerto Rican "freedom fighters" established a "Free Puerto Rico" embassy in Havana, and on the same day signed a "pact of solidarity" with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam at its Havana headquarters. The Puerto Ricans claimed that they were "recognized as the only legitimate representative of the Puerto Rican people." Shortly thereafter, 26 Latin-American Communist delegations agreed to establish National committees of solidarity with Free Puerto Rico in their countries.

All members of the tricontinental organization must contribute funds to the Aid Vietnam Committee. One way to raise money was described by Pedro Medina in an interview broadcast by Radio Havana. The Vietcong delegation had presented the helmet of a U.S. pilot shot down over North Vietnam to the Venezuelans. In turn, he said, "The Venezuelan NFL gave the helmet to the Tricontinental Committee to Aid Vietnam." He continued, "We will wage a campaign with it, on the island of Cuba and in Latin America, and we will carry it to every continent to give more impact and more brilliance to the week of solidarity with Vietnam which is scheduled for March on all three continents." Similar "solidarity" demonstrations are planned for the United States mainland and Puerto Rico.

#### THE CUBAN SPEARHEAD

Havana was a natural choice as the operational headquarters for worldwide subversion and wars of national liberation, for it is dedicatedly anti-American and pro-Soviet, and has a well-developed apparatus of subversion already active in the hemisphere. Following the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962, many of the obsolete Soviet military establishments in Cuba were converted into guerrilla training camps, and new camps have also been constructed. The U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed 10 such installations as early as 1963. Today, according to some intelligence estimates, there are 43 camps equipped to train as many as 10,000 activists a year—guerrillas, terrorists, propagandists, experts in sabotage and espionage, and specialists in sophisticated radio equipment. The basic training period lasts 4 months, with longer period for certain categories.

When the guerrilla candidate arrives in Havana by a clandestine route, he is given a questionnaire on areas and personalities vulnerable to subversion techniques. He is asked, for example, about targets for

sabotage and the terrain surrounding those targets, about homosexual tendencies among members of his hometown police force, army units, and politicians, and about tax irregularities condoned by local bureaucrats. This information, checked and rechecked by contacts in the country in question, provides a starting point for campaigns of subversion.

Castro's Soviet-financed fishing fleet is especially useful in bringing guerrilla recruits to Cuba and reinfiltrating them into their homelands. According to a defecting crew member of one of the ships, "Cuban patrol boats and fishing vessels are continually introducing arms and men into Mexican territory."

The Cuban training program is coordinated with international Communist subversion. Vietcong, Soviet, Red Chinese, and Spanish Communist instructors teach recruits from Africa as well as from Latin America. Cuban Negro instructors have been used to train African recruits in special camps established in the Provinces of Las Villas and Oriente. One, identified as Sádez Gómez García, was killed while operating with guerrillas in the eastern Congolese district of Maniema. A diary found on his body indicated that he had arrived in the Congo from Cuba via Moscow, Prague, and the Tanzanian capital, Dar-es-Salaam. Defected Castro officers state that 200 Africans have returned to Dar-es-Salaam following 8 months of "leadership training" in the Minas del Frio guerrilla camp in Cuba. On September 17, Congolese government forces patrolling Lake Tanganyika intercepted and sank a troop and supply boat, the *Ajaz*, which had been running Cuban-trained Congolese guerrillas from Tanzania into the eastern Congo. Last June, 27 Senegalese were tried in Dakar and found guilty of subversion. All 27, it was brought out at the trial, also had completed 8 months of training in Cuba.

Lumumba University in Moscow, according to a broadcast from the Soviet capital, is training thousands of Latin-American students. The broadcast beamed to Latin America in the Quechua language of the Indians of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, said that when these students return to their homelands, "They will teach their brothers the modern techniques they have learned. But they will do more than teach. \* \* \* They will fight alongside peasants and humble people to ensure that their countries have freedom."

The collaboration between Cuba and Soviet-bloc embassies in Latin-American subversion is exemplified in Ecuador, which broke relations with Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and Poland in April 1962. After an uprising launched by a youth organization that took its inspiration from Castro, the government found that the Czech legation had been handing over funds to the Ecuadorian Communist Party obtained through the sale of Skoda trucks and other Communist-bloc products. Poland was also involved. Bolivia broke with Czechoslovakia in October 1964, when the embassy in La Paz was shown to have delivered 500,000 Bolivian pesos to rebellious tin miners that were used to buy Czech weapons.

Venezuela, under almost constant attack for years from Cuban-supported guerrillas and terrorists, discovered last October that the Communists had set up an efficient underground arms factory on the outskirts of Caracas. There were "enough explosives to blow up Caracas," according to a Cabinet Minister, and the Director General of the Interior Ministry declared that "specialists from Havana, Moscow, and Peking are trying to get into Venezuela to execute terrorist operations" planned for 1966—what they called "The Year of the Explosives."

Castro-trained men have also infiltrated the notorious bandit groups of Colombia that

have extorted more than a million dollars ransom from relatives of 148 Colombian ranchers kidnaped over the past few years. Kidnapping has been used to raise funds by guerrillas in Guatemala, as well as to create an atmosphere of terror to disrupt the recent elections there. And in the remote valleys and mountains of Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala, minor government officials and progovernment peasants are sometimes murdered, Vietcong style. Che Guevara's Guerrilla Warfare is the handbook for Latin-American rebel leaders: it preaches the same tactics urged by the Tricontinental Conference "to sow seeds of discord everywhere and keep the oligarchs busy putting out the fires."

The Soviet Union has backed up its investment in direct support for subversion by diplomatic maneuvers in the United Nations. It has striven constantly to divert OAS complaints against Cuban subversion from the OAS to the Security Council, where the Soviet veto could block any punitive measures. It has also succeeded in heading off in the world body any definition of aggression that would include "wars of liberation."

At the same time, Moscow has pursued its double-track policy of "peaceful coexistence," attempting to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with the very governments its agents are working to destroy. In Uruguay, on the verge of bankruptcy and beset with social problems as a result of a disastrously overextended welfare state, the Soviets found one of the hemisphere's weakest points. The oversized embassy in Montevideo has long been the center of a clandestine network extending throughout Latin America. In December Soviet agents were accused by the Government of having engineered a strike that paralyzed the country for days. This intervention, according to one Latin-American expert in Washington, was an "act of supreme contempt" for Uruguay's weakness.

The Uruguayan Foreign Minister asked the Soviet Ambassador for an explanation of his Government's role at the Havana Conference and was not impressed by the answer that Sharaf Rashidov was speaking "privately." National Council President-elect Alberto Heber Usher called the reply "insulting." Heber has now vowed to muster the votes in Uruguay's ruling nine-man National Council to break relations with Moscow as a first step toward diplomatic rupture with the Communist powers.

In other Latin American countries, particularly those most exposed to subversion, the leaders did not mince words either. Peruvian Premier Daniel Becerra de la Flor said that the Soviet Union was involved in "tacit aggression," and that delegate Rashidov's statements in Havana now made Soviet activities in Peru official. Minister of the Interior Gonzalo Barrios Bustillos, of Venezuela recommended the use of force to combat the subversion planned at the conference, which he told Agence France-Presse "is nothing more or less than a consequence of the blind struggle the Communists are waging against the United States, particularly in southeast Asia." In 1964, the Cuban newspaper Revolución had made more or less the same point, declaring that "Colombia and Venezuela form the embryo of a vast Latin American Vietnam."

The resolution which the OAS passed on February 2 "emphatically" condemned the policy of aggression and intervention adopted at Havana. Chile and Mexico abstained, saying that while they deplored intervention from whatever source, they considered the resolution exceeded the Council's powers. The U.S. alternate delegate, Ward Allen, voted in favor, but was less fiery than some of his Latin-American colleagues. The resolution denounced in particular "the open participation \* \* \* of official or officially sponsored delegations of member states of

the United Nations" which on December 21 had voted in the General Assembly in favor of a nonintervention and self-determination resolution. Among those voting in favor was the Soviet Union, which a few days later sent its delegation to Havana.

The central issue was stated before the OAS by Colombian Ambassador Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, who said, "If there is to be war and no peace, let it at least be known who declared it."

#### EDITOR'S NOTES

"The Havana Conference" elicited the following editorial comment on March 21 in Barron's business and financial weekly, which is quoted in part:

"One publication rarely quotes from the pages of another, let alone from its publicity blurbs. Herewith, however, Barron's is pleased to reproduce the first paragraph of the release summarizing the contents of the current issue of the Reporter. Though open to the world press, as the magazine quietly observed, and followed closely in Europe, the Havana Conference 'received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers'. Thus, the New York Times considered only one short, unilluminating dispatch from Reuter's fit to print. \* \* \* Unlike the Iron Curtain, which supposedly isn't soundproof, a wall of silence has kept most Americans from learning the truth about Havana. Yet, despite the remarkable lack of interest shown by so many great media of communication, the tricontinental conference was momentous news."

The editorial ended with a quote from a press conference on September 13, 1962, "the late President Kennedy flatly stated: 'If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect our security and that of its allies'."

Barron's concludes: "To judge by all the foregoing, that time has come. The United States is at war not only with the Vietcong and North Vietnam, but also with a new Communist Internationale. Until it learns to recognize the enemy it cannot hope to win."

#### H. RES. 560

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American Continents, by the free and independent positions which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portion of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States; and

Whereas the ninth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance recognized that acts possessing characteristics of aggression and intervention carried out against one or more of the member States of the Organization of American States may be responded to in either individual or collective form, which could go as far as resort to armed force, until such

April 20, 1966

time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that (1) any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) In any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, which could go so far as resort to armed force, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism, and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

#### POLICY IS PRAISED

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Rusk's policy statement on China is noted editorially by the Washington Daily News, which states that it would give Peking a clear understanding of the U.S. position in Asia—if the Chinese want to listen.

It is the opinion of the News that this country must continue urgent efforts to persuade the leaders of China to a more peaceful course "on the chance that new younger leaders someday may shift to other policies."

The paper's forthright appraisal illuminates an issue of grave concern, and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### POLICY ON RED CHINA

Secretary Rusk's policy statement on Red China to a House subcommittee, made public over the weekend, would give Peking a clear understanding of the U.S. position in Asia—if the Chinese Communists wanted to listen. Obviously, they don't.

Even the suggestion that scientists and scholars from Red China would be welcome at some of our universities was officially rejected as nothing but a fraud. Mao Tse-tung and company are pathologically committed, as the Secretary described their attitude, to a combination of violent arrogance and obsessions of their own making.

The crux is Taiwan. The Chinese Foreign Ministry repeated its militant position on this issue as recently as Saturday—so long as the United States stands in the way of Communist seizure of the 13 million Chinese who fled the mainland because of Communists, the aging men of Peking will have no truck with us. But yielding on this issue would be impossible for the United States.

We cannot read the minds of Red China's leaders, but it is plain they are intent on worldwide subversion as a means of making China not merely a world power, but the world power. All who show friendship, or even arm's length relations with the United States, are targets for Chinese hostility.

The policy enunciated by Mr. Rusk, then, is the only policy which offers any hope at all:

1. To resist Chinese aggression wherever possible, because "if Peking reaps success from its current policies not only its present leaders but those who follow will be emboldened to continue them."

2. To continue to make plain that if the Red Chinese give up their strategy of violence, we would be prepared for an era of good relations. We do not intend to disturb the regime in Red China, but neither will we yield to its designs on others.

While there is little hope of any softening on the part of the old men now bossing China, we must continue urgent efforts to persuade them to a more peaceful course, on the chance that new and younger leaders someday may shift to other policies.

We cannot be sure, as Mr. Rusk said, of what Peking intends to do. So, most of all, our policy has to be based on readiness for anything. As the Secretary put it:

"We do not expect the worst, but we must be prepared for it."

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure and admittedly a sense of pride that I invite the attention of Members to an article by Daniel J. Elazar, of Temple University, in the March 1966 issue of Public Administration Review, dealing with the publications of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Along with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], I sponsored legislation in the 86th Congress to create the Advisory Commission. It was a new experiment in federalism. During the first session of this Congress, in cooperation with the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Senate, joint hearings were held on the 5-year record of the Commission. A record of the hearings was published last year, and a report of the House subcommittee will be forthcoming in the next few weeks.

Dr. Elazar has prepared a rather penetrating analysis of the Commission's reports taken as a whole over the last 5 years, and he provides some useful summaries of the major findings of the Commission on a host of problems of Federal-State-local relations. Dr. Elazar submits a number of suggestions as to ways in which intergovernmental relations may be better appreciated and understood by the American people.

The text of Dr. Elazar's article follows:

#### THE CONTINUING STUDY OF THE PARTNERSHIP—THE PUBLICATION OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

(By Daniel J. Elazar)

On May 25, 1965, the House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Rela-

tions held 5 days of joint hearings on the 5-year record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.<sup>1</sup> The week was dominated by a procession of witnesses who testified as to their general satisfaction with the work of the Commission and their firm belief in its continued utility. The only serious questions raised about the Commission's functioning to date were in regard to its effectiveness in securing the improvements which it has recommended. It was generally agreed that an assessment of its effectiveness is a difficult matter, involving as it does immediate achievements such as the passage of Federal and State legislation implementing Commission recommendations, and longer range considerations such as the provision of vital information that will guide officials at all levels in future decisionmaking and the molding of a climate of opinion favorable to its larger concerns. It was also agreed that, whatever the conclusions in regard to the former question, the Commission had succeeded in producing a large number of useful and timely publications that have provided important and previously unavailable data for legislators, administrators, lobbyists, and scholars concerned with federalism, intergovernmental relations, and metropolitan problems and whose impact was beginning to be felt at every level of government.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations speaks through many channels. Its influence is felt in congressional committees, in the halls of State legislatures, at conferences of elected officials and higher civil servants, and before citizens' groups. But the permanent record of its voice is made through—or at least reflected in—its publications. These publications not only provide information but the recommendations included within them offer a clear view of the Commission's general outlook, its own perception of its role. Moreover, because of the representative composition of the Commission, its reports also offer important insights into the attitudes of contemporary American policymakers toward the basic propositions of federalism, most particularly the ideas of noncentralized government and local control.

In the September 1965 issue of this Review, Dell S. Wright presented an extensive discussion of the origins and operations of the ACIR.<sup>2</sup> Here, the focus is upon an analysis of the Commission's image and emphasis as portrayed in its own publications over the first 5 years of its existence.

#### THE SOURCES OF THE COMMISSION'S MANDATE

The very existence of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is a clear reflection of the times. The Congressional enabling act states the case succinctly:<sup>3</sup>

"Because the complexity of modern life intensifies the need in a federal form of government for the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government, and because population growth and scientific developments portend

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as the Commission or the ACIR. The published record of the hearings is available as "5-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Its Future Role," joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations, Congress of the United States, 89th Cong., 1st sess., May 25–27, 1965.

<sup>2</sup> Dell S. Wright, "The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Unique Features and Policy Orientation", Public Administration Review, vol. XXV (September 1965), pp. 193–202.

<sup>3</sup> Public Law 86-380, 86th Cong., H.R. 6904, Sept. 24, 1959, sec. 2.

an increasingly complex society in future years, it is essential that an appropriate agency be established to give continuing attention to intergovernmental problems."

The creation of a permanent body with an exclusive concern for intergovernmental relations is the culmination of 20th century America's growing awareness of the need to institutionalize governmental consideration of the complexities of American federalism. Until Theodore Roosevelt convened the first Governors' conference in 1907, Federal-State-local relations were allowed to grow "like Topsy." Later generations mistakenly assumed that there had been no earlier recognition of the problem of intergovernmental relations because of their erroneous assumption that intergovernmental collaboration was new to our century. The fact is that the relations did exist, long before the first years of the present century, but within a political order whose velocity was so low that they led to few complexities and fewer difficulties.

Theodore Roosevelt had wisely envisaged a continuing "summit" level concern with relationships between the Federal and State Governments, expressed through the elected Chief Executives of the two levels. The course of events, however, led to the development of new cooperative relationships along functional lines, on the same piecemeal basis as had always been the case, but with accelerated tendencies toward fragmentation of general-purpose governments because of the greater functional specialization and greater complexity of each program.

After it had become apparent that government action on a wide variety of fronts was here to stay and that the responsibility for such action would, for the most part, be shared by the various levels of government rather than divided among them, the men responsible for living with the new arrangements began to try to rationalize the sharing process. The first studies, in the nature of quasi-private affairs conducted by scholars under private auspices or for internal consumption within government, simply assumed the existence of intergovernmental cooperation in certain fields without inquiring as to its desirability or the desirability of extending or contracting cooperative relations in the interest of any overall Federal balance.<sup>4</sup>

Interest in these larger questions came after World War II. In a historically significant task force study appended to the main report of the first Hoover Commission in 1949, at Herbert Hoover's own request, the intellectual groundwork was laid for the great studies of federalism of the 1950's.<sup>5</sup> The entire episode was a curious one because of the clear dichotomy between the analytical report of the task force, written in the main by Morton Grodzins under the auspices of the Council of State Governments, and the recommendations themselves, written by the Hoover Commission staff. The former traced the existence of cooperative federalism back to the early days of the

Republic, showing how collaboration among governments had been essential at every stage of national development; the latter stated flatly that the survival of American federalism demanded a restoration of the erstwhile classic system of dual federalism whereby the Federal and State Governments functioned separately within their respective spheres. For the next decade, these two contradictory themes appeared side by side: In the studies of the Kestnbaum Commission, in the Fountain subcommittee hearings, and finally in the reports of the Joint Federal State Action Committee.<sup>6</sup>

Yet, clearly, there was a growing conviction that—whatever the past had held—cooperative federalism was a fact of life that had to be reckoned with. This conviction was the basis for a search for means to institutionalize the study of intergovernmental relations, a search formally inaugurated by the Hoover Commission and joined in both by those who wished to "unwind the system," to restore the State's erstwhile autonomy, and by those who wished to preserve the States' integrity within the cooperative framework.

The Advisory Commission was the outgrowth of these efforts. Its creation marked significant changes in the direction of informed thought on the subject. First, the notion of unwinding the cooperative system was abandoned in favor of learning how to live within its framework. Second, the idea that an improvement in the Federal balance must come from retrenchment in Washington was modified, to incorporate the notion that States had a primary role to play by assuming new responsibilities. At the same time, demands for new forms of Government action to meet the needs of the postwar period were about to bear fruit in the return of an activist Democratic administration to national power.

The mandate given the Commission by Congress reflected the changes in thinking and made it possible for the Commission to anticipate at least partially the programs of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Because of its importance in setting the framework for the ACIR's work, that mandate, cited in all Commission reports, is quoted here in full:<sup>7</sup>

"It is intended that the Commission, in the performance of its duties, will—

1. Bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems;

2. Provide a forum for discussing the administration and coordination of Federal grant and other programs requiring intergovernmental cooperation;

3. Give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs;

4. Make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system;

5. Encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation;

6. Recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government; and

7. Recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers."

It is important to note that the ACIR is not a Federal body, or instrumentality of the National Government, but a Federal one, an instrumentality representing all levels of government equally. Its 26 members include 3 members representing the Federal executive, 6 from Congress, 7 representing the States, 7 representing local governments, and 3 representing the general public. They are chosen with the formal assistance of the associations most concerned with State and local affairs: The Council of State Governments, the Governors' conference, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of County Officials. These agencies and others of similar orientation have become the major constituency of the ACIR. The Commission has generally been composed of persons concerned with the problems of intergovernmental relations, whether from the point of view that State and local governments are put upon by a concentration of power in Washington, or from the view of those who believe that important public purposes are being frustrated by the complexities of sharing responsibilities.

#### THE SCOPE OF THE PUBLICATIONS PROGRAM

The ACIR issued its first publications in January 1961. In the 5 years of its existence, it has issued over 50 items, enough to fill a library shelf. Twenty-six of these have been Commission reports setting forth policies formally advocated by ACIR members, with recommendations for implementation by Federal, State, and local governmental bodies. Nine have been information reports or supplements to Commission reports, designed to provide basic data for the assistance of public officials. The rest have been staff statements, including the annual reports required by law, descriptions of the ACIR and its activities, and summaries of the Commission's legislative program.

The scope of these publications, and the kinds of problems they deal with, are of utmost significance. For example, of the commission reports, 11 deal with perennial intergovernmental tax and fiscal problems: 6 with intergovernmental tax overlapping, and 5 with State-local fiscal relations. Eleven are directed at metropolitan area problems: eight cover interlocal relations and metropolitan reorganization, two being primarily concerned with the Federal role, and three describe and analyze Federal aids to metropolitan areas. Ten (including three already counted because they deal with tax questions) cover State and State-local relations; six, the States' role in local affairs, and one, legislative reapportionment.

Despite the popular tendency to associate cooperative federalism with grants-in-aid, only four reports deal with grants as such, either raising general questions about termination and equalization, or evaluating specific grants programs. A major purpose of all four studies is to provide detailed information about the grant programs presently in operation. One report, entitled "Transferability of Public Employee Retirement Credits Among Units of Government," deals with a general problem of intergovernmental relations.

<sup>4</sup> The first of the early studies was that of Austin F. Macdonald, "Federal Aid: A Study of the American Subsidy System" (New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1928). This was followed by the 1 Government-assisted study of the period, Carroll H. Woody's "The Growth of the Federal Government, 1915-32" in *Recent Social Trends* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933) prepared for the President's Research Committee on Social Trends.

<sup>5</sup> The task force report was published as Council of State Governments, "Federal-State Relations," S. Doc. No. 81, 81st Cong., 1st sess. The Commission's recommendations were presented in its report on "Overseas Administration, Federal-State Relations, and Federal Research" (Washington: 1959).

<sup>6</sup> See Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, "A Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress" (Washington: 1955).

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Congress 30th report by the Committee on Government Operations, Federal-State-Local Relations, "Federal Grants-in-Aid," 85th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 2533, Aug. 8, 1958. Pp. 72-73 detail activities and reports of the Fountain subcommittee. "Final Report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee to the President of the U.S. and to the Chairman of the Governors' Conference" (Washington, GPO: February 1960). This document contains progress reports and working papers of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee.

<sup>7</sup> Public Law 86-380, sec. 2, op. cit.

The stress on tax and fiscal matters reflects the explicit instructions in point seven of the statutory mandate. The Commission's other choices, however, were not dictated by statutory provisions, but, rather, may be used to reflect the preferences and interests of the Commission's leadership in choosing among the many pressing problems of intergovernmental relations. The emphasis on metropolitan problems, for example, reflects the Commission's conviction that the complex problems of metropolitanization offer the greatest potential domestic threat to the continuation of the Federal system. The very first Commission Report on the subject opens with the statement:

"At no point in the structure of the American Federal system of government are problems of intergovernmental relations so marked, varied, and difficult as in the large metropolitan areas, where the activities of all three levels of government function in close proximity. Within such areas, Federal, State, county, and municipal agencies, often supplemented by a small host of special purpose units of local government, must carry on their functions in close juxtaposition, subject to an extremely complicated framework of Federal, State, and local laws and administrative regulations.

And closes with a warning that indicates the direction of the Commission's recommendations in this and subsequent metropolitan studies:

"The Commission believes that the problems of governmental structure, organization, planning, and cooperation in the metropolitan areas are so urgent and critical as to require the ushering in of an 'era of reciprocal forbearances' among the units of government concerned. For example, unless counties and cities are willing to yield some autonomy to each other and unless the States take necessary, though controversial action along a number of fronts, the final result can only be a much wider assertion of direct Federal action and control than either States or local government officials or the people themselves would be willing to accept under normal circumstances. The Commission would point out that moderate Federal action now, designed to stimulate more effective State and local action, is much to be preferred to a more unitary approach at a later date."

Similar concerns motivate the Commission's substantial interest in State government and State-local relations, as shown below:<sup>10</sup>

"The best assurance of a balanced set of relationships among National, State, and local governments in the metropolitan areas is not through inveigling by the State against Federal encroachment but rather through such assertive and vigorous action at the State level that the State automatically becomes a full partner in these future undertakings."

One would be hard put to find a single ACIR publication that does not refer to this interest in stimulating greater State effort and consequently greater State strength in the Federal system.

The general pattern of the ACIR's work was visible in the 10 Commission reports issued in 1961. The very first report, "Coordination of State and Federal Inheritance, Estate, and Gift Taxes," was labeled a study of a model cooperative tax program, formally designed as a sharing arrangement as early as 1924. Other tax studies that year included "State and Local Taxation of Privately Owned Property Located in Federal Areas" and "Intergovernmental Cooperation in Tax

<sup>9</sup> "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," July 1961, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Administration" while the fiscal studies emphasized State-local relations; i.e., "Investment of Idle Cash Balances by State and Local Governments, Local Nonproperty Taxes and the Coordinating Role of the State," and "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Government Debt." The grant-in-aid studies covered both specific and general concerns: "Modification of Federal Grants-in-Aid for Public Health Services" and "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments." Finally, the Commission's metropolitan interests were expressed in two equally practical ways, in reports on "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Mass Transportation Facilities and Services in Metropolitan Areas" and "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas."

All the themes set forth in the first reports can be traced through those that have followed. For the most part, subsequent studies have also concentrated on timely and even controversial issues where careful preparation and prudent language, coupled with the provision of useful data, have made possible expression of a clear point of view and specific recommendations for proper courses of action without evoking explosive responses. Stylistically prosaic, the reports have a rhetoric particularly their own. The style reflects the efforts of the Commission staff to fulfill its different functions: To provide basic data for those who must make the vital decisions affecting intergovernmental relations, and, at the same time, to make a substantial case for the recommendations adopted by the Commission members. On the whole, the presentations successfully accomplish both tasks. The reports are designed to be working political documents—highly pragmatic in tone, phrased in practical terminology, confined to the clearly marked purposes at hand. They are sober and, in the highest sense, conservative documents, offering a careful analysis of each subject based on clear and reliable information. The Commission staff must be commended for its demonstrated ability to deal with issues, particularly in the realm of metropolitan governmental organization, without becoming embroiled in specific controversies that would only serve to weaken its overall effectiveness.

Beginning in 1964, the Commission has shown an increased inclination to tackle more difficult and controversial questions. The most significant reports reflecting this new trend are those dealing with the role of equalization in Federal grants, the problem of unequal treatment of persons and businesses displaced by Government-sponsored projects, and the very touchy issue of social and economic disparities in the Nation's metropolitan complexes.

#### THE SUBSTANCE OF THE REPORTS

The substantive contents of the reports are best considered within the context of the general topics outlined in the previous section, three of which will be reviewed here.

##### Fiscal and tax matters

The commission is constantly seeking ways to increase State and local tax revenues, enlarge the tax options available to local governments, reduce the jurisdictional and policy conflicts in areas where different levels of government levy overlapping taxes, and promote intergovernmental cooperation in the collection of taxes. Studies in the first two categories have emphasized State restrictions on local debt and taxing powers, the possibilities for investing idle cash balances to increase State and local revenues, and the necessity for States to provide technical assistance and coordinating services to the local governments in their tax efforts. The question of overlapping taxes has been examined in regard to documentary and cigarette taxes

specifically, plus two general studies of tax overlapping, 1961 and 1964, the latter an information report to serve, in the commission's words, as "an almanac of the principal taxes involved in local, State, and Federal fiscal relations." With these multiple interests in mind, the commission's policy recommendations follow no easy line of consistency, here advocating greater coordination, there the reallocation of taxing authority.

The commission faces a basic conflict in the revenue area which affects its recommendations. While wishing to preserve the discretionary powers of the States, it is bound by business-bureaucratic ideals of maximizing "efficiency and economy"; these ideals could lead to conclusions that, if implemented, would do much to limit the States' discretionary powers. The rhetoric of the reports, though guarded, indicates the dilemma:<sup>11</sup>

"Political considerations, in turn, are enmeshed in the enduring issues surrounding the role of the States in the Federal system, their sovereign right to shape their own tax systems and to engage in experimentation within the wide latitude afforded by the Constitution, their corollary obligation to assume political responsibility, and to satisfy a democratic society's compulsion to keep decisionmaking close to the people.

'Yet, as the economy grows more truly national . . . the utilization of markets, raw materials, labor and managerial skills . . . recognizes no State lines.'

Since the commission affirms the need to have "rational market decisions respecting the location of economic activity," it sees valid grounds for encouraging "a minimum of interstate diversity" in tax matters and often in other matters as well.<sup>12</sup> Here the commission reveals its tendency to rely upon the conventional wisdom. Who is to say but that in a case like this, where public attitudes are preponderantly on the side of "rational market decisions," discretion is not the better part of valor?

One may, however, reasonably ask whether a developed economy such as ours cannot now be directed toward rational decisions based on factors other than the market, if we have a serious interest in preserving our States and localities as meaningful communities and if it should become clear that only such a course would do the job. These questions and others like them are never asked by the Commission; perhaps they can only be raised by scholars working outside of official bodies.

Still, the Commission does its utmost to develop rational political criteria within the confines of the situation as given. In its very first report, it sets forth certain criteria for the evaluation of proposals for coordinating State and National taxes:<sup>13</sup>

"1. Will the proposal help to strengthen State government:

"(a) By preserving freedom of tax action for the States and by affording them full latitude to exercise political responsibility?

"(b) By increasing State tax revenues and their year-to-year stability?

"(c) By increasing the States' share of total tax collections?

"(d) By helping to safeguard the States against destructive tax competition?

"(e) By reducing jurisdictional conflicts between States?

"2. Will it preserve the freedom of Congress to shape and reshape the Federal taxes to accord with requirements of national policy as they emerge?

<sup>11</sup> Coordination of States and Federal Inheritance, Estate, and Gift Taxes, January 1961, p. 7.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

"3. Will it preserve the combined contribution of these taxes to Federal, State, and local revenue requirements?

"4. Will it ease the task of taxpayer compliance and State tax administration by reducing interstate and Federal-State tax diversity and complexity?

"5. Will it facilitate a fair distribution of tax revenues among the States?

"6. Is it compatible with established and familiar institutions?

"7. Will it avoid undesirable economic or social effects?"

With a few modifications, these criteria appear to be used as the basis for the Commission's work in other fields as well.

It would be difficult to argue that these words alone can mask the basic contradiction between striving for objective efficiencies from a nationwide perspective and the emphasis on freedom of tax action for the States. The Commission recognizes the contradiction in its 1964 report on tax overlapping:<sup>14</sup>

"This term carries an odium to which we do not subscribe. The use of the same tax by two or more levels of government is not poor public policy in and of itself. It becomes poor policy only when one level \*\*\* uses a particular tax without regard for the use made of it by another and in such a way that (a) the cumulative tax take of all governments does gross violence to an acceptable pattern of tax burden distribution, and (b) the overlapping is accompanied by inefficient use of tax enforcement resources and needless taxpayer compliance burdens."

The report continues:<sup>15</sup>

"Out of the aversion to overlapping taxes the citizen has evolved an image of a utopia in which each level of government is assigned its own private tax domain and governments are enjoined to keep out of one another's fish ponds. This kind of tax utopia is pleasant to contemplate. It caters to man's love of symmetry and simplicity. Unhappily an idle dream is all that it can ever be."

I dwell on this matter because it points up a basic conflict in the ACIR's outlook on other issues as well. Perhaps this is an irrepressible conflict in a complex Federal system. Perhaps the conflict is the principal reason that the ACIR was called into existence. The inevitable consequence of the conflict is that the commission approaches its work on an issue by issue basis, as pragmatically as possible. Invariably, decisions are based on the particular alignment of interests among its membership at any given moment. Only rarely do decisions represent an effort on the part of commission members to rise above sheer representativeness and view the Federal system as a whole.

#### *Metropolitan affairs*

The Commission's studies in this field have ranged from expression of a clear, if cautious, concern for creating some kind of overarching governmental structure for the larger metropolitan areas, to efforts to promote interlocal cooperation on an ad hoc basis in specific problem areas. In the first category is the 1961 report dealing with governmental structure organizations, and planning cited earlier, and such others as "Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas" (1962), "Factors Affecting Voter Reactions to Government Reorganization in Metropolitan Areas" (1962), "Performance of Urban Functions: Local and Areawide" (1963), and "The Problem of Special Districts in American Government" (1964). The latest report issued by the Commission bearing on this question was "Metropolitan Social and Eco-

nomic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations" (1965).

The pattern here may be significant. The first report came close to advocating area-wide metropolitan government as the preferred organizational form for dealing with metropolitan problems. This writer would guess that the Commission stopped short of an explicit recommendation to this effect for practical political reasons. The two reports issued in 1962 reflected much the same outlook, but with less confidence in the possibilities for creating anything approaching metropolitan government. The following year, the emphasis of the Commission's publication shifted to the development of rational criteria for determining the proper allocation of specific public functions within the complex of local governments in the metropolitan area, probably in recognition that overarching metropolitan governments were not emerging, and that the case for even limited governments of this kind would have to be made, repeatedly and in closely reasoned fashion. The 1963 study was followed by one dealing with the proliferation of special districts, treating that proliferation as an unhappy, if very real, attempt to meet urban needs in a fragmented way.<sup>16</sup> Finally, the 1965 study of social and economic disparities recognizes that serious efforts at metropolitan area coordination and equalization must come from the outside, particularly from the States.

The 1965 study is the most ambitious one published by the Commission to date, not so much for the data it provides, but because of the analysis of that data and the implications of its recommendations. First, the study clearly points out that generalizations about metropolitan areas based on the situation in the Northeastern megalopolis are not accurate for most of the Nation's SMSA's, or even for a majority of those living in SMSA's, thus adding a healthy dose of sectional perspective to the consideration of metropolitan problems. Second, the erstwhile disparities between central cities and suburbs are shown, on the basis of the statistical evidence, to be much less important than heretofore imagined. Beyond that, the Commission builds a series of recommendations for Government action to reduce the very real social disparities that do exist. The recommendations must be taken as expressions of a conviction that the role of Government as equalizer transcends questions of intergovernmental relations. The cautious presentation in the report leads one to the conclusion that the Commission was quite aware of this.

The emphasis in other reports dealing with metropolitan problems is designed to stimulate the States and the Federal Government in their efforts to strengthen local government, to encourage areawide actions to meet metropolitan problems, and to enlarge the sphere in which general-purpose local governments may act. Overall, the Commission's recommendations are conventional ones, supported by solid data but offering few new points of departure to excite opposition or, for that matter, to capture the imagination. The only deviations from conventionality come where the Commission's own research forces it to modify conventional views. In its report on mass transportation, for example, it accepts and repeats a highly conventional statement that "the typical grid arrangement of streets tends to limit vehicular flows at best to a halting, stop-and-go rhythm," only to continue its analysis by showing that no other pattern has proved to

be any different in securing improved traffic flow.<sup>17</sup>

#### *The ACIR and the States*

The concern of the Commission for strengthening the States is clear in almost every one of its reports. This in good part reflects the ACIR staff's sound empirical understanding of the central role of the States as the keystones in the Federal arch. In addition to the conventional recommendations for administrative reorganization for more effective State government and tax reform to increase State revenues, the Commission strongly urges greater State involvement in such metropolitan problems as mass transit, interlocal cooperation, urban redevelopment, and even local zoning where the police power is being used for discrimination.

In all this the Commission at least hints that current Federal policies of bypassing the States to deal directly with the big cities fall short of the best course of action, even where it accepts such policies as the inevitable result of the States' failure to assert themselves in the urban field.<sup>18</sup> Overall, the Commission has consistently advanced the still radical notion that the States and the cities are strengthened through the development of programs involving them both.

ACIR concern for the States is by no means doctrinaire. In the controversy regarding categorical versus block grants in the public health and welfare fields, for example, the Commission has sought to find a middle ground that would leave intact the Federal power to set national goals while allowing State Governors to transfer funds, under prescribed conditions, to meet particular needs. Such a middle ground solution, which would use Federal grants to strengthen the elected chief executive of the State's general government, and would thus reduce the tendency of grants to fragment State government along functional lines, is typical of ACIR.

Similarly, the Commission attacked the question of State legislative apportionment as soon as *Baker v. Carr* was decided (timeliness is one of the ACIR's working goals). "Apportionment of State Legislatures," the December 1962 report, is notable for its concern with the historical patterns of apportionment in the States and for its recommendations that the States apportion both houses of their legislatures on a population basis even before the U.S. Supreme Court decided that they must.<sup>19</sup>

#### *The annual report*

Under its basic legislation, the Commission is required to submit an annual report to the President every January 31 in the manner of other permanent boards, commissions, and councils. There is good reason to believe that the drafters of the legislation intended this report to be a major public statement comparable to that of the Council of Economic Advisers. Perhaps because the Commission was particularly a congressional creation and has never enjoyed significant Presidential support, its report has not developed past that of an ordinary annual accounting of its activities.<sup>20</sup> For the first 3 years, the annual reports were confined to such things, as budget, staff changes, and summaries of Commission actions during the preceding year. Beginning with the fourth

<sup>14</sup> See Wright, op. cit., pp. 200-201 for discussion of the Commission's commitment to strengthening general purpose local governments headed by elected officials in opposition to the perpetuation and expansion of functionally oriented officials and agencies.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, the statement describing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the ACIR's Sixth Annual Report, Jan. 31, 1965, p. 2.

<sup>16</sup> Reynolds v. Sims, 374 U.S. 802 (1963).

<sup>17</sup> See Wright, op. cit. for an account of the Commission's creation and its relations with the White House.

<sup>18</sup> "Tax Overlapping in the United States 1964," July 1964, p. 3.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

annual report in 1963, a brief summary of no more than a page or two outlining the significant events affecting intergovernmental relations in the previous year has been included.

The author strongly believes that the educative role of the Commission would be enhanced if its annual report could be developed into an important State paper. Considering the difficulties in attracting public attention to the problems of intergovernmental relations, the public presentation of a comprehensive report to the President each year, one that would analyze the current problems of intergovernmental relations and predict trends could be the best way to secure a wider audience for the Commission's work. Properly done, it might even earn a few minutes on the network newscasts that blanket the Nation every evening and which are notably reluctant to discuss such problems unless they involve riots in the streets. Should a report of this scope evolve, the Commission might find it appropriate to transmit it formally to the Governors as well as to the President, a gesture entirely possible under the terms of its enabling act.

#### GENERAL TENDENCIES AND LARGER QUESTIONS

The thrust of the ACIR's work has followed along the lines set out for it by earlier efforts to come to grips with the problems of intergovernmental collaboration. Inconspicuously and without fanfare, it has sought to clarify the historical record as to the perennial necessity for intergovernmental collaboration. Returning to the spirit of the first Governors' conference, it has sought to stimulate elected officials to take an active concern in the problems of intergovernmental relations so as to overcome some of the functional fragmentation that has developed from piecemeal programming in order to strengthen general-purpose governments at all levels.

In its publications, as in its deliberations, the ACIR adheres closely to the mandate to consider practical problems of intergovernmental relations "within the framework of the Constitution." Its members and staff avoid contact with larger theoretical questions and couch their ideas in solid terms of conventional wisdom. Yet the Commission has a viewpoint which can be abstracted from its publications by any who care to make the effort.

This viewpoint is traditional in its honest appreciation of the existing federal structure and deep concern for the federal system, but it is also radical in its equally honest and open commitment to pervasive, permanent, and institutionalized intergovernmental collaboration. To the Commission, cooperative federalism is real and good. Its concern is to make the cooperative system work for the benefit of all levels of government.<sup>21</sup>

"The Commission believes that the years ahead present serious challenges to all levels of government, and that if our governmental system is to prove equal to these tasks, the resources of each level must be utilized to the highest degree of effectiveness. The Commission is therefore dedicated to strengthening this 'cooperative federalism' by enabling local and State governments to play their full part, alongside the National Government, especially now when international tension, rapid population growth, and marked technological change are increasing the tasks and responsibilities of government at all levels."

In this respect, the Commission's work reflects the new thought about American federalism. Accepting the validity of the compact that established the Federal sharing of power in the first place, it is willing to embrace the principles of partnership that in-

evitably flow from a compact relationship. It consistently argues that, properly implemented, intergovernmental sharing strengthens all levels of government and the democratic process generally.

As the foregoing quotation indicates, the Commission takes an activist attitude toward the role of government in American society. This is clearly reflected in its reports, which not only support the greater involvement of all governments in each other's affairs but greater governmental involvement in heretofore private activities. Urban mass transit is a case in point, but the Commission's recent concern with social and economic disparities in metropolitan areas is even more far reaching in this regard.

The Commission accepts the idea that there is a delicate balance between the division of powers and responsibilities among the constituent governments in the Federal system which must be preserved in the face of growing governmental responsibilities and an uneven distribution of governmental resources. Within the context of cooperative federalism, the Commission holds that "civil government in the United States is primarily a State and local responsibility." Hence, its recommendations are designed to strengthen the States and localities in their discharge of that responsibility. The Federal role in the system is vital, primarily as supporter and stimulator of State and local activities. The power of the Federal Government assures that its presence will be strongly felt wherever it is active. The Commission further believes that it is possible to use Federal power to achieve nationwide reforms which can strengthen State and local governments by increasing their capacity to act.

On reviewing the printed works of the Commission, the author was struck by the way in which the attitudes reflected in those works were reminiscent of the outlook of the old Progressives. Activist in its orientation toward government, positive in its commitment to social welfare programs, seriously interested in designing governmental institutions that are politically responsible to the people, and vitally concerned with the maintenance of non-centralized government as a means to promote and preserve free popular government, the Commission appears to be an important heir to a tradition that has virtually disappeared from public view in face of the more exciting arguments between quasi-collectivists and neo-individualists. The Progressive tradition is a decent one that deserves better treatment. Thus it is doubly unfortunate that so much of what the Commission has to say is necessarily bottled up in technical reports.

During its first 5 years, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has successfully established itself as an intelligent and important voice, concerned with timely questions, and predisposed to applying the best analytical techniques to examine them. Practitioners and scholars alike are finding its publications sound and useful. Though it is still heard by all too few, even among those who should be listening, the quality of its work is attracting more attention and—more important—is beginning to get results in National and State legislative halls.

#### AN OUTLINE OF THE NEW ECONOMICS

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the term "new economics" is receiving increased attention by our people. An article which describes it has been written for the Christian Science Monitor by Saville R. Davis. I think the article is very informative and recommend it to my colleagues.

The new economics centers on the concept that our National Government should provide private business with conditions that favor a rising and well-distributed prosperity but should be prepared to do something to protect people from the excesses of boom and crash in our modern industrial system.

As Mr. Davis puts it, the new economics describes for the National Government a task of not accepting tragedy but of adjusting to do something about it. It seeks a balance of the entire economy during steady growth.

His article follows:

#### AN OUTLINE OF THE NEW ECONOMICS

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Talks around Washington with friends, doubters, and foes of the new economic order produce reasons for hope and reasons for concern. They begin with an explanation of the new economics—a composite that will satisfy no one group. But for the interested citizen, it may suffice.

#### ITS ORIGIN

It begins with the obvious breakdown of the old theory that the economic system was best left alone. That it had built-in economic stabilizers. That in a market economy, any excess would soon right itself.

It turned out that the modern industrial system righted itself only by extremely painful boom and crash, with human and social costs that became unbearable.

#### ITS REASONING

That these "wide, self-aggravating swings in total demand" could be corrected, without going over into Socialist planning. When demand and spending threatened to collapse, enough new buying power could be introduced into the system to offset it. And later, when the stimulated system threatened to spill over into inflation, the total demand could be contracted by opposite means.

A small correction up or down, at the right time in advance of trouble, could have a big effect on the whole system—just as a small turn of the steering wheel of a truck could avert what otherwise would grow into a big and damaging skid.

#### ITS TOOLS

One is supposed to be voluntary but isn't—the use of Government guideposts for new wage contracts and for prices. They should be kept in line with increases in productivity—3.2 percent at the moment, says the Government.

Another is traditional, but still of the utmost importance: the ability to loosen or tighten credit through the banks.

The last is the most powerful and the key to the new system. It is the Federal Government's ability to have either a positive or negative net effect on the economy. It does this by adjusting what it puts into the economy through spending, so that it's either greater or less than what it takes out of the economy through taxes. This is called fiscal policy.

#### NEW TACK FAVORED

This much seems reasonable at first hearing. But then come the two shockers.

First, it had always been considered good morality, in time of economic trouble, for the Government to tighten its belt, cut its

<sup>21</sup> ACIR, third annual report, Jan. 31, 1962, pp. 1-2.

spending, balance its budget. This is what an individual has to do, unless he has money in the bank or other resources to tide him over.

But, said the new economics, a national government ought to do precisely the opposite. Its task is not to accept tragedy and adjust to it but to do something.

If the body economic is acutely malnourished, it should not be further starved but fed, so as to regain its strength. And the National Government—so the economists say—is not helpless like a bankrupt individual. It has the resources to tide the country over.

#### Resources from where?

This leads to the second shocker. When the Government runs a deficit deliberately, in time of expected recession, in order to feed an undernourished economy, it adds to the national debt.

If this were carried to excess, the economists concede, the result could be bad. But short of excess, the long-term credit of the National Government is good. It has the resources of the Nation behind it. It should be able to borrow against its future, in time of great need, to help the present. Provided it isn't being overdone.

#### LESS OF A BURDEN

Here comes the surprise for those who haven't studied the subject.

It isn't being overdone, the economists say. By any measurement that counts, the national debt has steadily become less of a burden on the country during the postwar era. Much less.

This is one of those surprises to the general public—like the fact that the huge postwar farm surpluses, piled up in storage at public expense, have largely evaporated without people's noticing it.

The national debt, at the end of World War II, was more than 1 year's national income. That was about 20 years ago.

Today it is less than half of 1 year's national income.

It's as if an individual did a good deal better than double his income, while the mortgage on his house went up by less than one-fifth. And the burden of the debt on his income diminished by more than half.

Or compare the debt of the U.S. Government with that of industry. Businessmen use debt and borrowing like capital—as part of their investment in doing business. Corporate debt multiplied by more than five times since the war—and profits rose by three and one-half times. That's very good business.

#### U.S. DEBTS LOOKS CONSERVATIVE

But while corporate debt was multiplying by five, the national debt of the United States went up by only 19 percent. That's at a rate of 20 times slower. The two kinds of debt are not strictly comparable. But the striking conservatism of the national debt by comparison with the private is considered significant.

Why has the national debt of the United States gone up by less than 1 percent a year, in the postwar period, while the general public thought the increase was relatively huge? Because the Government keeps its books by three methods, and the public emphasizes one which make the deficit always seem larger than in fact it turns out to be.

These answers, given by the economists to the chief points of criticism raised by the old economics, are now widely understood by insiders, and by students. The general public is only beginning to hear them now.

But to state the case for the new economics fairly, a much broader view and a different vocabulary is necessary.

The real issue, the economists say, is not the narrow one of national budget deficit or balance. It is the balance of the entire economy. The aim of businessmen as well as of the White House should be to keep the

economy in what might be called a dynamic equilibrium, moving ahead with a lively but stable growth rate which does not spill over into the excess kind of boom that makes for crash.

And to provide jobs and careers for the people.

#### GROWTH IS THE KEY

This is the whole economic picture, of which the Federal budget is only one part, the argument goes. At its core are incentive and enterprise, which beget growth.

The only way to keep these peculiarly American virtues thoroughly alive and kicking is to keep as much of a market economy as possible, under modern conditions, and always to have an enticing outlook for stability and profit. This means leaving the private sector as much alone as the Government can—so it can push ahead and take risks and iron out mistakes and correct itself as needed.

Looked at in this way, the function of the Federal Government in the new economic order is to give private business favorable conditions for a rising and well-diffused prosperity, and then stand by to make corrections if this properly unplanned economy begins to get out of kilter, either going too slow or too fast.

This puts Government budgetmaking (apart from the question of controlling waste expenditure which is always with us) in a much larger context. It is one of a number of tools for adjusting the carburetor and arranging for the intelligent use of throttle and brakes.

These tools include (1) lesser maneuvers like price and wage guideposts, (2) loosening or tightening credit, and (3) most powerful of all, adding to the total level of private and public expenditure, or subtracting from it, in order to keep total demand in good relation to total supply.

The last of these, the newest blockbuster weapon added to the national armory for averting boom or crash, includes the raising or lowering of taxes (what the Government takes out of the economy) and expenditures (what the Government plows back into the economy).

#### CONTROLS PROVOKE CAUTION

Critics call these Government controls and are wary of them. The defending economists are wary of them too, but they define them differently:

If the vast private sector of the economy (seven times larger than the Government sector) is to be left as free as possible under a system of incentive and enterprise, then somebody has to be ready—obviously the Government—to do some steering when the uncontrolled chariot starts to career to right or left. The past has proved, the economists say, that the chariot cannot otherwise right itself without first going through an accident with heavy cost, drastic repairs, and loss of distance traveled.

If the argument stopped here, the new economics would have it easy. It sounds like a kind of engineering.

But it so happens that the economists need a flexible system, a fluid situation, if they are to give the economy a nudge here and a restraint there, and expect it to respond.

They don't have this kind of flexibility.

First, there is always the rigidity of the balance-of-payments problem. As everyone knows, the United States has been steadily losing gold. This is partly due to many overseas commitments, partly because important reforms are overdue in the world trade and currency system.

The President has to keep one eye on the gold outflow—which calls for cooling down that part of the economy that deals with exporting and foreign investment—whenever he wants to heat up and stimulate the domestic part of the economy.

These are mutually contradictory controls, much of the time. Each one tends to spoil the other. And neither can be ignored.

Then there is the so-called cost-push inflation. This is a recent, spontaneous invention within the American system. Big industry and big labor, which had been kept in conflict through the early part of the century, changed their tune as high prosperity set in. They suddenly discovered they could agree on continuously rising wage and price levels—as long as consumers in the United States were unorganized and could not stop it.

So wage contracts and prices have steadily gone up. The ancient glory and dynamic of the American competitive system—by which prices were constantly lowered in order to create new customers and expand markets—seem to have been forgotten by much of the economy. This created a massive inflexibility at the heart of the American system.

#### WAR HEATS THE ECONOMY

It was chiefly to deal with this expedient that the wage-price guideposts were invented by the economists and the Government. Otherwise, if the Government merely applied overall measures of credit and budget and tax policy in time of inflation, to drain off the excess demand, these measures might never penetrate into this thick-walled citadel that parts of industry and labor had built in the center of the economy to insulate themselves so they could do as they pleased on the inside.

Another factor beyond the control of economists or Government is war. Everyone understands that Vietnam is one of the big factors heating up the American economy today.

But so, too, in a semiwartime atmosphere at home, is another factor. Other sectors of labor and industry, including small businesses and retail traders and huge supermarket chains, have suddenly caught onto the cost-push idea, lured as they are by the seemingly endless supplies of money in the consumer's pocket in this age of rapidly expanding prosperity, and the almost carelessness with which much of it is flung into the tills.

A whole new area of updraft has increased the pressure on prices. Is this a rigidity, or will it respond to the moves of the new economics?

Then comes the most baffling of the problems afflicting the economists: politics. It opens up a wilderness of conflicting interests, personalities, political myths, and maneuvers of vote getting, the conflict of competing empires within the Federal Government, which ought not to concern the economists who advise the President.

But it does and must.

The moment the President's Council of Economic Advisers turns from analysis to policymaking, it finds itself inextricably deep in politics.

#### CONGRESS DEEPLY INVOLVED

Congress, for example, doesn't want to yield up any of its prerogative in taxing. This is a profoundly political matter. Yet it also is the most powerful tool of the new economics.

What to do? President Kennedy asked for a tax reduction and it came a year and a half later. President Johnson got a lesser cut, to be sure, but more quickly.

The economists need to act in advance of crisis, if the swings of maladjustment are to be kept narrow. How can the politicians arrange to move fast enough? Will Congress let go, even partly? Should it?

As for the wage-price guideposts, they are half buried in a sea of politics, and the waves are getting higher.

Nobody really likes these guideposts. There is no precedent or constitutional base for them.

They involve headlong and often nasty clashes between Presidents of the United States, big corporations, and big labor unions, which are bad business and bad politics by any reckoning.

They produce maneuver and deception and strong-arm tactics concealed in sheep's clothing, in a matter which ought to be technical and impartial and ought not to put such strains on the White House-business-labor relationship.

They annoy labor, which sees them as a weapon to maintain the status quo: Wages are bolted onto an escalator that moves upward at an average speed of 3.2 percent (or whatever the average productivity increase is in any year) and can never come nearer to a big increase in profits.

#### AN IMPROVISED COURSE

They annoy business, because any Government interference with prices is an interference with the "free market."

The guideposts smack of controls by indirection, in a society which abhors economic controls. They are an improvised course between the twin shoals of doing nothing and of using stronger measures and doing too much. There is nothing nice about them, except that they are the only way yet devised of doing a necessary job.

Unless there is some such way of coping with cost-push inflation, unless there is some semivoluntary way to restrain the coiled steel of inflation now, before it leaps out of control, then much more unpleasant and drastic steps will have to be taken later.

As one economist here said, "What would you do, if you were one of the President's advisers? You'd try to make the guideposts work." Or find something else to do the job.

Then there are political problems directly affecting the community of economists themselves. They often don't agree on what should be done.

To be sure, the President's Council of Economic Advisers has a record of acting as a unit in its brief postwar orbit, and the strains between it and the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board have probably been less than what was publicized.

#### POLICIES NOT ECONOMICS

Also, Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, the most powerful figure in the field of tax legislation as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has a record of deep devotion and statesmanship in reconciling political forces and helping the new economic experiment to be made. He had had to put off his great desire, reform of the many inequitable tax laws, to get the other, still bigger show on the road.

Nevertheless, despite much statesmanship and willingness to change opinions on the part of Congress and the Government departments, they have been disconcerted when the economists argued among themselves over steps to be taken at one point or another. And the economists have been similarly thrown off base as they recognized the importance of the many political resistances, inertias, limits on the President's ability to act, and the like.

Because they were forced to take these noneconomic forces into account, this has transformed their own job of advising what to do, and when, into an awkward mixture of things they understand and things they don't.

Of course, the disputes between economists deal with the smaller advance decisions of how to guide the economy, and what the timing should be. If big trouble came, the economists would unite and speak as a man: "In inflation, pull money and credit out of the system. In recession, pour them in."

#### AGREEMENT WIDELY BASED

This has been described as the triumph, belatedly, of the theories of the British Economist John Maynard Keynes. His basic ideas are, in fact, the starting point of today's economic thinking. From the twenties through the fifties, they steadily gained the support of more theoretical and practical economists. Today there are few dissenters on the major lines of his argument among economists.

Time magazine recently quoted presidential candidate Barry Goldwater's chief economic adviser, Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago as saying, "We are all Keynesians now."

The Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson economic advisers broadly agree. And Congress, for several years now, has accepted the main outlines of the new economics. But it has done so quietly, not wishing to arouse citizens who have been told that Keynes was an exponent of socialism. Said Time magazine, typical of the large circulation periodicals which are beginning to discuss this subject:

"Contrary to the Marxist and the Socialists, Keynes opposed government ownership of industry and fought those centrists who would plan everything. ('They wish to serve not God but the devil.') While he called for conscious and calculated state intervention, he argued just as passionately that the government has no right to tamper with individual freedoms to choose or change jobs, to buy or sell goods, or to earn respectable profits. He had tremendous faith that private men could change, improve, and expand capitalism."

#### POLICIES GREATLY MODIFIED

The debate is by no means over on the public level or in the business community, and may be prematurely considered to be largely past business here in Washington.

Today's new economics is greatly changed in many respects from the policies of Keynes: The American economic system has itself developed new phases. The economists have produced a modern "neo-Keynesian" approach (in the phrase of economist Paul Samuelson). All sorts of practical and political problems have emerged as this approach was accepted in Washington and put to work.

Especially there are today's great questions: Will the new economics cool down the boom it has heated up? Conversely, can President Johnson heat up the good relations he earlier had with the business community, which have since cooled down? And can the political leaders of the government bring themselves to apply brakes as effectively as they earlier stepped on the gas at the debut of the new economics?

To quote the present chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, "We're learning to live with prosperity. And frankly, we don't know as much about managing prosperity as getting there."

#### GOVERNMENT IN ACTION

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNLEY. Mr. Speaker, the steps this administration and this Congress are taking to give the people a better chance to live so they can enjoy liberty and pursue happiness are recalled

most effectively in an editorial that appeared in the Louisville Times of April 11, 1966.

The paper points out that throughout all ages it has been easy to say unkind things about government—no matter whose, no matter what kind.

The paper mentions the fact that "Congress, through the Senate Commerce Committee, is seeking ways to make the Nation's automobiles safer." Notes that in another area, the Federal Food and Drug Administration is working hard to assure that the drug industry gives the public products that are adequately tested and honestly labeled.

Since others will want to see this timely reminder of Government in action, I make the editorial a part of the RECORD: [From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Apr. 11, 1966]

#### A KIND WORD FOR GOVERNMENT THAT DOES THINGS FOR PEOPLE

Through all the ages, including this one, a good many unkind things have been said about government, no matter whose, no matter what kind. Government has been regarded almost universally as being, at best, a necessary evil.

Evil it may be, but necessary it certainly is. In recent days our own Government has been giving a useful demonstration of the fact that it is necessary; that it is, to put a more affirmative face on it, more than a mechanism for collecting taxes and putting men in the Army and enacting and enforcing laws, not all of which are of unquestioned wisdom and justice.

In its best moments, government does things for people, not just to them. It fulfills the role of doing for people what they cannot as individuals do for themselves.

At present the Federal Government is, among other things, taking very active and thoroughly justified steps to try to give the people a greater degree of protection, a better chance to live so they can enjoy liberty and pursue happiness. In one area, Congress, through the Senate Commerce Committee, is seeking ways to make the Nation's automobiles safer. In another, the Federal Food and Drug Administration is working hard (maybe harder than even before) to make the drug industry give the public products that are adequately tested and honestly labeled.

These, clearly, are two fields in which the average person usually is unable to protect himself. How many motorists are equipped by training or experience to recognize a manufacturing defect that might kill them? Even if a few motorists do suspect something about their car, what can they as individuals do about a gigantic industry which had displayed no burning passion to make the safest possible car?

The average man is even more helpless when it comes to assessing the efficacy and safety of the drugs he takes. He must rely on the knowledge of his doctor and the integrity of the drug manufacturer. Even his doctor must trust the drug companies; he cannot possibly test every drug himself.

Government, of course, consists of a multitude of men of differing philosophies and interests. Not every Member of Congress is an ardent crusader for greater automobile safety. Not every person in the Food and Drug Administration is wholly dedicated to giving the public utmost protection. In fact, sometimes the original impetus for such campaigns as these comes from individuals and organizations outside government.

Nevertheless, it finally is the Government which must act if effective action is to be

taken. In the drug and automobile cases, we are seeing the Government—or segments of the Government—take that kind of action.

#### PRESIDENT APPEARS TO REVEL IN RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by J. A. Livingston that appeared in the Washington Post on April 4, 1966:

#### PRESIDENT APPEARS TO REVEL IN RESPONSIBILITY

(By J. A. Livingston)

"Mr. President, you're trying to do something no President has ever done before, you're trying to create an environment that \* \* \*."

Lyndon Baines Johnson waved his hand in an emphatic negative and said:

"I don't agree. Every President has to provide leadership. I'm trustee for 190 million people. I was selected. I was not appointed. It's up to me to keep the most-advanced, the most-rewarding economy moving forward.

"The kind of economy we have today is the kind I've dreamed about since I was a boy. More than 73 million jobs. The unemployment rate is the lowest in 12 years. We're going in the right direction—where a man who wants work can get work and with decent pay.

"For the progress we've made I'm grateful. That we can go further, I'm hopeful. But remember, 3 million are unemployed. We have 3 million to go."

The conversation—it wasn't exactly an interview—took place in the President's cozy, personal office in the White House. The President was immaculate—blue suit with vest, light blue shirt with a blue, soft collar, and dark tie. His smoothly ironed French cuffs edged out under his jacket sleeves to show modest blue cuff links with the State seal of Texas.

Surely, he is one of the world's best dressed men and one of the most vigorous. That he ever had a heart attack is difficult to credit. His mind roves actively, alertly, and comprehensively. His voice is loud and confident. And he's at ease with—you get the feeling that he revels in—responsibility.

He has no doubt where he stands and where the economy stands. He wants further gains in employment without inflation. He doesn't want to sacrifice social progress.

By persuasion, by putting price advances and economic trends in perspective, he hopes to tone down demand and overexpectation. In that sense, he's strictly a conservative—trying to keep what has been gained without losing out to a boom.

Nobody is being shanghaied. The Government does not tell businessmen or labor leaders what to do. It is, however, his duty and that of his Council of Economic Advisers to put at the disposal of persons who make wage and price decisions the statistical findings and judgment of the Government. The wage-price-productivity guideposts at 3.2 percent aren't law. They're like a sign: "New Grass Planted."

The businessman, the labor leader, and you and I—all of us—must decide whether

we want to destroy what has been planted. Profits must be put in perspective so that the businessman can decide whether a price increase is necessary at a time when American sons are giving up lives in Vietnam.

Similarly, the individual worker ought to be able to measure whether union leaders are asking too much and thus adding to living costs. Is a big wage increase fitting when men are on the battlefield?

Again, I came back to the beginning: "But you're trying to develop a mood, you're trying to influence decisions \* \* \*."

Again the President broke in. He is only trying to lay facts before men who make decisions so that they can make good decisions. Labor leaders and businessmen should be helped to see the economy in its entirety.

At a time such as this, businessmen should ask themselves: Is this the best time to expand? Will money be as high priced and as hard to borrow later as now? What will be the status, the usefulness of plants built now if Vietnam spending, if war orders decline? Might it not be less costly and less risky to postpone construction?

The Government is setting an example. The President has issued orders to all Cabinet officials to review construction plans with a view to postponing or stretching out Federal or federally supported projects. Such reviews will be made at the beginning of each quarter.

The guideposts have been applied to pay increases in the Government and the armed services.

And the President is pleased that the New Jersey Operating Engineers Union finally agreed to submit its recently negotiated contract to the arbitration of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. Undoubtedly, the contract, calling for wage and fringe benefits more than double the 3.2-percent guidepost, will be rolled back. This should set at rest the idea that the administration only operates against corporations on price increases.

Here is the economic shape up: The Vietnam budget is up about \$6 billion from last year. The total output of goods and services—the gross national product—will increase this year by about \$50 billion. And Federal outlays aside from Vietnam will remain approximately stable. Consequently, there will be \$44 billion more in goods and services for the civilian economy.

For the economy to overheat, the consumer, the businessman and State and local governments will have to buy more than \$44 billion above last year; they will have to scramble for more than the economy can produce.

To keep demand in line with growth of output available for civilians, an increase in the Federal income tax on individuals might be effective. But how many votes would such a proposal get in Congress? It would have to be accompanied by an increase in corporate tax rate, too.

As for the 7-percent investment tax credit: Many persons who originally opposed it now want it to stay. And Secretary of the Treasury Fowler is disinclined to take it off.

The President is waiting for the April returns, even as, on an election night, he'll wait for the reports from critical counties. What effect will the \$6 billion a year increase in social security taxes have on consumer demand?

Will the increase in excise taxes and the speedup in corporate tax payments skim off some demand? And will the tighter money policy of the Federal Reserve System—higher interest rates—slow down plans for expansion?

He is looking ahead—beyond April, beyond May and beyond the November election. And if I understand the President, economics is to him a social tool. He's not interested in

dollar aggregates, but in human needs—in jobs. He doesn't want to take some of the heat out of the economic bloodstream by taxing off buying power only to discover that he has to put the buying power back. He can't afford, as President, an on-and-off policy.

He's like the physician before examining a patient. He still hasn't taken the thermometer out of the black bag. He still has to put the thermometer under the patient's tongue, count to 60, and see how much the fever is and whether the fever is accompanied by chills. Then, and only then, will he decide what kind of pills to use—red, white or blue. As yet, he has made no diagnosis. In his public life, he has met too many persons who talk first and think afterward. He'd rather think and then act.

And he's extremely wary of the regional or local viewpoint. He tries to avail himself of all the views he can—from that of George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, to that of Frederick Kappel, head of American Telephone & Telegraph; from Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, to that of Gov. Richard Hughes, New Jersey; from that of Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York, to an official of Johnson City.

Yes, and he likes to get the views of men on his farm, who have time to reflect and ponder and are not riding around in Cadillacs preoccupied with hour-to-hour business decisions.

You feel with the President as he says: "When a decision has been made on taxes, you can be sure it will be right for the economy and not dictated by political considerations." You know he's a politician. You know he's interested in votes. But he's experienced enough to know that votes depend on being right, not wrong. He is conscious that success brings many partners, but failure is his responsibility—alone.

The problem—the dilemma: The signs point both up and down. The reading is not absolutely positive for the President.

Foremost in the President's mind are the Kennedy-Johnson achievements. He does not want to give up 5 years of steady progress to a recession or to inflation. He hopes to flatten out the boom and so prolong prosperity. He notes that industrial production is up 9 percent over a year ago. Retail sales are also up 9 percent in a year. And the average pay of a worker in manufacturing is \$110 a week. Further, corporate profits in relation to capital are the highest on record over a sustained interval. And this is after taxes.

After that, the President smiles, but it's a grim smile, reflecting the accomplishments to date and the difficult task ahead. "This is the kind of economy we need to produce the goods the boys out in Vietnam must have and that we all want. We have to provide jobs for 1,500,000 new workers every year. We've got to avoid explosions like Watts. We've got to demonstrate to the world the abundant fruitfulness of free men operating in a free society.

"I know from my Economics 101, 102 and 103 that this is the kind of economy in which the seeds of speculation and overexpansion take root. I've had enough experience with inflation to want no part of it. Our economic policy must be to balance the gains of prosperity against the dangers of overheating."

That epitomizes the strength and aspirations of the man whose hand is on the economic throttle. His eyes and mind and thoughts are circumambient. On Vietnam, on Watts, on illiteracy, on joblessness, on price indexes, Government spending, private planning and politics—the art of the possible.

He is temporizing from day to day and week to week—seeking to avoid a tax rise, which subsequent events might indicate was

premature and unnecessary. He is hoping that the good sense of the American people—labor leaders, businessmen, State and local government officials, and consumers—will help him.

He wants no part of rigid wage-price-and-profits controls. He doesn't want to repress Great Society programs. He may be overstaying his market. Price advances may accelerate. But he knows what he's doing. He calculates all risks.

For the President, this is a two-front war: A struggle to contain communism in Vietnam and a continuous battle against "discrimination, despair, poverty, disease and illiteracy" at home. He's determined to succeed on both fronts.

#### WORKS OF PEACE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Louisville Courier-Journal on April 4, 1966, called attention to the fact that humanitarian aid in an emergency is one thing, sustained multinational aid for the economic and social development of all Asia another.

The paper thinks:

One of the happiest developments during Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's Washington visit was Eugene Black's report of progress in this area through the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong River power and dam project.

An "inspired" work of peace, the paper adds, is "the proposed creation of a permanent binational educational institution in India."

Because many will want to read of these positive efforts for economic and social development, I suggest that this editorial be made a part of the RECORD. [From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal, April 4, 1966]

#### HEARTENING INDICATIONS THAT OTHERS WILL AID, TOO

Canada's decision to join the United States in helping to feed India, stricken by the worst drought of the century, is heartening indication that other "have" nations will accept President Johnson's challenge to a multilateral aid effort not only in India but in all Asia.

If famine is to be averted in the world's largest democracy, such aid must be forthcoming. The Indian Government estimates that 6 to 7 million tons of food grain will be needed between now and December to avert mass hunger. Canada will provide 1 million tons. The United States, once Congress gives the President the emergency authority he asks, will ship 3½ million tons.

For the rest, the United States must, as the President put it, "expect and press for the most energetic and compassionate action by all countries of all political faiths"—an invitation to Communist-bloc nations, too, to participate. Surely most Americans will agree with the President's next remark: "If their response is insufficient, and if we must provide more before we stand by and watch children starve, we will do so."

But humanitarian aid in an emergency is one thing, sustained multinational aid for the economic and social development of all

Asia another. One of the happiest developments during Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's Washington visit was Eugene Black's report of progress in this area through the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong River power and dam project.

The Asian Bank stems from Asian initiative, with Mr. Black, the former World Bank president, helping to inspire more. Some 31 nations have already signed the Bank charter. It is expected that by September 15 more will have ratified the charter and the Bank will begin functioning in its new Manila headquarters. The United States has offered \$200 million toward the Bank's capitalization, \$100 million more in a trust fund to be administered by the Bank if other nations match that amount.

And behind this challenge to international cooperation, already accepted by 31 nations, is President Johnson's pledge of last April of an American investment totaling \$1 billion—with the first step already taken on what he sensibly conceives to be "a very long journey." That first step was his signing of legislation authorizing U.S. participation in the Asian Bank.

Equally impressive is the record of international cooperation which brought the United States and seven other countries to pledge \$21.4 million for construction of the largest Mekong River project so far scheduled, that on the river near Vientiane, capital of Laos. The other contributors are Japan, the Netherlands, Canada, Thailand, Denmark, Australia, and New Zealand.

Even more significant, perhaps, is the achievement of agreement between four frequently squabbling nations affected by the lower basin of the 2,600-mile-long river—Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. Agreement for the exchange of power between Laos and Thailand was signed also by Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Mr. Black sensibly counsels patience—"you cannot run out and develop a country overnight." But as the President's special adviser on southeast Asia, he manifestly is in optimistic agreement with the Presidential dictum: "Neither independence nor human dignity will ever be won by arms alone. It also requires the works of peace."

Among such works, one of the most inspired, surely, is the proposed creation of a permanent binational educational institution in India to be financed with \$300 million in U.S. counterpart funds—20 per cent of the rupee credits for grain shipments set aside to the account of the United States and spendable by it only in India. Half of the administrators of this binational "foundation" will be Indians, half Americans—drawn mostly from private life.

Congress surely will never negate the vision and generosity of this proposal, or deny our self-interest in it. For as Ambassador Chester Bowles once pinpointed the basic reason for international aid: "Unless the poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy of countries such as India are met and mastered, there can be no hope for security and prosperity in the more privileged countries of the world."

#### OUR BANKING BUSINESS

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently concerning the Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon, the soundness of the banking business, and the possibility that the the criminal element has infiltrated our national banks.

The following excerpts from the Monday, April 18, 1966, editorial in the Washington Post seems to pinpoint this issue with particular clarity:

To be sure, James J. Saxon, the Comptroller of the Currency, is one of the more controversial luminaries of the Federal firmament. He is a stubborn, proud man and his aggressive thrusts on more than one occasion have outraged sensibilities by disturbing the equilibrium within the bureaucracy that regulates the banking industry. But compatibility with the establishment is not the sole criterion by which a civil servant should be judged. By urging innovations and pointing to new opportunities for profit and growth, Mr. Saxon has shaken the federally chartered national banks out of a lethargy that was induced by the trauma of the 1929 crash and the stagnation of the 1930's.

Since 1961, Mr. Saxon has chartered 500 new national banks and acquired many enemies in the process. In some localities his new institutions are a threat to local banking monopolies. In others hackles were raised because charters were granted to groups which by virtue of religion, color, or national origin have seldom enjoyed the privilege of creating credit.

The fact is that only one of the new national banks has failed, and a very small one at that. Moreover, if there is in fact a drive by racketeers to enter the banking industry, they are more likely to succeed by taking over existing State-chartered institutions than by applying for new national bank charters which are granted only after exhaustive investigations.

There is no place in banking for unscrupulous men. But concern for the depositor—actually they are amply protected by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—must not be used as a mask to perpetuate privilege.

#### SOCIETY HILL WEEK IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since I have the honor and privilege of representing the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in which the Independence National Historical Park is located, I am delighted to announce to the Members of the House of Representatives the following program for Society Hill Week, in the city of Philadelphia, during the period June 5 to 12, and to invite any and all to participate in these events:

SOCIETY HILL WEEK, JUNE 5-12, 1966

The many varied events of the week, still incomplete, are:

June 5, opening day: There will be a display of old police and fire equipment, antique cars, horse-drawn carriages, an antique flea market (also on June 4), open house at the historic churches in the area, as well as the dedication of Delancey Square by the Philadelphia Recreation Department, at

which Mayor James H. J. Tate will be principal speaker.

June 6, business and industry day: A nationally known speaker will talk to Philadelphia's business leaders at a luncheon at Gimbel's. Dr. F. Bruce Baldwin, Jr., president of Abbott's Dairies, is chairman of the day. The oldest companies in Philadelphia, which date back to post-Revolutionary War days, will be honored.

June 7, beautification day: A replica of an 18th century garden in the heart of Philadelphia, at Third and Walnut Streets, will be dedicated by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, who will then receive the second annual Society Hill Medal. The garden, adjacent to the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society headquarters, is part of the National Independence Park that is operated by the National Park Service.

June 8, Pennsylvania Hospital day: A colorful fair in Washington Square Park.

June 10: Children's event at Independence Hall in a.m., tying in with salute to Flag Week. A band concert, swim show by the famed Vespers Club, and fireworks at Society Hill Towers, in the evening.

June 11, Colonial Fair day: Children are invited to participate in playing colonial games for prizes, ride on the *Good Ship Lollipop*, along the historic Delaware River.

#### DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. JAMES G. FULTON ON SPACE PROGRAM

**Mr. WYATT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

**Mr. FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that NASA authorization be reduced by \$66 million. I further urge that management procedures, both in NASA and NASA contractors, be substantially revised for efficiency and economy.

#### LUNAR RECEIVING LABORATORY

I strongly oppose the decision of the Science and Astronautics Committee to approve the construction of a lunar receiving laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex., at this time. I believe that this proposal, with an initial construction cost of \$9.1 million, is poorly conceived and has not been given an adequate amount of study and analysis.

We must have, for the processing and analyses of lunar samples, existing laboratory facilities, be they Government, university or college, corporate, foundation, or private. We will also need vacuum chamber facilities, combined with specialized laboratory equipment and instruments to make a thorough study of the spacecraft and astronauts returning from the moon.

I do not agree with the NASA arguments that there should be one facility, that it should be centralized, that it should be located at the Manned Spacecraft Center, or that it should be started at this time.

We do not have at this point any of the results of the planned unmanned lunar research missions, such as the Surveyor and lunar orbiter programs. These are to provide the very directions that our

future programs are to take. Making a decision at this time could as well be based on the "green cheese" theory of the moon.

Nobody has now any knowledge other than surmise or guess as to what the crust of the moon is. Let us face it, we simply have no facts at this time on which to build a practical foundation for a laboratory. Hence, no considered judgment can be formed.

The ideal location for analyzing lunar samples is in the lunar environment on the moon; namely, a lunar-based laboratory. Under the circumstances, possibly and probably, temporary interim earth facilities or installations should be planned. For this, we should use as many of our existing facilities as are available, with such modifications as may be necessary in the light of the results of the coming unmanned lunar exploratory flights.

It would make more sense to have a small delay at this time rather than guess 3 to 4 years into the future, before the unmanned lunar exploratory programs are completed, so that the finally constructed facilities can really meet the actual needs when the lunar samples are actually returned from the moon.

Considering the vast distances involved in our galaxy and the very close proximity of our satellite, the moon, as well as its close identity to the earth in mass, density, color, and surface variations and other factors, we should not proceed on the bare assumption that the moon's composition varies greatly from that of the earth. This will certainly be an expensive and costly guess.

The question of contamination of the earth from lunar samples is at best a debatable one. High NASA officials have stated that the chances of such contamination are no lower than one in a million. This "number" is pure fantasy.

I would like to add that the earth now receives hundreds of millions, really uncounted numbers, of micrometeorites, many of which are not dissipated in the upper atmosphere but reach the earth relatively unchanged from their original state. Many of these are so small that they become entrapped in the moisture of our upper atmosphere and fall to earth slowly rather than in a fiery descent as is the case with the larger "shooting stars" or sizable meteors. We have yet to know of any contamination occurring as a result of these particles of matter reaching the earth from outer space. Or are we contaminated already?

In the NASA site selection survey, I enjoy pointing out the method of selection of the NASA site selection committee.

From the point of view of an intelligent person, the appointment by NASA of five out of nine members on this committee from the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, is charmingly innocent. It is really disarming to learn that, to insure a majority of five members working as a team, two additional members were appointed from NASA headquarters to the committee.

It is enchanting to learn that the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston was the very site finally chosen, as there seems to have been some slight predis-

position in that direction. Entirely by accident, as top officials of NASA have so adequately pointed out in their testimony to our Science and Astronautics Committee.

Needless to say, such predisposition does cause a few wry smiles and rather knowing chuckles, particularly in the complete absence of any doubt or disagreement by any member of the site selection committee, as evidenced in testimony, either before or after the final choice, on any factor, or on other installations. When everybody on a committee thinks alike, some people are not thinking very much—or at all.

A reading of the site selection survey reports does not convince me that an adequate and thorough survey was made. For example, NASA gives an order of consideration in site selection as: (1) availability of utilities; (2) accommodations for visitors; (3) scientific investigation capabilities; and, lastly, (4) construction, operation, and maintenance costs. I believe the last two factors shown, namely (3) and (4), should properly be (1) and (2) in the order of consideration.

NASA officially predicts that the proposed laboratory will have to be expanded as samples are obtained from other planetary bodies. Hence, the decision to locate the basic foundation of all extraterrestrial sample processing only at the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston is tantamount to locating all such future activity at the same location.

I believe this is wrong, particularly in view of the many existing facilities in the country which are capable of being used with but minor modifications and which already possess pools of scientific talent trained in biological quarantine and processing of metals and mineral samples. Many also have vacuum chamber facilities.

Considering only selected Government facilities, these include: (1) the Communicable Disease Center of the U.S. Public Health Service at Atlanta, Ga., with facilities for radiation counting, and laboratory work as well as trained personnel; (2) the U.S. Army Biological Center at Fort Detrick, Frederick, Md., with facilities for radiation counting, quarantine, biological research and development, as well as trained personnel; (3) the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., with facilities for radiation counting, quarantine and laboratory support, with trained personnel; (4) the Oak Ridge National Laboratory at Oak Ridge, Tenn., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting, quarantine and laboratory support, as well as trained personnel; (5) the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., with facilities for radiation counting and trained personnel; (6) the Ames Research Center at Moffett Field, Calif., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting and laboratory support, as well as trained personnel; (7) the Naval Biological Laboratories at Oakland, Calif., with facilities for quarantine and laboratory support as well as trained personnel; and (8) the Los Alamos Laboratories at

Los Alamos, N. Mex., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting, and laboratory support as well as trained personnel.

In addition to these facilities with capabilities, there are numerous other Government installations with capabilities as well as numerous industrial corporations with the ability and plant to perform analyses on all types of metals and minerals.

I believe existing facilities can easily perform the required tasks. This would eliminate a further concentration of still more research and development dollars at one NASA center.

Should none of the existing facilities be used, separately or in combination, the best location for a lunar receiving laboratory would be in an area as close to the splash down point in the Pacific Ocean as is possible and where power and utilities exist, such as Honolulu or some other Pacific island.

I oppose strongly the thesis advanced by NASA that the returning spacecraft, astronauts and lunar samples be kept together from the time of splash down to the time they reach a lunar receiving facility. I advocate the exact opposite, that they be kept separate to prevent any losses or contamination in the event of an accident while being transported across the oceans and the country.

I see no reason why the facility proposed must be constructed at this time with a crash program. NASA states that the facility must be started now if the United States is successful in achieving a lunar landing in early 1969. Why did they take so long to make up their mind? Why was it necessary to ask for approval of a project with inadequately prepared presentations and with such a sense of urgency and rush?

NASA claims it needs 15 Saturn V-Apollo systems to insure a successful lunar landing mission. If most optimistically the lunar landing mission is successful in early 1969, then some lunar receiving facilities must be considered.

If this early triumph and success occurs, then NASA will not need at least half of the expensive systems which they have already ordered.

NASA programs cannot be presented in opposite and contradictory ways.

Either the laboratory could be started now or NASA should eliminate about half of the 15 Saturn V-Apollo systems and return the funds saved to the taxpayers.

Let us face it, the original NASA presentation on the lunar receiving laboratory was completely inadequate. Everybody, but everybody on the Science and Astronautics Committee agrees to that. Their second presentation took place less than 1 month later without adequate preparation.

I must point out that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight which examined this matter and on which I am the ranking minority member, unanimously and on a nonpartisan basis, deferred the NASA proposal for the laboratory in its report of March 24, 1966, to the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

My position against the proposed construction project is based on inadequate justification for a central, major facility, improper consideration of the many alternative facilities available, and insufficient time for the conduct of a meaningful field study, with outside expert help, of these alternative facilities.

I criticize the proposed project specifically because the Science and Astronautics Committee could not conduct a full and detailed field examination of the problem and its possible solution. No effort was made to make the necessary field investigations, to contact various competent industrial and construction contractors, to discuss the problem with members of the scientific community, or to examine the inadequate estimates presented on the costs of modifying existing facilities.

Over my strong objections, the full Committee on Science and Astronautics approved reinstatement of the lunar receiving laboratory based on a further hearing of several hours on one day. I believe the decision to start the laboratory on a centralized basis, at this time, at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, is a shot in the dark rather than a decision made on an adequate development of area of reference and basic facts upon which to base sound business judgment.

#### APOLO APPLICATIONS AND ADVANCED MISSION PROGRAMS

I strongly and firmly oppose the NASA request for \$41.9 million for the Apollo Applications program and recommend it be deleted for purposes of economy and efficiency.

The Apollo Applications program has not—repeat not—been approved by the administration, according to testimony presented to the Science and Astronautics Committee. In fact, the administration saw fit substantially to reduce the original request of NASA for this program. It must be remembered that this Apollo Applications program follows the completion of the Apollo lunar landing program in this decade. This is at least 3 or 4 years from now.

NASA witnesses stated that the entire \$41.9 million would be used in fiscal year 1967 to buy long leadtime hardware for additional Saturn 1B vehicles and additional Apollo spacecraft. This hardware is beyond the needs of the Apollo program. We do not even know and cannot possibly, at this time, estimate how much and how many surplus boosters, spacecraft and hardware will be available from the Apollo program after the lunar landing is completed.

NASA has not determined how many additional boosters, spacecraft and hardware will be needed for post-Apollo programs. Nobody can even guess at the programs. NASA has not presented to the Science and Astronautics Committee any information on the number of Apollo Applications flights, their purposes, missions or destinations—absolutely nothing.

NASA witnesses during the hearings stress that the funds requested for Apollo Applications programs are merely to maintain the current production capability. I would point out that this pro-

gram capability is to be maintained without a set program or purpose, and no use has been planned for the hardware.

It is impossible to hold "open options," as claimed by NASA, for decisions on the Apollo Applications programs to be made, hopefully, in fiscal year 1968. This is an expensive, really expensive, theory. Businessmen would laugh at such "bone yard" production.

NASA indicates that the delay in approving the Apollo Applications programs already has increased its estimated program cost by as much as 20 percent. This is pure poppycock. No reasonable person can make such estimates at this time.

It is my opinion that NASA's plans for the Apollo Applications program are so indefinite that any estimates as to cost increases are purely speculative. They cannot be considered as substantive factors by the Congress in reaching a decision on this matter.

The hardware planned to be purchased by NASA will surely be obsolete by 1970, which is the earliest date for any flights under the Apollo Applications programs. The present generation of boosters, spacecraft and hardware, as well as fuels, will look like 1914 Fords by 1970. What are we to have: "Army and Navy and Space" surplus sales stores on every town corner?

The leadtime on the Saturn 1B vehicle and the Apollo spacecraft and current manufacturing lines are such that the proposed hardware will not be available until late 1969. We know that the tempo of launch activity will increase in the next few years. It is certain that the facts that will be learned from coming Apollo flights will require major changes and developments in the current generation of boosters, spacecraft, and hardware.

On my insistence, along with others, the Science and Astronautics Committee has voted additional funds for work—above administration requests—on high energy propellants, large solid rockets, and nuclear propulsion. This research will lead to propulsion breakthroughs, automation and control equipment, that will make the current launch vehicles obsolete elephants with rabbit-size payloads.

It is, therefore, premature to procure launch vehicles, at this time, that cannot be used until 1970 at the earliest, when known purposes cannot be determined for such vehicles.

I have always supported and continue to support the manned lunar landing programs. I have always stated that man's exploration of space will not end with the first landing on the moon. We should continue to take advantage of the almost limitless possibilities of space exploration and benefits to mankind.

The discovery of the relations of the 9 planets with their 37 moons of our solar system will be the work of generations. It staggers the imagination to realize there are over 30,000 objects in the area between Mars and Jupiter alone, the largest known to us being Ceres with a diameter of about 500 miles—and consider the tremendous size of Jupiter.

Future U.S. space programs beyond the manned lunar landing must be undertaken in a realistic, efficient, and orderly manner. I strongly recommend the requirement that NASA submit definite plans for Apollo Applications programs to Congress prior to the Science and Astronautics Committee's consideration of the fiscal year 1968 NASA authorization request. This is a must.

I state my firm conviction that NASA should delay the procurement of any hardware of additional launch vehicles and spacecraft until its plans for Apollo Applications programs have been more thoughtfully and thoroughly defined. This definition must take into account the results of the coming Apollo research flights on an integrated basis. It must include plans and specific projects and outline future research programs.

These plans and projects should be submitted through appropriate channels to Congress for prompt approval when the necessary justification and base for decisionmaking has been provided.

Consequently, I strongly recommend the deletion of the \$41.9 million requested for the Apollo Applications programs at this time. NASA should be encouraged to continue project definition but I strongly oppose the purchase of any "shelf-type" unnecessary hardware at this time of Government deficits, war, and inflation.

The U.S. Government is advising U.S. business at present to forgo unnecessary inventory purchases and to defer capital expenditures, to assist the war efforts, prevent inflation, and ease pressure on the economy because of the shortage of skilled personnel. The U.S. Government certainly should not now buy this large amount of useless, expensive, technical inventory that has no definite use or program.

I also recommend the deletion of \$5 million from the \$8 million request by NASA for its advanced missions program. NASA has failed to provide any justification, plans, projects, or results in its presentation regarding this program.

In my opinion, the advanced missions program is purely "blue sky," and should be reduced by at least \$5 million. I therefore recommend \$3 million as the budget level for this "no purpose" think department.

#### FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN

As a senior member of this committee, I joined with other committee members in placing heavy and firm emphasis on the efficient use of facility planning and design funds. The purpose of this emphasis has been to bring about improved construction planning and management procedures within NASA. I have strongly supported this element of NASA's program since I am a firm believer in sound, long-range planning.

NASA has not used or programmed a substantial part of the authorization granted for these purposes in past years. At present, the records show a balance of \$11.9 million in unfunded and unprogrammed authorization for facility planning and design. In addition to prior years' authorization remaining un-

funded, testimony received from NASA witnesses indicated that \$5 million in funds appropriated in past years for facility planning and design remain unobligated at the present time.

NASA requested \$7 million for facility planning and design in fiscal year 1967. The committee wisely reduced the amount of the request to \$5.5 million. There seems to be no reason why NASA should continue to request from \$7 million to \$10 million annually for advance facility planning in view of the large unfunded and unobligated balances available. There is no doubt in my mind that amounts available and to be made available for these purposes in fiscal year 1967 are not justified.

In my opinion, this element of the space program should be tightened in order to insure careful use of the funds authorized. The theory behind advance facility planning is sound and serves a good purpose, but the Congress must insist upon better use of the authority in order that the full benefit may be obtained.

Under these circumstances, I recommend that \$10 million of prior years' unfunded authorization now available to NASA be rescinded.

#### CHANGING NASA OBJECTIVES

My criticism of the development of NASA is that its original objective was to be the research and development agency of the Federal Government in the fields of space and aeronautics. But primarily, research and development jurisdiction was to include research and development, wherever it occurred, be it in the Government, private or public sectors, civilian or military sectors.

NASA is now settling down to become primarily a manufacturing, production and engineering operation. Frankly, the research effort in every field is being crowded out and held to a bare minimum by the demands of the Apollo lunar landing mission. This started to become true in the original Mercury era, advanced greatly in the Gemini era to the point where science, research, and development are now being forced into total eclipse in the \$5.012 billion presently requested by NASA.

In fact, I consider that only about 5 percent of the total current NASA budget request is to be devoted to science, research, and development.

NASA's claim that the construction of boosters, the development of hardware, flight training and navigation missions, the production of spacecraft, the operation of tracking networks, and so forth, constitute research and development is a far cry from the scientific meaning of the term.

My view of the present Apollo program is that its proponents are afraid at this point to try anything new or integrate new boosters or high energy fuels into the complex.

It is safer to proceed with the same old fuels, the same old generation of boosters, and the same old type of hardware, as the demand is for immediate success, and not for the best type of performance nor for the scientifically most productive and advantageous. It is bet-

ter not to risk any new developments but to make do with what NASA has at present, simply performing engineering, plumbing, and construction chores.

The race with Russia is hurting NASA scientific and research programs.

#### URGENT NEED FOR MANPOWER SURVEY OF NASA

I believe that the continuing mushrooming of NASA personnel strength, particularly in the area of scientific and engineering personnel, has reached the point where it requires a detailed review by the Congress.

As an example, I point out the situation at the only recently approved Electronics Research Center at Boston, where personnel requirements have increased from 250 in fiscal year 1965 to 550 in fiscal year 1966 to an estimated need of 1,000 in fiscal year 1967. All this increase happens while the Center itself has yet to build one building for its activities.

If the large amounts of personnel used by NASA were blue-collar workers rather than technicians, there might not be such need for caution. But the fact of the matter is that the great bulk of NASA personnel are scientists, engineers and technicians, all of whom are in critical shortage in the U.S. economy.

Aside from the question of determining the actual needs of NASA, there is the major question of management. Is NASA using these critically-scarce personnel in the best possible fashion? Is NASA management responding to the sudden changes in our space program as projects phase out and others expand or reach their peak effort?

The impact of reserving to our space activities, both in Government and contractor plants, a large percentage of our scientific and technical personnel can only be judged serious and critical, in view of the war in Vietnam, the current inflation in the economy, and the need to maintain a healthy scientific pool of talent in our scientific and academic communities, as well as for defense industries and business in general.

I strongly recommend that a management survey be conducted by an outside firm of experts of the management and utilization aspects of scientific and technical manpower in NASA. I further recommend that the report of this survey be provided to the Congress before final action on the fiscal year 1967 NASA authorization bill takes place.

I recommend a study in depth of NASA manpower utilization by the appropriate committee of the Congress—either the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, or by the House Government Operations Committee.

#### INADEQUATE FIELD MONITORING OF NASA ACTIVITIES

I am seriously concerned over the lack of field monitoring of NASA activities by the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Science and Astronautics Committee.

For example, the Bureau of the Budget has far too few people with far too much control over the NASA budget. I understand that there are only two or three people in the Bureau of the Budget who

have the responsibility to make all types of major decisions concerning the \$5 billion NASA budget, and this over a period of less than a week. This type of control can only be superficial.

The General Accounting Office has yet to provide Congress with any meaningful management surveys or audits of one of the largest agencies in the Government. I feel that this agency is far too bound with its past history and is emphasizing accounting and bookkeeping practices at the expense of scientific management surveys.

On a \$5 billion annual budget, we need to move far beyond the limitations of accountancy and bookkeeping so that we have available for congressional purposes, personnel with adequate judgment and experience in research and development activities. These are needed in the General Accounting Office as well as on the Science and Astronautics Committee so that Congress can make decisions of choice among the various programs presented by NASA in the light of the potential research and development gains, all based on an adequate base of reference.

The days of monitoring and supervising large technical programs on the basis of accountancy and bookkeeping are gone forever. We must have technically qualified people to oversee technical programs. Real current and continuing program evaluation is badly needed, and sorely lacking.

For several years I have been urging the Science and Astronautics Committee to increase its technical staff by at least five scientists, engineers, and accountants, for continuous field investigatory duties. I repeat my recommendation, particularly in view of the fact that the committee has not used all of its present allocated funds.

For the Congress to be fully responsive to the U.S. taxpayers on a highly technical program involving about \$5 billion a year, it must have research and development, construction, and technical management personnel assigned exclusively for field duties.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

An Inspector General, with necessary staff and facilities, should be established in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The current NASA program is replete with a myriad of complex and sophisticated projects designed to meet a wide variety of objectives of importance to the Nation.

Management problems are bound to arise as a result of the various programs and objectives, involving an annual Federal expenditure of over \$5 billion and the future of the national space program. I believe it is necessary that the Administrator of NASA be provided with the capability of obtaining independent evaluations and examinations of management actions by personnel other than those involved in formulating or implementing management policies.

It is significant to note that numerous other agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the importance of utilizing Inspector General offices to effectuate internal and periodic examinations, evaluations, and corrective meas-

ures. Among these agencies are the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Department of State, and, more recently, the Department of Agriculture.

The Cost Reduction Directorate within the NASA headquarters, supposedly established for investigative purposes, is only a bug on the surface of the problem. It is a superficial device which centers attention on minor cost accounting matters to determine if eggs are cheaper on another counter. There is insufficient depth of investigation in the cost reduction activities of this Directorate, and it does not provide the across-the-board analysis of NASA activities at all levels of management that an Inspector General type of organization would provide.

This Directorate, established in 1964, consists only of three professional persons, none of whom have any engineering, scientific, or technical background in the space and aeronautics field. Assigning three nontechnical people to oversee a \$5 billion program from a management analysis point of view is like a canary pecking at the mountain. This Directorate was established after the introduction of my H.R. 7770, in July 1963, for an independent NASA Inspector General and does not solve the problem.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that NASA establish and maintain an Inspector General to insure that the space program and objectives of this Nation are carried out and met with both economy and efficiency.

#### POOR GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF NASA CONTRACTS

NASA continues to place the bulk of its contracts on a noncompetitive basis in areas of the country which have been the recipients of major prior year contracts. The provision by the Science and Astronautics Committee in the fiscal year 1966 NASA authorization act, that NASA take measures to promote a more equitable distribution of its contracts has had, in my opinion, no effect whatsoever. NASA has simply ignored this provision.

I have yet to see any reports from NASA as to what, if any, measures they have taken to carry out this congressional mandate. Nor have I seen any practical results since the inclusion of the provision in last year's authorization act. The plain fact is that NASA displayed its complete lack of interest in the subject by excluding this provision in the administration bill sent to the Science and Astronautics Committee for fiscal year 1967.

The NASA program which appears to be distributed on an equitable basis is the NASA sustaining university program of research, facilities, and training grants. But this is not to be considered to be a solution to the problem of securing a reasonable and equitable distribution of NASA contracts throughout the Nation and the various States. NASA is to be complimented on its efforts in distributing this \$40 million annual program on broad geographical basis. But the overwhelming portion of the remaining \$5 billion continues to be awarded or expended annually in specific, almost fixed locations, with no known efforts to

spread new work, or diversify to neglected regions.

This causes an unhealthy concentration of science, research, and engineering talent and drains the taxpayers of the rest of the country of their most valued asset, "brains." Technical competence in this country is an asset to which every State and section of the country is entitled to its just share, and as a step in the opportunity for progress.

I recommend that NASA be required to report to the Congress, not later than January 26, 1967, the specific measures NASA has undertaken to correct the current distortion and unbalance in the geographical distribution of NASA contract awards. This report should also include the most current distribution of all NASA expenditures by State, region, congressional district, or metropolitan area.

Congress should take specific action to correct this situation and prevent the continuation of the current "brain-drain" of outstanding engineers, scientists, teachers, and students to certain concentrated areas. The problem of trained students should be faced directly and handled by Congress to protect the local taxpayers who finance the local education and specialized training of outstanding students who are immediately lost to local communities, through actions of NASA roving recruiting teams for technical, scientific, and engineering personnel.

JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

I believe that the "reform" of the management of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory has gone too far.

I remain strongly opposed to the industrial-type management structure that has been imposed upon the organization of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory by the current NASA contract. I believe that the Laboratory, devoted to science, research, and development, should not be severely limited to carrying out programs under specific contracts of NASA.

The Laboratory should be organized so as to permit maximum flexibility in the employment of expertise. It should also be organized to bring about the greatest amount of interchange of knowledge in the various scientific disciplines, both on a horizontal basis as well as on a perpendicular basis.

I believe that the present type of industrial organization heavily emphasizing completion of programs under NASA's contracts does not at present allow the degree of flexibility necessary in a high level research laboratory such as Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

The rigid channel of communication imposed by this type organization structure tend to limit and put a real constraint upon the creativity of the scientific and research personnel of the Laboratory. This prevents the optimum use of the scientific talent of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory process.

There are two extremes in organization applicable to the Laboratory: First, a purely industrial-type operation where all tasks are specifically defined; or second, an academic or university-type

operation where the initiative in formulating tasks comes from the faculty.

What is required at the Laboratory is a "formula" or "middle of the road" organization and relationship with NASA which permits responsible NASA control and at the same time does not inhibit the creativity and initiative of the Laboratory scientists.

The important thing is not manpower or money but rather flexibility in operations. The interchange of interdisciplinary information remains an internal problem within the Laboratory. Working level scientists must have the initiative to effect such an interchange.

JPL should have an "in-between" type organization compared to a solely industrial-type or academic-type organization. It would not be proper for NASA to completely freewheel. There must be a middle ground to permit initiative on scientific research and development. There is "room for improvement" at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

The present NASA contract spells out broad areas of scientific research to be undertaken by the Laboratory concerning the moon and planets. NASA must not, in its zeal to maintain control, restrict the Laboratory from exercising its initiative in proposing the specific tasks and methods to achieve the broad goals specified in the basic contract.

Let us face it: the imposition of an industrial-type organization on a research laboratory such as Jet Propulsion Laboratory can well smother creative activity and reduce the quality of the output and make the facility a manufacturing and plumbing concern.

There is room for improvement in the management and relations of the NASA under the contracts at JPL.

It is my belief that NASA has tightened the management control of the Laboratory, as was necessary in the test phase of the Ranger and Mariner programs. The technical and managerial performance of the Laboratory has certainly improved and is now on a high level. Now there is no need for maintaining rigid, tight managerial control and close program supervision and direction, which in reality is useful only in space-craft and hardware manufacturing activities and scientific payload construction.

There is no doubt that the purely industrial-type organization clearly specifies what programs are to be done, when they are to be done, and how they are to be done. But we need a compromise management and organizational form at JPL which is between the industrial-type organization and the university type.

There is no doubt that many of the scientists and research people at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory feel that they are constrained under NASA contracts at the working level. There is therefore a real necessity for compromise in order to be able to restore initiative and provide flexibility so that initiative is given to the scientists at the working level.

I recommend that an early meeting be held between NASA, Dr. Pickering, of Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and Dr. DuBridge, of California Institute of Tech-

nology, on measures to improve the management and structure.

#### MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY PROGRAM

I strongly oppose the administration's placing the manned orbiting laboratory program under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Air Force.

MOL should be placed under the jurisdiction of NASA, the research and development agency of the Federal Government for space and aeronautics. Or at best, MOL should be placed under the joint jurisdiction of NASA and the U.S. Air Force, for development.

I believe the action is a serious mistake both in organization and philosophy as well as for public relations purposes.

I strongly oppose the action of Secretary of Defense McNamara when, in his December 10, 1963, news conference, Mr. McNamara announced without prior notice of any kind, that the manned orbiting laboratory program would be assigned to the Air Force. Neither Congress nor the scientific community of the country had any prior notice or inkling that this was to be the case until Mr. McNamara made his bland announcement.

I also oppose the announcement by the President on August 25, 1964, at a news conference that the MOL program would be worked upon by certain major contractors. This is certainly not the way to do business nor is it appropriate to ignore the existing science and research facilities of the Federal Government without any consultation or authorization by Congress whatever. It is complete fiction to state, as Secretary of Defense McNamara has assumed, that MOL is completely a military task and therefore can be handled by him as Secretary of Defense, as if he and that Department are the only people concerned in this tremendous development.

The announcement by Secretary McNamara makes a fiction and is in direct violation of the expressed intent of the Congress in section 102(a) of the original Space Act, Public Law 85-568, dated July 28, 1958, wherein it was expressed that:

The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

The action of Secretary of Defense McNamara is also in direct violation of the provisions of Resolution 1472, International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, adopted by the United Nations at the 856th plenary meeting of the 14th General Assembly on December 12, 1959. Under this resolution, the United States, along with other countries including the U.S.S.R., agreed to, among other things, foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. It was a privilege and a real responsibility for me to be able to work as one of the delegates on the U.S. mission to the United Nations for this purpose, under the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. delegate.

Is the Presidential order the beginning of a new military era in space? This basic national policy the Congress of the United States should decide, according to

the will of the American people after thorough study and due deliberation.

Being first in space for scientific and prestige purposes is one thing. Being first in space to better deliver weapons of destruction or nuclear and atomic weapons is quite another field entirely.

Do the American people want the administration to have the first Manned Orbiting Laboratory solely dedicated for military purposes, and by so doing, to exclude all research and development which could be done by NASA for the benefit and progress of the American people?

#### THE MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN POLAND, MAY 3, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on a matter that should be of the gravest concern to every American regardless of creed or national origin who shares my deep and abiding belief in the necessity for more and broader international communications. If we are to see the reemergence in our time of a world free from anxiety, rid of the specter of war, swept clean of misunderstanding, and delivered from the plight of spiritual rootlessness, we must be willing to accept every opportunity for peaceful and meaningful dialog; whether as individuals, in groups, communities, institutions, and even nations and families of nations. When such opportunities arise only to be thwarted, whether from fear, political expediency, or any of a host of reasons, then all men must rise to speak out.

I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to yours, my distinguished colleagues, items in recent newspapers reporting the refusal of the Government of Poland to grant visas to the supreme pontiff and to prelates from around the world so that they may participate in celebrating the millennium of Christianity in Poland this May 3.

I can hardly find words to express my profound sorrow as an individual and as an American that the people of Poland are to be denied this opportunity to meet with these great spiritual leaders in a spirit of communion and celebration.

I have this day sent the following telegram to the cardinal primate of Poland. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that all men of good will share the sentiments I am about to read:

His Eminence, STEFAN CARDINAL WYSZINSKI,  
Archiepiscopal Palace  
Warsaw, Poland

YOUR EMINENCE: In my own behalf and in behalf of those of my constituents who proudly claim your great nation as their ancestral home I extend to you sincerest good wishes on the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

Let me also express my profoundest regrets that you will be unable to celebrate this joyous occasion in the company of the

supreme pontiff and your princely brethren in the church.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN G. DOW,  
U.S. Congressman.

### TO MAKE FREEDOM A LIVING REALITY

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

**MR. WOLFF.** Mr. Speaker, I stand here proud to be an American. I share the national warmth that grips each of us when we continually take our giant steps toward that great society in the sciences, in outer space, and when we go to maximum lengths to secure freedom for a tiny nation half a world away. This makes me proud as an American and as a legislator.

I am proud too that as an American and as a legislator I can stand and tell this assemblage and the world where we have failed and where we are failing. While we defeat maladies that have plagued the world for centuries, perform miracles in outer space and sweep totalitarian forces for the villages and jungles of southeast Asia, we still turn a deaf ear to the fact that one-tenth of our Nation still finds it necessary to take to the streets with picket signs, chants, and slogans to try to gain the most elemental freedoms—guaranteed by a host of laws dating back for centuries.

Our newspapers show daily that in many parts of America you cannot be black and choose to work for freedom for black men—the penalty for such activity has too often been death.

We have a civil rights bill. We have a voting rights bill and also antipoverty legislation. Each of these are landmarks along the road toward meaningful equality and I am proud to have helped with their passage. But neither of these, nor the combination of all three, has yet lifted the Negro and other minorities meeting discrimination in our Nation, to the level of first-class citizenship enjoyed by their white, fellow Americans.

When I remember our civil rights bill, our voting rights bill, and our antipoverty legislation, I cannot help but remember also our 14th amendment of some years ago, the century-old Emancipation Proclamation, the Bill of Rights, and the Magna Carta. Each of these recognized that some men were not free—that there was a universal need for all men to be free.

I am not saying that we have made no progress. The truth is we have made much progress. We have come a long way—from a long, long way—and I cannot forget that life still in these United States, from Natchez, to Tuskegee, to Los Angeles and to Long Island, can be separate, unequal, and hell for most Americans who are Negro.

What I am saying is that we now come to the hardest part of our long fight for racial justice. It is now time to translate the high sounds of the legislator's language into humanity, dignity, and a vote for that gnarled-handed Negro sharecropper in the Black Belt;

into the right of the Negro family traveling across this Nation—seeing America first—to eat, sleep, and go to the bathroom in places of public accommodation. It is time to implement the training programs that would point to a better future for our minority youngster than that of the day laborer at best and wino or drug addict at worst.

Our recent summers have pointed to still another future for the Negro youngster—that future filled with the angry, naked, violent defiance of the society that he believes has failed him and that he must, in turn, fail every day of his life. Some like to say that the screaming, unreasonable youths who fought society's guns, billy clubs, and troops with far fewer guns and mostly bricks, sticks, and fists, from Los Angeles to Harlem were hoodlums and not a part of the "responsible" Negro community. I cannot fully accept this because this is the easy answer. This implies that conditions are not really so bad in our Negro communities because only hoodlums have objected violently and it lets us off the hook. It leaves us comfortable while we procrastinate a little longer with the lives and aspirations of our different fellow Americans.

It says that we do not really need to change things because our riots were not by those we like to regard—mostly for convenience—as our Negro spokesmen. We repeat the old bromide that most Negroes are content with their place in America. The truth is they are not.

Three young Negroes were arrested last year and convicted on charges of plotting to blow up the Statue of Liberty and other national monuments. This was one of the most bizarre and ironing stories to come out of the American scene. Americans were surprised, shocked, and frightened that three young men, Americans, could even consider the destruction of such purely American symbols.

Many a good white liberal, I am sure, grew warm inside to learn that a Negro policeman was the hero in the capture of the three young men.

But let us look closer than the volumes of newspaper copy that painted the three young men as far-left radicals. Let us remember, of course, that to many Americans, this light held high in New York harbor signaled freedom, dignity, and a real opportunity to follow the American dream, for European migrants since 1886. And let us not forget, let us never forget, that by 1886 the ancestors of our Negro citizens had already given their tears, their sweat, and their lives for this Nation.

And we still must fight and plead and pass laws to grant the Negro the basics of human needs. The sons and daughters of the European migrants have long left the slums, the initial poverty, and the second-class citizenship behind them while the Negro—with his physical difference and because of our national hypocrisy—has not.

The point that cannot be overlooked is that these three young men should have had this dedication for the building of American symbols and not their de-

struction. We should have seen to it. Since we did not, we certainly must see to the future of aspirations of the rest of our Negro youths. We must make certain that they share in the making of America in practice what she is in concept. We must make them even more welcome in General Motors, on Wall Street, in Government service, and our many national mainstreams.

We must ask ourselves—and the answer has to be a loud clear, "none,"—just how many young Negroes do we want to lose to our prisons, to our walking-death addictions, and to foreign ideologies.

Every day, and the evidences are quite clear and all around us, we sacrifice other young Negroes to the same disaffiliating frustrations because some are too timid to act, some too much involved in making a profit off Negro miseries to act or too anxious to address ourselves to other national problems and rationalizing that "the Negro problem takes time."

It cannot take endless time—it has taken too much time already. It takes effort now. It takes national integrity now instead of national expediency. President Johnson said last spring at Howard University that we must give the Negro "not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact." Vice President HUMPHREY said later that "if we can spend \$25 or \$30 billion to put a man on the moon, we ought to be able to spend enough to provide an environment here on earth that will let him stand on his feet."

And I add to this that we commit one of the greatest crimes imaginable, we continue to wallow in the filth of our national hypocrisy, when we continue to force our Negro youngsters into outlaw activity because we are not willing to share with them the Horatio Alger dream that we demand for ourselves.

This is our challenge and this is our responsibility—to make the freedom men of all races are dying for in Vietnam, a living reality in the United States. Our national battle cry must be that we stop being expedient when expediency will so horribly misshape men's lives. We must do what is right now, not what is convenient. Let us not pretend that all is well because no bottles are presently flying or because that Negro you know says he would not be caught dead on a picket line.

Let us give our minorities what everyone else enjoys and let us do it because it is right to do it, and not because we want to head off racial violence. Let us rise to our centuries-old challenge, accept our responsibility, for by doing so we are indeed making a most meaningful investment in the growth in greatness of our Nation.

### HARMONY NOTED

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 10 minutes.

**MR. McDOWELL.** Mr. Speaker, in dedicating the Lincoln statue in Mexico,

Presidents Johnson and Diaz reaffirmed to the world that two nations can live side by side in harmony, respecting one another's past and present, the Newark Evening News states.

The article, which like many others points up the value of the informal visit by President Johnson to Mexico, will be read with much interest, and I therefore include it in the RECORD:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, April 14, 1966]

#### SYMBOLIC VISIT

In Mexico, Abraham Lincoln is revered to a degree surpassed only by that Nation's own heroes in the struggle for freedom. The statute of the Great Emancipator which will be unveiled in Mexico City tomorrow is a symbol of that affection.

But United States-Mexican links are more than symbolic. President Johnson's last-minute decision to attend the ceremonies is proof of that. No drawn-out diplomatic exchanges were needed to pave the way for Mr. Johnson's informal visit. Rather, President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz simply made a cordial suggestion that Mr. Johnson accompany the U.S. delegation. Mr. Johnson promptly agreed.

The fact is that Mexico and the United States have no pressing problems. True, the two nations diverge in their attitudes toward Castro's Cuba and on the Inter-American Peace Force in the Dominican Republic. But they are situations that Washington and Mexico have learned to live with while maintaining their essential friendship.

Accordingly, in dedicating the Lincoln statue, Presidents Johnson and Diaz will be reaffirming to the world that two nations can live side by side in harmony, respecting one another's past and present.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. LANDRUM), on account of official business in district.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 21.

Mr. FRAZIER, for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 28.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. WYATT), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. WYATT), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. WYATT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARSTEIN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 20 minutes, on April 21, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. WYATT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. WHALLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. TENZER in two instances.

Mr. KORNEMAY.

Mr. VANIK.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1746. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th

Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948; LERA (MRS. ALBERT) THOMAS, Eighth District, Texas.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2321. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 426); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

2322. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1965 to February 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2323. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Governor of Guam, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 6(b) of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2324. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for the fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 604(a)(4) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2325. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation, as follows: (1) to establish minimum standards for passenger vessel and to require disclosure of construction details on passengers vessels, and (2) to repeal the laws authorizing limitation of shipowners' liability for personal injury and death, to require evidence of adequate financial responsibility to pay judgment for personal injury or death, or to repay fares in the event of nonperformance of voyages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 14324. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 820. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12617, a bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 821. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to

regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the House Calendar.

**Mr. BOLLING:** Committee on Rules. House Resolution 822. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14082, a bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the House Calendar.

**Mr. GARMATZ:** Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the *Yarmouth Castle* disaster; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 14535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate used or sold for use, as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 14536. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14537. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 14538. A bill to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Central Intelligence Agency from exploitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 14539. A bill to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14540. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to study and report on an alternative coinage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 14541. A bill for the relief of the Colbert County Board of Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 14542. A bill to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 14543. A bill to provide compensation for damages to certain facilities rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected as a result of the modernization of the Monongahela River navigation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14544. A bill to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14545. A bill to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to

permit naturalization for certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations engaged in disseminating information which significantly promotes U.S. interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 14546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area, in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 14547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred for the higher education of himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14548. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 14549. A bill to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 14550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 14551. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 14552. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the literacy requirements thereof in connection with their naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14553. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 14554. A bill to establish a National Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14555. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 14556. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14557. A bill to protect children and others from accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end, and by amending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to

ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 14558. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 14559. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 14560. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14561. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, to increase by \$2 the fee for such stamp; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14562. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 14563. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such program, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 1076. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 1077. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 1080. Joint resolution to establish a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 628. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of its hearings entitled "20th Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946: An Economic Symposium"; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

461. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to restoring in the Federal budget the cut in the

school lunch and milk programs, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14564. A bill for the relief of Angelo Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 14565. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Argos National Fish Hatchery in Indiana to the Izaak Walton League; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14566. A bill for the relief of Menachem Joseph Hershowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14567. A bill for the relief of Pedro Luiz DeMelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 14568. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Figliomeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14569. A bill for the relief of Domica Listowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14570. A bill for the relief of Melbourne Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14571. A bill for the relief of John White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14572. A bill for the relief of Chief Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14573. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Namur, and their two children, Joseph and Marie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 14574. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esfandiar Safayan and his son, Masood Safayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 14575. A bill for the relief of Jakub Waldemar Ladosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

375. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., relative to extension of time to file for medicare benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1966

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 19, 1966)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Dr. P. Edward Rickenbaker, minister, First Baptist Church, Denmark, S.C., offered the following prayer:

Many have often prayed, O God, that wisdom might be the measure of these to whom in Thy name we have entrusted the legislative authority of government. We pray today, however, that Thou would help the leadership of our Nation also to have equal wisdom in Thy moral and spiritual legislation. Confound the paralysis of fruitless and weakening fears. Allay the phobia of confusion and dismay in these trying times. Instill the moral integrity and courage in these our

leaders to stand for the hard right against any easy or expedient wrong that might seem attractive. Give to all who are called into positions of authority and government in our Nation not only wisdom in judgment, but also purity in motive and discernment in administration.

We confess our need for Thee. The problems which confront us loom so large and the loneliness which inflicts so often those in positions of authority teach us our dependence upon Thee in all things.

O God, Thou hast given this Nation great responsibilities. In our day when we seek mastery in nature and conquest in outer space, make us ready to acknowledge Thy right in us and in all we control. In our day of wars and rumors of wars, lead us in the paths of peace.

Enable us to stand for righteousness and truth against their enemies. Recall to us the unfailing truth that righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people. Grant unto our leaders the grace and courage to seek first the Kingdom of God that we may be enriched in our Nation with a great spiritual heritage. Then make us humble in the acceptance of that heritage. Give us Thy healing forgiveness and Thy grace which can transform our lives and our purposes.

In the Saviour's name we lift our prayer. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 19, 1966, was dispensed with.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will vote at 2 o'clock today, and the time between now and then is under the control of and to be equally divided be-

tween the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the outcome of this debate regarding the reapportionment of our State legislatures will determine the course of representative government in the United States for many years to come.

With this fact in mind, I am sure that all Members of the Senate on both sides of this issue recognize the gravity of our responsibility. This debate over the reapportionment amendment is one of truly historic proportions. Rarely must Congress face the task of amending the basic blueprint of our freedom, the U.S. Constitution. Rarer still do such amendments go to the very heart of our system of government.

The Supreme Court decisions in the apportionment cases, culminating in the case of Reynolds against Sims, have severely strained what Justice Harlan has aptly termed "the fabric of our federalism."

First, the Court has invalidated our traditional system of balanced representation.

Second, by the very act of ruling that State legislatures must be apportioned in a certain manner, the Court has denied the underlying principle of our entire system of government—the right of the people, themselves and through their elected representatives, to determine the structure of their political institutions.

The unique American system of balanced representation has been the genius—the true key—to our Nation's political stability. It has achieved its ultimate end by successfully balancing majority rule and minority rights. We speak with the voice of the majority—but only after we have assured that the minority has been heard and is fairly represented in our councils of state. This is the essence of the system devised by the Founding Fathers.

For can any of us truly deny that there is a direct cause-and-effect relationship between our concern and protection of minority interests and our history of 178 years of political stability and continuity?

The Founding Fathers saw in the system of balanced representation the best protection for minority rights in our legislative branch of the Government. Thus, they adopted it for the U.S. Congress. They established a National House of Representatives which would reflect and represent the population of the United States through equivalent congressional districts. The U.S. Senate was designed to take into account the rights and interests of the individual States, which differed in size, geography, and political and economic orientation.

This system permitted two important results.

First, the rights of the States to govern at the local level—close to the people—