

Norman E. McKonley
 Walter J. McManus
 David R. McMillan, Jr.
 Don A. Mickle
 Robert L. Milbrad
 Hubert E. Miller
 Donald L. Mitchell
 Ralph F. Moody
 Wendell P. Morgenthaler
 Dean H. Morley
 Edward C. Morris
 Wilbur J. Morris
 Donald R. Navorska
 Charles L. Nesbitt
 Charles C. Newmark
 Bruce C. Ogilvie
 Arthur S. Ohlgren
 James H. Olds
 Joseph H. Oliver, Jr.
 Donald P. Ostlund
 Wilford E. Overgaard
 Evan L. Parker, Jr.
 Landon W. Parker
 Victor E. Patrick
 James R. Penny
 Horacio E. Perea
 Frank E. Petersen, Jr.
 Jimmie R. Phillips
 John Phillips
 Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
 Bayard S. Pickett
 Earl F. Pierson, Jr.
 Paul P. Pirhalla
 James R. Plummer
 Gerald H. Polakoff
 Rollin R. Powell, Jr.
 Robert E. Presson
 Joseph V. Price
 Ronald M. Proudfoot
 Daniel J. Quick
 Thomas M. Reedy
 James R. Rehfus
 Martin B. Reilly
 Donald L. Rice
 Wesley H. Rice
 William E. Riley, Jr.
 Fred C. Rilling, Jr.
 George H. Ripley
 John F. Roche, III
 Carlo Romano
 Richard E. Romine
 William E. Rudolph

George V. Ruos, Jr.
 Dale W. Sanford
 Jacques L. Saul
 Melvin H. Sautter
 Joseph Scoppa, Jr.
 John A. Scott
 John E. Seissiger
 Rufus A. Seymour
 Harold G. Shaklee
 James L. Shanahan
 Arthur B. Shilan
 William D. Shippen
 Don J. Slee
 Conway J. Smith
 John K. Smola
 Bradley S. Snell
 Billy R. Standley
 Robert W. Stark
 Raymond B. Steele
 Melvin J. Steinberg
 John C. Studt
 Rudolf S. Sutter
 Robert E. Switzer
 Vernon L. Sylvester
 Richard D. Taber, Sr.
 Spencer F. Thomas
 William J. Thomas
 David S. Tolle
 John J. Tolnay
 Kyle W. Townsend
 Robert M. Tremmel
 Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
 Frank P. Turner
 James R. Vandenzelen
 Billy F. Visage
 Henry R. Vitall
 Douglas A. Wagner
 Dallas R. Walker
 Phillip C. Walker
 Charles F. Wallace
 George W. Ward
 John E. Weber, Jr.
 Joseph K. Welland
 William Weise
 Joseph J. Went
 Walter A. Weston
 Albert Whalley
 Michael E. White
 George A. Wickman
 Kenneth W. Williams
 George M. Wilson
 Charles R. Winfield
 Lewis C. Witt
 Herbert L. Wright

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald D. Amick
 James L. Anderson
 Leslie P. Day
 Ernest L. Defazio
 John H. Dubois
 Joseph E. Mullen, Jr.

Jack W. Newman
 George A. Ridgway
 Richard F. Skinner
 Harold Sobol
 Joe Vuckovich

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

OCTOBER 16, 1967.
 I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.
 JOHN W. McCORMACK,
 Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the Lord, who daily bears us up; He is our salvation.—Psalms 68: 19.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, disturbed by the demanding duties of this disruptive day and pursued by the persistent problems of this present period we would pause again at the altar of prayer to remember that Thou art God, that this is our Father's world, and to remind ourselves that though the wrong seems oft so strong Thou art the ruler yet. In Thy strength we would be made strong, with Thy wisdom we would become wise, and by Thy grace we would face the tasks of this week with confidence.

We pray for our country—for our President, our Speaker, and all the leaders of our people. Rule their hearts and direct their endeavors that law and order, justice and peace may prevail everywhere in our land. Make us mighty in moving along right paths that we may be worthy of Thy blessing and in turn become a blessing to all nations, to the glory of Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 12, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;
 H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;
 H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;
 H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;
 H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;
 H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;
 H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;
 H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine;
 H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and
 H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8629. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Sofia Dorr;

S. 552. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense;

S. 772. An act for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown;

S. 948. An act for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy;

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Mariana Mantzios;

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Dr. Brandia Don (nee Praschnick);

S. 1440. An act to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures;

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Margurita);

S. 1556. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez;

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Lliteras;

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly;

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long;

S. 1865. An act, for the relief of Bertha Iturroz Arteché;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar;

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Carlos Fernandez;

S. 2005. An act for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez;

S. 2022. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Ramirez DeEstenoz;

S. 2023. An act for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, M.D.;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle;

S. 2078. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto DeJongh;

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng;

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio Suarez-Murias;

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims;

S. 2139. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron;

S. 2167. An act for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez;

S. 2176. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez;

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke;

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida;

S. 2200. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.;

S. 2216. An act to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works;

S. 2303. An act to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate President Johnson.

On Friday, October 13, at long last he amended Executive Order No. 11246 which was issued in September of 1965 so that the order now protects women as well as other minorities. In my opinion, it ranks with Lincoln's freeing of the slaves.

I would like also to say that I hope Mr. Macy now takes this opportunity to see to it that women are not only protected in promotions but that they are given equal fringe benefits with men in the Federal civil service. It will be much more difficult to promote women than it would be to give them equal fringe benefits.

Perhaps Secretary McNamara and Postmaster General O'Brien will have time to call up those airlines who demand that their stewardesses be young, attractive, and single and notify them that they will no longer be considered for Government contracts because of the discrimination in their employment contracts. If the Cabinet members would just do this then the Education and Labor Committee could quit worrying over whether a 32-year-old stewardess is too elderly to serve your lunch in the sky, and go back to working on other important matters.

Finally, I hope that the President invites Chief Justice Warren over and casually mentions that since the Congress of the United States recognized in 1964 that women are people and that the Executive has now recognized that it really is not too much to ask that the judiciary get out of the Middle Ages and apply the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to women. But if this is too much for the judiciary then I hope they will at last realize that the cruelest and most unusual punishment has been reserved for women, when they are not recognized as people, and apply the eighth amendment.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10345, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the follow-

ing conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, SLACK, SMITH of Iowa, FLYNT, JOELSON, MAHON, BOW, LIPSCOMB, CEDERBERG, and ANDREWS of North Dakota.

INVESTIGATION OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Mr. WYMAN. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many sightings of unidentified flying objects in recent months and years that I think the time has come for a committee of the Congress to take sworn testimony on this subject. In other words, we ought to investigate whether there is anything to this.

Again and again officials pooh-poo the sightings or the stories. Yet the National Investigating Committee on Aerial Phenomena—NICAP—has accumulated a book of sightings going back more than a decade reporting many instances of dual pilot corroboration by radar and otherwise.

The most recent reported instance of UFO's was that in Colorado last week in connection with the carcass of a horse from which the brain cavity had reportedly been emptied.

I believe that the Committee on Science and Astronautics should be authorized and directed to conduct a complete and full investigation and study of unidentified flying objects with subpoena powers. It seems to me that the American people are owed a documentary analysis and cross-examination into this subject by a responsible committee of the Congress.

More important, perhaps, it should be determined whether these objects are by any possibility from foreign sources.

Should this be the case, it is apparent that major changes in U.S. space policy would be indicated. I shall introduce a resolution for the investigation of unidentified flying objects in the Congress this week, and I hope it will be implemented as soon as is reasonably possible.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE MALAGASY REPUBLIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, October 14 marks the ninth anniversary of the proclamation of the Malagasy Republic. This proud nation may be more familiar to you by its geographical name of Madagascar. It was Madagascar with which the United States opened official relations over 100 years ago. Then, as now, Madagascar was a sovereign and

important nation. While initial American contacts restricted themselves to exchanges of commodities such as skins and salt fish, in trade for exotic American products such as window glass, that trade and the accompanying relations have grown and flourished ever since. Today, the United States is the Malagasy Republic's second largest trade customer. Today, too, the Malagasy Republic is co-operating with us in man's quest for knowledge concerning space, through the location of a NASA tracking station at Imerintsatosika. How fortunate we are to have this wonderful friend in the Indian Ocean, a nation which is a true bridge between Africa and Asia. To the Malagasy President, Philibert Tsiranana, who led his country to independence, and to the Malagasy people, we offer heartiest congratulations and our best wishes on this historic occasion.

I add my personal good wishes to the Republic's able Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Louis Rakotomalala. And it is pleasing to us all that our former colleague, the able and popular gentleman from Utah, the Honorable David I. King, is the American Ambassador to the Malagasy Republic.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON S. 1985, THE FLOOD INSURANCE ACT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 1985, to amend the Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 862) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL, and Mr. SAYLOR objected; and,

under the rule, the bill was stricken from the Consent Calendar.

EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 23, 1962, RELATING TO RELIEF FOR OCCUPANTS OF CERTAIN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10583), to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10583

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes", approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before one year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits its final report to the President and to the Congress under section 4(b) of the Act of September 19, 1964 (43 U.S.C. 1394(b))".

Sec. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 709(b)) is amended by striking out "five years from the date of its enactment" and inserting in lieu thereof "one year after the date on which the Public Land Law Review Commission submits its final report to the President and to the Congress under section 4(b) of the Act of September 19, 1964 (43 U.S.C. 1394(b))".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes', approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out 'five years from the date of this Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the period ending June 30, 1971'."

"Sec. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 706(b)) is amended by striking out 'five years from the date of its enactment' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the period ending June 30, 1971'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have before us today—H.R. 10583—merely extends the provisions of the Mining Claims Occupancy Act, Public Law 87-851, until June 30, 1971.

This act, also known as the Johnson-Church Act, was initially drafted and introduced by me in 1962 to correct a serious problem which existed in the Second Congressional District of California as it related to certain unpatented mining claims. The second district is largely federally owned, either through the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land

Management, or other agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Over the decades we have had a vast number of people file or purchase mining claims in good faith, believing they were acquiring valid title to their lands. In many instances the original claims were located many, many years ago when the price of gold was reasonable and the gold prospector could make a reasonable living on a claim of this nature. There is no question in my mind but that many of these claims could have been patented at that time but were not for one reason or another.

Now, many of these claims cannot, because of the price of gold, be patented and the people who have built their homes and their lives on these claims face the loss of their improvements, their occupancy, and their homes.

It was my hope that through the introduction of the Mining Claims Occupancy Act we would enact a relief bill which would assist occupants of these unpatented claims to obtain, at fair market value, their homesites up to 5 acres of land.

The authority for Public Law 87-851 expires October 23 of this year, 1 week from today. Many people have yet to file applications under this authority. If we extend the life of the existing state from October 23, 1967, to June 30, 1971, this would permit many qualified individuals living on unpatented mining claims—who have been unable heretofore to apply for relief—to submit applications under the provisions established by the act of October 23, 1962.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10583, a bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

The act of October 23, 1962, provides that if an unpatented mining claim is determined to be invalid, and the determination is made between October 23, 1962, and October 23, 1967, the Secretary of the Interior may convey to a qualified applicant title to not more than 5 acres of the claim. To so qualify, the applicant must have been the owner of valuable improvements on the mining claim on October 23, 1962, which constituted a principal place of residence for him and his predecessors in interest for at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962. Such applicant must have made application for purchase before October 23, 1967.

The act of October 23, 1962, will expire on October 23, 1967. The purpose of H.R. 10583 is to extend the provisions of that act to June 30, 1971. Enactment of H.R. 10583 will permit those individuals relinquishing or occupying an unpatented mining claim within the terms of the act who have been unable to apply for relief under the act to do so by June 30, 1971.

It is estimated that there are in the neighborhood of 2,000 occupants of un-

patented mining claims who have failed to apply for relief under the act. An extension of the act as proposed by H.R. 10583 is a desirable and equitable program. In return, the Secretary of the Interior receives on behalf of the United States the fair market value of the 5 acres conveyed.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H.R. 10583 will insure that these lands will serve the highest public interest and public needs. At the same time, H.R. 10583 will provide equitable relief to occupants of invalid mining claims who would be subject to great hardship and forced to leave their residences.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 10583.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10583 which I regard as a valuable legal tool in providing relief to occupants of certain unpatented mining claims. This bill extends the life of the 1962 act which has proved to be equitable and worthy of extension.

This legislation will affect several thousand residents of unpatented mining claims in the western United States including the Black Hills of South Dakota. In many of the old mining districts, it has been customary for miners to live on their claims. Often when occupancy began, the claims were valid and often productive. However, during the years many claims were worked out, or the economic situation changed, but the claimant continued to occupy and live on the claim while it could no longer qualify for a mineral patent.

Other situations involved purchasing a mining claim as a place of residence by people who did not fully understand the restrictions and limitations on using unpatented mining claims.

It is important to note that the land is not given to the applicants. They must pay the fair market value less the value of improvements on the land, with consideration given to other equities. Fee title need not be granted, but a lesser interest instead.

Enactment of this bill will extend the life of the existing statute until June 30, 1971. It will permit many individuals residing on certain unpatented mining claims to submit applications for relief under the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962.

Therefore, I would urge support of this necessary legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2121, to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims, an identical Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2121

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes", approved October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 701), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

SEC. 2. Section 6(b) of such Act of October 23, 1962 (30 U.S.C. 706(b)), is amended by striking out "five years from the date of its enactment" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period ending June 30, 1971".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10583) was laid on the table.

DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES HOLDS CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE PAWNEE INDIAN TRIBE, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5910) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described lands and improvements thereon, embraced in the Pawnee school and agency reserve, and in four cemetery sites, comprising seven hundred twenty-six and three one-hundredths acres, more or less, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to valid existing rights-of-way, and subject to the right of the United States to use, without compensation, a tract of land comprising approximately five and forty-six one-hundredths acres, together with facilities located thereon or hereafter installed, which are now used by the United States Public Health Service:

Indian Meridian, Oklahoma

Township 19 north, range 5 east, section 16, southwest quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter.

Township 21 north, range 5 east, section 18, southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 22 north, range 4 east, section 32, southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 22 north, range 5 east, section 20, northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter; section 32, east half, east half west half; section 33, west half.

excepting therefrom the following lands:

(a) Lot 1, comprising 88.43 acres, more or less, located in the west half east half and east half west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office plat approved November 5, 1907, which has been conveyed to the city of Pawnee;

(b) Lot 2, comprising 12.68 acres, more or less, and lot 3, comprising 12.86 acres, more or

less, both located in the west half east half and east half west half section 32, as shown on General Land Office supplemental plat approved February 4, 1920, which has been conveyed to the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention;

(c) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the northeast quarter section 32 conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particularly described in quitclaim deed dated May 31, 1957, recorded in book 2, page 610 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records;

(d) The surface of 20 acres, more or less, but not the minerals therein, located in the southeast quarter and southeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, conveyed to the city of Pawnee, and more particularly described in quitclaim deed dated July 15, 1960, recorded in book 4, page 377 of the Pawnee County, Oklahoma, records.

SEC. 2. If at any time title to the surface of the land referred to in paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 1 of this Act reverts to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), as amended (25 U.S.C. 293a), the title shall be held in trust for the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike the words "west quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter," and insert in lieu thereof the words "west quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill will make possible a program of tribal development and improvement for the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, on lands which have long been dedicated to uses beneficial to this great Indian tribe.

I commend my colleague, the Honorable PAGE BELCHER, for sponsoring this needed and just bill, and am proud to join in supporting it and urging its approval.

It is hoped the other body will join speedily in approving this bill in the form which the tribe supports and the House committee has recommended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANCELING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND IRRIGATION ASSESSMENTS CHARGEABLE AGAINST LANDS OF THE FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7820) to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against

lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1499) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I have no intention of objecting—I should like to ask some member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, since this is the first of four bills of a similar nature, as a matter of history for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whether these bills entail any expense to the Federal Government?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I shall be happy to answer the question.

These bills, which are all noncontroversial, do not entail any cost at all to the Federal Government. The cost of the medals is to be borne by the sponsoring organizations.

Mr. GROSS. And all costs are reimbursable to the Federal Government?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct; every cent of cost must be paid by the sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as I assured the gentleman from Iowa, this bill, and the three which follow it on the Consent Calendar are all noncontroversial measures to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike certain commemorative medals to be furnished at cost—without any expense to the Federal Government—to nonprofit organizations or to official State agencies, for the purpose of promoting important anniversaries such as the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Mississippi to the Union, the 200th anniversary of the city of San Diego, Calif., and the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette along the Mississippi river.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been handling such legislation over a period of some years without any controversy arising in connection with any of the medals which we have approved. In all cases they have passed the House and passed the Congress without objection.

Many years ago, in the 1930's, the States and nonprofit organizations sponsoring important anniversaries, such as the four covered by these medals, would come to Congress for the passage of leg-

islation to authorize the striking of commemorative coins—half dollars in all cases. A great many commemorative coin issues were authorized by Congress in those years. Those Members of the House today who remember the late Congressman John J. Cochran, a predecessor of mine from St. Louis, will remember the anger with which he denounced this whole business of commemorative coins as a "racket." Some of the coins authorized in the 1930's which sold then at a premium of perhaps 100 percent, for \$1, say, for a 50-cent coin, are now quoted in the numismatic market in the hundreds of dollars. I am sure we do not want to go back to the commemorative coin as a means of demonstrating the Federal Government's approval of or participation in some of these outstanding State and organizational anniversaries.

The commemorative medals are national medals as defined in the Revised Statutes. They are widely accepted and contribute greatly to the success of some of these anniversary observances. We were very proud to have a commemorative national medal marking the 200th anniversary of St. Louis several years ago and I am sure the States and organizations sponsoring the four medals which we are considering this afternoon will be very proud of them when they are struck and made available for public sale.

We held hearings on the subject of commemorative coins and commemorative medals in my subcommittee in 1963, and I think we established a good record at that time to demonstrate the value of the commemorative medal in preference to commemorative coins. Since that time we have approved quite a number of these bills and in almost each instance the legislation resulted in the striking of very handsome medals which were highly prized by those sponsoring the anniversary the medals commemorated and also by citizens participating in those observances. There has been a growing interest in such medals among coin hobbyists. So I think a very worthwhile purpose is served by the passage of this kind of legislation.

Again, I repeat that the medals will not cost the Treasury of the United States a single cent. All costs of striking the medals must be paid by the sponsoring organizations before any work whatsoever may be done in the mint to produce the medals. So this is not going to add anything to the cost of operating the mint.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if there is to be any silver taken from the U.S. Treasury to be used in the striking of these medals?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to state that the materials for these medals are not specified in the legislation. It is up to

the Secretary of the Treasury to decide in each case what materials may be used. Usually these commemorative medals are made of bronze.

Mr. ASPINALL. That does not exactly answer my question. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not any silver will be used?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I ask the gentleman to repeat his question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will there be any silver taken from the U.S. Treasury in the striking of these medallions?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I can tell the gentleman, again, is that the materials are not specified in the bills. We have depended upon the Treasury not to use strategic materials in short supply.

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understand the gentleman correctly, inasmuch as silver is one of our strategic materials at the present time, there will be no silver used; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I can say, again, is that the Secretary of the Treasury will have the power to decide that. I believe that if silver is considered a strategic material in scarce supply, he would probably decide against its use in these medals. It would depend, I am sure, on how many of the medals the sponsors proposed striking in silver. If the number were very small, the Secretary might feel differently than if the sponsors wanted the bulk of the medals to be made of silver.

It is my feeling—and I mean to so advise the Secretary—that if silver is used at all, in any of the medals, it be silver acquired at market price and not on the basis of the original cost to the Treasury of silver now in Treasury stocks. That silver is now worth far more than the Treasury paid for it years ago, and far more than the \$1.29-plus monetary value of silver.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to state this: I am not going to object, but inasmuch as our silver is in short supply and if we are not careful the U.S. Treasury is going to run out of its stockpile of such metal, it seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury must take this into account.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would certainly like to reaffirm what the gentleman said. The gentleman raised an interesting question, and the answer was not fully satisfactory. I want to join with the gentleman in protest to the use of any silver in any of these medallions because, as the gentleman from Colorado well stated, it is in short supply and these medallions can be made of other material.

Mr. ASPINALL. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], for their excellent work in bringing this bill, H.R. 1499, to the floor of the House.

I know I speak for the other members

of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission in expressing deep appreciation to them and to all members of the Banking and Currency Committee for their unanimous support for the proposal.

As has already been explained, this legislation provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States.

It was to mark these same historic explorations that the Congress last year passed Public Law 89-187, creating the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission and charged it to "develop and execute suitable plans" for a national celebration.

As an original sponsor of the legislation creating the Commission, and now as a member of the Commission, I am pleased to report to this body that the mandate of the Congress is being carried out far beyond original expectations.

Under the vigorous leadership of the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. James C. Windham, of Milwaukee, the Commission has developed plans for a 5-year celebration from 1968 to 1973 in honor of the missionary-explorer. The years coincide with the arrival of Father Marquette in U.S. territory in 1668 until his death here in 1673.

The committee report which accompanies this legislation details some of the projects which now are underway.

In these efforts, the medallion plays an important part. It will be a tangible symbol of the celebration and a treasured memento for those who take part in activities connected with the observance.

Further, the sale of these medallions to participants, collectors, and the public will help generate funds to carry out the purposes of the Commission.

Just as the Commission itself has received its funds entirely from private donations, so the medallion would be struck at no cost to the Federal Government. The Commission is prepared to furnish security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint for full payment of the cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

There is not even one penny of taxpayer's money involved here.

What is involved is an opportunity for the House to reaffirm its earlier unanimous support for a national observance of this landmark in North American history.

In doing so, it will once again demonstrate a lively and constructive interest in the historic past of our Nation, a past which has been filled with the noble lives and courageous deeds like those of Father Jacques Marquette.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous consent of the Congress to this measure, H.R. 1499.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in com-

memoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America (which anniversary will be held 1968-1973), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission not more than two hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1973. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture: including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, strike "manufacture;" and insert "manufacture;".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill and the following bills pertaining to the striking of medals.

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

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10105) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi, which anniversary will be celebrated in 1967 and 1968, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi not more than one hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi subject to the approval of the Secretary

of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the board in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1968. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such Board.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this year on December 10, the State of Mississippi will observe the 150th anniversary of her admission to the Union. On this date in 1817 an act of Congress admitted her as this Nation's 20th State.

The history of Mississippi, first as a territory and then as a State, is a long and colorful one. Beginning in 1540 with the explorations of Hernando De Soto, who was probably the first white man to enter the area, the modern day history of the State begins. Subsequently, the State passed through periods of Spanish rule, French rule, English rule, and then Spanish rule again. Mississippi was granted the status of a territory in 1798 by act of Congress.

The State of Mississippi did not observe the centennial of her admission as a State due to World War I, and it is for this reason that the State is making especial mention of her sesquicentennial.

The issuance of a commemorative medal will be one of the major events in the State during the celebration. In addition, a commemorative stamp will be placed on sale in Natchez, the territorial capitol of the State, on December 11, 1967, with appropriate ceremonies. Also, a special edition of the Journal of Mississippi History will be issued and a film will be produced depicting the history of the State as a territory and as a member of the Union. One of the very important features of the sesquicentennial will be the construction of a new archives building, funds for which were appropriated by a special session of the legislature in 1966.

Along with the introduction of my bill in the House, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND introduced an identical bill in the Senate. The introduction of the two bills came about through the cooperation of the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, the Sesquicentennial Commission, and the Mississippi Numismatic Society. The bill will authorize the mint to strike the medals, the design of which will be determined by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board. Present plans call for the medals to feature on one side the great seal of the State of Mississippi as it first appeared, and on the reverse side the medal will carry the image of Mississippi's first Governor, David Holmes.

Few States could surpass my State in having such a glorious and colorful his-

tory, and few States have the potential for development that Mississippi does. I feel that the issuance of a commemorative medal would enhance this very important celebration in the history of the State.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10160) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding in 1919 of the American Legion, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Legion not more than one million medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Legion subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the American Legion in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1969. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Legion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 10160 to authorize commemorative medals marking the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, I am sure the House of Representatives will want to support this bill unanimously as a means of expressing our admiration for the gallant men who founded the American Legion, and for the millions of American servicemen and servicewomen who have joined this outstanding organization and contributed to its tremendous effectiveness.

The American Legion, the largest organization of veterans of our armed services, was founded in Paris, France, March 15-17, 1919. It has grown to a membership of 2,600,000 in 16,500 posts in this country and abroad.

Born in the crucible of war but dedicated to peace, the American Legion has been an integral part of the fabric of American life throughout most of the 20th century. From the beginning its objectives have included the strengthening of our way of life, maintenance of the national security, care for the children of America, and aid to those who have

fallen in battle and to their widows and orphans.

The American Legion helped to conceive and pilot through Congress the broad structure of compensation, pension, and medical programs which now guard the safety, security and health of the wounded and the disabled. The crowning achievement of this effort was the GI bill for veterans of World War II. This milestone in the history of veterans affairs was sponsored by the Legion and approved by the Congress so that the men and women of World War II would not return to a nation unprepared to receive them as it was to receive the victors of World War I. Extension of this far-sighted program to Korean veterans and later to veterans of Vietnam was supported by the Legion.

Through its rehabilitation program the Legion stands watch over the rights and fair treatment of all veterans and their dependents—with particular concern for the service-connected disabled and for the families of those who gave their lives.

Early in the life of the organization it recognized that the threat to the security of our country had not ended with World War I. Through the years it has worked diligently to alert the American people to the fact that communism poses a serious threat to the safety of the Nation.

The Legion recommended against the neglect which the armed services experienced in the years between the two world wars. Consistently it urged that all branches of the military services be modernized. In the years since the end of World War II it has continued to urge a strong defense and to support the efforts of the armed services to maintain a state of readiness which would both deter aggressors and enable America to defend itself if attacked.

While concerned with matters affecting the welfare of the country in difficult times, the Legion has never forgotten that the future of the Nation depends upon its younger citizens. Its child welfare program for nearly 50 years has demonstrated concern for America's children. With thousands of volunteer workers in the Legion and in its auxiliary—and with the broad principles developed in the field of child care—it is recognized as one of the leading non-professional private organizations in this area. Through the years the organization has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in direct assistance to children, and in addition has secured passage of enlightened legislation at both State and National levels for the benefit of all the children of America. The Legion's Boys State and Boys Nation programs teach better citizenship to thousands of boys each year. The organization seeks to build character and desirable habits in young Americans through its sponsorship of over 4,000 Boy Scout units across the Nation and a quarter of a million American youth learn the rules of the game of life while playing American Legion baseball each year.

As plans go forward to celebrate its 50th anniversary the American Legion

continues as a strong, vigilant, and responsible organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to maintenance of law and order and service to the community, State, and Nation, an organization which has contributed immeasurably to the advance of freedom.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN DIEGO 200TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13212) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the San Diego Two-Hundredth Anniversary, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization for the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the San Diego community, national medals in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Not more than five hundred thousand of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13212, which would authorize the U.S. Mint to strike up to 500,000 medals commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego in 1769.

It should be emphasized that the medals are to be produced and furnished at no expense to the Federal Government. Full costs will be borne by San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., the nonprofit organization that has been set up to plan the city's bicentennial celebration.

The medals will carry an appropriate design, in keeping with the dignified and historic nature of the year-long observances. San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., hopes to raise at least \$50,000 from the public sale of the medals, and all proceeds will be applied toward the overall budget of nearly \$1 million for anniversary year activities.

Under the legislation before the House, the Secretary of the Treasury, may not order any of the San Diego medals stamped until he has solid assurances that all the bills, including labor, material, dies, use of machinery and

overhead, will be met by the San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc.

Time is of the essence, since the 200th anniversary is less than 15 months away. I would urge my colleagues to give swift approval to H.R. 13212, so that the work of producing the medals may proceed on schedule.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with much gratitude and pride that I commend this body for the passage of the bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

There is not much doubt that the faith in the Supreme Being, upon which this pioneer California community was founded, was in large part responsible for its tremendous growth, and more particularly for the high caliber of that progress.

The southwesternmost tip of our country enjoys more than a pleasant year-round climate; it includes the finest in culture, research, education, job opportunities, and residential advantages, and I am pleased that its completion of two centuries of existence shall have lasting memorials for the future.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 years, my home city of San Diego will celebrate her 200th anniversary. It will be a proud and auspicious occasion for all San Diegans.

Vital in the planning for our celebration is the measure, H.R. 13212, which we are considering today. It authorizes the U.S. Mint to strike commemorative medals for the anniversary. There will be no cost to the Government for the bill specifically states that all expenses for the production of the medals will be borne by San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., the nonprofit corporation in charge of preparations for the yearlong celebration in 1969.

San Diego is California's oldest city, and as such is the cradle of California's rich and glorious history. San Diego's site was claimed for Spain in 1542 by Adm. Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, a Portuguese navigator who first came to the New World with Cortes. It was not until 1602, however, that the site received its name. In that year, Don Sebastian Vizcaino, one of the most famous of the west coast explorers, anchored off Los Guijarros in the shadow of beautiful Point Loma. Vizcaino was delighted with the harbor, pronouncing it probably "the best to be found in all the South Sea." He named the port and its future city after the canon San Diego de Alcala, whose feast day came 2 days after he arrived on November 10, 1602.

The actual colonization of San Diego and California began in 1769 with the founding of the first mission by Father Junipero Serra. From that first mission was built a chain of 21 missions up the California coast, each a day's journey apart. By 1850, San Diego had become a large settlement of more than 500 foreigners, 10 stores and 88 houses, and some 2,000 Indians. It became a center for hide collecting and a base for whalers.

Today, San Diego is no longer the quiet Spanish settlement of the past. Its industrial and cultural development symbolizes the tremendous growth of the

Golden State itself. San Diego in 1967 is a great seaport, a vital naval base, an important training center for sailors and marines, and an aircraft manufacturing center. Indeed, this city and its harbor have become, in the words of its founder, Vizcaino, "the best to be found in all the South Sea."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the House give speedy, unanimous approval of this legislation. The medals that will be provided through this measure will provide a lasting memento of San Diego's vital role in California and American history.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13048) to make certain technical amendments in the Library Services and Construction Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303 of the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. 355e-2) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that the Federal share for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be 100 per centum".

Sec. 2. Section 403 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968".

Sec. 3. Paragraph (5) of section 404(a) of such Act is amended by inserting "second" immediately before "preceding".

Sec. 4. Section 413 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967," and inserting "June 30, 1968,".

Sec. 5. Paragraph (2) of section 414(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "State plans for".

Sec. 6. Subsection (d) of section 504 of such Act is amended by inserting "acquisition," immediately before "expansion".

Sec. 7. The amendments made by the first section and section 3 of this Act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PERKINS. 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. 308]		
Anderson, Tenn.	Fountain, Tenn.	O'Neill, Mass.
Annunzio	Fulton, Tenn.	Patman
Barrett	Gardner	Rarick
Bates	Grover	Rees
Battin	Gude	Resnick
Boggs	Hagan	Reuss
Bolton	Hébert	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brasco	Herlong	Roberts
Brock	Horton	Ronan
Broomfield	Jonas	Rooney, Pa.
Button	Jones, Mo.	Roush
Cabell	Jones, N.C.	Sandman
Cleveland	Kluczynski	St. Onge
Cramer	Kupferman	Smith, N.Y.
Curtis	Landrum	Stephens
Delaney	McCarthy	Stubblefield
Derwinski	McClory	Talcott
Diggs	Madden	Tunney
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Everett	Morse, Mass.	Vander Jagt
Fallon	Morton	Williams, Miss.
Fino	Murphy, N.Y.	Willis
Foley	Nix	Young
	Olsen	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, providing for certain technical and clarifying amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act. Initially, may I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], for his continued interest and leadership with regard to legislation affecting libraries. The legislative record of the Select Subcommittee on Education during this session of Congress is quite impressive and the bill, H.R. 13048, is yet another example of the fine bipartisan work of that subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in legislation to expand and strengthen library resources and services is of long standing. As one of the original sponsors of the Library Services and Construction Act, I have followed very carefully developments in the program. In each State of the Union, there has been significant progress in bringing to the American people in large urban areas and in remote rural districts a broad range of library services. In my own State of Kentucky, for example, developments have been truly exciting. Under the leadership of Miss Margaret Willis, our State librarian, the number of legally established libraries in Kentucky has arisen almost 800 percent since the Library Services and Construction Act was enacted in 1957. The success of Kentucky's effort in opening the world of the library has been due in large part to Miss Willis' consistent, good and dedicated work. And I offer my own State's achievements as evidence of what has been accomplished under the Library Services and Construction Act.

In 1956 there were only 14 legally established libraries in Kentucky. In 1966 there were 110. In 1956 no county in

Kentucky had a library tax, but by 1966, 27 counties have voted or petitioned for such a tax. In 1956, there were no multi-county library federations. In 1966 there were 16 multicounty federations comprising 84 libraries in 71 counties. Local support for public library services has increased over 100 percent in this 10-year period. State support has increased over 500 percent. And Federal support, which was nonexistent in 1956, amounted to over \$400,000 in 1966. By June 30, 1966, 96 new walk-in type bookmobiles had been purchased to provide library services to rural areas. There are now over half a million books available through the State bookmobiles. Mr. Speaker, I could continue citing accomplishments. But perhaps our State librarian best summarized the changes which have occurred in Kentucky because of the Library Services and Construction Act program, when she said:

When one looks back to fiscal 1956, one can see tangible evidence of great progress in public library services in Kentucky.

That Kentucky's response to the Library Services and Construction Act has been enthusiastic and wholehearted is beyond doubt. The statistics contained in the committee report accompanying H.R. 13048—House Report No. 744—show that what has happened in Kentucky has happened and is happening across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, progress has been great under this legislation, and the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048 will facilitate even greater progress in the future. The purposes of the amendments are threefold:

First, to clarify the language of the Library Services and Construction Act;

Second, to establish uniformity in the four titles of the act; and

Third, to carry out the congressional intent of the 1966 amendments.

Four of the amendments proposed are, without question, minor and technical in nature. These propose, first, that the Federal share under title III of the act for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be set at 100 percent, thus making the provision identical with provisions in the remaining three titles of the act; second, that the maintenance of effort requirement for part A of title IV of the act be perfected to make it consistent with maintenance of effort provisions in other portions of the act; third, to clarify the purpose of part B of title IV providing for library services to the physically handicapped; and fourth, to broaden the definition of "construction" to include the acquisition of buildings, thus making the construction authority consistent with other Federal construction programs such as the Higher Education Facilities Act and Public Law 815.

The major amendments in H.R. 13048 propose the continuation of 100 percent Federal financing through fiscal year 1968 for title III of the act, providing for interlibrary cooperation to bring more efficient and effective library services to all people, and title IV, providing for specialized State library services, for persons in State institutions such as

correctional schools and prisons, and for handicapped persons. The 1966 amendments authorizing titles III and IV provide for 100 percent financing only through fiscal year 1967. For that fiscal year, however, only \$1 million of a \$13 million authorization was appropriated and funds were not made available until just shortly before the close of the fiscal year. The amount appropriated was earmarked for planning, thus no program operations could be undertaken. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, without the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048, that the titles III and IV programs will be severely handicapped, and in some States actually not undertaken at all, because matching funds will not be available in fiscal year 1968.

As one State librarian advised the subcommittee:

The argument for the amendments is brief but to the point. The majority of the States are ready with their plans for the implementation of the programs under Titles III and IV but are now unable to obtain the required matching funds in fiscal year 1968.

In connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker, a survey was taken of the 50 State library agencies for the purpose of ascertaining whether the existing matching provisions in titles III and IV were satisfactory. Only two States responded that matching funds were available to meet the existing requirements. One State indicated some funds were available for matching. Forty-seven States replied that there was a real need for 100 percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1968, with such statements as: "need is desperate"; "cannot participate without 100 percent for title III"; "will be unable to handle III and IV-A"; and "State provides no matching funds for 1967-1969 budget."

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the problem we are discussing here is neither one of public apathy nor reluctance to comply with the matching requirements. Rather, it has been the lack of opportunity on the part of people who earnestly desire continuing progress in library services to adjust their plans in the time provided. Across the Nation the States have shown in meaningful action their wish to accept their share of the cost of library programs. There can be no doubt that this acceptance will continue to manifest itself if possible are allowed the necessary time to respond.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13048 presents to the House an excellent opportunity to respond to the requests of library administrators at the State and local level. In the committee's response to these concerns—as embodied in H.R. 13048—we are not suggesting any additional appropriations by the Federal Government, nor are we authorizing any new programs. We are simply perfecting and making more efficient a series of programs which have already proven their value, and of which we can all be proud. In my judgment there is no Federal program under which funds have been more wisely expended and produced greater results than the library program. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the bill, H.R. 13048. The bill was reported by the subcommittee and the full committee

unanimously and it is sponsored by members on both sides of the aisle.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the bill will be overwhelmingly approved by the House today.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1967, H.R. 13048.

Although the several amendments proposed in this legislation are relatively minor and of a technical nature, they reaffirm our support of this important educational endeavor.

Almost 27 million books and library materials were purchased under State plan programs with Federal, State, and local funds since the inception of the library services program in 1957. In addition, significant construction of 719 new library facilities has been undertaken both in rural and urban areas. Public library service was extended for the first time to 13 million Americans, and 75 million people received new or improved service.

In my own State of New York, progress has been commendable. The State has received some \$10.7 million in Federal funds. This money has assisted with the establishment of some 14 additional library systems in the State, so that there are now 22 library systems encompassing all 62 counties and serving over 98 percent of the State's population. New York's Deputy Commissioner of Education reported that:

In the 10 years since the passage of the Library Services Act, there has been an almost total transformation of New York's public library landscape. It is the result of an uncommonly common effort by local, State and Federal agencies to achieve the goals of modern library service in the face of conditions of environment that are changing at a rate faster than in any previous time in history.

Because the world and the conditions in which we live are changing so rapidly, it is even more important today than ever before that we make available the materials and the facilities our citizens need to read about the past, to understand the present and to realize better the future. Our efforts to assist education are less than wholehearted unless we also encourage and promote reading, a love of scholarship and a respect for the great writings of others—unless we bring to the children of the ghetto a broader horizon.

As amended in 1966, the Library Services and Construction Act consists of four titles. Title I provides matching funds for acquisition of books and other materials, equipment, salaries, and other operating expenses. Title II authorizes matching funds for public library construction as part of the State plan. New last year, title III provides money for the establishment and maintenance of cooperative networks of libraries at local, State, regional, or interstate levels. Part A of title IV makes available funds for a program of State institutional library services for penal institutions, orphanages, hospitals, and so forth. Finally, part B of title IV provides a program of library services to the handicapped.

The legislation passed last year authorized funds for these programs through 1971. The measure before us today includes a number of simple amendments that will improve the quality of services available under the act.

The first amendment corrects what appears to have been an oversight in early legislation so that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will be eligible for 100 percent Federal financing under all grant titles of the act. The Virgin Islands and Samoa are already covered specifically under the act.

Second, the base year for measuring State maintenance of effort requirements under the program of State institutional library services is changed from the preceding fiscal year to the second preceding fiscal year. This will enable more realistic planning as States cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period and their annual programs must be submitted prior to that date.

The third amendment would give State library administrative agencies the authority to acquire used buildings for renovation into suitable library facilities. This amendment broadens the definition of "construction" as presently in title II to include the necessary authority to alter existing structures.

The final major series of amendments would extend 100-percent Federal financing for a second fiscal year to programs under titles III and IV-A and IV-B—in interlibrary cooperation, State institutional library services, and library services for the handicapped. Fiscal year 1967 was the initial year of these programs and the Federal contribution for that period was fixed at 100 percent. However, appropriations for these titles were made only in April of 1967 and the very limited sums available were only for planning. Thus, fiscal year 1968 will, hopefully, be the first year of real operation for these three important programs, and this amendment would allow the States the benefit of the 100-percent Federal financing that they were not able to utilize last year.

This change, I believe, is essential and important to carry out the intent of the Congress.

I should like to stress that the legislation before us today makes no authorizations or appropriations. The Library Services and Construction Act amendments of 1966 made authorizations for fiscal years 1967 through 1971.

These total \$275 million for title I—library services, \$300 million for title II—construction, \$50 million for title III—in interlibrary cooperation, \$50 million for title IV-A—State institutional library services, and \$25 million for title IV-B—library services for the handicapped. Members may also be interested in funds expended for this program prior to its expansion in 1964. From 1957 through 1964, when the act covered only library services for rural areas, a total of \$60 million was authorized. In 1965 funds were also made available to urban areas and title II, dealing with library construction, was added. Authorizations in 1965 and 1966 totaled \$50 million for rural and urban library services and \$60 million for rural and urban library construction.

Although H.R. 13048 is not the appro-

appropriate legislation in which to make these changes, I think it is useful to point out at this time that the appropriations request for all titles of the Library Services and Construction Act for fiscal year 1968 is less than half of the amount authorized. The request totals \$68 million while authorizations were made in the amount of \$114 million.

In the last fiscal year appropriations were only \$12 million less than the authorizations. I believe that this is a most unfortunate example of the upside-down priorities that have characterized the budget requests in some of our most meaningful and most urgent domestic programs.

Nevertheless, by passing the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1967 today, we will be reaffirming our commitment to the effective partnership between Federal, State, and local governments in providing progressive and much-needed library services and facilities for all Americans.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] and say that I heartily support passage of this legislation.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I rise in support of this legislation, but it is not quite clear to me, so far as the financial responsibility portion is concerned, and I have studied the bill and the report in detail.

I would like to know if I have the proper concept in determining that this will, for example, prolong for an additional year the 100-percent participation in bills III by the Federal Government—which is hardly a basis for a partnership—only in the first year of its association with any State, as far as the establishment of library facilities in rural and metropolitan areas are concerned?

Mr. REID of New York. In response to the gentleman, it is my understanding that this just changes two titles, titles III and IV. To recapitulate on the matching formula, under the present statute, titles I and II, the Federal share could not exceed 66 percent, or fall below 33 1/3 percent. In titles III and IV the Federal share is 50 percent, except in fiscal year 1967, and, as amended today, the Federal share for these two titles is 100 percent for fiscal 1968 as well.

Mr. HALL. In light of that, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. REID of New York. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. In title III it does extend through fiscal year 1968 to States that are participating for the first time at 100 percent matching level, is that not correct?

Mr. REID of New York. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALL. If that is true, even though I believe the gentleman said we have not appropriated less than 50 percent of what has been authorized and this is of course effective management, per se—then it would actually take from the assets of the Treasury for those who would in the future come under the new deadline authorized, but being precluded by the old fiscal year 1967 deadline, is that not a fair assumption?

Mr. REID of New York. I think that is true. I would merely point out again that the totals amount to only \$68 million whereas the authorization was for \$114 million. So there are some funds that the Congress very clearly indicated should be authorized in support of libraries.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that. Would the gentleman tell me whether this additional extension which comes out of the assets of the Treasury are budgeted for the fiscal year 1968 or not?

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, they are.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation making technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act, and I wholeheartedly approve of the act. This legislation has been constructive in every sense of the word.

Here we have a Federal program which is structured in such a manner that State and local administrative and fiscal responsibility is encouraged and enhanced by its operation. It operates not by the dictate of some Federal official, but through a State agency which is responsible for the formulation and execution of a State plan. The State plan varies from State to State, reflecting the considerable differences in needs, priorities, and resources among the States. This is a program which requires matching of Federal funds by the States and localities, and in three of the four titles—titles I, II, and IV—the percentage of State and local funds required for matching is graduated from 33 percent in the poorest States to 66 percent in the wealthiest States. This arrangement means that the most help is given where it is most needed.

I hope my colleagues will forgive me when I point out that the broad outline of this legislation—which they are about to approve unanimously because it is a very successful and useful program—is almost exactly that which I proposed earlier this year for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Quie amendment.

This is not an accidental coincidence, because all of our more successful Federal programs in education and in many other fields involve these principles: State and local administration, often through a State-devised plan of operation; State and local financial responsibility for a share of the cost; and Federal aid based in some measure upon fiscal ability of the States. When these

principles have been abandoned—as they have in so much of the Great Society legislation—we find a serious erosion of Federal-State relations, a slackening of State and local financial support for worthwhile institutions and programs, and a vast increase in redtape, confusion, and expense stemming from the attempt to run local programs out of a Federal bureau in Washington.

I hope that the example of such successful programs as library services and construction, vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and activities under the National Defense Education Act will not forever be lost to the present administration, and I trust that they have been rediscovered by the Congress.

The success of the Library Services Act in Minnesota is typical of the Nation. In the 8 fiscal years from 1956 to 1964 the number of library volumes in the 21 participating counties grew from 475,000 to over 925,000, and library services were made available to 100,000 rural residents who had not previously enjoyed this necessity. With only \$200,000 in State and Federal funds, the support for public libraries in these 21 counties increased from \$500,000 to \$1,650,000. This demonstrates how a true incentive program can work to increase the level of local support for vital institutions such as libraries and schools.

We have made further progress in our State since the act was amended to extend its benefits to urban areas and to improve the State library system. Our very able director of library services, Mr. Hannis Smith, of the State department of education, has made an excellent start in implementing the title III provisions for interlibrary cooperation—despite limited Federal funding—in a project involving 23 cooperating libraries across the State. Altogether, the 1964 and 1966 additions to the act have benefited some 2 1/2 million citizens of Minnesota.

In conclusion, I hope that in the future, as we deal with related matters, we apply the lessons of this act in devising sound Federal-State provisions which contribute to a truly creative federalism. And I would also hope that we shall be able to fully fund the act so that the Federal commitment is more nearly commensurate to the vital contribution of modern libraries to our entire society.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, to make technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill, as has been explained, only makes technical amendments to the act to correct certain inadvertent errors and to facilitate its smooth administration. It does not authorize additional funding or add to the cost of the act. The major amendment would be to provide for 100-percent Federal funding of the title III "Interlibrary cooperation" section during fiscal year 1968. This is consistent with the intent of Congress that the first year of this program should not require State

matching in order to allow time for necessary State legislative action. Since the funding really began very late in fiscal 1967, fiscal 1968 is the first year of the program.

I shall insert at this point in my remarks a statement in support of this amendment from our very able director of library services for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, W. Lyle Eberhart:

In recognition of needed additional library services through the states, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-511) made provision for three new programs: cooperative library services; state institutional library services; and library services to the physically handicapped. These new programs were to be 100% federally supported in their first year of operation.

Because of budgetary contingencies, only planning moneys were received by the states in fiscal 1967. H.R. 9518, in line with the original intent of P.L. 89-511, would provide 100% federal matching for these new programs during fiscal 1968, their first operational year.

In Wisconsin, and in many other states in which these programs are entirely new to the state library agency, 100% federal funding for fiscal 1968 is of key importance to demonstrate to state government, other state departments, and participating local agencies the need for and value of these library programs. Wisconsin's biennial executive budget for 1967-1969 was already set before proper consideration could be made for matching expenditures for these programs. To secure supplemental appropriations will require prior demonstration of the worth of new programs.

Each of these new library programs, in Wisconsin and many other states, requires the understanding and support of several departments of state government and of other educational agencies for most fruitful programming. It is my belief that H.R. 9518 will serve to implement the original Congressional intent with these library programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to review the significance of this exemplary act, because hopefully the Federal budgetary situation will ease to the point that, in the next few years, we can begin to provide really adequate funding for meaningful and vital domestic programs. Unfortunately, even as we support library services programs, we tend to dismiss their importance with high-sounding cliches. We take the existence of libraries for granted and tend to think of them simply as "a nice thing to have." Libraries are often thought of in the same terms as museums, art galleries, or community drama groups. Only upon closer examination do we begin to see that an adequate and modern library system is, in truth, an economic resource of critical importance.

And in saying this, I do not mean to imply that the library as a cultural resource is unimportant or, for that matter, that drama, music, art, and the other cultural pursuits are not vital to our society. They are vital, and in their cultivation, we find an essential function of mankind.

But the other great work of a modern library system is in the organization, storage, and retrieval of knowledge. Without this work, a technological and industrial society could not long exist as we know it. Moreover, the task of compiling knowledge in a usable form has

become increasingly difficult and complex, and increasingly vital, as the staggering pace of information growth accelerates.

My point is that we are not dealing here with legislation which is helpful to a "good cause," but rather, with legislation which is likely to become a matter of national urgency. I hope that in the years just ahead, we shall come to view library services more in this light.

Wisconsin is making extremely good use of the relatively small amount of Federal funds available under this act. In fiscal 1966, we received \$528,780 for library services under title I, which was matched by \$243,181 in State funds and \$313,076 in Federal funds. I am pleased to note that we overmatched by more than \$54,000. We received \$640,403 for construction which we matched with \$608,189 in State and local funds. We are strengthening and developing multi-county library services, extending services to inner-city disadvantaged areas and to migrants, and making progress in relieving the serious shortage of trained librarians.

In the Sixth Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, there is an interesting experimental program aimed at strengthening book collections, promoting areawide cooperation among libraries, and providing professional reference and training services. We shall need a great deal more such work in order to make necessary knowledge available to users in every part of the Nation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in acting upon this relatively minor and technical bill today, I hope we shall remind ourselves of the very striking accomplishments under this act and of the need for moving ahead in this exciting and necessary work of information storage and retrieval. One of the very great satisfactions of my work on the Committee on Education and Labor is the opportunity to look ahead at some of the emerging needs that will become more and more challenging in a vigorous and growing nation. The provision of first class library services is one such need. I am pleased that we are approaching it through a soundly conceived Federal support program which is administered through and by the States with a high degree of State and local financial participation.

In conclusion, I only wish that the Congress and the administration would apply the lessons of this pattern of administration under this act to other areas of national concern.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important legislation.

It was my privilege to sponsor the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966. I was privileged to join with a very distinguished group of previous sponsors of this legislation. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], has been the forefront in sponsoring legislation as early as 1950 to bring some meaningful assistance to the

libraries of America, and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], sponsored the first legislation that brought the urban areas of America into this Federal aid program. All of us have worked together and have been able to bring some very meaningful assistance to the libraries of this country.

The bill before us today came out of our committee by a unanimous vote.

I know of no greater investment the American people can make than an investment in their libraries. As the gentleman from New York said a moment ago, the very complex world that we live in, we need these libraries to bring enlightenment and the resources of such library material to the people of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to that of Members who are supporting this legislation.

This legislation started out brand new a few years ago but when we changed the formula for participation in Federal benefits from the 10,000 population community so that any community could participate, however, at that time there was an oversight which I believe is being corrected now. We allowed for maintenance and for materials a certain amount of appropriations—and a certain amount of the appropriation for construction. However, we failed to take into consideration the fact that there were many libraries that just needed some renovation and rehabilitation and so on, and during all of these years we have only given aid where they were constructing new edifices or buildings and new institutions, whereas those who needed just a small amount of money to rehabilitate were cut out of the bill. This bill takes care of that situation and we are also taking care of the situation that while some communities have not been able to get off the ground, we allow an extension of 1 year for further 100-percent funding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill by the House, and unanimously if possible.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note particularly the tremendous contribution of the chairman of our select subcommittee, out of whose committee this legislation is now presented to the House.

In commending the distinguished chairman of our select subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], I would like to mention to the House that this is the fourth bill reported out of our subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be a member.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will see fit to pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the chairman of our House Education and Labor Committee [Mr. PERKINS] in urging my colleagues to give wholehearted, favorable consideration to this bill, H.R. 13048, to amend the Library Services and Construction Act. These amendments are technical in nature, clarify the language of the act, add uniformity to similar titles, and carry out congressional intent in permitting the States to initiate approved programs under titles III and IV with 100-percent Federal funding in fiscal year 1968.

No doubt, most of you can recall last year's debate when we expanded this important program to provide improved library services for the people throughout our country. The vote was 336 to 2. It was held up as a model—an ideal bill in terms of the coordination of State and local functions with the Federal Government insofar as implementation is concerned. From the beginning the legislation has had bipartisan sponsorship and support.

As chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on these amendments and as one of the early sponsors of this legislation, when it was limited to providing public library services to rural areas without such service or with inadequate services, I would like to point out some of the outstanding accomplishments of this relatively modest program.

Before going on, however, I want to thank our chairman [Mr. PERKINS] for introducing the bill and for his leadership and assistance in helping to expedite the handling of this measure. At this time I also wish to point out that Mr. PERKINS is one of the pioneer sponsors of this library legislation. Long before it won the general acceptance of Congress, the gentleman from Kentucky had the vision and practical foresight to recognize the Nation's need and the educational benefits which it would eventually bring to people of all ages and walks of life.

I also want to pay tribute to the gentlelady from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for her very able handling of this legislation. In addition, I want to voice my sincere appreciation to the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee for their cooperation and unanimous endorsement of the bill before you today.

Now, although, I am tempted to elaborate on the accomplishments of my own State of New Jersey, which has participated in this program since its beginning in fiscal 1957, I want to highlight the Library Services and Construction Act accomplishments throughout the Nation.

In the decade since its advent—fiscal years 1957-66—the LSCA has resulted in the expenditure of \$108.2 million for books and library materials for public libraries. In fiscal 1966, Federal funds, with State and local matching funds, have purchased \$29.7 million in books and library materials. If we can presume that the same rate of expenditure will be maintained in fiscal 1967 as in 1966, we can estimate that a combined expenditure of \$42 million will be made for library materials under this act. It is important to understand that title I of the LSCA permits not only the pur-

chase of books, but the financing of a variety of activities and purchases relating to public libraries under the guidance of a State plan. The significance of this legislation to the urgent needs of the Nation is clearly evident.

Between 1956 and 1966:

All 50 States, and the District of Columbia, plus American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands operated library programs under approved State plans. In 1967 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands became eligible and participated.

Areas containing more than 75 million people received library services for the first time or had their local libraries improved under this act.

More than 550 bookmobiles were added to existing library resources, primarily to reach rural readers.

An estimated 27 million books and related materials purchased with Federal, State, and local funds were added to library collections in the States.

Nearly \$100 million in Federal funds for public library services were used by the States and matched with over \$300 million State and local funds.

During fiscal 1965, 1966, and 1967, nearly a thousand library construction projects have been approved.

In fiscal 1967, when Federal funds first became available for planning library services under two new titles, 52 States and territories picked up \$7,075 each for interlibrary cooperation—title III; 51 States and territories picked up \$7,075 each for State institutional library services; title IV-A; and 51 States and territories picked up \$4,735 for planning library services to the physically handicapped—title IV-B.

As I stated at the outset, the specific amendments covered in the bill we are considering today, to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, H.R. 13048, are chiefly of a technical nature intended to clarify the language of the law. They would also permit the States to carry out approved programs under titles III and IV with 100-percent Federal funding in "the first fiscal year for which funds are appropriated," as was the intent of Congress in passing the law last year.

The first amendment to section 303, which would strike out the date June 30, 1967, and substitute June 30, 1968, would continue for another year the 100-percent funding to begin interlibrary cooperation programs.

The second amendment would correct what appears to have been a drafting oversight, since the law does not now provide for 100-percent Federal funding for all grant programs for the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.

The third amendment would continue through fiscal 1968 the 100-percent Federal funding to implement programs under title IV-A for State institutional library services.

The fourth amendment would change the maintenance of effort requirement covering expenditures under part A of title IV, as provided for in section 404 (a) (5) of the act so as to refer to the "second preceding fiscal year"—rather than the "preceding fiscal year"—as the base year for measuring the requisite

minimum State effort, as is the case in title I and in part B of title IV. States cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period and their annual programs must be submitted prior to that date.

The fifth amendment would permit approved programs under title IV-B—library services for the physically handicapped—to be 100-percent federally funded in fiscal 1968.

The sixth amendment would correct a language error in section 414(a) (2). Section 414(a) deals with the requirements of a State plan; subsection (2) is intended to cover establishment or improvement of library services and not the establishment or improvement of State plans.

The seventh amendment would expand the term "construction" so as to include authority to acquire buildings to be used or remodeled for use as public libraries. This would give State library administrative agencies another option to exercise; namely, the purchase of existing buildings, in those instances where this would be economical or more efficient than to begin new construction.

All the amendments proposed in H.R. 13048 would be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

The foregoing changes in this library law will greatly enhance the working of this legislation which was so widely and enthusiastically acclaimed by Members on both sides of the aisle last year.

A library system is an increasingly complex and absolutely essential instrument of progress in every field of learning. Our technological revolution has brought about a grant explosion of research, information, and new knowledge.

This bill before us builds soundly upon the existing act and moves in the direction of improving the scope and effectiveness of that act. I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 13048, a bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation which fills a significant and urgent need.

This legislation will remedy certain technical difficulties in the present law, and will also enable the States to more effectively implement their library programs in fiscal year 1968, and thereafter.

The Library Services and Construction Act, passed originally in 1956, stimulated the local communities and the States to raise the quality and effectiveness of public library services, so that every citizen would have available the essential tools for his education.

Library legislation has produced a notable partnership between State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

In 1964, the inclusion of urban libraries within the scope of the act—Public Law 88-269—resulted, among other things, in the improvement of library services to disadvantaged communities; extension of high-quality library services to suburban areas; and the strengthening of urban library collections to be used over larger regions of a State.

Remarkably, since the construction provisions under title II of the act have been in force, 719 public library construction projects have been approved to serve 23 million people.

Title III, "Interlibrary cooperation," provides funds for the greatly needed networks of interlibrary cooperation among State libraries, public libraries, school libraries, college libraries, and special libraries. This pooling of efforts, as far as possible, in regard to acquisitions, cataloging, storage, bibliography, reference, and other areas, makes appropriated funds go further and achieve the purposes for which they were intended.

Title IV-A, is designed to assist the States in providing library services to inmates, patients, and residents of State institutions, including penal institutions, reformatories, residential training schools, or special hospitals. Unfortunately, libraries in these State institutions are far behind what is required of them to assist in the plans for rehabilitation and education.

Title IV-B, is designed to assist in making possible, library services to physically handicapped persons, including the blind and the visually handicapped. It is estimated that this segment of population numbers almost 2 million persons—including 400,000 blind; 600,000 near-blind; and 1 million paraplegics and victims of cerebral palsy and other severe conditions—who cannot read conventionally printed books, magazines and newspapers. Making reading available to these unfortunate people, will bring hope and inspiration to them.

As I stated at the outset, the specific amendments covered in H.R. 13048, are chiefly of a technical nature.

The first amendment will provide a Federal share of 100 percent for the trust territory of the Pacific Islands under title III, "Interlibrary cooperation." Titles I, II, and IV of the act presently authorize such a provision for the trust territory, but by an oversight no such language was included in title III, and H.R. 13048 is drafted to correct this and maintain consistency throughout the act for this territory as intended in our previous actions on the legislation.

This same title III, which was added to the original act in 1966 to authorize the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries for more effective and systematic coordination of library resources throughout the country, was not funded until April 1, 1967, at which time \$375,000 of the \$5 million authorization for planning funds was appropriated to 52 States and territories.

Since the Congress made it clear in passage of title III that the intent was to provide 100 percent Federal funding for the first full year, there was inadequate time for the States to initiate their programs in fiscal 1967, and it is the feeling of the committee that the Federal share of 100 percent should be continued through fiscal 1968 to make this title workable before the States are required to provide matching funds.

The small appropriation for this title, along with delays in the approval of regulations, issuance of guidelines, and

allotment of funds, effectively prevented a full program year in 1967 as was intended when we passed Public Law 89-511 in 1966.

A similar pattern occurred in the funding of section 403 of part A of title IV, also added to the original act in 1966 to establish and improve State institutional library services. Of the small \$375,000 allocation that was made for Public Law 89-511 on April 1, 1967, 51 States and territories received minimal amounts of planning funds for title IV, and we believe that we should continue the same 100 percent Federal share for this title through fiscal 1968 to reflect the intent of the original legislation.

A further amendment is recommended in recognition of the fact that while States are required to submit their annual programs prior to the end of a fiscal period under the maintenance of effort requirement in part A of title IV of the act, they cannot supply expenditure data before the end of a fiscal period. This apparent oversight can be corrected by amending this section to refer to the second preceding fiscal year as the base year for measuring the requisite minimum State effort. This is the present provision in title I and part B of title IV, and is necessary for practicable administration of part A of title IV.

Section 4 of H.R. 13048 would authorize 100 percent funding of part B of title IV, library services for the physically handicapped, through fiscal 1968 in the same manner as that recommended for title III and for section A of title IV. For what was supposed to be the first program year, \$250,000 was allocated to 51 States and territories on April 1, 1967, and we think it similarly desirable to consider fiscal 1968 as the first program year of part B in order to get the State programs into operation. Only planning moneys have been made available to States to date, without any program operations undertaken with Federal assistance as the Congress intended.

Further, a technical amendment is proposed for a language error in section 414(a)(2). The amendment would delete the words "State plans for" as unnecessary since subsection (2) is intended to cover the establishment or improvement of library services and not State plans as it presently reads.

Another provision in H.R. 13048 would give State agencies the option to acquire buildings to be used as public libraries if this would be more economical than building a new library in any specific case. Public Law 89-511 authorizes construction of new buildings for libraries or expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings. A State cannot presently acquire a used building which might be converted into a library facility more cheaply than by building a new one, and we feel that it is desirable to include "acquisition" under the definition of "construction" in section 504(d) of the act.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, section 7 of H.R. 13048 will make the amendments in sections 1 and 3 of the bill effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

Your Committee on Education and

Labor recommends that the House approve this legislation to continue at maximum effectiveness the Federal effort to upgrade library facilities and services throughout the country. Beginning with passage of the Library Services Act of 1956, the Congress has demonstrated its commitment to this goal by extending and amending the program regularly to broaden its scope and increase the appropriations.

From fiscal 1957 through 1966, \$100 million in Federal allocations for library services have been matched with \$321 million of State and local funds, while \$60 million in Federal funds for public library construction has been matched by State and local appropriations of \$130 million.

The Federal stimulus has thus proved exemplary in encouraging States to expand their own efforts in this area, and we may reflect with pride that 75 million people have received new or improved library service during this period and 13 million people have received library service for the first time. An impressive total of 719 public library construction projects have been approved, serving 23 million people, 550 bookmobiles have been placed in operation to give service principally to rural areas, and 27 million books and materials have been added to library collections through these added Federal, State, and local funds.

We feel that the amendments embodied in H.R. 13048 are necessary for the continued effectiveness of the administration of this program, and it is particularly important that we provide the means by which State programs under Public Law 89-511 can be made operational. We are certain that prior experience with this legislation bears out our conviction that State matching funds for these two titles will be forthcoming in fiscal 1969 by which time the programs will have proven their worth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 13048, which was unanimously reported by the Select Subcommittee on Education, and the full Education and Labor Committee, with bipartisan support.

The enactment of this important measure will provide our citizens with the opportunity to continue to grow in knowledge and understanding.

This legislation is part of a program which I am proud to have supported throughout my service in Congress, and I am sure it will be overwhelmingly approved by the House today.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13048, the bill to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act.

Reviewing the legislative history of this public library development program, with its modest beginning in 1956, only serves to dramatize what a spectacular success has been achieved in the brief span of one decade. In my own State of Kansas, great progress has been made in improving and extending library service. Funds under the LSCA are being used for developing reference and resource centers; for book processing centers; for extending service through the use of bookmobiles, branches, and mail service; for improving book collec-

tions and service in both urban and rural areas.

A regional system of cooperating libraries is to be established. This program is beginning in three areas of the State, involving 27 counties.

Kansas had 5 public library construction projects approved in 1967.

On June 7, 1967, a pilot project in interlibrary cooperation was launched in Kansas under the Library Services and Construction Act between the Kansas informational circuit which is composed of six public libraries in the State and Kansas State University in Manhattan. The six public libraries in Topeka, Johnson County, Wichita, Hutchinson, Salina, and Kansas City formed the Kansas informational circuit, known as KIC, to share their book resources with the citizens of the State. This interlibrary loan circuit works through the local public libraries.

The six KIC libraries, plus the State Library, had been filling about 61 percent of the book requests by local public libraries. It is expected that with the advantage of the academic library at Kansas State University, the percentage of requests filled by the KIC system will increase.

During the hearings on the bill before us today, an impressive list of accomplishments, made possible under the provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act in the last decade, was recorded. However, despite the substantial improvements in library service to date, much remains to be done, and passage of H.R. 13048 will help our States to meet more readily some of the great needs. For instance, Denny R. Stephens, the Kansas State Librarian, stated in the record of the hearings on this legislation that:

In order for the State of Kansas to participate in Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act in Fiscal Year 1968, it would be necessary to find a means of matching Federal funds. We are working on this at the present time and believe we could be prepared to match Title III funds in Fiscal Year 1969.

Library service in our State institutions is in too many instances non-existent and in all cases substandard. If we were able to match the full allocation, we would endeavor to initiate a program of rehabilitation through reading and self-study for institutional residents. (Title IV-A)

I should also point out that this bill does not involve the authorization of any additional Federal funds. What it does is permit the States to implement the plans they have made during the past fiscal year under the three newly authorized programs for interlibrary cooperation, for specialized State library services to institutions, and for library services to the physically handicapped.

The Library Services and Construction Act is a measure of great merit and is helping to meet the urgent and essential library needs of the people of the United States in the fields of education, science, technology, business, culture, and everyday living.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor, makes technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act in order to improve the operations of the act. This

has been an extremely successful and worthwhile Federal-State-local program and it deserves our support.

Library services are an extremely important element in the educational, cultural, and economic life of the Nation. Sometimes the part libraries and their informational services play in our economic life is overlooked; but it should not be forgotten that the handling of information grows more complex as our industrial society grows more complex. I am happy to report one example from Ohio of the imaginative use of library services to help meet vital economic goals.

In its State plan under title I of this Act, Ohio has included a books-jobs project to develop effective links between Ohio libraries and the State and local offices of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation. The purpose is to get job information to the unemployed and underemployed who need it, and to put the resources of libraries to work on the problems of unemployment.

This act—although it is very modestly funded—has done much to strengthen our State and local libraries and library systems. It has demonstrated many other possibilities for the effective use of library services through such projects as books-jobs now underway in Ohio.

It is my hope that we can give further attention to library needs as soon as the present Federal budgetary crisis has eased. This should be high on the list of priorities in the next Congress.

Mr. FRASER. I rise in support of H.R. 13048, which amends the Library Services and Construction Act. I am particularly pleased with the amendment to section 504, which will provide Federal funds for the acquisition of buildings to be used for libraries.

The Minneapolis public library system has been a victim of the present law, which allows Federal funds to be used for the construction of new buildings, but not the acquisition of used buildings. Last year the Minneapolis library wanted to purchase an existing building which was well suited to library use, and which could be acquired at much less cost than a new building. Unfortunately, the present law would not allow any Federal funds to be used for this purchase; Federal funds could be obtained only if the library constructed a new building at a much greater cost. The building the library officials wanted to acquire was such a good bargain that they went ahead and purchased it anyway, even though they had to forgo Federal aid.

The Library Services and Construction bill which passed the House in 1966 provided for the acquisition of buildings. Unfortunately, this provision was not included in the Senate bill, and it was dropped in conference. I am hopeful that this time the acquisition amendment will be passed into law.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that the House will resoundingly approve the bill now before us, H.R. 13048, designed to improve the existing Library and Construction Act by the addition of certain technical amendments.

I advocated the initial enactment of this legislation back in 1956 and have continued to urge and support its extension over the past 10 years. This wholesome legislative program, which began with such a modest level, has truly succeeded far beyond the most optimistic expectation. Its overall educational impact has certainly justified the Federal expenditures involved.

The record shows that over the past 10 years, 75 million people received new or improved public library service; 13 million people received public library service for the first time; 27 million books and related materials were purchased with Federal, State, and local funds and added to local library collections; 550 bookmobiles have been placed in operation across the country, primarily giving library service to rural areas; 2,800 persons have been employed in our States and localities to carry out the program of library services and construction; 719 public library construction projects have been approved, to serve 23 million people; \$100 million in Federal funds for public library services in the States has been matched with \$321 million in State and local funds; and \$60 million in Federal funds for public library construction has been matched with \$130 million in State and local funds.

Mr. Speaker, there is no fuller truth contained in any expression than the old adage, "Knowledge is power," and today it is strikingly clear that such "power" is imperative for our survival and our leadership for world peace.

The libraries of this country are special instruments supremely capable of not only providing our citizens with this survival power, but also with the sustaining strengths of the disciplined minds and spirits essential to the accomplishment and preservation of peace in a civilized society.

By all recognized standards and measurements, this substantive legislative program has been good for all Americans and the proposed amendments in the bill before us are designed to technically strengthen and expand the program's operations; in other words, they are designed to make it work even better than it is. Therefore, I hope that it shall be overwhelmingly accepted and adopted without delay.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 13048.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13048.

The question was taken.

Mr. REID of New York. 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 pro tempore. 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 351, nays 0, not voting 81, as follows:

(Roll No. 309)
YEAS—351

Abbott	Edmondson	Lennon
Abernethy	Edwards, Ala.	Lipscomb
Adair	Edwards, Calif.	Lloyd
Adams	Edwards, La.	Long, La.
Addabbo	Eilberg	Long, Md.
Albert	Esch	Lukens
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	McClure
Andrews, Ala.	Evans, Colo.	McCulloch
Andrews,	Evins, Tenn.	McDade
N. Dak.	Farbstein	McDonald,
Arends	Fascell	Mich.
Ashbrook	Feighan	McEwen
Ashley	Findley	McFall
Ashmore	Fisher	Macdonald,
Aspinall	Flood	Mass.
Ayres	Flynt	MacGregor
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Machen
Belcher	Ford,	Mahon
Bell	William D.	Marsh
Bennett	Fraser	Martin
Berry	Fulton, Pa.	Mathias, Calif.
Betts	Fuqua	Mathias, Md.
Bevill	Galifianakis	Matsunaga
Blester	Garmatz	Mayne
Bingham	Gathings	Meeds
Blackburn	Gettys	Meskill
Blanton	Gilmo	Michel
Blatnik	Gibbons	Miller, Ohio
Boland	Gilbert	Mills
Bolling	Gonzalez	Minish
Bow	Goodell	Mink
Brademas	Goodling	Minshall
Bray	Green, Oreg.	Mize
Brinkley	Green, Pa.	Monagan
Brooks	Griffiths	Montgomery
Brotzman	Gross	Moore
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Moorhead
Brown, Mich.	Gurney	Morgan
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Morris, N. Mex.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hall	Mosher
Broyhill, Va.	Halleck	Moss
Buchanan	Halpern	Multer
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-	Myers
Burleson	schmidt	Natcher
Burton, Calif.	Hanley	Nedzi
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Nelsen
Bush	Hansen, Idaho	Nichols
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	Nix
Byrnes, Wis.	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Cabell	Harrison	O'Hara, Mich.
Cahill	Harsha	O'Konski
Carey	Harvey	O'Neal, Ga.
Carter	Hathaway	Ottlinger
Casey	Hawkins	Passman
Cederberg	Hays	Patten
Chamberlain	Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Clark	Helstoski	Perkins
Clausen,	Henderson	Pettis
Don H.	Hicks	Philbin
Clawson, Del.	Holifield	Pickle
Cohelan	Holland	Pike
Collier	Hosmer	Pirnie
Colmer	Howard	Poage
Conable	Hull	Poff
Conte	Hungate	Follock
Conyers	Hunt	Pool
Corbett	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Corman	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Cowger	Irwin	Fryor
Culver	Jacobs	Pucinski
Cunningham	Jarman	Purcell
Daddario	Joelson	Quillen
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Calif.	Railsback
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Dawson	Jones, Ala.	Reid, Ill.
De la Garza	Jones, N.C.	Reid, N.Y.
Dellenback	Karsten	Reifel
Denney	Karth	Reinecke
Dent	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Pa.
Devine	Kee	Riegle
Dickinson	Keith	Rivers
Dingell	Kelly	Robison
Dole	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	King, N.Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Kleppe	Rooney, N.Y.
Dow	Kornegay	Rosenthal
Dowdy	Kuykendall	Rostenkowski
Downing	Kyl	Roth
Dulski	Kyros	Roudebush
Duncan	Laird	Roush
Dwyer	Langen	Roybal
Eckhardt	Leggett	

Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Seiden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers

Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler

Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson,
Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zion
Zwack

Mr. Young with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MR. MAHON TO
FILE A HOUSE JOINT RESOLU-
TION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a House joint resolution, providing for continuing appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL
MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE A
REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a House joint resolution making continuing appropriations and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PA-
DRES NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5161) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in accordance with section 3, subsection (b), of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891), the area shown on the map entitled "Los Padres National Forest, San Rafael Wilderness, proposed", revised July 1967, is hereby designated the San Rafael Wilderness. Said map is and shall continue to be kept on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the area thereon shown, comprising approximately one hundred and forty-five thousand acres, is within and shall continue to be a part of Los Padres National Forest.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.*

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. May.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Derwin-

ski.

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Horton.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Button.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cramer.

administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress approved the Wilderness Act. This act incorporated 54 national forest areas into a new wilderness preservation system with a total acreage of 9.1 million acres. The Wilderness Act also authorized the President to examine and recommend the inclusion in the system of certain additional areas. The legislation we have before us today is the first such area recommended by the President. H.R. 5161 would designate about 145,000 acres of land located in the Los Padres National Forest, Santa Barbara County, Calif., as the San Rafael Wilderness.

The San Rafael Wilderness area, which is about 10 miles wide and 21 miles long, has all the characteristics to justify this designation; yet it lies within 100 miles of approximately 6 million people. Its preservation will afford these people an opportunity to visit the area and enjoy a wilderness experience.

Most of the area is extremely rugged and is made up of steep slopes and rocky cliffs. Precipitation averages 12 to 16 inches and occurs almost entirely in the winter months. The summers are hot and dry and, due to extremely hazardous fire conditions during the summers, public use will usually be limited to winter months. The San Rafael Wilderness Area contains numerous sites of unusually well-preserved pictographs which are of archaeological interest as reminders of the now extinct Chumash Indians. The rare California condor, of which there are only about 40 known to be alive, are also found in this area.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Wilderness Act, a study of the potential natural resources of the area has been conducted. The mineral report on the area, prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey, assigns a low mineral potential to the area. Nevertheless, the area will remain open to mineral development under the conditions stated in the 1964 Act.

Although some timber exists within the area, it is noncommercial because of its poor quality and scattered stands. Grazing, which will not be disturbed by the wilderness designation, is likewise limited to isolated patches along the river bottoms. The use of the area's water resources will remain essentially unchanged under the wilderness designation. No storage reservoirs are planned within the area.

The prevention, suppression and con-

trol of forest fires is of utmost importance in this area and this is a major factor in the establishment of the boundaries for the wilderness area.

The area recommended by the President comprises 142,722 acres. The committee amended the legislation to include an additional 2,200 acres along the northeast edges of the area in order to preserve outstanding examples of Indian pictographs.

Mr. Speaker, the area to be designated as wilderness is already being administered as national forest lands and, therefore, no additional cost to the Federal Government is anticipated by enactment of this bill. While there was some objection to including the area added by the committee, there was no opposition in the committee to the approval of the bill. I urge the passage of H.R. 5161.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the manner in which he led the committee action, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member.

At the same time, I would hope the very extensive, significant and fragile values which are represented by pictographs and petroglyphs in the designated area will receive the greatest possible attention from the department administering the wilderness, because these are extremely significant and they are of very great value. Any depreciation of the site would cause a great loss.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I can realize what prompts my friend from Iowa [Mr. KYL] to make this statement. I spent almost all of my life in the land of the pictographs, and I know how easy it is to desecrate and profane them, and how easy it is for people who visit these areas to take any kind of stone or article and chip and absolutely ruin the values to be found in them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for having arranged to bring this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5161, a bill to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation if enacted will mark itself as a historic first. H.R. 5161, designating approximately 145,000 acres as the San Rafael Wilderness constitutes the first proposed addition to the national wilderness preservation system as established under the Wilderness Act of 1964. This legislation focuses both national and international attention on an area of primitive beauty.

The Wilderness Act of 1964, calls upon the President to make recommendations to the Congress of additional areas proposed for inclusion in the national wilderness system. On February 1, 1967, President Johnson proposed the San

Rafael Wilderness as an addition to the national wilderness preservation system.

At such time the President said:

This is only a beginning. We must—and will—do more. We must continue to move forward toward seeing to it that every city dweller—especially those imprisoned by the bleakness and blight of the slums—has ready access to parks, playgrounds, and the untarnished beauty of nature's landscape.

H.R. 5161 is the beginning. I am happy to have sponsored similar legislation for the preservation of this area and for the enjoyment of future generations of American people. I also wish to commend the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Forest Service in their support of the San Rafael Wilderness Area as the first proposed addition to the national wilderness system. I commend Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE for his interest and enthusiasm in this legislation. His introduction of this legislation was an important step in moving this legislation. I also commend the interested citizenry of Santa Barbara County, Calif., who have come forth in public hearings and enthusiastically endorsed this area for inclusion in the national wilderness system.

The proposed San Rafael Wilderness Area is a wooded, mountainous area, 12 miles north of Santa Barbara, Calif. The area is located within a 2-hour drive of 6 million people. The area lies in the San Rafael and Sierra Madre Mountain Ranges in southeastern Santa Barbara County, Calif. It is made up of extremely rugged and rocky cliffs and steep, brushy slopes.

In addition to satisfying the prerequisite qualities of a wilderness area, the San Rafael Wilderness Area also contains several areas of archaeological interest. The area contains some well preserved pictographs of the now extinct Chumash Indians, which are located in the northeast portion of the area. This area also serves as a flyway and resting area for the rare California condor. There are only about 40 of these birds known to be alive today.

The addition of the proposed San Rafael Wilderness Area to the wilderness system involves no expenditure of Federal funds.

The committee, during consideration of this legislation adopted an amendment including an additional 2,200 acres in the wilderness area. This acreage comprises the area of archaeological interest, Indian pictographs and resting area of the California condor.

The only opposition to this legislation comes from the Forest Service as a result of the adoption of the committee amendment to include an additional 2,200 acres. As the sponsor of that amendment, I looked over the testimony presented at the hearings in Santa Barbara and in Washington, D.C. It is remarkable how the Forest Service has changed its attitude and position regarding this legislation. Originally the Forest Service sought to exclude an area of 4,500 acres proposed to be added to the wilderness on the grounds that this area was needed for grazing. Now the Forest Service is opposed to the addition of the 2,200 acres on the basis that its inclusion in the wilderness area interferes

with their ability to fight and suppress forest fires.

Mr. Speaker, testimony taken before the committee clearly shows that one of the outstanding firefighters in the San Rafael area told the committee that the inclusion of this area does not hamper the ability of the Forest Service to prevent and suppress forest fires in the area. On the contrary, the area has little, if any, timber and contains mostly brush. It was also stated that the natural "patreros" constituted adequate firebreaks. The area of 2,200 acres included by amendment was proposed for inclusion only after it was determined that all the standards and prerequisites for firefighting could be met by the addition of this area to the San Rafael Wilderness. I would only point out to my colleagues that the opponents of the wilderness system have always pointed to the lack of adequate fire protection as a basis for objecting to wilderness areas in general. The problem of preventing and suppressing fires in this 2,200 acres I am certain is no greater than what is required to prevent and suppress fires in the other 142,722 acres also comprising the San Rafael Wilderness Area.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with our President when he states that we should have access to the untarnished beauty of nature's landscape and I urge the passage of H.R. 5161.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks about me. I express also my most sincere gratitude to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], as well as all members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the very thorough and careful way in which they studied this bill of mine.

I testified, of course, in support of the bill. I attended almost all of the hearings on the Senate and on the House sides. I was particularly impressed by the thoroughness with which the members of the committee explored this proposal. I am, of course, gratified that they gave it their approval.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, but I believe there is a question as to the interpretation of the Wilderness Act of 1964 under which San Rafael would be created that definitely should be cleared up. During his remarks the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs already alluded to it and specified his belief that the 1964 act requires continued renewal and leasing development of these lands until the end of 1983.

It is my understanding that this bill, H.R. 5161, creates a new wilderness area, the San Rafael Wilderness, which adds about 145,000 acres of land to lands administered under the provisions of the 1964 Wilderness Act. Now, I am gravely concerned about the administration of lands under the Wilderness Act by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture insofar as mineral development is concerned. In the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H.R. 5161, there is the following reference to oil and gas leasing:

However, as practically all of the area has been segregated from oil and gas leasing since 1953 and much of it has also been withdrawn from mining location since 1936, the area has probably not been prospected thoroughly. The area will remain open to mineral development under the conditions stated in the 1964 act.

It has come to my attention through testimony of representatives of the Department of the Interior at the hearings on this legislation and from policy statements by the U.S. Forest Service, that there is an erroneous interpretation by the executive agencies of those sections of the 1964 Wilderness Act dealing with oil and gas leasing of lands within wilderness areas under the Mineral Leasing Act.

There are two sections in the Wilderness Act that apply to mineral development of wilderness areas. Section 4(d)(2) of the Wilderness Act provides for obtaining information on mineral values of wilderness areas by the executive agencies. Section 4(d)(3) provides for the development of minerals under the mining laws and the various mineral leasing acts by private industry, and reads in part as follows:

(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1983, the United States mining laws and all laws pertaining to mineral leasing shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extended to those national forest lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas" . . .

In the administration of primitive and wilderness areas under the 1964 Wilderness Act, I have been advised that the Secretary of Agriculture acting through the Forest Service will not recommend approval of oil and gas leases except where the lands subject to the lease can be developed from drill sites located outside of a primitive or wilderness area. This policy is expressly set forth in the Forest Service manual and has been repeated in communications to private industry. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture has construed section 4(d)(3) of the 1964 Wilderness Act to authorize the Secretary to prohibit the leasing of wilderness or primitive area lands for the purposes of oil and gas development if surface use is required. Since the passage of the 1964 Wilderness Act, the Department of the Interior, acting upon the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, has issued no oil and gas leases in wilderness or primitive areas with the right of surface entry. This has effectively blocked any development of wilderness and primitive areas for oil and gas purposes. It is depriving the United States of what might be sub-

stantial revenues at a time when the Treasury is sorely in need of every cent it can get.

This interpretation of the executive agencies flies directly in the face of both the intent and the express language of section 4 of the Wilderness Act. The passage of the subject bill, H.R. 5161, appears to be an appropriate time to re-emphasize the intent and purpose of section 4(d)(3) of the Wilderness Act, and to make this perfectly clear to the agencies administering lands subject to the Wilderness Act. It was at the time of the passage of the Wilderness Act, and is now, the intent of Congress that the Mineral Leasing Acts, as well as the mining laws, shall have a meaningful application to primitive and wilderness lands until December 31, 1983. Applications for oil and gas leases may not be rejected by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture solely on the basis that such lands are within a primitive or wilderness area.

Is the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, in agreement with my statement as to the affect of the provisions of the Wilderness Act on oil and gas leasing, and the intent of the Congress in this regard?

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's statement. The Wilderness Act was the result of 8 years of hearings, studies and conferences and was an attempt to harmonize viewpoints which, in some cases were in violent conflict. As chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, I held extensive hearings and heard the views of over 600 witnesses. One of the biggest conflicts that appeared during the deliberations on this legislation was the treatment of mineral resource development. The final compromise solution between the views of the House and Senate after conference appears in the Wilderness Act as section 4(d)(3). The final solution followed the House viewpoint and consisted of a phasing out of mineral development activity during the period terminating December 31, 1983. I am confident that the Wilderness Act would have never become law without the inclusion of the provision that allowed a definite period of time for private industry to either develop or condemn a wilderness area for its mineral values.

Now, to my great shock, it has come to my attention that the executive agencies have interpreted 4(d)(3) to be authority for the agencies, in their discretion, to withdraw from the operation of the Mineral Leasing Act all lands within wilderness areas. To me, this is a glaring example of executive agencies defying the express direction of the Congress. It is therefore appropriate and necessary at this time to reaffirm the intent of Congress in regard to the administration of section 4(d)(3) of the Wilderness Act. It is now and always has been the intent of Congress in the Wilderness Act that no application for a lease under the mineral leasing laws shall be rejected for the reason that the lands involved are contained within a wilderness or primitive area—and the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are obligated to administer these lands accordingly. Any other

interpretation of section 4(d) (3) would lead to the untenable result that wilderness areas would be completely withdrawn from the operation of the mineral leasing acts, without ever having been tested or explored under the procedures provided by the Congress in the Wilderness Act.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for his very explicit clarification of this matter.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the designation of the San Rafael Wilderness.

However, I do want to express my very deep concern about a certain portion of the area involved.

This is approximately 2,200 acres which were added by the committee to the initial proposal of the Forest Service.

The original proposal submitted to Congress by the Forest Service amounted to 143,000 acres; so you can see the basic wilderness area is considerable, and the 2,200 acres which subsequently was added is a relatively small amount as compared to the whole.

I raise my objections to the inclusion of this 2,200 acres because of the substantial forest fire threat to the whole parcel that this poses.

If the Forest Service is going to be able to fully protect the San Rafael Wilderness from forest fire, this additional area should be left out of it.

It is needed by the Forest Service for vital forest fire suppression work of a type not permitted in wilderness areas.

As a Californian, I am especially aware of this need.

As in much of southern California, the vegetation of the proposed San Rafael Wilderness and the surrounding region is largely brush type.

Whenever fire breaks out in this type, it burns with great intensity.

When fanned by the winds common to the area, these huge conflagrations sweep over the countryside faster than men can run. The best chance to stop one of these fires is by removing the flammable vegetation from its path. Ridgetops are the best place to do this because the fires move more slowly before spilling over the ridges.

Accordingly, throughout California, Federal, State, and local fire prevention agencies have established or are establishing systems of fuel breaks extending along strategic ridges.

This is true on the ridgetops bordering the proposed San Rafael Wilderness.

However, during the subcommittee hearings on H.R. 5161, certain groups proposed that 2,200 acres be added along the northeast edge.

It was stated that the proposed addition did not include areas where the Forest Service had done fuel-break work, or planned to do it.

The Forest Service was asked to review this proposal from the standpoint of fire control needs.

The agency did so and reported in a letter to the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, dated July 11, 1967.

Here is what the Forest Service stated about fire control needs in this area:

One of our major concerns during the entire review process has been what effect the designation of the San Rafael Wilderness will have on our ability to redeem our fire protection responsibilities for lands both inside and outside the wilderness.

After this further study, we believe the boundaries we have recommended are essential to permit the most effective advance preparations for fire control.

One of the most serious fire threats in brushy areas such as the San Rafael is from great sweeping conflagrations that move rapidly on a wide front.

It has been proved that advance preparations of fuel breaks will greatly enhance our chances of keeping such a fire from sweeping over a ridge from one drainage to another.

Several years ago, we embarked on a program of establishing such a system of fuel breaks along a nearly 10-mile stretch of the Sierra Madre Ridge southeast of Montgomery Potrero.

This system consists of areas of type conversion (brush and grass) connecting the natural poteros.

About 900 acres of this work has been done to date, and another 600 acres are planned for treatment.

The suggested 2,200-acre addition to the wilderness would preclude doing this additional work.

We think the additional work is as important as the work that has been done.

I am assured that this represents the position and views of the local forest officers who are familiar with the situation on the ground.

Most of the type conversion work done to date in this area is outside the proposed 2,200-acre addition. But some of it is inside the proposed addition. The fuel-break job is not complete. To make the protection line fully effective 600 acres more needs to be treated within the proposed addition.

I believe we should accept the professional judgment of the Forest Service. They are the experts on forest and brush fire control and prevention. If we fail to heed their advice, the San Rafael Wilderness will not be adequately protected from fire; and the bordering drainage to the northeast will also be endangered.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the situation is emphasized by the morning news reports of the fires which are sweeping large acreages of southern California.

Already more than two dozen homes have been burned and one elderly woman has been killed in a fire-related traffic accident.

These fires that are ravaging lands of southern California are not an immediate threat to the San Rafael nor are they on national forest lands; however, they are in the same type of brush country that we are talking about in the 2,200 acre addition to the San Rafael Wilderness.

As is seen by the current fires with the high humidity and high wind conditions which exist both in these fires and can exist on the 2,200 acres there is practically nothing that can stop them without adequate fire protection which can be accomplished only through construction of firebreaks which would not be permitted if the 2,200 acres were retained in the wilderness.

Therefore I think that we have a dramatic and tragic example of why we need these firebreaks in the 2,200-acre area under question and they should be excluded.

It has also been stated that the 2,200-acre addition to the administration's proposal must be made to adequately protect the Chumash Indian pictographs in the area.

The Forest Service made it clear during the subcommittee hearings, and reiterated in its letter of July 11, 1967, that it agrees with the need to protect these pictographs, but their protection does not depend upon the area being classified as wilderness.

The agency already has sufficient authority to protect the archeological features on any national forest lands. There is no need to make the addition for this purpose. The Forest Service has already taken steps to protect the pictographs involved by closing to public travel the road in this vicinity. They plan to keep it closed.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to emphasize that I am in complete agreement with the proposal to establish the San Rafael Wilderness. I intend today to vote in favor of H.R. 5161 which we have before us. However, I do want to make the record clear the problems which can result and the threat which will be posed to the entire San Rafael Wilderness Area if in the final analysis these 2,200 acres are not excluded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5161, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, a similar bill to the one just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the San Rafael Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto, as generally depicted on a map entitled "San Rafael Wilderness—Proposed," dated October 3, 1966, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the San Rafael Wilderness within and as a part of Los Padres National Forest, comprising an area of approximately 143,000 acres.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture

shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing area designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike all after the enacting clause of S. 889 and insert the provisions of H.R. 5161 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5161) was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112) extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 301(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking "within 18 months" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than December 31, 1968."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 112 was approved by voice votes in the Subcommittee on Housing and the full Committee on Banking and Currency without controversy. The resolution simply extends from March 6, 1968, to December 31, 1968, the deadline for the report of the National Commission on Urban Problems chaired by former Senator Paul Douglas. This Commission was established pursuant to section 301 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, sponsored

by our distinguished colleague and ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. The Commission finds that it cannot meet the 18-month reporting period provided in that act and has requested this extension. In particular, it has requested that the additional time be approved as soon as possible so that in hiring staff experts it can give them some assurance that the work will continue beyond next March.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the urgency and seriousness of the problems which this Commission is studying and the value of its activities. I urge all of my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this was fully approved within the committee and by the subcommittee. It continues the work of the Commission that has been set up and which has a reporting date of March 1968. It extends the time for reporting until December 1968. It does not involve any new authorization or appropriation. I believe the time extension is fully warranted and the Commission is for a good purpose and is doing a good job.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I find it difficult to understand why the President did not name this Commission on or shortly after September 6, 1966. Why did he wait until January 12 of 1967 before naming the Commission? We have had several pieces of legislation to extend the time and life of commissions, not always for the same reason, but we getting too many of them. In this instant case I do not understand why the President did not timely appoint this Commission, because he had the authority to do so after the appropriation was made, and I reiterate, the appropriation was made last September.

Mr. WIDNALL. This I understand, but I cannot answer as to why the President did not appoint the Commission sooner. I do not feel, that having been appointed, they have had sufficient time during which to act. The extension of time which has been requested as a result of the introduction of this legislation in my opinion represents a reasonable request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if it is due to politics? The President had the money and the authority to name this Commission more than a year ago. I just do not understand why he laid back in the harness until January 12, 1967?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a response to the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise the gentleman from Iowa that this is a nonpartisan Commission engaged in a nonpartisan inquiry, and a very important one. It took some time to find well-qualified people to serve on this Commission. When one reads the list of the members of the Commission,

one can see that this represents a good selection of highly competent citizens and will recognize the further fact that they are qualified to do a very good job, and are doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Well—

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I respect the views of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and appreciate his yielding. However, I would like to go just a bit further and ask three very simple questions about the extension of this Commission. All of these questions are predicated upon the fact that in this calendar year, this is the third Commission for which request has been made for the extension thereof, according to my personal recollection.

The first Commission for which request was made for extension was the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission upon which action was extended in this House on April 24, 1967, until November 1968, at a cost of \$20,500. The colloquy having to do with the extension of this Commission occurred in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 10497.

Second, was the extension of the Indian Claims Commission, the request therefor which came before the House on March 20, 1967. The beginning of that colloquy can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 7254. This extended the life of the Commission for the period of 5 years, and added two additional members. Further, it carried an additional cost of \$70,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, I would like to know why 6 months ahead of time the Commission now determines that it cannot get its work completed and its report in on time and, second, how much more it will cost? Third, why the President waited from September to the following March of this year to make the appointments?

Mr. WIDNALL. I have no figures and no indication to the effect that there will be any additional cost, other than the original cost contemplated under this legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield further, this is most satisfying in this time when we are trying to cut back on expenditures as well as obligational authority. It is my opinion that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is giving me what information he has in his possession, but the question of so many, and such prolonged and highly paid study groups remains. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. 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 pro tempore. 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 344, nays 10, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—344

Abbutt	Elberg	McCulloch
Abnerthy	Esch	McDade
Adair	Eshleman	McDonald,
Adams	Evans, Colo.	Mich.
Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	McEwen
Albert	Farbstien	McFall
Anderson, Ill.	Fasell	MacGregor
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	Machen
Ashley	Fisher	Mahon
Ashmore	Flood	Mailliard
Aspinall	Flynt	Marsh
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	Martin
Baring	Ford,	Mathias, Calif.
Bates	William D.	Mathias, Md.
Belcher	Fraser	Matsunaga
Bell	Frelinghuysen	Mayne
Bennett	Friedel	Meeds
Berry	Fulton, Pa.	Meskill
Betts	Fuqua	Michel
Bevill	Gallfanakis	Miller, Ohio
Blester	Gallagher	Mills
Bingham	Garmatz	Minish
Blackburn	Gathings	Mink
Blanton	Gettys	Minshall
Blatnik	Gialmo	Mize
Boland	Gibbons	Monagan
Bolling	Gilbert	Montgomery
Bow	Gonzalez	Moore
Brademas	Goodell	Moorhead
Brinkley	Goodling	Morgan
Brotzman	Green, Oreg.	Morris, N. Mex.
Brown, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Morton
Brown, Mich.	Griffiths	Mosher
Brown, Ohio	Grover	Moss
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Multer
Broyhill, Va.	Gurney	Murphy, Ill.
Buchanan	Haley	Myers
Burke, Fla.	Hallock	Natcher
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	Nedzi
Burleson	Hamilton	Nelsen
Burton, Calif.	Hanley	Nichols
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Nix
Bush	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Mich.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hardy	O'Konski
Cabell	Harrison	O'Neal, Ga.
Cahill	Harsha	Ottinger
Carey	Harvey	Patten
Carter	Hathaway	Pelly
Casey	Hays	Perkins
Cederberg	Hechler, W. Va.	Pettis
Celler	Heckler, Mass.	Philbin
Chamberlain	Helstoski	Pickle
Clark	Henderson	Pike
Clausen,	Hicks	Pirnie
Don H.	Hollifield	Poage
Clawson, Del	Holland	Poff
Cohelan	Hosmer	Pollock
Collier	Howard	Pool
Colmer	Hull	Price, Ill.
Conable	Hungate	Price, Tex.
Conte	Hunt	Pryor
Conyers	Hutchinson	Pucinski
Corbett	Ichord	Purcell
Corman	Irwin	Quile
Cowger	Jacobs	Railsback
Culver	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Cunningham	Joelson	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Reifel
Daniels	Johnson, Pa.	Reinecke
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Riegle
Dawson	Karsten	Rivers
de la Garza	Karth	Robison
Dellenback	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Denney	Kee	Rogers, Colo.
Dent	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Devine	Kelly	Rooney, N.Y.
Dickinson	King, Calif.	Rosenthal
Dingell	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Dole	Kleppe	Roth
Donohue	Kornegay	Roush
Dorn	Kuykendall	Roybal
Dow	Kyl	Rumsfeld
Dowdy	Kyros	Ruppe
Downing	Laird	Ryan
Dulski	Langen	St Germain
Duncan	Lennon	Satterfield
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Saylor
Eckhardt	Lloyd	Schadeberg
Edmondson	Long, La.	Scherle
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Edwards, Calif.	Lukens	Schneebeli
Edwards, La.	McClure	Schweiker

Schwengel	Taft	Whalen
Scott	Taylor	Whalley
Selden	Teague, Calif.	White
Shipley	Teague, Tex.	Whitener
Shriver	Tenzer	Whitten
Sikes	Thompson, Ga.	Widnall
Sisk	Thompson, N.J.	Wiggins
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Williams, Pa.
Slack	Tierman	Wilson, Bob
Smith, Calif.	Tuck	Wilson,
Smith, Iowa	Udall	Charles H.
Smith, Okla.	Ullman	Winn
Springer	Van Deerlin	Wolff
Stafford	Vander Jagt	Wright
Staggers	Vanik	Wyatt
Stanton	Vigorito	Wydler
Steed	Waggonner	Wyle
Steiger, Ariz.	Walde	Wyman
Steiger, Wis.	Walker	Yates
Stratton	Wampler	Zablocki
Stuckey	Watkins	Zion
Sullivan	Watts	Zwach

NAYS—10

Andrews,	Clancy	Roudebush
N. Dak.	Gross	Snyder
Ashbrook	Hall	Watson
Bray	Quillen	

NOT VOTING—78

Anderson,	Gardner	Morse, Mass.
Tenn.	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Annunzio	Gude	Olsen
Arends	Hagan	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Hammer	Passman
Battin	schmidt	Patman
Boggs	Hawkins	Pepper
Bolton	Hébert	Randall
Brasco	Herlong	Rarick
Brock	Horton	Rees
Brooks	Jonas	Resnick
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Button	Kazen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cleveland	King, N.Y.	Roberts
Cramer	Kluczynski	Ronan
Curtis	Kupferman	Rooney, Pa.
Delaney	Landrum	St. Onge
Derwinski	Latta	Sandman
Diggs	Leggett	Smith, N.Y.
Erlenborn	McCarthy	Stephens
Everett	McClory	Stubblefield
Fallon	McMillan	Talcott
Findley	Macdonald,	Tunney
Fino	Mass.	Utt
Foley	Madden	Williams, Miss.
Fountain	May	Willis
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Young

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Foley with Mrs. May.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Horton.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Button.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Gude.

Mr. Young with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Battin.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Stubblefield.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Passman.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Landrum.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON'T RUN TO THE SHOWROOMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 model automobiles are in the showrooms. Except for a few new body design creases, they are not much different from the 1967 models. However, the prices are up—way up. The \$101 to \$114 factory markups announced by General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler tell only part of the story.

The 1968 price markup coupled with the tight market in car supplies generated by the early cessation in the production of 1967 models and the automobile strike have created a dealer's delight. Under these pressures, the buyer is urged to pay the full sticker price and take as much as \$500 less for his trade-in.

Personally, I am going to keep my 1965 model a little while longer. After I purchased it, it took almost the full 2-year period of the guarantee to get it completed. Automobile manufacturers are using the warranty program as a do-it-yourself car completion device. During the warranty program, the owner is given the opportunity to complete his own car and get essential things done—such as attaching the steering wheel, rewiring the horn, and getting the brakes hooked up. In the old days, a completed car usually ran for 50,000 or 60,000 miles on occasional lubrications and a change of oil. I can remember owning several cars that never went back to the dealer.

Getting an automobile completed is no easy job. It is almost a career. If you bring in the car with a bad horn switch, it must be left overnight. After five trips to repair the horn, I still have problems. I was unlucky enough to buy a car on which they forgot to fasten the body to the frame—that took 3 days. Do you know what an oscillator is? I found out after three more trips under the warranty.

In order to complete my 1965 automobile under the warranty, I lost the use of my car for 11 days and I had to arrange for travel to and from the dealer's repair shop on 11 occasions. Since the dealer was located 6 miles from my home, I had to travel 66 unnecessary miles to deliver the car. In addition, I had to arrange for transportation from the dealer on the 11 occasions. This would have cost \$33 in cab fare.

Therefore, the total cost of completing my 1965 automobile under the do-it-yourself plan was:

In cab fare.....	\$33.00
In loss of use of my car for 11 days at \$8 per day.....	88.00
Estimated value of frustration.....	264.75

Total cost of car completion..... 385.75

If the automobile manufacturers think I want to go through this again on a new 1968 model, they have another thought coming. My 1965 model has just been completed, and now I want to enjoy it.

THE HIGH COST OF BEING A CONGRESSMAN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Dodd, Powell, and Bobby Baker affairs, so thoroughly investigated and reported by the mass media, have adversely affected Congress standing in the eyes of the American people. These scandals, however, are symptoms of a larger, more troublesome problem—namely, our system of financing and conducting elections.

Our able and widely respected colleague, MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona, diagnoses this illness in the body politic and prescribes some remedies in the current issue of *Playboy* magazine.

I recommend Congressman UDALL's article, entitled "The High Cost of Being a Congressman," to everyone concerned with the strength and vitality of American political institutions, and with permission granted I insert the article at this point:

THE HIGH COST OF BEING A CONGRESSMAN

What does it take today to succeed in politics? Speaking ability, personality, a willingness to work long and hard, certainly. Leadership ability, a quick mind, television showmanship—these qualities still count, too. But as one who has been down that political road, I must sadly report that there is something rapidly becoming more important than all of them: The name of the game is money and the ability to raise it.

In case you don't know it already, the subject of campaign money, who gives it, who gets it and the preposterous bundle of laws that "control" it is approaching a national outrage. These laws and practices, in the judgment of one who has to live with them, are shot full of hypocrisy, threatening to corrupt many good men in public life, giving unnecessary influence and power to special-interest groups and lobbies and posing a serious threat to the integrity of American political institutions.

Hardly a newspaper of recent years has been without headlines about Senator Thomas Dodd and his financial problems, Representative Adam Clayton Powell and his use of taxpayers' money, ex-Senate Majority Secretary Bobby Baker and his reported fund-raising exploits, the \$1000 President's Club, testimonial dinners, corporate ads in political program books, etc. As I see them, these are all symptoms of a basic illness—our dismal and archaic system of financing and conducting elections. It's a mess that

no amount of patchwork will correct. Your lawmakers—state and Federal—are partly to blame for this deplorable situation, but the public shares a heavy responsibility, too. All of us should join in insisting that fundamental changes are made, and made now.

One might counter that we've always had unsavory things in political finance—so what's new? Well, escalation is new, for one thing. It's not news that campaigns cost money, but the explosion in costs over the past 15 years is dramatic and dangerous. It adds a whole new dimension to the problem. Jackson, Lincoln or even Grover Cleveland could campaign on a small budget and stand a good chance of success. Lincoln was elected President without leaving Springfield, and the major parties spent less than \$200,000 total. But by 1960, John F. Kennedy had to travel 44,000 miles and the two parties had to spend more than \$40,000,000. And just four years later, Johnson and Goldwater found themselves pouring more than \$55,000,000 into their pursuit of the same office.

My brother, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, was elected to Congress in 1960 from the Congressional district I now represent—with an expenditure of under \$13,000. His partisans charged his Republican opponent, who reportedly spent \$35,000, with a "blatant attempt to buy the election." Just four years later, when I ran for re-election in the same district, I was opposed by an able and well-financed candidate—and I had to step up my spending, too. I can imagine that 1960 loser laughing when I reported spending \$35,000 and my opponent \$5000 more than that. Even these figures, however, pale beside those of the hard-fought race in Virginia's Tenth District last year—between Congressman Joel T. Broyhill and his unsuccessful challenger, Clive DuVal. Total spending: \$220,000. Or the 1964 race in New York where Representative Richard L. Ottinger spent \$193,000 all by himself! Such examples are becoming more common every year and threaten to become the general rule.

Take the case of Milton Shapp. In 1966, this wealthy but obscure Pennsylvanian decided to run for governor. Into a successful primary against the "organization" candidate, he poured \$1,400,000 (all but \$3000 of it his own). He reported spending another \$2,400,000 of his money in his losing effort in November. (With all due respect to a fellow Democrat who may have made a good governor, I find his losing the one ray of hope in an otherwise forlorn picture. However, Shapp's campaign manager says the Republicans spent \$5,400,000, and that hardly lightens my gloom.) Nelson Rockefeller spent at least this much in his successful 1966 re-election effort. More and more men of great wealth are going into politics, and this is not all bad; the Rockefellers, Harrimans, Kennedys and Scrantons have given distinguished public service, just as I suspect Shapp might have. But we are approaching the point where only the wealthy, or those financed by special interests, will be able to serve.

From these case histories, it can be seen that a candidate's decision on his campaign finance arrangements may be the most important one he makes—unless it's the selection of his public-relations firm. For the era of the political PR man has dawned with a vengeance. The best-known invention of this new breed of political expert is the "packaged candidate," sold with the same Madison Avenue expertise that works so well for a new laxative or detergent. And, as you can imagine, this new political technology has no place for a Lincoln with principles, strong views and a desire to talk tough issues ("Oppose slavery? Hell, man, there goes half the electorate.") Today's PR man would laugh Honest Abe all the way to the elevator.

The new technique eliminates risk taking. Before a single thing is done, the PR firm

conducts a market survey to find out not what the country needs but what a majority of voters at this fleeting moment think they want. Then the candidate is presented with a carefully selected list of positions he is supposed to take. Thereafter, an appropriate "image" is sold to the public with slogans, jingles, billboards and all the rest. As one commentator said, this is like polling high school students to find out which courses are easiest and most fun, then drafting the curriculum accordingly.

An important part of this package technique is to avoid all debates and all but the blandest speeches. Hal Evry, a highly successful Los Angeles PR man, says: "Clients who campaign least win the most votes." Last year, he boasted about one client, a political unknown with no organized support, who was elected without making a single speech or shaking a single hand. His entire campaign consisted of billboard posters, newspaper ads, telegrams and handbills proclaiming, three cheers for Pat Milligan. He had enough money, and he won.

The major Federal law governing elections, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, is a farce. Despite regular violations of its letter and spirit, there has never been a candidate or a political committee prosecuted under its provisions. The Justice Department isn't about to start, either. This law limits spending in Congressional elections to \$5000 for each candidate. As my able colleague Representative Jim Wright of Texas wrote recently: "If I told you I had never spent more than \$5000 in a House race, I'd be a hypocrite. And if I actually had spent so little in my first race, I'd never have been elected."

The ineffectiveness of this law is apparent by noting three gigantic loopholes: First, it doesn't cover primaries—the real fights in many states. In primaries, the sky is the limit. Second, the \$5000 limit doesn't apply to expenditures for such "extraneous" items as printing, postage, telephone and telegraph expenses, travel or speechwriting. This is like telling your wife that her use of the department-store charge account is limited to \$100 per month except for hats, dresses, fur coats and shoes—on which there is no limit. As if these loopholes weren't big enough, there is an even bigger one. It relieves me of any duty to report—or to have anyone else report—expenditures of a Udall for Congress Campaign Committee. The phony explanation, of course, is that I don't really know what my committee is up to. And there is no Federal law limiting what it may spend.

Congressmen, aspirants to unseat them, lobbyists, businessmen, ordinary citizens—all of us are caught up in a financial web. Suppose you are a freshman member of Congress. It's 1968. You have worked hard at your job, studied issues, tried in every way to represent your district fairly and diligently. You've learned the ropes and you would like to continue. What must you do? If your district is anything like mine (and not beset with even higher costs), you've got to lay your hands on something like \$25,000 to \$40,000. Either that or your new political career will go down the drain.

Or suppose a young lawyer or businessman, equally sincere and honest, decides to run against you. He's a prisoner, too. He may believe he can do a better job. He may think your policies are bad for the country. What must he do? For him, money is even more important. He needs "name identification," because he's a newcomer. But he might as well save his money, shoes and breath unless he can raise \$30,000 to \$50,000. My question to you is: Where would you go to get this kind of money? Seriously.

Of course, even these amounts are small potatoes in some Congressional districts. And if you want to be a Senator from New York or the governor of California, the cause is almost hopeless without a kitty of literally millions. Which brings us to the great new

phenomenon in American politics—the superstar candidate. Because it costs so much to create name identification, particularly in the big races with large constituencies, someone figured out that there would be inherent advantages to fielding candidates who had already achieved fame in other activities—especially show business and sports. Already we have elected several such men to high office.

Some people are inclined to pass off the election of actors George Murphy (to the United States Senate) and Ronald Reagan (to the California governorship) as aberrations of a zany state that has produced both Disneyland and *Gold Diggers of 1933*. I don't think the phenomenon can be dismissed that easily. This is surely the wave of the future in an increasingly large and mobile electorate.

Other examples come to mind. Except for the Goldwater debacle, Oklahoma might well have sent football coach Bud Wilkinson to the Senate. And except for a bathroom accident, Ohio might have done the same for astronaut John Glenn. Congressman Bob Mathias of California, the great Olympic decathlon champion, won with a big majority in his first try last year. "It's not that people voted for me because I was an athlete," he told a reporter, "but what did help was that people knew my name. Look what other candidates spend just to get their names publicized. The two Olympic gold medals were the most important contributions to my campaign fund."

I don't contend that we must elect only lawyers or those with prior political experience to high office, but as long as it costs millions to get name identification, I'm afraid there will be a tendency to pass over able but lesser-known candidates who offer nothing but a capacity for effective public service. The famous names of show business and sports will get the nod.

Although neither side wants it—in any race—escalation is the order of the day. I would be happy, for example, to limit my spending in the 1968 campaign to \$10,000. I would even stay at this figure and let my challenger spend \$15,000. If I knew we were both *tightly limited* to these amounts. He might be willing, too, but it never works out that way. Things quickly get out of hand.

My advisors will call me in Washington: "You'd better adjourn and get out here. Your opponent is campaigning like crazy." They tell me he has put up 60 billboards, each averaging about \$80 to \$100 per month. They insist we get billboards, too, and \$5,000 is gone. They tell me he has contracted for \$6,000 worth of television time and \$3,000 in radio spots. We buy TV and radio time. Taking the initiative, we run two full-page newspaper ads in Tucson (at \$1,200 each) and in three smaller out-of-town dailies (about \$200 each). He answers. I learn of the opposition's direct-mail campaign to reach every voter (up to \$18,000 for a single mailing). Do we meet this? Probably—if we can. As the election nears, my opponent, sensing victory, raises the ante—two more full-page ads and ten extra television spots. We think we're ahead, but we can't be sure. Another \$3,000 down the drain.

Thus it ever goes. Few candidates can make a budget and stick to it. Each candidate's budget is made by his opponent, and by the fears of what might be coming next. In most of the 434 other Congressional districts, the story will be repeated. Candidates need money; in most cases, they don't have it. It must come from friends, relatives, supporters and the party faithful. And by virtue of this sick and dangerous system, much of it inevitably will come from special-interest groups with an ax to grind.

An ax to grind, yes—and yet I suppose I would not be giving you a complete or a fair picture if I left it at that. Even special-interest groups are a part of our American sys-

tem. The Constitution guarantees the people the right to petition their Government, and this right doesn't belong to Aunt Mary in Spokane or to the lonely pensioner in Arizona. It belongs to labor unions, the American Medical Association, the American Beekeeping Federation, the Sierra Club and thousands of other organizations composed of citizens directly affected by the taxes the Government levies, the money it spends, the laws it passes or defeats. As government grows, so do the stakes in influencing public policy; how and where the Federal Government spends more than 100 billion dollars this year can mean jobs and prosperity—or unemployment and depression—for whole communities and occupational groups.

It's the honorable lobbyist's job to influence, by legal means, the decisions of the Government. And it's a lot easier to have favorable decisions made for your group if candidates are elected who believe in your legislative program. The problem is with the candidate who—perhaps against his better judgment but out of financial pressure—wakes up on election morning in bed with one of these special-interest groups.

But back to our hypothetical campaign. Suppose you're the lucky winner. Even more luckily, you find that your campaign donations equaled your expenditures. You assume you are going to Washington with that fat \$30,000 salary and all those huge expense accounts the press likes to write about. Your money troubles—you think—are over.

This is a cruel joke. Your troubles have just begun. You're not joining the jet set—it's more like the debt set. Now, don't get me wrong. I'm proud to be in Congress in these troubled times. I knew the salary when I ran and I have managed to get by reasonably well. Most of my fellow citizens earn far less. It's kind of laughable to "poor-mouth" with a \$30,000 salary, and I'm not asking for sympathy. But I do ask for understanding.

What does it cost to be a Congressman? In the first place, you find that your \$30,000 salary doesn't go as far as you thought it would. With two homes to maintain, more clothes to buy and higher prices than you paid back home, you discover it's really the equivalent, in standard-of-living terms, of about \$20,000 in Topeka, Tulsa or Tucson. As for those fat allowances you read about, you suddenly realize they cover only such things as electric typewriters, dictating machines, stamps, stationery, long-distance calls and staff salaries. You never even get to feel the money, and yet people back home imagine you're rolling in it.

These allowances are regular operating costs, which a third vice-president of a dog-food company would take for granted. None of them puts any money in your pocket or any food on your table. Yet at least one newspaper chain regularly "exposes" the fact that published laws provide Congressmen with these "bonus" gratuities from an unknowing and hapless public.

A Congressman has three kinds of expenses. Like every other citizen, he has to pay for food, clothing, the education of his children, life insurance, transportation and all the rest. Also, in common with all political candidates, he has campaign expenses. And unlike ordinary citizens, and unlike losing candidates, he has a whole range of semiofficial expenses. He has these only because he is a public official and, contrary to popular belief, almost none of them are paid by the taxpayers.

Let's look at some of these semiofficial expenses. Every month, certain things are expected and demanded of you if you are to represent the people of your district adequately and establish a record you can be proud of. They come from your pocketbook and they add up to \$10,000 or \$15,000 every year:

Trips home. Until three months ago, I was

entitled to five Government-paid round trips to Arizona each year, but my constituents expected to see me a lot more often than that. Thus, to do my job adequately, I had to pay out about \$2000 a year in additional air fare. Under a new law, I'll be able to make one Government-paid trip for each month Congress is in session, but I'll continue to pay my own car-rental bills, hotel, and restaurant expenses on those trips. I estimate my trips home will still cost me about \$1000 a year.

Local office. In the Tucson Federal Building, as a service to my constituents, I maintain a two-room office. It gives me a base of operations when I'm in Arizona and it provides the people I represent with ready access to their Congressman. I get the rooms and a part-time staff courtesy of Uncle Sam; but part of the telephone expense, answering service, equipment and supplies are on me. Another \$1500 a year down the drain.

Public information. Every month or so, I try to write and publish an informational newsletter. It goes to 22,000 people who have asked to be on my mailing list. The exchange of views that it prompts enables me to do a better job. While Uncle Sam pays the postage, I pay the printer about \$250 per issue. Each year, I send a questionnaire to every one of the 175,000 addresses in my district and, again, I pay for the printing. Also the computerized tabulation. Debit M.K.U. \$3000. Still another part of this informational function covers regular public-service radio and TV reports to stations in Arizona. Congressmen get a cheap price from the "plush" House recording studios; but even so, the bills run another \$2500 per year.

Miscellaneous expenses. On top of these items, a Senator or a Congressman has constituents to entertain, within-the-state travel to be paid for, official dinners to attend and a duty to contribute to most of the organized (and some of the most unorganized) charities you've ever heard of. More money gone.

All these things are semiofficial, because, you don't legally have to do any of them. And let's face the fact that if they are done right, they may help you get reelected; they have a political aspect, too.

Remember the famous \$18,000 Nixon Fund of 1952? These are the things it was established to cover. I frankly never quite understood all the fuss about the California businessmen who gave \$250 each to make up this fund for Senator Richard Nixon. Each of them could have given Nixon more than this—and probably did—for his regular campaign expenses. At that time, a Senator made \$15,000 a year; and out of his salary, he was expected to do the kinds of things I have listed above. Although such funds are now out of style, the expenditures they were intended to cover are still with us. And they're escalated, too.

If you are the winner in your race and you're lucky, you may have a modest surplus of campaign funds for these purposes. Wealthy ancestors and the laws of inheritance can also turn the trick. If you have neither of these, you may have to go into your salary and savings—and perhaps resort to one of the quaint rites and ceremonies that have evolved to meet the financial needs of our political system.

On his way to jail, the notorious robber Willie Sutton was asked by a reporter why he robbed banks. "Because that's where the money is," he answered. Where is the money for all the political campaigns in this country—and for all of the semiofficial expenses I have talked about? Because of the inflated costs of campaigning and serving in public office, an elaborate system of raising money has grown up.

Heading the list of these rites is the testimonial dinner. From John F. Kennedy to Barry Goldwater, nearly every political candidate in modern times (including this

writer, on a single occasion) has used this device. Its time-honored features include a famous speaker to draw a crowd, bunting and partisan oratory, rubber chicken or drab roast beef and a price tag of \$25 to \$500 per plate. It's a dangerous diet in more ways than one; but given the present state of affairs, it's a proper, legitimate and usually effective fund-raising device—if the proceeds are used (as I have used them) strictly for campaign or semiofficial expenses. Former Senator Paul Douglas, one of the most honest and frugal men ever to serve in Congress, has called this kind of testimonial the "most effective and decent device that has yet been developed." But the testimonial dinner is a deplorable device if used (as I understand Senator Dodd has acknowledged doing) to raise money for a new house, suit, car, wedding or family vacation.

Another variation of this game is the party gala held each year or so in Washington by the Democratic and Republican national committees. Tickets are usually \$100 to \$500, and as many as 5000 businessmen, lobbyists, ambitious upper-level bureaucrats and party faithful crowd the hall to see, hear and touch the party greats. A successful night will bring in \$500,000, or maybe two or three times that.

There are other popular rituals. For example, there are the President's Club (for Democrats) and the Booster's Club (for Republicans). A \$1000 to \$10,000 donation will get you an autographed picture of Johnson or Eisenhower and perhaps an invitation to the White House or Gettysburg. I think the American people ought to be outraged at a system that requires our Presidents, ex-Presidents and Presidential candidates to resort to such demeaning devices.

Yet another popular ritual is the Washington cocktail party. A fund-raising event in one's home state is at least aimed at local money. But the \$25-to-\$100 Washington cocktail party levels its guns at the Capitol Hill lobbyists, and it's always "R.S.V.P." As I've noted, the invitees are mostly legitimate representatives of trade associations, unions and business groups. They have constituents, too, and their constituents expect them to know the lawmakers and have their ear. The system traps them just as much as it does the politician, for failure to attend a function for the chairman of an important committee may not go unnoticed. Some of these trade representatives receive up to 100 such invitations a year.

Then there is the local finance committee. The candidate and his finance chairman compile a list of a few hundred local businessmen, friends and others who might contribute in the \$25-to-\$200 range. These names are placed on cards, in the best Community Chest tradition. A group of 40 to 50 solicitors comes to lunch or breakfast with the candidate. Hopefully, each will take on the job of contacting five to ten prospects. In my case, this drive generally nets \$10,000 to \$15,000. I must say, I have always been proud of the caliber and diversity of the Arizonans who come to my aid—business and professional people, fellow lawyers, Democrats and a surprising number of Republicans. There are few of these people who give from other than decent, honorable motives or who ask more than that I do a conscientious job as their Congressman. I would say 98 percent—at least—of my donors never ask for help of any kind. These are the people who keep both parties in business, but the burdens on all of us grow heavier each year.

Finally, there are small-donor solicitations. Nearly everyone agrees that big contributors tend to obligate candidates, and that therefore a large number of small contributors is preferable. However, this is easier to preach than to practice. Few such efforts succeed. Of every 100 Americans, 95 have never contributed to any political candidate.

Early in my Congressional career, I had the

optimistic belief that I could gradually build a base of one-to-ten-dollar contributors who eventually would provide all the financial support I needed. I even designed a return envelope with a little hole into which contributors could fit "George Washington's picture." The idea has been widely copied by other Congressmen and it has succeeded far beyond most other mail campaigns. I'm proud that 1500 people thought enough of me last year to send back my envelopes with green bills enclosed, but the \$5200 they gave (\$4000 after expenses) is far short of the \$22,000 I spent.

How did the American people allow themselves to become mired in this ruinously expensive and dangerous financial swamp? There are many answers, but two are especially important: population and television.

Congressman Abe Lincoln served perhaps 40,000 people—a smaller number than the constituency of an Arizona state senator today. Personal contacts were important; money was not. False images were hard to create. Today, I represent nearly 550,000 people, and I couldn't shake every voter's hand if I did nothing else until the next election. Thus, along with my opponent, I must spend money for mail, radio, television, newspaper ads and all the rest.

Television, of course, is the big new factor shoving campaign costs out of sight. The Federal Communications Commission reports that \$35,000,000 was spent in the 1964 campaign just for radio and TV. By 1968, the PR boys will demand ads in "living color," and costs will rise even more. If you're running for governor of Arizona and want to buy just one 20-second spot (now you see it, now you don't) in prime time on each of the state's ten commercial TV stations, you shell out \$1000. In New York, the same quickie commercial would cost you \$2500—on just one station. I shudder to think what a package of such spots would cost.

All of this might be worth it if we were using TV's great potential for political education and debate. When TV became common, political scientists predicted a national political revival—with Lincoln-Douglas debates in every living room. But this great potential has been perverted. Lincoln and Douglas would be lucky today to get on after *Monday Night at the Movies*, and even then, they would have to compete with Johnny Carson or Joey Bishop—or both. In truth, TV has drastically lowered the intellectual quality of our campaigns. One Congressional candidate's chief TV commercial revealed him in an apron taking cookies out of the oven. Election year 1966 was, more than anything else, the year of the 20-second spot and the singing political jingle. Sadly, 86 percent of all political radio and TV money last year went for spots—so brief they precluded any discussion of issues.

Every two years, when I meet with my television experts, I regularly insist that some of my money go for half-hour segments to talk issues or to answer questions. We've tried it my way once or twice, but usually I lose out to the pros, who claim (rightly) that these programs don't make votes. Viewers will submit to a spot inserted in a favorite program; but if a 30-minute show is pre-empted, most folks will complain bitterly and then tune you out for *The Beverly Hillbillies*.

The end result of this thinking can be found in the text of one of my own 20-second spots from the 1966 campaign. Here it is, in its intellectual entirety:

"ANNOUNCER. This man has become one of the most dynamic leaders in Congress. He's won the respect of both parties. He's led the fight for the things Arizona must have for today and for the future. Arizona can be proud of him. Mo Udall, our man in Washington—let's keep him there. Paid for by the Udall Campaign Committee."

That little gem cost my supporters about

\$65 every time it went on the air. It isn't very enlightening, but it works—and this is what we've come to. By now you may understand why, if I had my way, I would pass drastic laws junking this whole system. Here, in a nutshell, is what I think we need:

1. Rigid, enforceable, reasonable limits on the costs of all campaigns, including primaries. If committees are allowed, their expenditures should be included in the totals allowed. One man, designated by the candidate, would be responsible for reporting all receipts and expenditures. All spending for a candidate, except that authorized and reported by this fiscal agent, would be a criminal offense.

2. Federal financing of some campaign costs.

3. Complete public disclosure of all campaign expenditures and contributors.

4. Free radio and TV time for candidates to present their views and to debate issues.

5. Shorter general election campaigns.

6. Tax credits and deductions to encourage and legitimize broad-based, private financial support of elections.

7. A meaningful, enforceable code of ethics for members of Congress—to include guidelines determining the propriety of gifts, testimonial dinners, special funds and the like.

8. Periodic financial statements required of all Representatives and Senators covering all outside income, gifts, legal fees and business interests. Senator Dirksen says that such a law would make Congressmen "second-class citizens." I've voluntarily printed these things and a summary of my assets and investments in the Congressional Record. It's not particularly pleasant to lay your personal affairs before the public, but I feel better having done it—first-class, in fact.

I have also introduced legislation aimed at achieving most of these objectives. Because my suggestions are sharply different from present practices, they deserve some discussion.

I don't anticipate much argument—outside of Congress—on several of my proposals. I suppose nearly everyone would be in favor of reducing the waste of political campaigns. But Federal financing? I can hear some of the reactions now. "After all the money you extract from us for Federal pork-barrel projects, now you're going to have us pay for your campaigns, too." I would answer that the public already pays—and it's a staggering price, in terms of legislative and administrative actions that serve the interests of big contributors and lobbyists.

President Theodore Roosevelt, more than 50 years ago, advocated financing Federal elections out of the Federal treasury, and his arguments make even more sense in the day of color TV. In a Congressional contest, my plan would work like this: The Government would deposit with the Treasurer of the United States to my credit and to that of my opponent or opponents a drawing account equal to ten cents for each registered voter in the district. In present terms, this would amount to perhaps \$18,000. The candidates would never see or touch this money, but companies that provide printing, broadcasting, mailing and similar services could submit sworn vouchers to the U.S. Treasurer for payment. Coupled with this would be a limit of \$10,000 that each candidate could spend from his own or contributed funds, thereby reducing drastically the dependence on big contributors. To qualify, a candidate would have had to be nominated by a bona fide party polling an aggregate of at least 15 percent of the total votes in a primary election.

As additional public support for the candidates, I would permit each of them to submit to the Government Printing Office a pamphlet outlining his qualifications and views. These pamphlets would be printed at public expense and would be delivered free

by the Post Office Department to every voter. This proposal is similar to Arizona law, which provides for public printing and distribution of pro and con arguments on referendums and initiative propositions appearing on the ballot.

Also, I would put the great potential of television and radio to work for cleaner, better and more enlightening campaigns. The airwaves belong to the public. Every two years I would require stations, which use these airwaves for profit, to grant a reasonable amount of free prime time to candidates for debate and discussion, in segments of not less than 15 minutes. Candidates desiring spot announcements or additional program time could buy more within the financial limitations above.

In the U.S. Senate races, the same procedures would apply. The public money spent would be ten cents for each voter in the state, or \$250,000, whichever is less. The limits on private contributions would be \$5000 times the number of Congressional districts in the state. While these figures may seem small compared with the huge sums now spent, I believe the introduction of partial public financing would provide the essential element of control previously lacking.

Many of the present evils in our system result from secrecy—about who is giving money, where it is spent and whether it ends up in the Congressman's pocket. Contrary to popular belief, hidden gifts don't buy many votes—but many citizens think otherwise. Doctors, oilmen, labor leaders, lobbyists of all kinds ought to have the right to help candidates whose policies they approve. But the public at large has a right to know where the campaign money is coming from and where it goes.

Thus, my proposals would bring the spotlight of publicity to bear on all aspects of political finance: who gave contributions, or things of value, how the money was spent, which Senator used campaign or testimonial-dinner funds for personal purposes, and all the rest. With this information, unconfused by saturation "image" campaigns, the public could vote more intelligently.

A three-week vacation costs more than a one-week vacation. One of the basic reasons for the escalating costs of campaigns is their interminable length. In some states, John Q. Public is now harassed from April to November every election year. The British do a better job in three or four weeks. While we can't outlaw handshaking or free speech, there are two things we can do. A bill I have introduced would prohibit the national parties from holding their Presidential nominating conventions before September first. This would shorten the campaigns substantially. I would also like to see a 90-percent tax on any general-election advertising appearing before October first of an election year. If the voter can't be convinced in five weeks, it seems to me he can't be persuaded in 10 or 20.

Federal tax laws now permit deductions for gifts to churches, educational institutions, research foundations, fraternal and charitable organizations. But campaign donations by private citizens have no dignity under our laws. This contributes to the prevailing attitude that there is something wrong or corrupt about politics and contributing to political campaigns. I think establishing clean, broadly supported political campaigns is just as important to the future of this country as conquering cancer, supporting our churches and colleges or financing our Elks and Moose.

In 1966, Senator Russell Long succeeded in attaching to an unrelated tax bill a rider allowing for "tax credit" financing of Presidential campaign expenses. This year, the Senate reversed itself and apparently wiped out any hope of including such a feature on 1967 income-tax forms. Had this reversal not

occurred, each taxpayer would have been granted a one-dollar tax credit (reduction in his tax) provided he checked a square indicating he was earmarking that dollar for a national campaign fund to be divided between or among major parties in the Presidential race.

While this plan had many flaws (it gave too much advantage to candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, as compared with new parties that might come along) and perhaps deserved its fate, the basic idea was good. It would have freed Presidential elections from many existing evils. I hope further thought will be given to making it workable. One refinement I might suggest would be for the taxpayer, having checked the square, to receive one dollar in scrip that then could be given to the party or candidate of his choice. This would put all present and possible parties on an equal footing.

A bill I have introduced would give a direct tax credit up to ten dollars for small contributors and, beyond that, would permit taxpayers to deduct from their total income up to \$1,000 paid out in political donations. I believe such an incentive is necessary if we are going to have a chance of broadening in the base of political fund raising to include more ordinary citizens or ordinary means.

I am modestly hopeful that the House of Representatives will take some action this year to establish meaningful guidelines for members, a code of ethics and mandatory disclosure of income and assets. These steps would be the product of labors by a new Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Something like this committee could also serve as a watchdog over national elections.

For many years, we have had the bipartisan National Fair Campaign Practices Committee. This unofficial organization has done much to encourage clean campaigns. Enlarging on this idea, I would create a permanent National Commission on Campaign Finance and Procedure, composed of prominent persons from both parties. It would watch the new system, see how it works and prevent abuses, investigate charges of election misconduct by candidates and national parties, recommend new legislation as needed and encourage and police voluntary agreements between candidates who want to avoid escalation of the kind I have described.

There you have it—a set of drastic changes that could breathe new life into American politics and recapture our political system from the money-changers. I frankly doubt that any less drastic changes will do the job. And, as a political realist, I know that changes of this kind won't come easily. We'll soon discover, I'm sure, that the present system has some pretty strong defenders among groups enjoying its benefits.

But gloom and doom are not my meat. I have always been one who believed that the needs of our nation can be met if we face up to them. And I truly believe we must face up to them if we are to continue to have a Government even remotely responsive to the public it serves. I don't suppose Bobby Baker, Adam Powell and Thomas Dodd will go down in history as great heroes. But the storms they generated by their actions just might awaken the public to the need for sweeping changes in our archaic system of financing and conducting elections. If this happens, these unfortunate men, unwittingly, will have performed an important public service.

A BRAVE, YOUNG AMERICAN SOLDIER AND HIS UNSELFISH FAMILY

Mr. POOL. 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 pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the trend toward draft dodging has been on the increase. I think that it is therefore particularly appropriate to take note of the many young Americans who are heroically and voluntarily serving our Nation in Vietnam. The following editorial on KLIF Radio in Dallas, Tex., illustrates the story of one such brave young American soldier and his unselfish family:

KLIF EDITORIAL: A STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL OPINION

In these days of snivelling draft dodgers and placard carriers, it is heartening to hear the story of Franklin Beggs of Gadsden, Alabama. It is a story the draft dodgers will not understand . . . it won't make sense to them. But to Americans who still salute the flag, and remember the stuff of which our country is made, the story of Franklin Beggs is inspirational. In 1965, Franklin Beggs was 25, married, the father of a young son, successful in his community. But there was a war going on—in Viet Nam—and Beggs realized his duty to fight for his country. The Army couldn't take him, though, because he had one too many dependents. Beggs and his wife Linda talked long into the night . . . and agreed they would divorce one another, then re-marry after Beggs was signed up. Beggs went to war. His wife Linda helped keep the family going by working as a singer in a trio with two sisters. United States Warrant Officer Franklin Beggs fought that war, and a grateful nation awarded him two Distinguished Flying Crosses, a Bronze Star, Air Medal with Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Commendation Medal for Valor, and the Purple Heart. Last Thursday night Beggs came home . . . alive and healthy. But he's only on leave . . . and soon goes back to Viet Nam. Franklin Beggs of Gadsden, Alabama—who gave up family, community and safety—will return to fight. May God see him home again safely. As I said, it's a story the draft dodgers won't understand. KLIF does understand, and we salute Franklin Beggs, 27, U.S. Army Warrant Officer. A man with honor!

EDUCATION IS THE ROAD TO FREEDOM, SECURITY, AND PROSPERITY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a dollar spent on education today means a thousand dollars saved on welfare in the next generation.

Education is the road to freedom, security, and prosperity.

Our first obligation to the youngsters of today is to provide a sound moral education, for morality is the cohesive fabric of the entire social structure.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide tax exemptions for educational expenses—a tax exemption for funds spent for higher education, either in family, or in the form of contributions to scholarship funds.

In recent years the costs of higher education have been advancing rapidly,

and have placed a heavy burden on both parents and students.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has been attempting to assist education by ever-increasing appropriations. My proposal is to allow a proper tax exemption for educational expenses, and thus reduce the demand for Federal aid to education.

I feel that when someone spends a large sum of money to provide himself or his children with a higher education, he is spending money in the national interest, and it is only fair that the Nation try to ease his burden through our tax laws.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, today I enter a bill that will provide a tax credit for higher education. Basically, my bill provides a 100-percent tax credit on the first \$200 which is spent on a person's education; 75 percent on the next \$300, and finally, 25 percent of the next \$1,000.

As an individual reaches a higher tax bracket, the tax credit will be greater to him in proportion to an individual in a lower tax bracket. In order to help equalize the benefits among different tax brackets, I am providing for a 1-percent reduction from the tax credit for those earning an adjusted gross income in excess of \$25,000.

The credit is available to anyone who pays the specified expenses for someone trying to obtain a higher education. It is available to students who are trying to put themselves through school. It is available to parents helping their children through college, and it will be available to other persons who contribute help. This measure would help to create individual scholarships in that the donor would receive a tax credit, and colleges could well use this provision to encourage their alumni to help some deserving student.

I am well aware of the fact that a college education is not the only form of additional training and education needed. Our advanced technology creates an unending need for upgrading the skills of these engaged in industry and science. It would be discriminatory to help only students attending college. Under my bill any person attending a post-secondary school such as business, trade, technical, and other vocational institutions would be qualified for the credit.

There are many students in college today who are receiving full or partial scholarships. The median family income of students receiving scholarships is \$8,436. Most State-supported colleges have a tuition of less than \$600. My proposal would furnish a maximum tax credit of \$675. The assistance from the tax credit measure could release scholarships for the benefit of those in greater need.

In my own State, Georgia, there are many outstanding institutions of higher learning. Included in the Fourth District are Georgia State College and De Kalb Junior College. Georgia State's tuition for three quarters is \$315 for residents of Georgia, and De Kalb Junior College's tuition for two trimesters is \$220 for residents of De Kalb County.

My bill would provide a \$296.25 tax

credit for any Georgia citizen who desired to attend Georgia State.

Also, a tax credit of \$215 would be provided for all those De Kalb County residents who desire to attend De Kalb Junior College. Thus, under my plan, any resident of my State who wishes to attend these institutions, and has the academic background, may do so.

Those college students who are working in order to pay for their college education will receive a larger rebate from the Internal Revenue Service under the tax credit. This rebate will give them additional funds which they need so badly to pay for food and clothing.

Our Nation today is confronted by many thousands of frustrated youngsters who are unable to obtain higher education because of the cost involved.

My bill helps promote the American ideal of helping those who desire to help themselves, without any interference from the Federal Government.

I feel it is very important for these ambitious young people to attempt to obtain an education by themselves, instead of having to rely on Government training, or some other federally sponsored program.

Thus, my bill will allow the individual to provide for his own education without seeking the help of the Federal Government.

I therefore urge the House to give this measure prompt and careful consideration at the earliest possible date.

POLISH WEAPONS IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, newspapers today show World War II weapons captured last week near Saigon.

This revelation underscores the importance of the amendment accepted by the House on August 25, which would suspend most-favored-nation status until Poland stops sending arms to our enemy. The amendment was dropped last week by House-Senate conferees after administration pressure.

The captured weapons, some of them manufactured by the United States, undoubtedly were shipped to Vietnam by the Polish regime from lend-lease stockpiles left over from World War II.

Poland is the only Government which has admitted publicly that it has supplied World War II weapons to our enemy. It is also the only country presently getting the advantage of most-favored-nation status under our tariff laws which is admittedly supplying them weapons of whatever vintage.

In its issue of Friday, July 28, the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, a publication of the U.S. State Department, carried the text of a speech in Warsaw to the General Staff Academy by Marion Spychalski, Minister of National Defense of Poland. In it, after vilifying

the United States for its role in Vietnam, he is quoted as stating:

In a way we, Poland, are participating in this war by lending assistance to the Vietnamese people, and the same weapons with which we fought during World War II are now used in Vietnam. These weapons, obsolete under our conditions, prove of excellent value in the hands of people who are dedicated to the cause and who have learned in action how to use them effectively.

On June 25 an Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw carried a report indicating that Poland was supplying military weapons to our enemy. Zenon Kliszko, a member of the Communist Party politburo and an influential leader of the Polish Government, was quoted as saying:

We are glad that Polish guns are bringing concrete results to you in your fight. We are giving and will continue to give material, political, and military aid.

While in Hanoi, Mr. Kliszko addressed a Hanoi anti-aircraft unit armed with equipment furnished by Polish workers which he said was responsible for shooting down or damaging 40 U.S. planes.

On September 10, at the very time when the House-Senate conferees were debating my amendment, three Polish ships were docked in Haiphong—unloading their cargo, which may well have included arms like those captured last week.

While on the one hand the administration is seeking to bring the conflict in Vietnam to a halt, on the other it wants to continue trade advantage to a country supplying weapons to our enemy.

The time has come to put a stop to such a double standard. Poland has been benefiting to the tune of some \$50 million annually from the most-favored-nation status. In 1962, U.S. Congress voted to suspend MFN to Poland because of its shipments of planes and helicopters to Cuba and because it mobilized its armed forces during the Berlin crisis. We should suspend MFN again, this time until Poland stops arming our enemy.

WITHDRAWING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 859, URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964, FROM SUSPENSION CALENDAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply appreciative of the action of those in charge of the program in having withdrawn House Joint Resolution 859, a resolution to extend for 1 year the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, from the Suspension Calendar today until such time as a rule can be granted and until such time as the troublesome paragraph 13(c) thereunder could be worked out.

It is a paradox that another Department, and particularly the Amalgamated

Transit Workers, could be given veto power under the assumed interpretation of this paragraph of this law. The cooperation of all concerned in holding this up from suspension, until we could either get amendments or a vote on it in the proper fashion and until the House could work its will, is indeed appreciated.

This past weekend I sent a letter to Members of Congress detailing what I believe to be the failure of the Secretary of Labor to fairly administer section 13(c) of the basic act dealing with the establishment of fair labor standards. It is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will look into the Secretary's attempt to use section 13(c) to establish new and previously nonexistent rights as a condition of gaining his approval for grant applications under this program. Otherwise a rule should be granted so that amendments can be offered to section 13(c) that would clarify the legislative intent, and to insure that administrative procedures comply with that intent. I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the September 17 issue of the Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press, and my letter to my colleagues:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday, October 16, 1967, H.J. Res. 859 will come before the House under suspension of the rules. This House Joint Resolution will extend for one year Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

This Act is administered by the Housing and Urban Development Department. However, under Sec. 13(C) of the Act the approval of labor standards must be made by the Secretary of Labor before a grant can be finalized by HUD to an applying city.

Under the discretionary powers possessed by the Secretary of Labor he has, in effect, established the unreasonable practice of obtaining the concurrence of the International Amalgamated Transit Workers Union before any grant is approved.

The City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri applied to HUD for a grant to purchase new buses. The City Utilities is municipally owned and has been for over twenty years. Under Missouri Statute employees of municipally owned utilities may not enter into collective bargaining contracts. Therefore, since the City is prohibited by law from signing a collective bargaining contract with the Transit Workers Union, the Secretary of Labor refuses to give his ancillary approval for the grant.

This now leaves the City Utilities and the Labor Department at an impasse. It, in turn, places a burden upon the citizens of Springfield who must suffer for lack of adequate public transportation. The people of Springfield, as represented by their public-owned utility, have complied with all provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act. To comply with the arbitrary and unreasonable demand of the Secretary of Labor, they must violate the very law that they had enacted by their representatives in the State Legislature.

It is my belief that H.J. Res. 859 should not be approved under suspension of the rules, but that a rule should be obtained which would permit amendments that would clarify the legislative intent of Section 13(C) of the basic Act relating to labor standards. I urge your support of this position when H.J. Res. 859 is considered on the House Floor Monday. Attached is an editorial from the Springfield, Missouri LEADER PRESS of

Sunday, September 17, 1967 which calls attention to this gross injustice.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

EDITORIAL REPRINT FROM SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
LEADER PRESS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17,
1967

U.S. Taxpayers who do not belong to labor unions—and there still are a few of us left—will be unpleasantly surprised to learn that signature of a union contract is well on the way to becoming a prerequisite for the approval of federal grants.

This strange situation has been revealed to Springfieldians through federal non-action on the request of City Utilities for \$294,333 in federal funds to provide air-conditioned bus service on all city routes. Checking on this long-pending application, CU learned it had been referred to the U.S. Department of Labor, under a section of the Federal Aid to Transit Act which specifies that federally aided projects shall have no detrimental effect upon employees.

Since it is hard to see how the air-conditioning of the municipally owned bus fleet could in any way harm or inconvenience city bus drivers, CU officials made inquiry of the Department of Labor—and learned that the application had been referred to international offices of the Amalgamated Transit Union.

And as they mulled over this interesting bit of information, a St. Louis representative of the union arrived in Springfield bearing a "proposed agreement" between the union and City Utilities—pledging not only the preservation of all existing CU union agreements and continued "collective bargaining," but the arbitration of disputes and other procedures long forbidden to municipal government agencies under Missouri law as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

CU Manager Marvin Castleberry and Attorney John F. Carr traveled to Washington last week, spent a morning in the offices of an assistant secretary of labor—and were referred by him, to an all-afternoon conference with the legal counsel for the Amalgamated Transit Union.

Nobody, apparently, had the colossal nerve to tell the CU representative that a city must sign a union agreement to get federal tax money for this or any other project. The Department of Labor said it would continue to review the application. The union counsel said the agreement offered here was "the kind we like to get."

Mr. Castleberry brought home a set of "supplemental instructions to applicants" for transit grants suggesting that, "to assist the secretary" in his determination that projects would not result in detriment to employees, "normal procedure" would be to "negotiate agreements" to that effect with employee-representatives.

We are very thankful that this suggestion is a part of administrative procedure, and not of the Aid to Transit Act. We suggest that the Secretary of Labor in at least nine-tenths of the projects which come before him, needs nothing more than ordinary intelligence and common sense to determine that they will or will not imperil employees. If he needs any further assurance, he or his numerous assistants should secure it firsthand, from the employees and employers involved, rather than from the international offices of a labor union. As for the Springfield project, we would point out that CU does NOT propose to substitute helicopters for buses, thus throwing bus drivers out of work. It does NOT propose to reduce the number of buses in the fleet or speed them up so that individual driver will be under any greater strain, or operate them by computer or electronic eye. It simply wants to air-condition them, so that passengers—and

presumably drivers also—can ride in greater comfort. Bus passengers these days include the elderly, working families for whom two automobiles are not economically feasible, students—and others whom the Federal government through a variety of programs claims that it seeks to aid. Bus service in Springfield is better and cheaper than in many other cities today, because the system is municipally owned and therefore subsidized by the more profitable departments of City Utilities. The Springfield bus system would indeed seem an ideal recipient for federal assistance.

It is true that Missouri law forbids the signature of contracts with Union employees, but City Utilities has long negotiated with the unions, for the most part peacefully, to the end that its employees enjoy a pay scale comparable to that of private industry and well above that of general city government. We are pleased that representatives of Sen. Stuart Symington and Congressman Durward Hall attended conferences of Mr. Castleberry and Mr. Carr with the Department of Labor and the Amalgamated Transit Union in Washington last week. It is just possible that these gentlemen—and other members of Congress—were unaware of the preposterous position in which the department has placed itself, and of the suspicion which must surely arise in the taxpayers mind that the individual, unorganized citizen has hardly any rights and privileges left to him at all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in his concern as to the glaring inequity in the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

My colleagues may recall my bringing to their attention in the last Congress a similar situation at Yakima, Wash., in my congressional district. The privately operated bus company there was losing money, and it was forced to notify the city that with the expiration of their franchise, they would quit business.

So that this city of nearly 50,000 persons would not be deprived of public transportation, the city arranged to take over the bus operation, and run it as a city expense. To finance the operation the city proposed a householder tax and applied for a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Department cleared the grant of a little over \$172,000 in all particulars except for section 13(c) which was inserted into the act for the supposed purpose of protecting union workers. In the case of Yakima, the eight bus drivers, all union members when employed by the private bus company, were to have their hourly wages raised from \$2 an hour to \$2.40 an hour as city employees. They were also to receive additional fringe benefits as city employees.

Washington State law, as well as the charter under which the city of Yakima operates, would make it illegal for these employees to have a union shop contract as outlined in section 13(c).

So, the Federal grant was not forthcoming. The bus drivers did not demand a union shop, the city was precluded by both its charter and State law, but the

Urban Mass Transportation Act is so inflexible that the city was denied Federal assistance.

Section 13(c), Mr. Speaker, has worked in this instance to discriminate against American labor by denying these bus drivers better jobs, and in fact, forcing them to look for work elsewhere. Section 13(c) also denies the Federal assistance to deserving communities that need and have every right to expect such assistance.

I am pleased to support the position of my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HALL] in protesting the interpretation of paragraph 13(c) of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as highly discriminatory and unfair to cities like Amarillo, Tex.

Under Texas State laws, Amarillo and other Texas cities that operate their own transit systems as a public utility cannot comply with the requirements demanded by the Secretary of Labor for approval of assistance grants for such transit systems.

The city of Amarillo a year and a half ago was presented a 30-day discontinuance notice by the operator of a privately owned and operated transit system and also with a non-negotiable offer to sell the assets of the system to the city. The city declined the offer as exorbitant, and instead, bought used buses and began its own service at the end of the 30-day notice period and has operated the service since.

The city of Amarillo also applied for assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which was approved except for approval by the Secretary of Labor.

Under the Secretary's interpretation of paragraph 13(c) of the act, there was no way the city of Amarillo could comply. Texas State law forbids municipal employees to enter into a union shop contract as specified in section 13(c) so the city of Amarillo has had to continue its present operation because of the inequity of this highly discriminatory section of the act.

The city is in dire need of assistance to expand and modernize the system which last year operated at a considerable loss.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress to force a city to go back to a privately operated system which in this case, had failed, so that the city could comply with the union contract provisions as interpreted by the Secretary of Labor.

Neither do I believe it was the intent of Congress to force States to change their laws concerning State and municipal employees so that a city such as Amarillo could comply with the Secretary of Labor's interpretation of the act.

So I join my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HALL] in seeking amendment to

section 13(c) of the act which has resulted in denial to Amarillo, Tex., of the Federal assistance for such communities as Amarillo, Tex., which is certainly as much entitled to grants under the act as any other community.

ANOTHER BOONDOGGLE

Mr. GROSS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, still another example of the boondoggles that clutter the record of operations of the Agency for International Development has been brought to light.

This latest one finds AID functionaries giving away a half million dollars of the taxpayers' money to a Lebanese promoter who, apparently, had only to walk in the door over at the State Department and hold out his hand.

Apparently nobody in the giveaway agency bothered to ask whether the school this individual was promoting even existed and sure enough, according to the account I have read, it did not.

I understand the Federal Bureau of Investigation has entered this case to do what the AID people should have done in the first place—find out who was doing what to who and why.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a newspaper article outlining some of the points involved in this particular case:

SWINDLE OF AID FUNDS IS REPORTED IN LEBANON

BEIRUT, LEBANON, September 29.—The U.S. government has been swindled out of \$500,000 to finance a Lebanese school that doesn't exist, authoritative Lebanese sources reported today.

They said the Agency for International Development (AID), on application of a Lebanese who said he owned a school here, sent half a million dollars worth of school equipment to Lebanon and part of it was sold for profit.

The alleged swindle was discovered about 10 days ago when an AID mission went looking for a supposedly thriving school and found only an empty house, the sources said.

The U.S. Embassy Friday refused to confirm or deny the report. "The entire case is now in hands of Lebanese judicial authorities," an Embassy spokesman said.

Police said the school promoter, Michel Hayek, and his assistant, Fouad Semaan, had been arrested.

The two men—who had told AID in Washington their school included 350 students and would soon grow to 500—said they had sold some of the American equipment, the sources reported.

[In Washington, a spokesman for AID had no comment on the reported school case but did say that there was no AID program in Lebanon now and had not been for several years.]

PATRICK LYNCH—A REAL AMERICAN SON OF THE EMERALD ISLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago Patrick Lynch arrived in Cleveland from County Mayo, the locale of my forebears. He had little of the world's material goods, but he was abundantly endowed with determination—the heritage of his sturdy antecedents.

In youth Pat Lynch set for himself a goal, and he never wavered in his determination to attain that goal. He would come to America, the land of opportunity, and he would make good. He knew he would travel a rigorous road to success and would encounter obstacles. Obstacles were challenges to Pat Lynch, which he met and conquered, perhaps not always with ease, but with the grace of the gentleman he is. He quickly realized the boundless opportunities this country offered, and he likewise became aware of the keen competition in which he must participate. This was "fairplay" to Pat Lynch, and he entered the U.S. Army, served with the AEF in World War I, was wounded in combat in France, and awarded the Purple Heart. Upon his return to civilian life in 1918 he became an integral part of the Irish-American activities in Cleveland, where his charity, beneficent kindness, and warm friendship have been a boon to many newly arrived immigrants, especially those from his homeland.

Pat Lynch became president of the Gaelic Athletic Association and in 1930, starred as a goalie for the Cleveland Shamrocks soccer team. In 1932 he helped found the West Side Irish-American Club, which he ably served as president for 34 years. He personally led the club's colorful units in the annual St. Patrick's Day parades and on many other occasions.

Pat Lynch is not one to indulge in reminiscence, nor does he surrender to the twilight cycle of life. He is now, at age 71, a vibrant and stimulating Irish-American—living proof of the wisdom of admitting immigrants to our shores, hundreds of whom he has befriended in multiple ways.

Writers have described Ireland as a somber, enigmatic land, with sudden brightness of green or gold. Undoubtedly when spring comes to Cleveland, Pat's thoughts drift back to the scenes of his childhood in County Mayo, with its deep green meadows and rolling hills, where he romped and played as a boy, but there is never a trace of regret in the tone of his voice when he speaks of these scenes, for, as he has made a name for himself in Cleveland, he has likewise emblazoned the name of Cleveland in his homeland, always giving full praise for the warm and friendly people in his adopted country, to those in his native Ireland.

We, in Cleveland, are proud of Pat Lynch—he is a credit to our city, our State, and our Nation, and to the land that gave him birth—Ireland.

On Sunday, October 22, the West Side Irish-American Club will give a testimonial banquet in honor of Patrick Lynch, its former president. It is difficult adequately to pay the honor and esteem this remarkable man deserves. He has

made full and good use of his rich life, dedicating his energies and interests to his fellowmen. I join his legion of friends in wishing him God's highest blessings.

LIMITATIONS ON DISSENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to commend the distinguished Governor of the State of California, Mr. Ronald Reagan, on a recent comment of his on the subject of dissent from our country's foreign policy.

This is somewhat unusual, because I do not agree with Mr. Reagan on a great many things, but yesterday he made a statement with reference to one of the principal detractors of the President, a Member of the other body, for which I want to commend him. He said some things which I as a Member of the Congress, under the rules, cannot say. Unfortunately, too many men in high places today have gone far beyond the simple right of dissent and are, indeed, helping and abetting the Communists in Hanoi.

I believe it is time someone put this matter of dissent into its proper perspective. The right to dissent means just exactly that, no more and no less. It does not guarantee, for instance, that no one will criticize the dissenters. It does not guarantee that they will not be scorned or ostracized or guarantee immunity from prosecution for law violations for which a nondissenter would be hauled into court. It does not guarantee that someone will not call their good sense or even their ancestry into question, nor does it guarantee that no one will accuse them of giving aid and comfort to an alien cause.

Certainly on a subject as complex and intricate as foreign affairs, and particularly on the subject of foreign affairs in Southeast Asia, there is room for differences of opinion. But any expert on this subject who chooses to criticize his President has no right to try to insulate himself from criticism in return, on the basis that his right to dissent is being infringed upon.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the determination of Hanoi to prolong and intensify the war is strengthened and encouraged by every word and every deed on the part of the American people which seems to show some hesitancy and uncertainty in our determination to stay on in South Vietnam. I am firmly convinced that this dissent is costing additional American lives and the letting of American blood in the combat zone.

By saying this, I am not in any way circumscribing the right of the dissenters to dissent. If the dissenters write under this type of criticism, then write they must. I have not in any way limited their freedom to speak out on Vietnam. I have merely stated my firm conviction of what the consequences of their

dissent are and have attempted to affix on them a responsibility which I believe they must accept.

Mr. Speaker, the right of dissent is a precious one. I would be the last in this House to infringe upon this right. But as is the case with all of our rights, they also carry with them certain responsibilities, and one of these responsibilities is the responsibility to stand up under whatever criticism may come their way for voicing their dissent.

THE 10-PERCENT SURCHARGE TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a temporary 10-percent surcharge on corporate and individual income tax liabilities is not a satisfactory solution to the Federal Government's revenue problems.

In my view, it would be improper to impose additional taxes on income which is already taxed at full rates while we continue to allow income derived from other sources—or by other persons—to completely escape income taxes, or to be taxed at rates very much below those which generally apply.

It may well become imperative for the Federal Government to raise additional funds through the tax system in order to meet the rising costs of providing for the country's defense and for essential domestic programs.

If such does become the case, I shall seek in every way possible to raise the additional funds through a program of tax reform, rather than through the device of imposing additional taxes on those who are already paying their fair share of governmental costs.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has been most fortunate in that its citizens have long accepted taxation as an inevitable, albeit none-too-pleasant, fact of civilized life. This has enabled us to have a system of self-enforced taxation under which our people, with few exceptions, file honest returns and pay their levies promptly and in full.

I believe the central reason that our system of taxation has worked so well is that the people have been of the view that it is an equitable system under which the burden of paying for required governmental activities has been fairly distributed among the various groupings of taxpayers whether these are individual citizens, corporations or other entities.

Americans deserve much commendation for the maturity they have demonstrated through the acceptance of the substantial tax burden which we have faced for so many years and which we continue to face.

Unfortunately, there is a growing threat to this acceptance; a threat which arises by reason of the many devices for tax avoidance—often called tax loopholes—which, over the years, have been

built into the Federal Government's income tax system.

I believe that there is a meaningful connection between tax loopholes and the opposition which is being expressed by so many citizens to the President's proposal for a 10-percent surtax on present income tax liabilities.

The ordinary taxpayer properly asks: "Why should my tax bill be increased by 10 percent when others with larger incomes than mine are able to avoid much if not all Federal income tax liability?"

I know of no adequate answer to this question other than action by the Congress to close to the fullest possible degree the loopholes now found in our income tax rules and regulations.

I feel that the American people are prepared to meet the costs of defense programs and to provide funds for the many vital educational, medical, and social programs conducted by the Federal Government. However, I also feel that the American people are impatient with an income tax system which disproportionately takes from some income groupings while allowing others to substantially avoid income taxes.

Tax avoidance devices generally are not available for use in any significant way by persons whose incomes consist largely of wage or salary payments. Instead, the prosperous corporations and high-income individuals are the ones who are able to arrange to take advantage of tax loopholes.

Overall, tax experts tell me that as much as \$40 billion in revenue may be lost to the Federal Government each year because of tax avoidance devices. Other experts place the figure somewhat lower.

I have had prepared a compilation which shows that revenue losses exceed \$21.5 billion a year for a selected group of tax loopholes:

Tax loophole and revenue loss	
[In millions]	
Minerals depletion, including oil and gas.....	\$1,500
Intangible oil and gas drilling costs.....	750
State and municipal bond interest.....	1,800
Capital gains.....	7,000
Multiple corporate surtax exemptions.....	150
Dividend exclusion.....	200
Sick pay allowances.....	85
Unlimited charitable contribution deductions.....	35
Split income provision.....	10,000
Total.....	\$21,520

¹ Over \$21.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, \$21.5 billion is a very substantial chunk of potential revenue. It would go a long way toward wiping out the deficit which the Federal Government faces during the present fiscal year. This huge block of potential revenue takes on great importance when weighed against the proposal to raise added funds through the device of a 10-percent income tax surcharge.

I believe that it would approach the immoral for the Congress to impose additional taxes upon those citizens who are already heavily burdened, while others are allowed to completely escape Federal income tax liability or to pay such taxes at inequitably reduced rates.

The Internal Revenue Service advises that in calendar year 1964, there were 35 individual returns filed with adjusted gross incomes of \$500,000 or more, on which no Federal income tax was paid. These returns represented a total adjusted gross income of \$75.2 million.

The IRS stated that in the same year there were 24,084 individuals who filed tax returns with adjusted gross incomes in excess of \$10,000 and paid no taxes. These returns represented adjusted gross incomes totaling \$523,515,000.

In 1966, the 22 largest U.S. petroleum companies reported gross profits of \$6,809,111,000. Their combined Federal income tax liability was \$585,115,000, or 8.5 percent of their gross profit. Most corporations are required to pay Federal income taxes at the rate of 48 percent of their gross income.

How can the imposition of additional taxes on wage earners with modest incomes be justified when other citizens, with incomes ranging into the millions of dollars a year are allowed to completely escape Federal income taxes?

For my part, I can find no such justification. Instead, Congress should promptly enact legislation closing tax loopholes.

One of the most unwarranted loopholes is the percentage depletion allowance for minerals. Under the percentage depletion provisions, owners of mines and oil wells are allowed to deduct a specific percentage of their gross income without regard to the capital cost of the property. These rates of deduction range as high as 27½ percent of gross income in the case of oil and gas. Percentage depletion continues to be deductible even after 100 percent of the original investment has been recovered tax free. It enables a producer to recover the cost of his investment over and over. The result is that effective tax rates for the extractive industries are far less than those borne by other industries, and of course the Government suffers a great revenue loss. In addition, the depletion allowance leads to waste and misallocation of resources since it makes it more profitable to invest in oil, gas and certain minerals than other industries.

The complete exemption from Federal tax of the interest received from State and local bonds has led to other abuses. These bonds were originally intended to be used to raise money for socially desirable public purposes such as the construction of schools, streets, sewers, and other facilities. The tax-exempt status was thought necessary to attract investment in these bonds, at rates of interest favorable to State and local governments. One result is that billions of dollars worth of these bonds are held almost exclusively by the wealthy, who, by investing large sums in these securities obtain tax-free incomes. What was originally intended as an aid to State and local governments has placed an added burden on the general taxpaying public which has to make up the revenue the Government loses.

Another abuse, which has grown recently, is the increasing use of the tax-exempt industrial development bond. A State or locality issues the bonds for the purpose of constructing a factory or other

industrial facility for a corporation and then leases or sells it to the corporation. The rents or the yearly installments of the sales price are fixed to meet interest payments by the issuing agency and amortization of the principal of the bonds. This method is often used to benefit financially strong corporations and amounts to a subsidy to private industry since corporate bonds would necessarily require a higher rate of interest. The flood of these bonds in the municipal bond market has also weakened the market for the traditional tax-exempt issues which usually have statutory interest limitations, since industrial development bonds are tending to increase overall interest rates.

Another device used by business to avoid the payment of taxes is the creation of affiliated corporate groups or subsidiaries in order to obtain multiple surtax exemptions. The corporate income tax consists of a normal tax on the full amount of taxable income and a surtax on the amount of taxable income in excess of a \$25,000 surtax exemption. Although there may be good reasons for consolidated groups, these do not justify giving such groups multiple corporate exemptions where a single enterprise is involved.

The President's Economic Report for 1967 specifically mentioned abuses by tax-exempt private foundations. Tax and business planners will often create a private foundation to hold the stock of a business enterprise solely to perpetuate the family control of that enterprise. Also, charitable organizations will use their tax-exempt privilege to borrow funds to acquire business concerns. The commercial enterprises conducted or controlled by private foundations have an unfair competitive advantage over those owned by taxable entities. The Treasury Department has recommended that Congress adopt legislation requiring private foundations to dispose of substantial business interests which are unrelated to exempt activities.

Another loophole, or tax advantage, is the stock option. Under a typical stock option plan, highly paid corporate executives are given options to purchase, at the market price, large blocks of their corporation's shares. When the market price of the stock rises they can purchase the stock at the original option price. If they decide to sell the stock, the profit is taxed as a capital gain rather than at the regular income tax rates applicable to high-income taxpayers.

Still another method of tax avoidance used by high-income taxpayers is to transfer appreciated property by bequest. For example, a man who has at one time purchased stocks which cost him \$25,000 holds them until he dies, at which time they are valued at \$200,000. He pays no tax on this increased value. His heirs in turn receive a step-up in basis; that is, they may treat the value of the stocks at the time transferred as their basis for computing gain or loss in a subsequent sale. If they sell immediately, they pay no tax.

A final tax loophole I will mention is the unlimited charitable deduction. A taxpayer may deduct, without limit, contributions to publicly supported charita-

ble organizations and certain private foundations if such contributions and his income tax payments in the taxable year and eight out of the last 10 taxable years have equaled 90 percent of his taxable income computed without regard to personal exemptions, operating loss carryovers, or deductible contributions. It enables many persons with millions of dollars in taxable income to escape taxation by giving to charitable institutions securities or other property which have greatly appreciated in value.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that these inequitable provisions are to be found in our Federal income tax system is appalling. I believe that the time has come for the Congress to act.

"MR. KLU"—CHAMPION OF INTER-STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of our Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, is truly an All-American Congressman.

"Mr. KLU" is beloved by those who serve on the subcommittee, by those on the full committee, and by his colleagues in the Congress in both political parties. In my 19 years in the Congress I have never known a more patriotic, conscientious, and devoted Member who labors so ceaselessly and tirelessly for his constituents and for our great country.

People throughout the country are daily becoming more aware of his great talents, his leadership, and dedication to developing the entire Nation.

The following splendid article about our colleague appeared as a feature story in the Chicago Tribune yesterday, Sunday, October 15, and is a fitting tribute to a great American statesman:

"MR. KLU" DOES HOMEWORK, KEEPS POWER—DEVOTES MOST OF WEEKENDS TO CONSTITUENTS

(By Aldo Beckman)

WASHINGTON, October 14.—He is the son of a Polish immigrant and the older brother of an Illinois Supreme court justice, whom he sent thru college and encouraged to get into politics.

And altho he has been a member of Congress for more than 16 years, gaining a position of great power, Rep. John Kluczynski [D., Ill.] remains, first and foremost, a Chicago politician who keeps in constant touch with his constituents.

He has missed going back to his fifth Congressional district on Chicago's southwest side only two week-ends during his tenure in Congress, and attends a wake, an anniversary party, or a neighborhood gathering of some kind almost every evening he's home.

HE HEARS CONFESSIONS

During the day, when he isn't looking after his Syrena restaurant and caterers business, at 4270 Archer av., Kluczynski is talking with constituents or, as he puts it, "hearing confessions."

Kluczynski, more commonly known as Mr. Klu, gains his power in the nation's capital from his position as fourth ranking Democrat on the House public works committee, and

more specifically from his position as chairman of the roads subcommittee of that group.

All federal legislation concerning the nation's highways is initiated in the subcommittee, which gives its chairman almost unlimited power in the field of highways.

CALL FROM THE MAYOR

Several weeks ago, Kluczynski received a call from Mayor Daley, telling him that the new crosstown expressway in Chicago would cost 500 million dollars, instead of the 350 million approved by the bureau of public roads.

Kluczynski picked up the phone and called Lowell Bridwell, administrator of the federal highway administration, and in seconds had assurances that Chicago would receive the additional 150 million in highway funds.

Altho Kluczynski experiences some pressure from his colleagues wanting new highways in their districts, nothing can compare with the pressure he felt two years ago as he shepherded Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification bill thru the House.

WANTS BILL PASSED

On the morning of Oct. 14, 1965, he got a call from President Johnson, informing him that Lady Bird would like to have the bill passed that day, since the President was going into the hospital the next day for an operation. Fourteen hours after the House convened, the bill was adopted, while numerous irate Congressional wives sat by in sables and mink, waiting for their husbands to finish business and take them to a Congressional party at the White House, scheduled months earlier.

No money has yet been authorized for the program, and none will be this session, because of the fiscal situation and the war. "We enacted the bill in too big a hurry," Kluczynski admitted candidly. "There are programs there that shouldn't be, and we have to take another look at it."

There have been "suggestions" from the White House that the program could be financed with funds in the highway trust fund, collected from gasoline taxes, but Kluczynski will have no part of that.

"I've promised lots of people that none of that money will be used for anything but highways, and I intend to keep that promise," he said.

IN SALT LAKE CITY

Many of those promises came as Kluczynski addressed highway officials at various meetings thruout the country. He is in Salt Lake City this week-end, to speak before a meeting of the American Association of Highway Officials.

One of his recent services to Chicago came when he went to work getting federal permission to fill in "Bubbly Creek," which was a spur of the Chicago river, a cesspool for waste from the stockyards. A modern city incinerator plant now rests on what was "Bubbly Creek," perhaps the most descriptive ever given a body of water.

Kluczynski went on the public works committee, a break for himself and for Chicago in March 1951, several months after he was sworn in as a congressman.

VOTE A STANDOFF

President Truman was pushing for development of the St. Lawrence seaway, but eastern opposition had successfully scuttled the plan, and the vote in the public works committee, which had to clear the project, was a stand-off.

So Truman offered an eastern Democrat on the committee, who opposed the project, a federal judgeship, and thru Col. Jacob Arvey, with whom he had fought at the 1948 convention, asked Kluczynski if he would resign his seat on the banking and currency committee and take the vacancy on public works. "Klu" was privately happy to get off of bank-

ing and currency, but assured Arvey, who wanted to get back in the good graces of Truman, that he would do it as a personal favor to the national committeeman from Illinois.

Ironically, by the time Kluczynski took his seat on the public works committee, eastern pressure had forced several proponents to change their vote, and the seaway still was not approved.

MAKES CHICAGO PORT

However, President Eisenhower, who was elected in 1952 also favored the project, and got a number of eastern Republicans to change their vote. The seaway was approved making Chicago a great inland port.

Kluczynski, from his post on the committee, helped direct the dredging and deepening of the waterways leading into Chicago docks from the lake, and was the prime mover in getting the duplicate locks constructed in Joliet.

He also has been the moving force behind re-activating Midway airport, which is in his district.

WORKS AT AGE 12

Kluczynski was born on Feb. 15, 1896, not far from his present home, at 2450 W. 55th st. Forced to go to work at 12, he had little formal education. He worked in the circulation department of the old Chicago Evening Post and later drove a truck before going into the restaurant business with his father, in 1919, now operated by him and his wife, the former Stephanie Estelle Polowy. After returning from World War I, where he served in an artillery outfit in Europe, Kluczynski had his first taste of politics, when John J. Sullivan, a Democratic committeeman, persuaded him to become a precinct captain.

"The Irish ran the town and they wanted someone with a Polish name like mine to work for them," Kluczynski laughed.

His first try for public office was in 1924, and he was defeated in efforts to be elected to the Illinois House of Representatives.

RUNS AGAIN IN '32

"Klu" ran again in 1932, was elected, and served in the state House of Representatives until 1948, when he was elected to the state Senate. He ran for Congress two years later.

A product of the Chicago Democratic organization, Kluczynski is well-disciplined and almost always votes with the administration. Several years ago, a colleague took the floor and wondered aloud how the Chicago delegation was going to vote on an issue.

Kluczynski, always known for his sense of humor, answered, "I don't know, Tom O'Brien [then head of the Chicago Democratic delegation] hasn't told us yet."

A STANDING OVATION

The House roared and gave Kluczynski a standing ovation, but O'Brien didn't think it was very funny. So Kluczynski had the remarks taken out of the Congressional Record, a privilege enjoyed by all congressmen.

His district, in the southwest corner of Chicago also includes Stickney township and part of Lyons township. It is composed chiefly of second and third generation Americans, mostly of Polish, Lithuanian, and Czech extraction.

Most of the residents own their homes and the 60 savings and loan associations in the district attest to the thrift of its residents.

The extraordinarily large number of small businesses in the district, besides owning one of his own, sparked Kluczynski's interest in the plight of the small business man in this day of chain stores. His interest, as a member of the House small business committee, triggered the creation of a special subcommittee, which Kluczynski heads.

His subcommittee holds hearings thruout the country, examining the problems of the small business man in the city, as they are

related to urban renewal, population growth, and other urban factors.

He has conducted hearings in Kansas and Utah and plans to hold more hearings this fall in Tennessee and up-state New York.

TALKS ABOUT DISTRICT

But, even with his wide travels, Kluczynski would rather talk about his district. He likes to tell about it being the largest manufacturing district in the nation and enjoys boasting of the trucking industries there.

The veteran congressman's favorite pastime is gin rummy, which he plays frequently with his colleagues. Altho he used to be an inveterate horse player, he hasn't placed a bet on a horse since 1936, "when I went broke for the third time."

Kluczynski has no plans for retirement. "I like people and I like my work," he said. He points out with pride to his brother, Tom, now an Illinois Supreme court justice.

"I think it says a lot for our country that a man could come over from Poland and have one son on the Supreme court and another in Congress," he said proudly.

INFLATION ENDANGERS VETERANS' BENEFITS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in voicing my concern over the ever-rising cost of Government expenditures over the years. I am in favor of making substantial reductions wherever possible, and putting our Nation on a sound financial basis. I have viewed with a troubled mind the ever-increasing national debt incurred in operating the diversified functions in which our Government has become involved.

Out of due concern for this great Nation of ours, I must align myself with those who are opposed to the free-spending policies which have developed. Our major concern at this time must be centered on the needs of our military and the winning of the war in Vietnam. I believe that reductions should and must be made in programs which can be postponed until such time as the costs of war are not upon us. I think much deliberation should be given to what costs are to be reduced, assuring that the welfare of our citizens will not be endangered by haste on our part.

One particular field in which we cannot shirk our obligations is that of veterans benefits. We have made our commitment to our fighting men—both while they are engaged in battle, and after they return home—and we must see that our promises are kept.

On August 1 the President signed into law the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967 which, incidentally, passed this House without a dissenting vote. But now, we must face up to some important facts. We cannot with one hand give a veteran a dollar, and with the other hand take back a dollar and a half because of the deflation of the American dollar. And, unless we act quickly to quell the nonessential spending, and take steps to insure that infla-

tion does not wipe out the benefits we have made possible, we will have failed in our avowed duty.

Today, we are faced with a crisis which will not only wipe out those well-intended increases which we provided, but will place all of our veterans in an even less favorable financial condition than before we passed the new law. In fact, unless we act expeditiously, these increases will become but false promises, empty and without meaning.

We are concerned that this nation is facing the prospect of a multibillion-dollar deficit this year because of our war commitment in Vietnam. This alone is sufficient cause for us to pause and give sober consideration to ways of alleviating this situation.

But if we are to keep the faith with our brave men now fighting in Vietnam, and those who have borne our battles in other wars, we must act to protect—not only the increases we have made possible—but the initial benefits to which they were entitled.

We have had a request from the President to consider a modest tax increase. We should consider the President's tax recommendations and we should consider a cut in Federal spending now. While we prolong and act as though the problem will go away if we ignore it, the situation worsens.

I am concerned that we are not facing up to the facts of this matter. The cost of the war in Vietnam will no doubt rise by \$4 billion more than we thought last January. Ignoring this truth will not make it vanish. We will pay for this in one way or the other, for there is no escape.

But, as we wait, time is running short, and we are being forced into choosing the least desirable way by our delay in considering the tax asked by the President. Unless we enact some tax and at the same time cut spending—and do it quickly—we face another spiral of inflation that will wipe out all of the increased benefits we have given our fighting men when they return home.

I do not want to see our men fight in Vietnam, and return home to find that the money we have appropriated for their education will not even pay their room and board. I do not want to see our veterans try to buy a home with a GI guarantee and find that interest rates have accelerated to such a point that it is impractical.

Every minute that we wait, we are imperiling the education of millions of Americans who have served this country in its time of need. We are reducing their possibility of becoming a homeowner. If inflation occurs it is our own fault.

If we fail, the 5 million veterans and their dependents who receive pension or compensation checks will suffer, for the purchasing power of their dollar will be so reduced it will place them in jeopardy.

It is my opinion that we must not wait any longer. We must pay for the war in Vietnam, and we must protect the economy of this country from ruinous inflation. We have as great a responsibility to our fighting men to see that they return to a stable country, as they have to fight for freedom.

THIRTY CONGRESSMEN ISSUE BIPARTISAN APPEAL FOR BOMBING HALT IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 30 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have joined in an appeal to the President to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. In our letter of October 12, 1967, addressed to President Johnson we expressed alarm at the continued escalation of the bombing and our view that its halt "best promises to open the way for a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this tragic conflict."

This is the view of many prominent world statesmen. United Nations Secretary General U Thant has repeatedly urged such a course. According to the New York Times on May 11, 1967, U Thant told the Speakers Research Committee that so long as the bombing continues "there will be no talks." He stated that "he knew, and several governments knew, that Hanoi had been ready to engage in peace talks before the opening of the air offensive against North Vietnam." On August 22, 1967, AP reported that U Thant said "there would be talks in 3 to 4 weeks" if the bombings were stopped. And again, just 9 days ago, according to Reuters, U Thant said on October 7 that he was "convinced that North Vietnam would talk peace if the United States stopped bombing that country."

At the current session of the United Nations General Assembly country after country has questioned our policy of bombing North Vietnam. Typical of the comments are those of Paul Martin, External Affairs Secretary of Canada, who said on September 27, 1967—Washington Post, September 28:

It seems clear . . . that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

On October 1, 1967, Hans R. Taber, Denmark's United Nations representative and President of the General Assembly, said the United States would run only a limited risk if it stopped bombing North Vietnam. He said on "Meet the Press," "It is our belief that a big country like yours, the biggest and most powerful country in the world, should be able to take this limited risk."

On October 6, just 10 days ago—Washington Post, October 7—India's Defense Minister Sardar Swaran Singh told the General Assembly that on the basis of a "positive response" from North Vietnam, India is confident that an unconditional halt to American bombing will lead to a cease-fire and a Geneva-style conference. He stated:

We are confident that if this is done it will lead to the cessation of all hostile activities throughout Vietnam and a Geneva-type meeting . . .

Mr. Speaker, in our letter of October 12 to the President we referred to Secre-

tary McNamara's testimony of August 25 on the air war in North Vietnam and included a brief quotation. It seems appropriate at this point to quote more fully from his testimony before the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on August 25. The Secretary stated as follows:

Our primary objective was to reduce the flow and/or to increase the cost of the continued infiltration of men and supplies from North to South Vietnam.

The capacity of the lines of communications and of the outside sources of supply so far exceeds the minimal flow necessary to support the present level of North Vietnamese military effort in South Vietnam that the enemy operations in the South cannot, on the basis of any reports I have seen, be stopped by air bombardment—short, that is, of virtual annihilation of North Vietnam and its people.

We have no reason to believe it (a less selective bombing campaign) would break the will of the North Vietnamese people or sway the purpose of their leaders. If it does not lead to such a change of mind, bombing the North at any level of intensity would not meet our objective. We would still have to prove by ground operations in the South that Hanoi's aggression could not succeed. Nor would a decision to close Haiphong, Hon Gai, and Cam Pha, by whatever means, prevent the movement in and through North Vietnam of the essentials to continue their present level of military activity in South Vietnam. On the other side of the equation, our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results.

The final decision in this conflict will not come until we and our allies prove to North Vietnam she cannot win in the South. The tragic and long drawnout character of that conflict in the South makes very tempting the prospect of replacing it with some new kind of air campaign against the North. But however tempting, such an alternative seems to me completely illusory. To pursue this objective would not only be futile but would involve risks to our personnel and to our nation that I am unable to recommend.

Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt as to what the Secretary meant by "risks," he also said on that day, in reference to certain targets proposed by the Joint Chiefs which had not then received authorization for air strikes, "the risk of direct confrontation with the Communist Chinese or the Soviet Union has thus far been deemed to outweigh the military desirability of air strikes."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the full text of our letter of October 12, 1967:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1967.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since April, 1965, you have often stated your desire to seek peace in Vietnam through negotiations. With this we strongly concur.

Yet, we have become increasingly alarmed at the continued escalation of bombings by American planes over North Vietnam.

The bombing of targets close to the Chinese border, and of the port cities of Cam Pha and Haiphong conflicts with the carefully reasoned and factual analysis presented prior to those steps by Secretary of Defense McNamara on August 25, 1967. We refer par-

ticularly to the Secretary's contention that "our resort to a less selective campaign of air attack against the North would involve risks which at present I regard as too high to accept for this dubious prospect of successful results."

Obviously the risks to which Secretary McNamara referred are catastrophic involvement with Communist China and the Soviet Union, including the possibility of nuclear war.

The policy of bombing in the North has been tried and has failed to accomplish its objectives of significantly reducing the infiltration of men and supplies into the South and of bringing the Hanoi government to the negotiating table.

We hold, therefore, that the time has come for the United States to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. The United States position in the world is strong enough to do so. Such a course, in our view and that of prominent statesmen throughout the world, best promises to open the way for a reasonable and peaceful settlement of this tragic conflict.

Respectfully yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, FRANK J. BRASCO,
GEORGE E. BROWN JR., PHILLIP BURTON,
DANIEL E. BUTTON, JEFFERY COHELAN,
JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS,
JR., JOHN G. DOW, DON EDWARDS,
LEONARD FARESTEIN, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
DONALD M. FRASER, JACOB H. GILBERT,
EDITH GREEN, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, HENRY HELSTOSKI,
JOSEPH E. KARTH, ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, PATSY T. MINK, THOMAS M. REES, HENRY S. REUSS, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, LESTER L. WOLFF.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK POINTS TO A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. COWGER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week last July, massive reports have been received on the ceremonies and activities of groups not only in this country but also in many other countries in the free world. Many of these illuminating reports and news coverages have appeared in the RECORD these past 3 months. To this day, they keep streaming in.

ADDITIONAL REASON FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The expanding annual observance of Captive Nations Week is an additional reason for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Alert Americans and citizens of other nations refuse to be hoodwinked into an apathy toward the captivity and freedom aspirations of Red-dominated nations in central-south Europe, Eastern Europe, and in the Soviet Union, in Asia and Cuba. In response to this vibrant movement the Congress should play its role by alerting all Americans to the continued captivity and exploitation of all the captive peoples in the very much thriving and threatening Red empire.

This it can do by establishing this special committee.

A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE EVE OF MOSCOW'S "50TH"

An excellent occasion for this action is now, the very eve of the 50th anniversary of the fraudulent Russian Bolshevik revolution. The creation of this committee would be a highly appropriate answer to the propaganda lies we are already being told about the glorious Bolshevik revolution. It would also be a positive and constructive tribute to the genuine 50th anniversaries to be celebrated soon in behalf of the once independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Their revolutions for national independence were in the tradition of our own American Revolution.

Examples of the most successful Captive Nations Week observance yet point to the urgent need of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I request that the following examples be appended to my remarks: First, the proclamations of Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, Gov. John H. Chafee, of Rhode Island, Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., of Florida, Mayor Victor H. Schiro, of New Orleans, Mayor Chuck Hall, of Dade County, Fla., and the late Mayor Robert King High, of Miami, Fla.; second, an address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky to the First Conference of the World Anti-Communist League in Taipei, China; third, an interesting letter to the Washington Post editors on the week; and fourth, the compiled reports on the week in the August-September issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin:

STATE OF ILLINOIS PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The United States of America has achieved, through the democratic process, a harmonious national unity of its people although they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, and

Whereas, The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of our nation and other peoples, and

Whereas, The unification of diverse elements of our own free society has led our people to possess a warm understanding and sympathy of the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world, and

Whereas, Since 1959 and every year thereafter, the President of the United States has been authorized by Congress to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week to be observed with appropriate ceremonies and activities,

Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the third week in July 1967, to be Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and request the appropriate observance of this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

OTTO KERNER, Governor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION BY JOHN H. CHAFEE, GOVERNOR

During the years following World War I, many nations across the world have been taken over by Communist regimes and there is constant danger of others being taken over by Communist forces.

In these countries the freedoms which we in a democracy so readily accept and cherish are unknown. There are no free elections, no free speech, nor free press, and the freedom of association and assembly is denied.

The people of these captive nations look for the active and moral support of the peoples of free nations and particularly the United States. Free peoples everywhere must work unceasingly for the liberation of these captives and for the preservation of fundamental freedoms; now, therefore, do I, John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim the week of July 16-22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week and encourage all Rhode Islanders to cherish our freedom and to support the liberation of captive peoples all over the world.

JOHN H. CHAFEE, Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas, the United States has become a great nation due to its ability through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious unity of its people despite the diversity of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, and

Whereas, this harmonious unity of our free society has led the people of the United States to have a warm understanding for the aspirations and interdependency of the people and nations of the world, and

Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of peaceful co-existence between nations and raises a barrier to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other people, and

Whereas, these captive nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoration of their religious freedom, and

Whereas, it is vital to our nation's security that the desires of these captive people be kept alive as a deterrent to war and a means of obtaining a lasting peace, and

Whereas, it is proper that we clearly show these people through an appropriate ceremony that we share their aspirations.

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida do hereby proclaim July 16-22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in the State of Florida.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, JR., Governor.

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of "Captive Nations Week" this past year clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of our citizens to decry the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations; and

Whereas, the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom dictates we commence to win the cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, and all the rest; and

Whereas, the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement and help to the oppressed; and

Whereas, these weapons of truth, fact and ideas will counter and effectively overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states;

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, Acting Mayor of the City of New Orleans, do hereby

proclaim July 16 to 22, 1967, to be "Captive Nations Week" in New Orleans, and urge all our citizens to appreciate and recognize the fact that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a positive means to the cause of freedom for captive peoples everywhere.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Acting Mayor.

**A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF
METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY, FLA.**

Whereas: The greatness of our nation is, in large part, attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious unity of its people, even though they stem from varied backgrounds, and

Whereas: In contrast to the freedoms which the citizens of our country enjoy, the people of more than 25 countries throughout the world have been subjected to Communist tyranny, through its enslavement having been deprived of their freedom of religion, or speech, or a free press as well as their free choice in determining their preferred form of government, and

Whereas: These submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and for leadership in bringing about their liberation, in recognition of which the Congress of the United States has annually designated the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and

Whereas: It is not only appropriate but also the consensus of our local citizens that we express and indicate publicly strong sympathy for and intense interest in the restoration of freedom to subjugated countries,

Now, therefore: Be it resolved that the board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, does hereby proclaim the week beginning July 16, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Metropolitan Dade County.

In observance thereof: I call upon the people of Metropolitan Dade County to join in offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

CHUCK HALL,
Mayor, Dade County, Fla.

**A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE
CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.**

Whereas the oppressive tactics of international Communism and other forms of tyranny are holding in a state of enslavement and terror the peoples of many nations, including the freedom-loving citizens of Cuba, just a few miles from our own continental shores, and

Whereas persecuted and oppressed individuals throughout the world have traditionally looked to our United States of America as a symbol of democracy, depending upon this country to lend its helpful influence in liberating those who are oppressed, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week in order that submerged nations everywhere may be reminded of this country's sympathy, thus sustaining their hopes for ultimate freedom, and

Whereas in our City of Miami this important period will be memorialized by the visit and address of United States Senator Thomas J. Dodd, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee;

Now, therefore, I, Robert King High, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 16, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Miami.

In observance thereof I urge the people of Miami to participate wherever possible in events arranged in observance of this special week and to join with others in offering

prayers for the liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

ROBERT KING HIGH,
Mayor.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS MOVEMENT

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, U.S.A.)

This past year in the American environment the National Captive Nations Committee advanced further the captive nations movement as the prime psycho-political weapon against Sino-Soviet Russian imperialism. Despite an atmosphere suffused with confusion inconsistencies in foreign policy, a spreading Grand Illusion about the Cold War being over, a hovering prospect of compromise in Vietnam, and several excesses of a national inward-look, NCNC scored new advances in concentrating on the imperio-colonialism of both Moscow and Peiping and, as in every year since 1959, has been bitterly attacked by Redmedia (e.g., *Izvestia*, July 7, 1967).

Mr. Chairman, following our practice in many APACL Conferences of reporting concretely instead of speechifying generalities, the highlights of NCNC's activity since the Korean meeting last November are, succinctly, as follows:

(1) We cooperated faithfully with the Committee of One Million to reinforce American opposition to the admission of the Red Chinese totalitarians into the U.N. and the contemplation of the absurd "Two China Policy";

(2) NCNC published thousands of copies of the Congressional reprint *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope*, which all members and observers of APACL received and which was distributed worldwide, even behind the Curtains to Moscow, Peiping, Havana and other capitals;

(3) We and our thirty-eight local committees observed with our Free Chinese friends the annual Freedom Day in January, intensifying further the strong, spiritual communion and solidarity of interest that exist between countless Americans and our friends here in this free Republic;

(4) For four months in the earliest part of this year NCNC was one of the three national organizations in the U.S. responsible for the open U.S. Senate hearings on the U.S.-USSR Consular Convention, and in my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, two of our main arguments against the treaty's ratification were that it would open a Pandora's box in Latin America for diplomatic Russian subversion and that it would discourage the freedom aspirations of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union who, too, are our natural allies in the Red Empire;

(5) As a clearing house for thirty-eight local captive nations committees NCNC again conducted the Captive Nations Week Observance in the U.S. during the 3rd week of July, with huge rallies in Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Phoenix and dozens of other cities, and one of the chief themes was the liberation of the captive North Vietnamese. It should be stressed that a couple of weeks before this, at the Glassboro summit in New Jersey, Mr. Kosygin anxiously inquired of President Johnson whether he would issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation this year, suggesting it would not abet "peaceful coexistence", but, as many of you know, our President did issue one in behalf of the freedom and independence of all nations on all continents;

(6) Constantly pursuing its international contacts NCNC makes every effort to stimulate Captive Nations observances in friendly countries, and we are happy to report that new advances have been made in this field, as witness the proclamation of the President of Argentina, that of President Park in Free Korea, the observances in Australia, India,

and Turkey. We pay respectful tribute to the Republic of China for its consistently superlative observances, and we wish to emphasize again and again that all of you join in this event that strikes the rawest nerve center of Moscow and Peiping, not to mention the puppets and members of the Red syndicate, for on this the record is clear and overwhelming since 1959;

(7) We are now in process of accumulating the published results of the 1967 Captive Nations Week Observance, and through U.S. Congressional members on the NCNC advisory committee these are published in the *Congressional Record*, which is a vital source of information to all the news and educational media in the U.S., not to mention the correspondents of *Tass* and other Red organs;

(8) NCNC is also implementing now its resolution for a Congressional hearing on "U.S. Policy Toward the USSR", one which calls for an unprecedented Great Debate on this policy. Strange as it may seem, there has never been a full review and examination of this policy in the course of U.S.-USSR relations since 1933, and such a review may well bring about fundamental changes in U.S. policy toward this power center of the Red Empire that, in turn, would substantially affect the policy of every part of the Free World;

(9) We are also concentrating now on exposing the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which Moscow and the Red Empire will be celebrating in the form of a 50th anniversary this November 7, and we earnestly hope you will join us in this by passing a resolution on this subject here and then implementing it in your respective country in the weeks ahead. One excellent way of implementing it is to pay respect to the many other 50th anniversaries of national independence that will be observed in the Free World—those of Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and so forth, who were among the first to lose their independence to Red power, subversion, terrorism, and takeover; and

(10) Plans are now under way by NCNC for the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week in July, 1968. Much to the chagrin of Moscow, Peiping and others, we seek to make this the most telling yet. A book which it has been privileged to write and is now being published for release in October, titled *The Vulnerable Russians*, contains in part all basic material on the Captive Nations movement since 1959. It tells you why Moscow in particular dreads the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which the U.S. Congress passed in 1959, Khrushchev, Suslov, Podgorniy, Kosygin and others have rallied against it. Do you know why? Become acquainted with this vital story, and allow your anti-Red conscience act accordingly for an inspiring "10th".

In conclusion, let us not delude ourselves as to where the ultimate power center exists in the Red Empire. By every measure, it is Moscow and the Soviet Union. Hanoi and its aggression wouldn't last for long without the Russian support; North Korea wouldn't exercise arrogant forays without its Russian back-drop; Peiping, like a rebellious child, wouldn't exude its frustrations without Russian concern for the communist conspiracy against the Free World in general and the United States in particular; and Havana wouldn't last a moon without Russian aid. Excluding the important product mix, the gross USSR product well exceeds the aggregate product of the entire remainders of the Red Empire. Let us concentrate on the center in order to free the outlying parts in Asia, Central Europe, and Cuba. The Captive Nations Movement points this way.

The Editors,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Recently my attention has been brought to your July 10, 1967 editorial concerning the Captive Nations Week.

It is surprising to find a major American newspaper published in the city named in honor of our first president speaking in a mocking tone about the ideals of national freedom and independence. Before becoming comic about Idel-Ural and Turkestan, it would be wise to remember that no more than two hundred years ago America was a tiny, backward nation whose struggle for national independence evoked a sarcastic smile on the faces of the "sophisticates" of Britain and Europe.

In addition, the editorial was openly insulting to the many Congressmen who sincerely and knowledgeably support the ideas of political self-determination and cultural freedom for over fifty percent of the population of the Soviet Union. The deliberate and tyrannical "russification" of these various nationalities is a historically documented fact and can be easily verified. Peaceful coexistence may be a tempting policy—but if it means peace at any price, then it is certainly a prelude to war: Munich should have taught us that, as the Soviet-Nazi Pact must have taught the Russians. It is an unjust peace that ignores the fact that the Soviet Union is an imperialistic nation, that it is the last colonial empire in existence today. More, it is an artificially forced collection of nations and races held together by the force of the Red Army and the fear of the secret police. It is only a matter of time before this inhuman and historically outdated political structure shatters.

I cannot, therefore, accept your editorial views on these matters as representative of the best American tradition which has always supported the political and cultural struggle for equality and freedom of all races and nations.

Sincerely,

WALTER OBAJNYK.

P.S.—I am a graduate student at Columbia University and the author of "Marxism and Existentialism" (Doubleday: Anchor Books, 1965).

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September, 1967]

U.S. CONGRESS AND TOP OFFICIALS OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967

U.S. opinion makers from all walks of life availed themselves of the opportunity offered by nationwide observances of this year's Captive Nations Week to show their deep concern for the plight of the captive peoples.

In addition to the traditional Presidential Proclamation, issued on July 12, and proclamations by many Governors and Mayors, the week of July 16-22 also witnessed a debate in the U.S. Congress on the timely topic of the subjugated nations.

Eighty-three Representatives and five Senators took the floor and thus helped demonstrate the continued interest of American legislators with the 200 million East-Central Europeans and Asians, living under Communist oppression.

THE MEANING OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The same as last year, the debate in the House of Representatives was initiated by Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.) who summarized the lessons of the observance: "... By their consistent opposition and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow ... has shown since 1959 its fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86-90. ... Our concentrated support of all the captive nations ... is one of the most powerful nonmilitary deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world."

Rep. Flood emphasized the need for a special House Captive Nations Committee.

Rep. Thaddeus Dulski (D-N.Y.) expressed the sentiments of his colleagues succinctly by stating:

"We must reaffirm a twofold promise: to remain firm against further Communist usurpation in the world, and to do all within our power to work for the ultimate liberation of every captive nation."

Other members of Congress who spoke on the same subject were: Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.), John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), William T. Cahill (R-N.J.), Glenn Cunningham (R-Neb.), Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.), James J. Delaney (D-N.Y.), Samuel N. Friedel (D-Md.), Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.), Seymour Halpern (R-N.Y.), James M. Hanley (D-N.Y.), Frank Horton (R-N.Y.), Edna F. Kelly (D-N.Y.), Theodore R. Kupferman (R-N.Y.), Odin Langer (R-Minn.), Robert McClory (R-Ill.), Thomas Meskill (R-Conn.), F. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.), William L. Murphy (D-Ill.), Lucien Nedzi (D-Mich.), Barrett O'Hara (D-Ill.), Philip J. Philbin (D-Mass.), Charlotte T. Reid (R-Ill.), Howard W. Robison (R-N.Y.), Henry L. Schadeberg (R-Wisc.), Henry P. Smith (R-N.Y.), Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D-La.), Albert W. Watson (R-S.C.), and Lester L. Wolff (D-N.Y.).

DENIAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A large number of Congressmen scored continued violations of fundamental human rights by Communist regimes.

Speaker Robert W. McCormack (D-Mass.) said:

"Present stage of Communist domination in which some autonomy of the satellites has been tolerated by Moscow ... has meant some amelioration of the living conditions of the captive peoples. It has not meant a restoration of the national and personal freedom which is rightfully theirs. The captive peoples continue to live in despair, in enslavement, in anguish for their lost past, in fear and trepidation for the present and in apprehension of the future."

Rep. Edwin Reinecke (R-Calif.) reminded his colleagues of the significance of the denial of freedom to the captive peoples:

"For if the freedom of one nation is destroyed, then the freedom of all nations is in jeopardy. And if any people anywhere suffer from the burdens of captivity, then all people everywhere are in some measure held captive."

Speeches on this topic were also delivered by Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.), Frank T. Bow (R-Ohio), James A. Byrne (D-Pa.), Silvio C. Conte (R-Mass.), John H. Dent (D-Pa.), Leonard Farbstein (D-N.Y.), Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.), William D. Ford (D-Mich.), Robert N. Gialma (D-Conn.), Clarence D. Long (D-Md.), Thomas G. Morris (D-N.M.), Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.), Roman C. Pucinski (D-Ill.), Albert H. Quie (R-Minn.), John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.), Peter W. Rodino (D-N.J.), J. William Stanton (R-Ohio), John M. Zwach (R-Minn.), and William G. Bray (R-Ind.).

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

"1967 marks the 50th anniversary of Communism," observed Rep. Harold R. Collier (R-Ill.), "the greatest social economic and political cancer to be found in the entire record of history ... the record since 1917 alone provides more evidence than one can use to show that communism is a fraud, a delusion, a conspiracy which has exploited the ignorance, inertia and apathy of masses of people. It is against the people."

Soviet aggression and imperialism were accentuated in the remarks by E. Ross Adair (R-Ind.), Frank J. Brasco (D-N.J.), John H. Buchanan (R-Ala.), Frances P. Bolton (R-Ohio), Dominick V. Daniels (D-N.J.), Robert V. Deney (R-Neb.), Edward J. Derwinski (R-Ill.), John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.), Margaret M. Heckler (R-Mass.), Henry Helstoski (D-N.J.), Donald E. Lukens (R-Ohio), Joseph M. McDade (R-Pa.), John S. Monagan (D-Conn.), Abraham J. Multer (D-N.Y.), Thomas M. Pelly (R-Wash.), Jerry L. Pettis (R-Calif.), Garner E. Shriver (R-Kan.), H. Allen Smith

(R-Calif.), Samuel Stratton (D-N.Y.), and Louis C. Wyman (R-N.H.).

TRENDS IN EAST EUROPE

Rep. Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.) showed the limitations on internal liberalization in Eastern Europe by pointing to the example of Prof. Leszek Kolakowski, who was ousted from the Polish Communist Party and the university for his outspoken views. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.), J. Herbert Burke (R-Fla.), James C. Cleveland (R-N.H.), Joshua Eilberg (D-Pa.), Cornelius Gallagher (D-N.J.), William J. Green (D-Pa.), William L. St. Onge (D-Conn.), John V. Tunney (D-Calif.), and Bob Wilson (R-Calif.) also gave examples of international trends in East Europe.

SENATE DISCUSSION

The Captive Nations Week debate in the Senate reiterated the support of freedom and self-determination for the captive East-Central European peoples.

Sen. Frank J. Lausche (D-Ohio) said, in part:

"It behooves us all to remind ourselves of the fate of those who have fallen under Communist totalitarianism lest the free world crumble bit by bit and be engulfed in the same way as those nations whose fate we now mourn."

Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R-Neb.) stated: "Never before in human history have we seen the imprisonment of nations on such a scale. But even in this grim situation, many of these people have managed to maintain their faith in freedom. Much honor is to be given to those who have given their lives for the noblest of human causes and to those who continue to carry on this fight."

Senators Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.), Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.), and Abraham A. Ribicoff (D-Conn.) also made appropriate remarks.

Here is a partial list of Governors and their states, and the Mayors and their cities, who called for the observance of Captive Nations Week.

GOVERNORS: Lurleen B. Wallace, Alabama; John A. Love, Colorado; John Dempsey, Connecticut; Roger D. Branigin, Indiana; Harold E. Hughes, Iowa; Edward T. Breathitt, Kentucky; Spiro T. Agnew, Maryland; George Romney, Michigan; Dan. K. Moore, North Carolina; John A. Rhodes, Ohio; Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York; Raymond P. Shafer, Pennsylvania; and John Connally, Texas.

MAYORS: Ray B. Bracy, Allentown, Pa.; Theodore R. McKeldin, Baltimore, Md.; Frank A. Sedita, Buffalo, N.Y.; Richard J. Daley, Chicago, Ill.; Orville L. Hubbard, Dearborn, Mich.; James W. Kelly, East Orange, N.J.; John J. Barton, Indianapolis, Ind.; E. R. Hammond, Kenosha, Wis.; Otto Festge, Madison, Wis.; Henry W. Maler, Milwaukee, Wis.; Arthur Naftalin, Minneapolis, Minn.; Richard C. Lee, New Haven, Conn.; Victor H. Shiro, New Orleans, La.; John V. Lindsay, New York, N.Y.; James H. Tate, Philadelphia, Pa.; A. J. Cervantes, St. Louis, Mo.; William F. Walsh, Syracuse, N.Y.; J. Bracken Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah; Douglas A. Merrifield, St. Joseph, Mo.; James F. X. O'Rourke, Yonkers, N.Y.; Anthony B. Flak, Youngstown, Ohio.

Moreover, New Hampshire legislators adopted on a voice vote a House resolution, containing a pledge to be "opposed to oppression and ... to help all ... captive nations until they have regained their freedom."

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

NINTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED THROUGHOUT THE NATION

NEW YORK, N.Y. (Special).—The 1967 Captive Nations Week observances (July 16-22, 1967) were held in several American cities from coast to coast, stressing support and understanding of the plight of the captive nations everywhere. With President Johnson issuing the annual Presidential Proclamation calling on the American people to rededi-

cate themselves to the ideals of freedom of all the peoples of the world, many governors and mayors of major U.S. cities followed suit and issued their own proclamations. A number of U.S. legislators made special statements on the floor of the U.S. Congress in support of the captive nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Stories pertaining to nationwide observances, rallies, special manifestations and meetings had been extensively covered by the American press and over the radio and TV networks.

The Ukrainian American organizations, led by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, took active part in these observances, thus contributing to the successful Captive Nations Week of 1967.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September, 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS AUTHOR CHALLENGES WASHINGTON POST EDITORS ON RUSSIAN IMPERIO-COLONIALISM

Addressing a Captive Nations Conference in Washington's Mayflower Hotel, the author of the Captive Nations Resolution (Public Law 86-90) challenged the editors of *The Washington Post* "to receive some elementary education on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee and an economics professor at Georgetown University, used the occasion of the conference to reply to the *Post's* July 10 editorial "Captive Congressmen." The conference was one of some fifty-five festivities about the country observing Captive Nations Week, July 16-22.

The Georgetown professor specifically challenged the paper's editors "to arrange a discussion meeting in the *Post's* auditorium which would bring the editors face to face with living victims of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism from Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and Cossackia." He held, "It doesn't require much courage to shield one's ignorance behind an editorial pen and continue to misinform the readers. Let us see how courageous the editors are in meeting these people before the audience of their own staff which would have the opportunity to gauge the level of their editors' understanding of this vital problem." In his challenge, Dr. Dobriansky pointed out further, "Just as many Americans have come to learn where Gambia, Chad and other African states are located, so the *Post's* editors will in time come to learn where Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and Cossackia are located in the Russian prison house of nations."

As a kickoff to the 1967 Captive Nations Week, the professor's address highlighted the themes of the observance. One theme is to initiate debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.N., as called for by President Kennedy in September 1961 and in part prepared by Adlai Stevenson's memo on the subject in November of that year. The professor also urged Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, which "would be unprecedented because we've never had any such thorough hearings in our contemporary history."

Captive Nations committees were also stressing this year victory in Vietnam through psycho-political liberation of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese, the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and exposure of the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. This last theme is underscored by the advertised publication this October of Dobriansky's book, *The Vulnerable Russians*, as "an American answer to the '50th.'" Some port-city committees have begun a "Nyets Campaign Against Russian Consulates," based on the Dirksen-State Department agreement arrived at during the Consular Treaty debate earlier this year.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

ARCHPASTORAL APPEAL

(By His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, OSBM, Archbishop and Metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States of America, on the occasion of Captive Nations Week, 1967)

"For the sick, the suffering, the imprisoned and for their salvation, let us pray to the Lord." (Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom).

During the month of July the American people celebrate the joyful anniversary of their national independence, but in the third week of July, however, the nation marks a most sorrowful event, namely, "Captive Nations Week." What a tragic irony! In the twentieth century of civilization and culture we observe a "Captive Nations Week." Today the primitive African tribes are forming their independent states, whereas civilized peoples with a thousand years culture and tradition behind themselves are enslaved in the communist imprisonment behind the iron, bamboo, and sugarcane curtains.

Amid these grave conditions of life for the captive nations a ray of hope burst forth on the horizons, because the conscience of the American nation was awakened from a deep lethargy in its unmasking of the face of the communist terror not only in the enslaved countries, but also in different localities throughout the free world. The Communists tell the free world that they have freedom. Yes, there is freedom, but only for the members of the communist party, and not so for the Ukrainian and other peoples in the Bolshevik dungeons. Every informed Ukrainian Christian should disseminate information depicting the true scene of the Communist enslavement, so that public opinion of the free world would bring to bear on the leaders of the Red Kremlin.

In observing "Captive Nations Week" we cannot pass over in silence the persecution and enslavement of our Silent Ukrainian Church behind the iron curtain. The Bolshevik administration with the aid of the Muscovite Patriarch liquidated the Ukrainian Catholic Church to such an extent that "the enemy doesn't even let us pray" in the Ukrainian Catholic churches. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church met the same fate. Today there is no Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral of Holy Wisdom in Kiev, for the communist authorities have confiscated it and turned it into a museum. There is no Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral of Saint George in Lviv, for the communist government has turned it over to the Muscovite Patriarch. In Eastern Ukraine as well as in Carpatho-Ukraine, our Church had flourished beautifully. In 1945 after the Bolshevik occupation, everything was changed. All our bishops were arrested and suffered either in prison or in exile, in forced labor with hundreds of priests and thousands of the faithful, where many of them gave their lives for the Holy Faith.

Before the Second World War and before the Bolshevik occupation in Western Ukraine and in the Carpathian region, there were 5 eparchies, 10 bishops and 2 Apostolic Visitation with episcopal powers, which had 2,950 priests, and 520 priest-monks and brothers, 1,100 Sisters and 450 theology students. Religious life was flourishing in 3,040 parish churches, and 4,440 missions and oratories. There were 9,900 elementary, intermediary and high schools, which were closely connected with the Church. There were also 41 Catholic organizations and 38 newspapers and magazines. All of these accomplished during many years of work by the clergy and faithful were destroyed by the communist regime. When the Bolsheviks persecuted the Church and Catholics in the satellite countries, then the free western world made its protest against the Bolshevik force, but when

the Vicar of Christ, Pope Pius XII appealed to the free world in the matter of the inflicted injury by the Communists on the Ukrainian Nation and the Ukrainian Catholic Church, this gracious appeal passed without an echo in the western world. This was a sign of the times, of how little the western world then really knew about the communist persecution.

Perhaps there are some who fall prey to the communist line that religious, social and national relations have improved in the Soviet Union. Let us not fool ourselves! Perhaps these conditions have improved for members of the communist party, but not for the Ukrainian people, nor for the Ukrainian Churches. Perhaps Catholics of the Latin rite in the various satellite countries have been able to preserve in some measure with great restrictions their bishops, clergy and churches. But not in Ukraine, for there the Bolsheviks liquidated everything and it is forbidden to publicly praise God. Perhaps in some localities behind the iron curtain there are Ukrainian Catholic priests, and perhaps even bishops, but these must take to the catacombs, for the Ukrainian religion among the Soviets does not have a right to even exist. Most unfortunate it is that the Soviet government seems to ignore the historical fact that not one state in the world ever was able to maintain itself by force and persecution. It continues to deceive the Ukrainian inhabitants in the free world through communist agents under the guise of national dress, dance, song and poetry, to "build a bridge" to enslaved Ukraine, where they will add to the pile of bones of martyred Ukrainians in Siberia.

This threatening situation for our people and Church behind the iron curtain ought to increase our empathy here in the free world. A healthy organism reacts to pain. Whenever one of the members of the human body is infected, then the others hasten to come to its aid. Thus should be the reaction in every human society, and especially in the Ukrainian community. We have glaring examples from history. The Irish did not lose their nationality or religious consciousness in the USA, but even continually sought to aid the fatherland, until it attained its independence. In latter times the Jews of the whole world manifested their solidarity and great generosity.

How is the religious and national question with Ukrainians in America? Do we hold the flag of religio-national traditions high? Have all preserved that religious and national consciousness and sympathy for our people's fate behind the iron curtain? Are the Ukrainians fleeing into strange camps, forgetting whose sons and daughters they are? The Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian Catholic Church needs you, so that you would be spokesmen in the free world. Do not be silent about the bitter fate of our Ukrainian people and churches. Do not listen to the whispers of godless dictators who enslaved the Ukrainian soul and body, from whom you fled and saved yourselves. Do not complain as did the Jews in the Bible at the waters of Babylon, raising their hands and doing nothing. Let us awaken our religious and national feelings. Let us help our brothers and sisters morally and materially. They do need your help. Have you given your mite to the sick and poor refugees that these might buy medicine and other necessities? I do not believe that the hearts of Ukrainians are cold like ice as that of the evangelic rich man who didn't aid Lazarus. American Catholics constantly come to the aid of various countries, and should we therefore not help our own Ukrainians?

In the first place, during "Captive Nations Week" let us pray before God in the words of the Church: "For the sick, the suffering, the imprisoned, and for their salvation, let us pray to the Lord." Let us pray for them not only during "Captive Nations Week," but every day, that the Lord have pity on our

Ukrainian Churches and people. Thus, let us give at least a small item from our wealth to those who need our aid. Our experience teaches us that whenever we save the needy, there comes with it a great spiritual satisfaction and the blessing of God.

The blessing of the Lord be upon you!

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

AMERICAN LIBERALS: KNOW THEY WHAT THEY DO?

Among a few self-styled American liberal newspapers *The Washington Post* claims to be the most liberal, if not the "only liberal" journal in the United States. Its liberalism, alas, is of a specious sort, if we are to judge by its high fanatical opposition to the cause of the nations enslaved by Communist Russia.

A few years ago, *The Post* waged a vitriolic campaign against the erection in Washington of a monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero. The basic premise of the *Post's* editors was that Shevchenko was a "forerunner of Bolshevism," and therefore had no place in Washington. Their confused thinking led the editors so far as to consult the puppet Ukrainian communist delegation in the U.N., who were only too glad to comfort and reinforce the *Post* editors in their anti-Ukrainian thinking and attitude.

Fortunately for this nation, neither the U.S. Congress nor the U.S. government was swayed by the *Post's* unique political insight and ideological acumen. The Shevchenko monument stands in Washington as a symbol of man's eternal quest of freedom and a decent life. It also is a symbol of the understanding of the American people (less *The Washington Post*) of those great works which Shevchenko produced on behalf of human freedom everywhere.

TODAY: AGAINST THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

In the past few years, *The Washington Post* has kept itself busy attacking the concept of support of the captive nations. It has assailed the U.S. Congress for enacting the Captive Nations Week Resolution. It has derided those U.S. citizens who support the captive nations movement, for in the *Post's* belief, this popular movement has impaired the prospect of peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. For this the *Post* received high praise—from the Communist papers in the USSR!

This year, *The Washington Post* again gave forth with a venomous editorial on the captive nations entitled, "Captive Congressmen" (it appeared in the July 10, 1967 issue of the progressive newspaper). It ridiculed U.S. Congressmen for succumbing to "a surge of hysterical anti-Communism" and passing the resolution in 1959. It satirized such captive nations as Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and Cossackia as "pseudo-states." Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who conceived the idea of the Captive Nations Resolution, was taken to task for not including Mother Russia in the list of captive nations, and it gave credit to President Johnson for at least not being specific in enumerating the captive nations.

In their discharge of bile the editorial staff of the *Post* has Mother Russia as a captive country, thereby opening up the fairly reasonable question: who is her captor? Try as we might, we glimpse no foreign troops on Russian soil. But in every one of the captive nations even the *Post* would acknowledge the presence either of Soviet Russian troops, secret agents and spies, or a subservient Communist Party—or all three. Each of these captive countries is ruled from Moscow as an alien power. Thus, Russia is not, and can never be considered a captive country.

HOW THE RUSSIANS FEEL ABOUT AMERICA

The pro-Russian bias of the *Post* is so blatant that one wonders if its foreign policy analysts ever bother reading anything that emanates from Moscow concerning America.

For instance, on June 25, 1967, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued its "theses" on the forthcoming 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. It was obviously timed with Kossygin's visits to the U.N., Glassboro, N.J. and Havana, Cuba.

The statement of the Russian Communist Party read, among other things, that "imperialism, notably U.S. imperialism, was and continues to be the main enemy of the national liberation movement . . ." It stressed, moreover, that "there can be no question of neutrality in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and anti-Communism. The struggle against bourgeois ideology and anti-Communism is one of the most acute aspects of the class struggle; it is a struggle for man, and for the triumph of freedom and progress of mankind" (cf. "Excerpts from the Soviet Document," *The New York Times*, June 26, 1967).

Clearly, whatever overtures the United States has made toward "peaceful coexistence" with the Kremlin have had no influence on the Soviet Russian position regarding the United States. Anti-Americanism is an ineradicable feature of Soviet foreign policy, a simple fact, demonstrated *ad nauseum*, which the *Washington Post* blithely chooses to ignore. In addition, the same anti-American policy was approved by some 24 Communist Parties of the world which gathered at Karlovy Vary in Czechoslovakia in April 1967. At this meeting of Communist worthies President Johnson's "building bridges of understanding" policy went without mention, as were other hopeful gestures on our part, such as the expansion of East-West trade, "cultural exchanges," and the like.

If the U.S. government still underestimates the significance of the captive nations in its global strategy, the fault lies in good part with the vocal, pseudo-liberal American press, as exemplified by *The Washington Post*, which has, for reasons almost beyond comprehension, tried to inflict sheer fantasies upon the minds of the American people. Their effort belongs to that sorry tradition which glorified Fidel Castro as a "genuine freedom fighter" against the dictatorial regime of Fulgencio Batista.

The Washington Post has distinguished itself in this tradition by ridiculing and degrading these forces within the USSR and without which are struggling for the liberation of the captive nations in the USSR. To the *Post*, the Soviet empire is inviolable, despite the fact that the Soviet government ruthlessly persecutes all the peoples within its purview, including the Jews.

Moreover, Communist Russia is the acknowledged instigator and sponsor of the "wars of national liberation" in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These movements are Communist-directed and Communist financed, and are directed against the United States as the principal enemy of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism.

Indeed, Communist Russia sees its relationship with the U.S. far more clearly than does the *Post*.

COUNTERMEASURES

What is needed on our part is not the irrationality of a *Post* but sane and constructive measures in confronting a dedicated enemy.

One of these constructive—and peaceful—ways to check Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism is to turn the tables against the self-vaunted Russian "champion of colonial peoples": pronounce unequivocal support of all the captive nations in the USSR in consonance with the Captive Nations Week Resolution of 1959.

That the Kremlin is sensitive so far as the captive nations are concerned has long been evident to the objective observer. Millions of Russian words have been expended on the

idyllic life of the "family of happy peoples" united under the "benign and lovable Russian older brother." While these words brainwashed the *Posts* of our country, others became aware of an underlying guilt and apprehension. Stalin unwittingly paid a prized tribute to the rebellious Ukrainians when he lamented that there were too many of them to kill off. Any possible doubts as to the menace to the Kremlin of the seething discontent of the enslaved peoples vanished when Khrushchev exploded into rage over the Captive Nations Week before an astonished Richard Nixon. Any "family" a fraction as happy as Soviet propaganda maintains should be quite impervious to a resolution which, in any event, express good will and expresses the common need of all men: freedom.

The *Post* lauds Mr. Johnson for exploring all openings to East-West peace and stability. Typical of its writings, it neglects to point out that Mr. Johnson believes that freedom, if need be, must be fought for, as in Vietnam. The posture of the *Post* becomes all the more craven in its refusal to acknowledge the validity of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. The Resolution merely expresses our sympathy for the plight of peoples forcibly deprived of their freedom. But not to have passed the Resolution would have betrayed a lack of belief in the most important pillar upon which our country and way of life rests.

The *Post* speaks not of this America; instead it anticipates another, wholly different America, something closer to the enemy whose integrity it seems obsessively bent on defending.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS CONFERENCE AND BANQUET HELD IN WASHINGTON

More than 200 civic, ethnic, and trade union leaders attended a Captive Nations Conference and Banquet at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., July 15. The day-long affair, first of its kind sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee, launched the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week, July 16-22.

Owing to the vital importance to the freedom world to work for the liberation of the Captive Nations, conferees and banquet speakers alike proposed extending Captive Nations observances and activities to a year-round basis.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, and General Chairman of the Conference, opened the Conference by giving the themes for this year's observance: (1) to initiate debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.N. as called for by President Kennedy in September 1961, (2) to urge Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, and (3) stress victory in Viet Nam through psycho-political liberation of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese.

This last theme is underscored by publication this October of Dr. Dobriansky's book, *The Vulnerable Russians* as an American answer to the Russian Communists' 50th anniversary in power in Moscow.

Speaking on the Middle East, Professor Roman Smal-Stocki, Visiting Professor at Catholic University, pointed out that the Russian imperialists have liquidated the Jewish autonomous republic, Birobidzhan, are strangling Judaism inside the USSR, and now have linked up with Arab anti-Semites to destroy the Israelis.

By their support of the Arabs, Professor Smal-Stocki said, the Russians also hope to forestall any effort of the Pan-Islamic Movement to undertake the liberation of some 40,000,000 people in Islamic "captive nations" inside the USSR, and, at the same time, deny Middle East oil to the West.

Getting the ideas, the concepts of "captive

nations" across to decision-makers was a major theme stressed by many Conference and Banquet speakers.

Congressman Edward J. Derwinski (R., Ill.) emphasized that "With your perseverance, with your patience, in the long run, justice will triumph. You can't have peace and freedom in the world until all people live in countries with governments of their own choice." Fortunately, the Congressman added, "It's at the grassroots America that ultimately we will shape our foreign policy. There isn't anyone here who can be apathetic."

Congressman Michael A. Feighan (D., Ohio) noted that: "Russian Communists boldly assert that they won't stop until all the world is their captive empire" and pointed out, "We have tens of millions of allies inside the Communist Empire. They call out to us for support in their aspirations for liberty and freedom and national independence. I am glad that the labor unions, which are the bulwark of the success of our way of life, understand this threat of Communism."

Speaking at the Banquet for Mr. George Meany, President of AFL-CIO, and Honorary Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Henry Kirsch, of AFL-CIO's International Department, said:

"The trade union movement stands with clear, unequivocal support for the aspirations of all people for freedom. Unless all people are free none of us is secure in our own liberty. It should be known throughout the world that the AFL-CIO has not abandoned these people to Communism."

Mr. Kirsch continued: "Despite de-Stalinization, forced labor camps still exist. The Party still continues to run everything. Collective leadership means that one tyrant has been replaced by an oligarchy. The tyranny has not been altered. The AFL-CIO will never admire the assassins of freedom." Naturally, he said, "Communists fear elections in countries they control. They fear these would go democratic."

Congressman John Buchanan (R., Ala.), referring to the Israeli-Arab war, said: "The Soviets have given one-third of their aid outside the bloc to Egypt. What is wrong in the Middle East is what is wrong in Cuba, in Asia, in Europe and everywhere else. That is the great wrongness of World Communism."

Speaking for Senator Thomas J. Dodd, David Martin pointed out that liberals as well as conservatives should support the Captive Nations movement. He said: "To be a consistent liberal or a consistent conservative, one has to be anti-Communist. The businessman who pushes for East-West trade for a profit betrays conservatism. The liberal who seeks detente with the Soviets betrays liberalism."

Mr. Martin continued: "We must seek the liberation of the captive nations because our security depends upon it."

Following the speeches, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, as Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, presented awards for outstanding service to the Captive Nations Movement to William J. Gill, Pittsburgh, Pa., the Georgetown University Forum and Rev. Daniel E. Power and Rev. Francis J. Heyden, and to Donald L. Miller, Executive Director, National Captive Nations Committee.

Other awards for outstanding service to the Captive Nations Movement, prepared for presentation at the Banquet, will be presented later to John M. Fisher, President, American Security Council; Senator Thomas J. Dodd; Senator Frank J. Lausche, and George Meany, President, AFL-CIO.

Other speakers during the Captive Nations Conference included Mrs. Claire Lee Chennault, Dr. George Dimitrov, Secretary General, International Peasant Union; Mr. Dimitru Danielopol, Copley News Service; and Dr. Peter P. Lejins, President, American Latvian Association.

The Banquet audience included leaders of 15 major trade unions and departments of AFL-CIO, as well as civic and ethnic leaders. Philip A. Guarino, a Director of the National Captive Nations Committee, was Chairman of the Banquet.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, August-September 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON (By Orest Szczudluk)

BOSTON, MASS.—This year's Captive Nations Week was observed here by informing the public, through newspapers and radio, about the captive nations. Governor John A. Volpe and Mayor John F. Collins of Boston enhanced the observance by issuing proclamations designating the week of July 16-22 as "Captive Nations Week" in Massachusetts and Boston, respectively. The official signing of proclamations was witnessed by delegations representing the New England Committee for Captive Nations and included representatives of American Armenian, Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Hungarian organizations.

Each major daily and radio station in the State received a press release, together with copies of the official proclamations. These newspapers commented on the observance: *The Boston Herald Traveler*, *Boston Record American*, *The Standard Times* (New Bedford, Mass.), *Manchester Union Leader* (Manchester, N.H.), *Morning Sentinel* (Waterville, Maine), *Hairenik Weekly* (Boston, Mass.).

The Boston Herald of July 19, 1967, carried a letter by James H. Tashjian, Chairman of the NECCN, urging concrete efforts in support of freedom for captive nations, such as exposing the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution and urging the U.N. to investigate Russian Communist aggression and demanding free elections in captive countries.

The Boston Herald of July 6, 1967, carried an interesting article, written by Ted Lewis. The nationally syndicated columnist, citing an interview with Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, chided the Administration for paying only "lip service to the cause of freedom" in captive countries. The article was entitled, "Captive Nations Get Lip Service."

The New England Committee for Captive Nations sponsored this year's observance, in cooperation with several other civic organizations. The Committee is headed by Dr. James H. Tashjian as Chairman and Orest Szczudluk as Executive Secretary.

ACTION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In separate letters, 25 New England Congressmen were urged to initiate action in the House Rules Committee on pending legislation and to vote for the establishment of a permanent Special Committee on Captive Nations in Congress. So far, favorable answers were received from Speaker McCormack and Congressmen O'Neill, Philbin, Burke, Cleveland, St. Onge and Conte.

SOMETHING FOR THE "ENZYME EXPERTS" TO PONDER

Mr. COWGER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Tribune of today there is a news item that should be pondered by the "enzyme experts." It relates that Mig pilots appear to have the benefit of a

new radar system which could cause increased losses for American pilots. This amounts to one more item for the Vietnamese Communists from the U.S.S.R., and it comes closely on the heels of reports of Soviet "Hook" and "Hound" helicopters, and a new variety of flame-thrower, recently introduced into the enemy's arsenal.

For those who believe we should not interdict these supplies, by bombing before they reach the North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldiers, the article also provides the latest American battle casualty statistics: 102,043 killed, wounded, or missing.

The "enzyme experts" can attempt to deduce why we should not bomb these supplies when they reach the port of Haiphong and surrounding areas rather than wait until they are used in hand-to-hand combat, or until they are used to haul artillery to be used against Con Thien, or against American pilots. They can attempt to establish a case against bombing targets which the true experts, the military experts, request. If a case can be made.

The article also suggests the question, did any of the equipment which went into production of this newly introduced radar, or the flamethrowers, or "Hook" or "Hound" come from American sources traded away through bridge-building programs of East-West trade? Did any of this equipment contain synthetic rubber, computers, synthetic fibers, radio communication equipment, or other items such as these which have been traded with the Communists?

These few points should be remembered when reading articles such as this one which I submit for inclusion into the RECORD:

RED GROUND RADAR AIDS MIGS

SAIGON, VIETNAM, October 12.—North Vietnamese Mig fighter pilots are using a new sophisticated ground-to-air radar targeting system that enables them to sneak up on American jets from behind and fire missiles, an air force official in Da Nang disclosed today.

The new system could be a major reason for the recent reappearance of supersonic Mig-21 fighters over North Viet Nam, he said, adding, "The Migs are getting better."

MISSILES NOT VERY GOOD

He said the Communists' ground radar, more powerful and sophisticated than radar sets aboard aircraft, is used to guide Migs to positions directly behind United States planes, so the communist pilots often have the American planes in their sights before the American pilots are aware they are being tailed. The Migs make one firing pass and disappear, he said.

"What's saving us is that their missiles aren't very good," the source said. "If they had the same kinds of missiles we do, we'd be hurting."

American Phantoms are equipped with heat-seeking Sidewinder missiles and radar-guided Falcon and Sparrow missiles. According to some reports, missiles supplied the North Vietnamese by the Russians are not the best ones in the Soviet inventory.

YANKS KILLED IN WEEK, 102

In Saigon United States officials announced that 102 Americans were killed in combat last week in Viet Nam, 26 were missing in action, and 890 were wounded, the lowest casualty figures for any week in two months. About half the wounded were hurt seriously enough to require hospitalization.

The new toll raised over-all American war casualties to 102,043—13,736 killed, 87,525 wounded, and 782 missing. More than half the casualties have been suffered in 1967.

In the air war, marine corps pilots streaked to within 20 miles of Hanoi to bomb the Hoa Loc Mig base and a railroad line 70 miles northwest of the communist capital.

PROBE GUERRILLA SANCTUARY

In ground action, United States 1st infantry division troops continued to sweep the fringes of the "iron triangle" guerrilla sanctuary northeast of Saigon where they ran into a Viet Cong force trying to protect caches of munitions and food yesterday and killed 24 of the Viet Cong. The battle resulted in the death of one American and the wounding of three others.

President-elect Nguyen Van Thieu of South Viet Nam will send a letter to Ho Chi Minh inviting the North Vietnamese president to peace talks after Thieu's inauguration, the Saigon government said today. A spokesman said Thieu would also propose a week-long bombing pause "if Hanoi's answer is favorable."

The spokesman said Thieu would send the letter to the North Vietnamese president through diplomatic channels, through a public announcement, and through third nations.

SELLING INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. COWGER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest products to sell these days, and yet one which is indispensable to our representative form of government, is individual responsibility. One need only consider the case of the automobile driver to appreciate the necessity for exercising personal responsibility. Each time an approaching car zips past—sometimes a matter of several feet apart—each driver is relying on the other not to be dangerously drunk or reckless or inattentive while the cars are in motion. We are all too familiar with the frightful penalties sometimes exacted due to the absence of driver responsibility. We all heartily agree that driving excesses should be punished promptly and directly. Yet, in other areas of everyday life, the subject of personal responsibility or duty often falls on deaf ears, possibly because the penalties are not as immediate or graphic as the twisted wreckage of an automobile.

Recently President John A. Howard, of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., in his opening convocation address, presented a forceful case on behalf of the responsibility of the individual. To the traditional three R's President Howard added the three R's of respect, restraint, responsibility, and reemphasized the principle of our forefathers that—

Man has discovered no code for living together which improves on the ten commandments.

His message demands a wider dissemination and adoption if our Nation is not

to disappear into history—the victim of its own internal decay.

I include the address, "Another Three R's," by President John A. Howard, of Rockford College, given on September 13, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

ANOTHER THREE R'S

(Opening convocation address by John A. Howard, president, Rockford College, September 13, 1967)

This ceremony marks the one hundred twenty-first year of this institution. Although there is a tendency to attach great significance to the age of a college, the fact is that age of itself indicates nothing more than a capacity to survive. We are the ones who must prove in our time that the long flow of personal sacrifices which created and sustained this college were well invested, that we have the courage and the vision to rise resolutely to the challenges of our times, holding to those attitudes and traditions which have enduring value and adding to them whatever will fortify our students for the particular circumstances in which they live.

In one respect, the circumstances are very fortunate ones. This is a year we have been waiting for. The Howard Colman Library provides us with one of the most attractive and well-appointed study centers ever created. The new science building gives promise of serving its purposes equally well and, moreover, cleverly gives us something to look forward to when it is finally finished. The College personnel are all, at long last, reassembled on one campus. And the new interim studies program next January fulfills the dream of many an academic, the opportunity for faculty and students to explore with full concentration an area of particular interest to each person.

The aura of rejoicing on our campus, however, contrasts rather sharply with the conditions of the outer world. Robinson Jeffers wrote of "A gathering in the air of something that hates humanity." It seems as if some malevolent force is now at work. The daily headlines remind us of the undeclared foreign war in Vietnam and the undeclared civil war in our urban centers. Recently released statistics tell us of three and a quarter million serious crimes in the United States in 1966—one for every fifty people—and twelve hundred and thirty-four crimes in our own city in the first seven months of this year, which considering the Christmas rush still ahead, should make it a banner year. The use of drugs continues to spread and some people named Cox, whose son killed himself under the influence of LSD, have instituted a \$600,000 wrongful death suit against Timothy Leary for recommending the drug. As of this writing hundreds of thousands of teachers are on strike. This baleful catalogue of cares could be extended at length, but the items already mentioned make it obvious that our nation is beset with mounting problems of such gravity that everyone must be concerned. The question is what are we to do about our disintegrating society?

Before I provide all the answers, I want to register my annual counter-demurrer. My comments this morning are not offered in any expectation of imposing upon you my higher wisdom—this college community, like any good one, includes a lot of faculty and students who, like Annie Oakley, can do anything better or higher than you—but rather to offer a point of departure for our deliberations in the coming months.

In August, the *Wall Street Journal* commented editorially on a prize-winning entry in a graphics contest. The theme of the competition was "Words We Live With." The successful poster presented three words, "In We Trust." There was a blank space between the "In" and the "We Trust." An excerpt from the editorial:

"Aside from getting into the theological or denominational ambiguity of the familiar 'In God We Trust' declaration—after all, which religion's God do we really trust in—the prize poster painfully clarifies the difficulty of pinpointing something in which man does indeed trust. While many people have managed to maintain their various faiths, there is a widespread questioning of values both spiritual and secular."

Then the *Journal* invites the reader to fill in the blank himself and suggests that neither Art, nor Science, Psychiatry, the State, Law, Logic, Power, nor any other currently popular basis for judgment seems to offer a sure refuge for modern man. That there is a vacuum of personal convictions today is, perhaps, one of the few observations one could draw about society on which there would be general agreement. The moral rootlessness of our population and failure of the nation to arrive at clearly defined public policies constitutes a damning indictment of the institutions of society, particularly the institutions of religion and education. On this occasion, I will leave religion to deal with its own short-comings, although it is clearly in need of help, and confine my musings to American education.

September, 1967, finds the public scene bespeckled with irrational love groups, irrational hate groups, irrational war groups, and irrational peace groups, often led by self-proclaimed Messiahs who have become impatient with traditional procedures and have taken matters into their own hands either to retreat from or drastically revise the conditions of living around them. And a high proportion of these irrational group participants are not the benighted ignorant, but the "well-educated." The provision by society of teachers and buildings and books and equipment is self-defeating if a sizeable and growing portion of the student products damage themselves through the use of drugs, or join causes which resort to murder and looting and arson, or take actions which render far more difficult the agonizing decisions in which a nation must choose between peace and war. The failure of our social institutions is suggested even more dramatically as we observe a highly educated populace frozen in indecision because there are no generally agreed upon principles for the conduct of society.

Unless we are prepared to let the forces of individual willfulness and disunity and crime and chaos carry us ever further into a state of fear and disorder, we are going to have to make some hard judgments and act forcefully upon them, praying that the judgments are well-founded and that the results of the actions will contribute to the conditions in which men of good will can live together in peace and fulfillment. And one awesome corollary of that statement is that men of ill-will must be recognized as such and thwarted in their mischief. Any such efforts will be cruelly difficult, for the decision about who falls into the good- and who into the ill-will categories will rest upon some human and therefore fallible processes. Still, the alternative seems to be to do nothing and slide on down the path to barbarism and anarchy.

It is, I think, not as late as we think. The public is not wholly insensitive to the circumstances, nor incapable of recognizing and applauding the kind of action that is needed. Recently there was an overwhelming approval among our citizens of an agency which followed the prescription. When Israel stood up and said it would no longer tolerate the deceit and threats and murder and destruction carried on by her neighbors with the aid of Soviet Russia, and took forceful action to stop them, the rejoicing in our country was even greater than would logically flow from the particular circumstances, greater than the normal pleasure in the survival of a good friend and the de-

feat of a collective bully. The level of reaction suggests to me a cosmic sigh of relief among Americans in discovering that it is still possible for a nation to make the difficult judgments required to sustain a society and to move with speed and singleness of purpose to act upon them.

Certainly the central endeavor of education is to increase the knowledge and skills of the student, but that mission must have context and direction. In a recent Commencement address, Elton Trueblood stated, "Colleges exist to make a fellowship by means of which standards of civilization will be erected and the progress of civilization will be enhanced." The problem is to determine the standards and discover the techniques.

In making some proposals toward that end, I would like first to state a thesis on which the proposals are based: It is impossible to arrive at a good society or a Great Society by any techniques other than the development of good individuals. If any substantial portion of the individuals are wholly self-oriented or undisciplined or estranged from the values of their society or unaware of such values, then that society will remain in turmoil until a new consensus has been reached and accepted voluntarily, or until order is imposed by powerful authority.

It appears as if the educational process in our nation has been highly successful in promoting the individuality of students and has failed to establish common limits within which that individuality can productively operate. A television program carried the paradoxical title, "The Congo-Victim of Independence." It appears as if our people, too, are the victims of independence, of a release from any restrictions other than those arising out of individual whims and conclusions and objectives. We are in the process of learning the hard way that men cannot live together in that fashion.

The reaction of our populace to the Israeli-Arab war, mentioned earlier, suggests that there is a broad and a deep area of agreement about what is worthy human conduct. And what is not. We have a nation facing the right direction but its feet don't move. The leadership of the nation has failed to identify the target and move us toward it. The leadership of our educational institutions has failed in precisely the same way. There seems to be no generally agreed upon advice for students, with the result that the boldest ones charge off every which way and everyone else squats in place. The whole situation is like the caucus race in *Alice in Wonderland* where prizes are duly awarded to every participant regardless of his performance.

I suggest that education must recognize its inevitable role in adding either to the orderly advance of society or else to its disintegration, and the educational leadership must find the raw courage to take steps to try to make it the former. Raw courage it will take, for whatever new conclusions are reached by any institution and whatever action is taken to attend to those conclusions will undoubtedly give rise to cries of anguish by those who think otherwise and provoke the most vigorous charges of breach of academic freedom. And it is probably because these consequences are anticipated that the academic leadership, like the national leadership, is immobilized, immobilized for fear of militant criticism. The inevitability of such criticism is, itself, a safeguard against over-reaction to present conditions. Those who would begin to give direction to the educational process will need to be fortified with persuasive reasons to back up their proposals.

To be useful to the citizen and to the society, it seems to me that education must superimpose on the currently accepted mission of transmitting knowledge and skills, the mission of engendering certain specific attitudes on the part of the students. I believe that the traditional three R's must be learned in conjunction with another three R's.

R FOR RESPECT

The first is respect. That means to hold in esteem, to regard as valuable. It seems to me that one of the prime necessities of civil life in a free nation is to bring each person to an observance of the rights and dignity of each other person. That does not imply that one must agree with all the ideas nor tolerate all the acts of everyone else, but as long as the other person is operating within the limits agreed upon by the society, then he should be permitted to carry on without being badgered or bullied or suppressed by others. This is one point where there have been outrageous transgressions in the academic community. If a person has been officially invited to speak at a campus, then he is entitled to make his presentation without heckling or intimidation or embarrassment. For those who disagree with him, there are numerous appropriate channels for expressing disagreement without resorting to techniques which are antithetical to the whole concept of academic freedom, techniques which are, in fact, those of the intellectual fascist.

Furthermore, there must be respect for the educational process and the institutions which engage in it. In an essay in *Look Magazine* last week, Eric Sevareid made this observation: "I must say that, kooky as we may have been in the first real American student movement in the thirties, we never, to my memory, even dreamed of using force. We thought of the university, much as we often hated its official guts, as the one sanctuary where persuasion by reason must rule supreme, if the university itself were to be preserved from the outside hands of force and unreason." Those who use coercive techniques in response to what they believe to be arbitrary or indifferent or oppressive educational administration merely strengthen the position of him whom they oppose. By their action, they plant the banner of academic freedom in his hands under which he must resist their coercion.

The respect for the educational process clearly requires that faculty members and students and administrative officers and policy boards back off from any natural inclinations to do battle with each other and try calmly to understand what the other fellow's position is and why. If you question anyone who has made the transition, ascending or descending according to your point of view, from classroom to administrative office, the chances are if you scratch him you will draw teacher's blood, but he has discovered that much of what used to look like indifference or rigidity or arbitrariness on the part of the administration is caused by real problems which are not readily dispelled.

The point is that as any educational institution becomes fragmented into warring parties, the creative potential for that institution is drastically reduced and valuable resources of time and energy are dissipated in waging war. If there is not mutual respect among the various constituencies, and an honest effort to arrive at a mutually accommodating outcome in the inevitable frictions, then the best can be hoped for in any dispute is a temporary victory for the stronger force or an armed truce. Neither condition is exactly conducive to the "quiet pursuits of the mind."

The point is also that if the educational institution provides its own living example of how people can, with mutual respect, cooperate toward the achievement of common goals, there is some reasonable expectation that the graduates may do the same as they move out into the larger society. If, on the other hand, the educational institution is beset by intrigue, back-biting, power plays, petty politics and other maliciousness born of disrespect, then that is what can be expected of its alumni when they assume positions of leadership.

R FOR RESTRAINT

The second R is restraint. In a society in which large decisions are made by representative bodies, those decisions need to be arrived at by the most searching deliberations, as free as possible from emotionalism. But the techniques for transmitting news have become so effective that an increasing percentage of the population becomes engaged on one side or the other and the longer an issue remains, the more rigid and excessive its partisans on both sides tend to become.

The Vietnam conflict offers a dramatic illustration. This long struggle weighs heavily on the minds of all Americans. And it would be strange if it didn't. Still, the emotional manner in which some advocates of peace-is-the-supreme-consideration, and some advocates of the containment of Communism press their causes discredits both camps. Surely no thinking person can possibly believe that President Johnson, or his predecessors, wants anything but peace at the earliest possible moment that it can be obtained without sacrificing critical fundamental interests of the nation. And likewise, there can be no doubt about his desire to win the war as swiftly as that can be accomplished without risking too much in escalation or in the loss of personnel. His judgment on these matters and that of his administration is the proper subject of debates. His motives are not. And the epithets which are being applied to him with increasing frequency and vehemence simply prove that thought processes have stopped and emotion is in charge.

In a conflict with an enemy, educators and clergymen and other civilians plying their own trades have no real basis for judgment about what to do. Only the highest officers of government have access to the fullest knowledge of the capacities and the intentions and the current actions of the enemy. Furthermore, only those governmental officers with that knowledge are in the best position to judge whether more bombing or less bombing will bring peace sooner and save more lives. What, after all, will save more lives? It is to be remembered that Stalinist Russia liquidated millions of unwanted citizens and that Mao's China is said by highly respected authorities to have done the same. It is even possible that the military containment of Communism will save more lives than an early East-West peace.

In time of war, above all, there is a need for restraint on the part of the citizens. They can be helpful by telling the President what they do know, that they personally do not perceive the advance of Communism in Asia to be such a threat as to be willing to risk their lives to stop it, if that is the case, or on the contrary, that they are willing to have the President take some major risks to prevent the spread of Communism, if that is the case. But to assert that he is the murderer of innocent North Vietnamese civilians or that he doesn't want to win the war only stirs more passions and divides the country further in time of peril.

Restraint is, of course, the necessary corollary of the respect we mentioned earlier. In the last Presidential election, some of the most widely respected popular journals and public figures delivered themselves of some of the most irrational and exaggerated accusations ever to come from what were generally held to be responsible sources. If restraint is not a quality widely honored and consciously cultivated, then the tense decisions faced by a man or a community or a nation are rendered far more difficult as fear and hate supplant reason.

In a report on some of the student radicals, Fred Hechinger of the *New York Times*, commented, "Such fervor discounts the danger that higher education may become a happening." Without restraint, the whole of society becomes a happening, and freedom

degenerates into license. In 1847, the year Rockford College was founded, Daniel Webster at a speech in Charleston, stated, "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint." I know of nothing that has happened in the intervening one hundred twenty years to deny that epigram.

R FOR RESPONSIBILITY

The third R is responsibility, which, to some extent, embraces the other two, but deserves its own commentary. If you obtain a driver's license in Illinois, the license comes to you as part of a larger card from which you cut the license along the dotted lines. On the remainder there is a message which reads, "Driving a motor vehicle is a privilege. This privilege is granted to you." And then follows a statement of the conditions under which you may retain that privilege.

Living in a free nation is also a privilege. It has been granted to us. It might be a very good thing if we had to apply for and receive a citizen's permit which also spelled out the conditions under which we could continue to live in freedom, because that happy state is not vouchsafed to us by any higher power. Freedom has to be continuously re-earned.

One of the conditions of freedom is that each man must be accountable for the consequences of what he says and what he does. Dr. Cleveland, in a sermon several weeks ago, told of a woman who was a compulsive and talented gossip. One day she passed on a story which caused the greatest anguish to her neighbor. In genuine remorse, the blabbermouth confessed to her priest. For penance, the priest told the woman to buy two ducks at the market and to pluck them as she walked home, and then return to him after she had done this. When she came back, the priest said, "To complete the penance, you must retrieve all the feathers and the down which you plucked from the birds." Then did the woman realize that she could not undo what she had done.

Most of our actions and our utterances have consequences for other people. If I get wound up in a fit of enthusiasm and go charging off on some darned fool project which I haven't thought through, and if it really comes a-cropper, I am not the only one who will suffer. My family will, and so will you because my knuckleheadedness reflects back on the college of which you are a part.

Now, this may sound like a Sunday School lesson for the second grade, but it has its relevance. In the last fifty years one central thrust of education has been quite thoroughly superseded by its exact opposite. Until the first world war, the training of character was a major undertaking by both school and family, and people went to some pains to encourage the second three R's. As the theory of individual development progressed and more was learned about psychological malfunctions, our society and our educational institutions tended more and more to be concerned with the uninhibited fruition of the individual personality until character education was contemptuously laid to rest along with its mother, Morality, nowadays thought to be a hypocrite, and posthumously awarded the scornful epithet, "Middle Class Morality."

The neo-New Enlightenment has taken over. *Time Magazine* observed in its report on the generation under twenty-five, that "no adult can or will tell (these young people) what earlier generations were told: This is God; That is Good; This is Art; That is Not Done."

More recently *U.S. News* published an interview with Dr. Jules Masserman, Co-Chairman of Northwestern's Department of Psychiatry. His concluding comment about counselling college students was:

"You don't say this is good because the Bible says so, or even because the Law says so—or, least of all, because I say so—but it is good because you will keep out of trouble

and have less sorrow and more fun in the long run."

Such a statement seems devoid of any concept of responsibility to anyone else.

In *Demian*, the work by Hermann Hesse which was one of the books in our freshman reading program, there is a mystical glorification of the transcendent evil in man's nature along with the transcendent good. Several quotations: "You can't consider prohibited anything the soul desires." "You must do what your inmost heart desires." "Then I would gaze into myself and confront the image of my fate. Its eyes would be full of wisdom, full of madness, they would radiate love or deep malice, it was all the same. You were not allowed to choose or desire any one of them. You were only allowed to desire yourself."

These are not isolated cases. Much of the thinking within higher education in this country and much of the consequent official policy is not only itself amoral, but tends to actively support and even applaud amorality. As one considers this attitude in conjunction with education's relationship to society, a statement by Professor E. J. Kaufman in a recent issue of the *American Scholar* takes on vivid meaning. The academy "is a place where hardy stupidities are dignified with the best arguments they are likely to find." Everyone keeps saying that we must have more education in order to prevent catastrophe, but if the education offers no consistency, no direction, no ground rules and simply helps people to use their minds better toward whatever personal inclinations they discover, then education, instead of preventing catastrophe, may provoke it. One student organization seems bent on just such provocation. The *New York Times* quotes Gregory Calvert, the national secretary of The Students for a Democratic Society, as saying, "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We are actively organizing sedition."

Here, indeed, is the marvelous fulfillment of the newest enlightenment. That statement, publicly proclaimed, if, of course, ridiculous, but you cannot laugh at it because it is so sad. Sad, because that young man is in dead earnest, and sadder still because he somehow has been led to believe that he will be helping somebody as he foments civil war, and saddest of all because it reveals so plainly the moral bankruptcy and the intellectual inversion of an educational system which can produce such confusion.

Certainly, one of the privileges of living in a free nation cannot be the intentional destruction of other people's lives and property. That is the quickest way to bring an end to freedom. Great though the grievances may be which stir the Gregory Calverts—and the recent essay by Ernest Dunbar, entitled "The Dispirit of 67," is heartbreaking in its picture of despair and exhausted patience—wanton destruction cannot set those grievances to rights.

The one hope for improvement is in trying to extend the base of conscientious people who will move earnestly to try to improve the lot of their neighbors.

Our great task is to find a way of living together that works. There aren't any shortcuts. There aren't any nostrums. We will always be plagued by situations where two people want exactly the opposite things, but by insisting upon the habits of respect and restraint and responsibility we can try to build good men who can work toward a good society. To fill in the blank on the prize-winning poster, I do not think there is any equivalent replacement for the original text, "In God We Trust." Man has discovered no code for living together which improves on the ten commandments. But for those who cannot find personal meaning in religion, I suggest that reason requires placing their confidence in a higher humanism. I suggest that it is only in the multiplying of per-

sistent, disciplined, respectful, restrained, responsible men of good will that the future can be regarded as anything but bleak.

I want to conclude with two items, a brief quotation which summarizes this message, and a story which illustrates it.

In the essay of Eric Sevareid already mentioned, he presents the following quotation from Edmund Burke:

"Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains on their appetites . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the internal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

An attractive girl asked her doctor if her appendicitis scar would show, and his reply was, "That, young lady, is up to you."

THE MISSISSIPPI TALE OF HORROR

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the shocking testimony revealed at the trial of 18 men in Federal district court in Meridian, Miss., confirms many of our worst fears at the time of the murder of Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and James Chaney in 1964.

The complicity of law enforcement officers with Ku Klux Klansmen and a deliberately aroused mob in planning and carrying out the brutal murders of the three young men is, as the *New York Times* stated this morning, "a tale of horror" and brings forth a renewed cry for justice which has been so long denied.

That such a horrifying plot still breeds in the minds of men and that their society permits it to come to fruition is a national shame. It is compounded by the fact that no one has ever been brought to trial by the State of Mississippi for the murder of these young Americans. The 18 defendants now on trial can be charged under Federal law only with conspiracy to deny the youths their constitutional rights.

The events of that summer night in 1964 now becoming clear make more urgent than ever the passage of the Civil Rights Law Enforcement Act of 1967. This measure, already approved by the House, provides Federal criminal penalties for interference—by force or threat of force—with the free exercise of certain enumerated Federal rights. It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee, under direction to report a bill to the floor by October 24, will recommend the passage of the legislation without crippling amendments.

Our commitment to the ideals for which Andy Goodman, Mickey Schwerner, and James Chaney died is empty if we fail to provide the Federal legislation necessary to bring to justice those misguided Americans who continue to deprive their fellow citizens of their civil rights. The least the families of these

three men and all America has a right to expect is action now on this bill.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago I stated on this floor that it was time for the Congress and the American people to recognize the devastating extent of air and water pollution in our country. Today, at least in the Chicago area, this recognition is being attained. It remains to be seen, however, whether the Congress will deal effectively with this problem. It is past time to implement programs to halt the polluting of our air and waterways.

The Pollution Abatement Incentive Act of 1967, which is similar to legislation I have introduced previously, seeks to combine governmental efforts with the efforts of business and industry in eliminating air and water pollution.

Industrial concerns must be encouraged to join the fight against pollution. Private funds must be added to Federal funds if the battle is to be successfully waged. This bill will encourage industries to utilize their own funds by providing a tax credit of up to 20 percent for facilities, including the cost of land, buildings, improvements, machinery, and equipment used to control air pollution and/or water pollution, which have been approved by the appropriate State agency.

The bill would also permit the amortization of the cost of constructing air and water pollution facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years. The pollution tax credit would be in lieu of the investment tax credit which is allowed under the Internal Revenue Code.

Prompt and substantial investments in antipollution facilities must be made. It seems clear that business and industry must be encouraged to do its part in the fight against pollution. The incentive tax credit, therefore, is wholly appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation has been languishing in the Ways and Means Committee for too long without the benefit of hearings and recommendations. Let us hope that the committee will turn its attention to this matter promptly and report legislation which can begin the long fight against pollution.

THE TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on July

18, 1967, this body passed by an overwhelming vote the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, 1968. I supported the measure because I felt, on the whole, it represented, as amended, a balanced appropriation. Of note was the limitation of expenditures to 95 percent of the total estimated in the budget.

In consideration of the bill, our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, offered an amendment to strike the \$142,375,000 appropriation for the development of two prototypes of the supersonic transport—better known as the SST. I supported the amendment because it represented a sound economy measure at a time when great care in Government spending is badly needed. Regrettably, the amendment failed.

Today I am introducing a resolution, identical to a resolution offered by Mr. MACGREGOR on October 5, 1967, which authorizes and directs the Clerk of the House to reengross the transportation appropriation bill, 1968, by striking the \$142,375,000 appropriation for the SST.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must not fail to exercise its responsibility to cut and to rescind excessive appropriations. The proposed SST expenditure is clearly defensible and of a low priority at a time when the Nation faces a \$30 billion deficit. Let this body demonstrate its responsibility by rescinding this and other appropriate appropriations. Hopefully, the administration will demonstrate its responsibility by limiting expenditures.

BEAUTY AND THE FIRST LADY

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 8, the First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, visited my congressional district and was deservedly honored by Williams College in recognition of her outstanding beautification efforts. Mrs. Johnson was the recipient of an honorary degree from Williams and in accepting the award spoke to Williams' fall convocation about the environmental crises that we presently face.

Last week, on October 9, I introduced Mrs. Johnson's excellent statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today, I would like to introduce a fitting tribute to the magnificent efforts and accomplishments of our First Lady, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on October 11, 1967. This editorial, endorsing Mrs. Johnson's speech at Williams and thanking her for her unremitting efforts on behalf of a fairer America, certainly speaks for me and it is hard to imagine that it does not speak for everyone in this country.

Text of the editorial follows:

BEAUTY AND LADY BIRD

One of the tests of a nation's level of thinking is the physical conditions which it permits to exist. It has been wisely said

that to those who think grossly, dirt and disorder cause no uneasiness. Although for a nation, as for an individual, outward condition is less important than inward worth, nonetheless the former is an embarrassing clue to one's thinking.

For this reason we wish both to thank Lady Bird Johnson for her unremitting effort on behalf of a fairer America and to endorse her words over the weekend. Speaking at Williams College, where she received a well-earned honorary degree, the First Lady warned that the United States must answer "one of the most fateful questions of our time—whether the physical setting of American life will be pleasant or squalid."

Many disagree with President Johnson over his various aims. But we fail to see how anyone interested in a more livable America could disagree with the First Lady's efforts. They set a noble and much-needed example.

National beauty is not something which can be created either by government fiat or by government effort, however strict the former or great the latter. It can only come through an awakened sense of beauty and fitness on the part of the average citizen. It is the motorist who tosses beer cans by the roadside, the alderman who does nothing about wayside junkyards, the billboard lobby, the housewife who uproots flowers and plants, the businessman who pollutes air and water, the thousand and one other offenders against beauty, taste and cleanliness who will determine whether America's physical face is grimy or shiny.

We are grateful to Mrs. Johnson for her sincere interest in a cause which has its intellectual and spiritual aspects as well as the merely physical. No one is in a better position to advance that cause than is she.

FUTURE OF RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned over the future of railroad passenger service throughout the United States; from the copper country of northern Michigan to the southern tip of Florida, the future of railroad passenger service in the United States is in grave doubt.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill calling for an investigation and study by the Department of Transportation into the passenger railroad service of the Nation. The bill calls for the Interstate Commerce Commission to declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service as well as the Post Office Department to declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railroad postal contracts. Rail transportation must play a vital role in relieving the ever-increasing congestion of the Nation's highways, promoting the spread of population throughout the Nation, and providing relief to an overburdened mail service. All over the United States, passenger service is being discontinued in a disorderly, haphazard fashion. It is time for a pause. We must know whether surface rail service will be relevant to the development of the megalopolis and the nonurban areas; whether high-speed

service will attract passengers back to the railroads; whether effective innovations are being tried to keep passenger service in operation; whether railway post office operations may soon again be necessary.

The startling fact is, passenger service has declined 50 percent in 15 years. Many of our smaller communities are being abandoned by the railroads. In northern Michigan, the Copper Country Ltd. has lost its postal car, and a large section of the area I represent is in real danger of losing the only railroad passenger service available to it.

It is time to halt this erratic destruction of passenger rail service and to initiate a thorough investigation of railroad potential in America. Such a situation cannot be allowed to continue unchecked. It is apparent from what has gone before that matters will go from bad to worse. So I am calling for a start to the solution of this problem—an overall national study to tell us at long last exactly where the problem lies, what has caused it, and most important, what we can do about it. This is exactly what my bill will accomplish.

THE CENSUS: COHERENT PLAN FOR NATIONAL DATA GATHERING NEEDED

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, a principal argument used to justify the 67 subjects proposed by the Census Bureau for the 1970 decennial census of population and housing is that such data is needed by public and private organizations and would otherwise be unavailable. In the previous statements I have presented to substantiate my position that the decennial census should be vastly changed, three separate issues were analyzed.

I sought to show that both a mandatory and a voluntary approach to parts of the decennial census are feasible. In another position statement I reviewed all of the proposed subjects for the 1970 census questionnaires including where items could be omitted, dropped to a smaller sampling, or deferred for current surveys which the Census Bureau conducts frequently. Invasion of personal privacy and the census was the subject of my third statement. In order to meet Census Bureau arguments for retention of their 67 subjects in 1970 on the basis of Federal information needs, let me address myself to this proposition.

DETERMINE FEDERAL STATISTICAL NEEDS

A nation investing billions of dollars in research and hundreds of millions on gathering information from American citizens should conduct these undertakings with some logically consistent plan of attack. I am unconvinced that such a coherent national data accumulation plan exists whether within the Federal Government, State statistical agencies, or

private and university information collection activities. It seems to me that an inventory of essential statistics on population, employment, education, income, housing, et cetera, should be developed by the Bureau of the Budget which now has authority to approve questionnaires. The scope and validity of these requirements should receive at least oversight review by Congress. This is a minimum assignment, I believe, to untangle the data-gathering machinery of departments and agencies which have exhibited octopuslike growth in recent years.

Such an inventory of Federal statistical requirements could encompass the needs of colleges and universities, non-profit enterprises, and private business so long as a public purpose is related to the initial collection of data. If the departments and agencies of the Federal Government except for security, defense, and law enforcement organizations, would identify information demands both required and collateral and these lists were correlated into an aggregate principal statistical research centers such as the Census Bureau could proceed in a more purposeful manner to collect only that information. In my opinion this would result in a major reduction in census inquiries from those now proposed.

DEVELOP NATIONAL PROGRAM

Once an inventory of important Federal statistical needs was developed, it would be necessary to identify all existing sources of data collected by Federal, State, and private agencies willing to cooperate in such a consolidated program. We must bring about maximum utilization of all existing bodies of data before plunging further into unrelated interrogation of segments of the American public and business. I do not believe that reaching this assessment would be difficult.

A review of the 1970 census questions brings the immediate thought to mind: Do any Federal agencies have current data on some of the subjects now on the census questionnaire thus minimizing the need for the Census Bureau to include them? It seems clear that the Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Veterans' Administration, and other Federal installations do possess such statistics, transferable without identifying any individual, if required by the Census Bureau.

After all questions properly deemed matters of public need are evaluated and a thorough review of existing sources of information amassed by Federal departments and agencies, decisions could be reached as to how all remaining facts should be collected. I am uncertain, as I expect many of my colleagues are, as to what determines whether departments and agencies conduct their own surveys for particular information, the project is contracted to the Census Bureau, or private or university research organizations are allowed to bid on the proposal. Qualitative factors such as the competency for the assignment as well as quantita-

tive factors, such as cost, no doubt receive consideration. Yet I am not aware of firm, public policies existing for each department and agency concerning their survey and polling programs.

CONCERNS FOR THE CONGRESS

The Congress must become involved in the major propositions concerning information collection by the executive branch for at least three reasons: It is a multimillion-dollar investment by the taxpayers annually, urgent questions as to the maintenance of personal privacy are involved, and determinations are needed as to the adequacy of information collected in terms of national objectives. Various House and Senate committees are charged with parts of this responsibility and in recent years a number of significant hearings have been held. No definite policy directions that I am aware of have been given to the executive branch. I hope before the adjournment of the 90th Congress several bills will become law in this field. There are four facets to this problem I would point to as arenas where Congress can help develop a coherent plan for national data procurement:

First. Full utilization of existing statistical services within the executive and greater consolidation of that data for intergovernmental users is the logical first step in the plan. This proposal embodies the creation of a national data bank. The greater efficiency and savings from such a facility plus increased information availability do not, however, overshadow its major weakness. I refer to the invasion of personal liberty which can result when extensive personal data is concentrated in one master information system. Foolproof statutory safeguards must precede the creation of a data center. Once protection against misuse of personal facts is guaranteed, this consolidated statistical unit has great possibilities for assisting every segment of American society.

Second. The 50 States are rapidly expanding their collection of all types of data useful to every level of government. Under the auspices of the Council of State Governments an individual or agency in each State has been designated for intra and interstate data processing coordination. Any national data center on the Federal level should be accessible to State governments. Maximum benefits can accrue to the State only if some coordination or standardization of present projects is developed.

An interstate compact on statistics and data processing might serve as the forum for State officials to plan greater integration of information systems. There should be greater Federal statistical information available in automated form to the States. Increasing such sharing of data will necessarily initially involve cooperation among the States. This is far more desirable, as I can see it, than for the Census Bureau or officials of a national data center to negotiate information exchange or transfer separately with every State. Early State action could mean expanded access to a center data operation if Congress is aware of the particular needs and automatic data processing capabilities of the States when a national data center is established.

Third. Whether any current surveys or population, housing, education, employment, or business now conducted under Federal auspices could or should be contracted to a private market research firm cannot be overlooked. I asked 200 market research firms if their organizations could successfully conduct some of the projects now handled by the Census Bureau. It was not surprising that the overwhelming response was "Yes." I was impressed, however, with the reasons given for the belief that more Federal survey work should be shared with private enterprise. Let me provide actual quotes from several representative letters:

PRINCETON, N.J.,
September 8, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: I am keenly interested in the problem you pose. The government can conduct some types of surveys better than private marketing research firms, such as ours. But, not from the point of view of technology. The decennial census would probably represent too great a project for any or all private firms. Also, there are some studies made by the government, requiring an answer by the respondents, that obviously could not be done by private marketing firms.

On the other hand, there are a great many surveys that not only could be done as well by private firms, and at a fraction of the cost. If all expenses were honestly taken into account, I believe that private research firms could conduct most of these surveys for about one-third or one-half of the amount spent by the government. My own fear is that the government will continue to build up its survey machinery and in time will take over more and more of the work that now goes to commercial research firms. From the point of view of quality, the government certainly has no advantage except that it can spend excessive amounts whereas commercial firms must normally work within much smaller budget requirements.

As the head of a market research firm, I should add that we have never been very much interested in getting survey assignments from the government because of the time and the money and the difficulties of fighting the Washington bureaucracy. It requires a lot of time of a lawyer, of accountants, etc., even for minor contracts. Moreover, it is always difficult to get money out of the government when the job is completed. In dealing with private industry, a simple contract is enough and we can expect to be paid on the completion of the study and the delivery of the report. In our experience this is not the case in dealing with the government. Often months go by before some minor detail is cleared up. All of this makes for work for the bureaucrats but it is discouraging to those who could do surveys for the government at substantial savings to taxpayers.

Sincerely,

GEORGE GALLUP,
Director, American Institute of Public Opinion

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 5, 1967.

Congressman JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BETTS: It is my opinion that private marketing research organizations can compete favorably for the studies undertaken by The Census Bureau for the benefit of government. This has application to studies in other areas of government as well.

The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated the success of this approach in a number of studies in which they have utilized private organizations.

Most sincerely,

A. EDWARD MILLER,
President, Alfred Politz Research.

RICHMOND, VA.,
August 14, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: We cannot admit to an unprejudiced viewpoint, but are convinced that private marketing research organizations could successfully contract some of the census projects. Our organization has, from time to time, attempted to persuade the Department of Commerce that this could be done—but to no avail. Insofar as I am aware, the Commerce Department is one of the few in the federal government which relies almost exclusively on its internal personnel for information gathering and other kinds of research.

Sincerely yours,

J. ALBERT FABER,
President, Southeastern Institute of Research, Inc.

URBANA, ILL.,
September 18, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You asked my opinion on the matter of having private market research firms undertake some of the projects now being done by the Census Bureau. I am quite confident that any one of a number of private research firms could do such work and perhaps do it as effectively as a government agency. I would guess that in a number of instances the contract price for research done by private firms would be lower than the cost of having it done by a government agency. This would be particularly true for special projects where a government agency is not already tooled up to conduct such research investigations.

Sincerely,

C. H. SANDAGE,
President, Farm Research Institute.

WATERLOO, IOWA.,
September 19, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: As to your second question: yes, certainly, in my opinion, private interviewing organizations could successfully contract many of the Census Bureau surveys.

Sincerely yours,

GLADYS L. WALKER,
Director, Black Hawk Research Bureau.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 1, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: We firmly believe that the Federal Government is in fact in competition with us along with many tax supported universities and also, in fact, we are being deprived of potential business which we could handle more economically, at profit, which would yield the government additional tax revenue.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD W. OUDERSLUYS,
President, Market-Opinion Research Co.

Mr. Speaker, one approach to an objective review of the polls or surveys which might be contracted to private organizations was presented by Mr. Henry Brenner, of the Home Testing Institute:

MANHASSET, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
August 16, 1967.

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BETTS: I would like to suggest a possible course of action to you.

1. To get from the Bureau of the Census and other Government bodies (Department of Agriculture, for one) that conduct "marketing research" surveys a list of the studies that have been completed during a recent twelve month period along with a description of:

- (a) The purpose of the study;
- (b) The design of the study;
- (c) A report of the study.

2. Then I would suggest that this material be forwarded to 15 or 20 heads of marketing research firms or other individuals involved in non-governmental marketing research activities.

3. Those who wish to would then be given an opportunity to discuss with you and other interested Congressmen and officials of Government bodies involved the capability of marketing research firms to undertake studies similar to those conducted by the Government bodies.

Cordially,

HENRY BRENNER,
Home Testing Institute, TrQ, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, the officers of the major trade associations for the marketing and opinion research industry should be asked to provide suggestions on the formation of industry-academic committees to advise Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, or specific agencies. There is a need for a better understanding of where lines are drawn separating federally conducted research efforts from those contracted with private firms. Such a determination might expand, decrease or not materially affect the amount of Federal research work. This would not be the objective of such a determination. It would be to set a standard everyone understood and to follow that course in future decisions.

Fourth. A broad, inclusive program of Federal statistical research must include nonprofit research organizations and universities. These institutions, important statistical users amass much information, also develop new research technology. It is true that some new techniques and methodology are now shared and this should continue. A closer relationship between these loci of vast information should not become one of domination by the Federal Government or reluctant cooperation from the non-government sector. This is a relationship to be considered as part of an overall national statistical plan.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ramifications of any commentary on improving the information gathering apparatus in the United States. I feel my remarks as they pertain to the Census Bureau and the 1970 census questionnaire lend support for the passage of H.R. 10952. I will let the experts consider the other aspects of my suggestions to strengthen the vital information sources in this country.

TRIBUTE TO COL. LEE B. HARR

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened today to bring to my colleagues the news of the passing of Col. Lee B. Harr, retired center director of the Veterans' Administration Center at Mountain Home in Johnson City, Tenn.

Colonel Harr's death last Friday evening came just a little more than a year after his retirement on July 29, 1966, following 32 years of service at Mountain Home.

On Memorial Day, 1966, I was privileged to speak at the annual services at Mountain Home, and in my remarks that day, I said:

It is particularly fitting that we, who are gathered here on these beautiful grounds, pay special tribute to Col. Lee B. Harr, who has put in more than 30 years of faithful, loyal, and dedicated service as Center Director.

A veteran of two world wars, Col. Harr has spent himself in the service of other veterans and has earned their respect and gratitude and that of all his fellow citizens. There have been wars in between, and the crosses have increased by row on row since he started here, but his spirit and his devotion to duty have never faltered.

We are privileged to have Col. Harr here among us, and we need but look around to see the fruits of his labors. Truly blessed is he and are we because of his efforts.

As impossible as it is for us to adequately thank those who lie beneath the crosses, so, too, we cannot render Col. Harr the appreciation that we feel for his unselfish and useful efforts. Yet as long as we pause to celebrate Memorial Day, we will remember you, and honor you, Col. Harr. You, your staff, and employees have done and are doing an outstanding job, and we are most grateful.

Johnson City, east Tennessee, the First District, and the entire area have lost a great, dedicated public servant and I have lost a good friend. Colonel Harr was an outstanding American completely devoted to the cause of his fellow man. Veterans from all walks of life praised him for his helping hand.

Yesterday, the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, realizing the immeasurable contribution "the colonel" had made to the community of which he was a part, devoted an entire page to picture highlights of his career, as well as excerpts from his remarks upon his retirement a year ago.

At the same time, this fine newspaper carried a beautifully written front-page editorial paying tribute to this great American.

It is my sincere hope that these items, both of which I am privileged to insert in the RECORD, will speak in some small way of my profound sense of loss.

My wife and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Harr, their daughter, and members of the family.

THE COLONEL: WHEN SERVICE WAS SECOND NATURE—HE FOUND DEDICATION AND CONCERN THE KEYS TO SATISFACTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here are concepts taken from an interview with Col. Lee B. Harr by Johnson City Press-Chronicle staff writer Johnny Jones in which some of the Colonel's views are expressed on the Johnson City which he loved.)

"It will be a very happy day in my life when I walk out of this station on July 29, feeling the satisfaction of 32 years of service to my fellowman. It will be a great day knowing I've done my best, and that all my efforts have not been futile," these words spoken by Col. Lee B. Harr at the time of his retirement last year exemplify more than any one thing the true spirit of dedication that exemplifies Col. Harr.

Harr was a native of Johnson City. Having spent his lifetime here, he spoke often of the development in relationships between Johnson City and Mountain Home:

"I am proud to say that Johnson City and Mountain Home are today one and the same. Our employees feel that they are a part of Johnson City and the citizens of Johnson City feel they are a part of the station," he would declare.

The Colonel came to the Veterans Administration Center desk in 1935. He was an attorney here, having interests in the Johnson City Insurance Agency and Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co. Agency.

He attended the University of the South, Sewanee and the University of Virginia. A lifelong member of the Kiwanis Club, he served as president of the club in 1932 and the Kentucky-Tennessee district in 1951. His father was a well-known attorney in Johnson City.

He was well-qualified to handle the affairs of veterans. Harr at that time was a veteran. He served as an officer with various artillery units during World War I.

A physical collapse during a party at his home prior to the Memorial Day observances, prompted the retirement of Col. Harr, although he was up and on his feet within three weeks.

"The one thing I look back to is the satisfaction of leaving a hospital that has a heart."

"I have had 32 years of very happy experience here. As I look back at the years now I see my years here at Mountain Home and the Veterans Administration Center as being the dearest years of my life."

"The veterans always come first to me. They gave their best when they were young, and it is up to us to take care of them now that they are old."

"As I look at the 32 years I have lived on this station I look at the whole. I see Mountain Home now as a great medical center."

"With great satisfaction, I have seen the station grow each year to where now we are very proud of the fact that we have a great hospital staffed with highly qualified medical people using modern equipment and rendering the finest service we've ever given the veterans of this country."

"No one man could have done it by himself. It has taken teamwork: no person of the staff has ever shirked from his responsibilities in working in a coordinating effort for Mountain Home."

"The public has been awfully kind to me. The various organizations that have offered help have all given their fullhearted support to the center." Harr included these organizations among the thousands of people who help in the Mountain Home programs.

HE WAS THE COLONEL

He was The Colonel and he was a great man—one of the greatest Johnson City has had.

Lee B. Harr . . .

Let his name be enthroned forever in the sweet perpetuity of memory—to be a blessing and a benediction to those who live now, his friends and contemporaries, and to be a shining inspiration and constant challenge to generations yet to be.

Lee B. Harr . . .

A name that stands for rugged integrity . . . for exemplary citizenship . . . for unflinching loyalty . . .

A name that stands for ceaseless endeavor . . . for mighty works . . . for invincible faith that all things work together.

Lee B. Harr . . .

How he loved his fellow man, and how his fellow man loved him!

How he loved his country, and how that love was reflected in a hundred and one areas of unselfish, and often sacrificial, service!

How he loved his church, and how he manifested this love by consistent and diligent labor in the often-rewarding, sometimes-forbidding vineyard of life!

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . .

As administrator of the Veterans Administration Facility for 32 years, he established himself as stalwart champion of the ex-service man—and established Mountain Home as one of the great facilities of the nation. The annual Memorial Day exercises which he originated drew country-wide attention and attracted many national leaders to Johnson City.

He saw to it that the VA meshed with the community, that it did not stand apart in institutional aloofness, that it became a participant and not just an observer in the ebb and flow of public life. He himself led the way—by putting himself on call, by standing "on the ready" when and where needed, by facing the issue and getting the job done.

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . . The Good Citizen . . .

A Johnson Cityan through and through was he, proud that he was born here, proud that his family had played such a significant role in local history, proud that he had lived to see his hometown grow from fledgling village to full-scale city.

But it would be a mistake to think of the Colonel as being of, by and for only one city. His activities encompassed many cities and many people, and all welcomed him as friend, neighbor, and often speaker for important occasions.

He was at his best in "firing up" workers for some special cause, such as the United Fund which he supported so earnestly; the Kiwanis Club which he reminded so regularly that "freedom is not free"; his church which he helped through many a hard place by the force of his personality and his leadership; and the Johnson City Preaching Mission which he helped organize and then supported so faithfully through the years.

Lee B. Harr . . . The Colonel . . . The Good Citizen . . . The Good Steward . . . The Good Friend . . . The Man of Many Talents . . .

He was trained to be a lawyer, and practiced for a time. He could have been an outstanding success in that field.

He had the qualities of industry, insight and vision to be a successful businessman. He would have ranked with the best, we believe.

He could have been an outstanding Chamber of Commerce executive, for he had the drive and enthusiasm needed for that.

And he could have been a great politician hands down and home free, for he could move and influence people in all walks of life and he had the intuitive ability to make the right move at the right time.

But back in 1934 he chose to become head of the VA Center, and that became the core of his life, the centerpiece of his being. From then until he retired last year, he magnified his office with devoted service far above, over and beyond the call of duty.

The Colonel . . .

Lee B. Harr . . .

Greatness has dwelt among us. Greatness will live after us.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House

the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk on the coverage that we have seen in the newspapers over the past year or two concerning the Office of Economic Opportunity and some of its programs.

Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the very distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma once said that all he knew was what he read in the newspapers. Unfortunately, I find myself in that condition, although I do not completely agree with what I see in everything which is published in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, the black power advocate Stokely Carmichael is talking about democracy, according to Hal Witt of the United Planning Organization—a poverty program—who criticized the Nation's newspapers for slanting news about black power. When whites understand the black power concept, he said, they will realize "to what extent this society is evil."

Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1967, under the heading of "The Poverty Program as a Gold Mine," there appears the following article by Maxwell Neil.

ROSEDALE, MISS.—Down the road leading from the square along the railroad tracks to the Negro district of this sleepy Mississippi delta town there stands a phenomenon of the poverty program—a pocket of prosperity.

It looks like anything but; it is a shabby frame house with fake-brick siding, once the parsonage of the Bethel AME Church next door, back when the church could afford a full-time parson. More recently it was rented to a family "for \$25 or \$30 a month," says a member of the church's board.

But that was before the poverty program came to town and turned the faded, 4-room dwelling into a gold mine by renting it for a Headstart center for 85 youngsters. The rent: \$240 a month. "I am pretty sure we would have taken less if they asked us, but it seems like they already had their policy set up to pay that much," says a member of the church's board.

The parsonage is an all-too-common instance of how the poverty program does indeed lead to increased wealth—but too often to the wrong recipients, and in ways which are not at all what planners of the massive assault on poverty had in mind. Deviations from the intended course are cropping up all over the U.S., but seldom do they show up with the frequency or the clarity that they do in Dixie.

Even right here in Bolivar County, a rural sector on the banks of the Mississippi, it takes only a few chats with officials to turn up other instances at least as blatant.

For a look at one, pull up at the dusty crossroads near Pace, where an old grocery and beer hall, its past attested to by rusting Miller's Beer and RC Cola signs, is now a Headstart center for 60 pre-school children.

The rooms, particularly the low-ceilinged one used for Saturday night dances, are large enough, but their adequacy as classrooms is still questionable. The dance hall converted to a classroom, for example, is lit only by two naked wall bulbs (two others do not work)

and a Schlitz Beer advertising advising "Take home a 6-pack."

I might interject here, Mr. Speaker, that this is perhaps not as bad as the situation which exists in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent.

The Kirksville Daily Express reports the poverty program Headstart was permitted to use a church basement and then requested the church to take out its religious pictures. You might imagine the excitement this caused.

The county antipoverty director, Earl Davis, agrees the facilities are suspect, but he says he is certain a conflict of interest exists on the part of the building's owner. The woman who owns the center is also the supervising teacher at the school there, although she has leased the structure to her nephew, who rents it to the Government for \$160 a month.

Apprised of the Pace situation and another in which the local poverty chairman owns the house rented to the program for \$240 a month, Mr. Davis says:

It sounds like as much conflict of interest as you can get, but in this county it is only a conflict when you get caught.

He adds that he will check into both cases, but not immediately. He states:

I'll put them on the list, but there are several ahead of them.

Mr. Davis, who says he spends much time trying to ferret out wrongdoing, adds that it is a thankless task because the Government shows so little interest in doing anything to stop it.

When a case is turned up of individual enrichment at the expense of poverty funds, "we either get reversed or nothing happens," he says. He adds:

Until the Office of Economic Opportunity gets some guts and backs us up, we might as well not even stick our necks out.

He cites one instance in which the \$10,000 salaries of the directors of the two Bolivar County Headstart programs violate OEO rules, even though the OEO approved them. One of the directors, Aaron Vence, says he used to make \$3,300 teaching school and \$3,900 more moonlighting in a plant, so under a general OEO rule that a poverty worker should not make more than 20 percent more than in his previous job, his ceiling would be \$8,600 rather than the \$10,000 he is paid.

Mr. Davis says:

The OEO is aware of it, but they haven't done a thing about it.

In Atlanta—and I shall come back to Georgia later in more detail—by contrast, where living costs are far higher, a director of the day care center who was also responsible for developing new centers, was paid only \$7,500—and the job required higher qualifications.

But criticism of the \$10,000 salary has not been nearly as sharp as protests against the smaller ones from citizens of the Atlanta slum area served by the center, who complain that \$7,500 is too high. "They ought to make him give half of it back," snaps a critic. He explains that since last summer the center has been run by a full-time teacher in the public schools who cannot be on his job at the

day care center during school hours. The acting director left recently, and has been replaced by a full-time acting director.

The center's finances are now being handled directly by Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc., the agency set up to funnel poverty funds in the city. But the center is still up for criticism.

For example, volunteers have just finished laying new floors in the bathroom, another room, and a hall; they had buckled because of leaky plumbing. The cost of repairs is being borne by the poverty program.

For another, when the lease was signed the landlord agreed to furnish a kitchen stove for fixing hot lunches for the youngsters. He did, but it was declared "completely inadequate," and the center spent \$440 of the OEO's money for a new one. OEO funds, not the landlord's, were also used for a new \$241 sink.

When auditors visited the center last summer they reported finding indications that employees were being paid when they were not there, that some were receiving higher salaries than the budget called for, that \$2,690 and 1 cent had been spent for unauthorized equipment, that items such as folding chairs, powersaws, and socket wrench sets were missing, and that some purchases were in excess of budget allocations.

For example, the budget allowed purchase of a dozen ashtrays at 50 cents each, or \$6. Instead, the auditors said, two ashtrays had been bought for \$15 each, or \$30.

If one were to seek out an example of the poverty program having a maximum impact on a pocketbook, one might choose the case of Dr. Reginald Hawkins, a Charlotte, N.C., Negro dentist.

Officials blanched when Dr. Hawkins submitted his bill of \$13,947 for work on 122 children in roughly 4 weeks. A dental review board checked his work and found a "significant number of discrepancies" such as billing for work not done, filling cavities without removing decay, leaving cavities in a tooth while filling others, and filling cavities in adjacent teeth and letting the fillings run together.

The board paid \$6,708, based on the 48 percent of his patients in whom discrepancies were not noted. This kept his pay for the month well above the poverty level, but Dr. Hawkins still insists he should have received the entire \$13,947.

Like most recipients of the largess of the poverty program, he insists he was entirely justified. "I'm an excellent dentist, and I used hypnosis," he says, explaining his whirlwind technique. Driving his gold-colored Cadillac down a rain-shrouded street, he grumbles:

They are trying to do the same thing to me as they are to Adam (Clayton Powell).

Daniel P. Moynihan, in the Washington Post of August, this year—a gentleman whose stature I believe is unquestioned—in the course of his article stated:

Anyone who was involved in the establishment of the War on Poverty knows that it was put together by fiscal mirrors; scarcely a dribble of new money was involved. Even an element of fraud entered the picture: the Bureau of the Budget began cal-

culating interstate highway funds as part of the financial aid going to cities.

Such money is of considerable aid to General Motors and the United Automobile Workers, and the Association of General Contractors, but as for the poor, the best that can be said for it is that it destroys a lot of bad housing.

Now I would like to quote from another letter, and I suppose this was received by many of us in the Congress, from a gentleman with whom I perhaps never find myself in complete agreement. But I offer this in the sense as in a legal case offering a declaration against interest. For a party who is very much for a certain type of program, to make a statement against his interest, I think, carries more weight, at least in a courtroom.

This is a letter from Mr. William Higgs, director of the Washington Human Rights Project dated August 1, 1966. The letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE: We would like to bring to your immediate attention what we consider to be a scandal of major proportions in the Poverty Program of Sunflower County, Mississippi.

Recently we received a long complaint detailing a series of incidents of mismanagement, racial discrimination, and intimidation directed towards the poor by the CAP Board of Sunflower County. It is an indictment of not only the local Board, but also of the Atlanta Regional Office—

There is Atlanta again—
of OEO and the national office in Washington.

A brief summary of the complaint is attached below:

This is a summary of the complaint submitted by the Associated Communities of Sunflower County on the Operation of the Poverty Program in Sunflower County, Miss.

Mr. Higgs' complaint further outlines, among others, these charges:

1. That the President of the CAP Board, Mr. R. J. Allen, when asked if the programs would be run on a segregated basis, replied: "The program will be segregated."

2. That there have been consistent incidents of intimidation of the Negro representatives, who have proved to be under the control of the power structure. For example, at a meeting with the CAP Board and representatives of Associated Communities on April 8, 1966, there were no Negro Board members present. Mr. Allen said that he had instructed them all not to attend.

And then going on to No. 5:

5. That there are on the Board representatives of non-existent civic organizations conceived by the white power structure.

6. That the CAP Board of Sunflower County is basically a group that seeks to frustrate the aims of the poor and maintain the rule of white supremacy in Sunflower County.

7. That the Board was handpicked by the white power structure, not elected as required by the O.E.O.

I refer now to a New York Times article dated January 1966, relating to Georgia.

Georgia ranks eighth in the number of poor and 11th in the amount of funds—that is poverty funds—received.

The article is entitled "South is Lagging in Requests for Federal Antipoverty Money."

Georgia being eighth in the number of poor and 11th in the amount of funds, it would have done less well if the Fed-

eral agency had not made an exception for the State.

Early in the antipoverty campaign, the agency pumped money into certain States without insisting on immediate compliance with all guidelines such as "Maximum feasible participation" of the poor in policy planning.

Georgia was one of the favored States, although nothing was said about it at the time. Grants made to Georgia carried conditions requiring full compliance later.

Texas has the largest number of poor, but is fifth in receipt of antipoverty funds.

Louisiana ranks 13th in the number of poor but 24th in the amount of funds.

South Carolina ranks 18th in the number of poor and 33d in antipoverty funds.

North Carolina's corresponding ranks are fifth and 17th; Virginia is 16th and 32d.

California, with \$87.4 million received, leads all the States, although it ranks third in the number of poor.

New York's \$66.7 million makes it second in receipts. It also has the second largest number of poor people.

New Jersey, relatively, has received a large advantage. It is ninth in funds received although 23d in the number of poor.

Michigan, too, is well advanced. It is sixth in funds received although 12th in the poverty rankings. Connecticut is 35th in poverty but 26th in funds.

St. Louis, Mo., has received \$14,004,701 in antipoverty funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in the last 3 years.

I refer to an article from the Post-Dispatch dated July 27, 1967:

St. Louis has received \$14,004,701 in antipoverty funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington in the last three years, ranking it tenth among large cities in the amount of funds received, the OEO announced.

The funds have been channeled through the St. Louis Human Development Corp., the local antipoverty agency. The OEO said that St. Louis ranks thirteenth in population size among the nation's major cities.

New York City, first in population, received the most antipoverty funds, \$87,110,913. Chicago was close behind with \$84,011,488. Other cities, ranked by population are: Los Angeles, \$41,429,844; Philadelphia, \$35,583,191; Detroit, \$41,037,105; Houston, \$6,287,431; Baltimore, \$11,475,662; Cleveland, \$18,494,070; Dallas, \$1,312,104; Washington, \$42,442,305; Milwaukee, \$5,890,646; and San Francisco, \$13,338,139.

On September 19, 1967, the Post-Dispatch carried an article indicating that the mayor would appoint directly 10 of the 15 members of the board of directors of the Human Development Corp. under a plan recommended yesterday by a special committee of the poor.

At present—and I am interspersing here the fact that for the moment the present is more important, since a later article indicates this city plan was not permitted to stand—at present he makes these appointments only from persons nominated by the board. The committee recommended that the other five board members be chosen by the Citizens Advisory Council, an elected body representing low-income areas of St. Louis and St. Louis County.

The committee, headed by Ernest Cal-

loway, a staff member of the Teamsters Union, said that it did not favor the present system under which the board was self-perpetuating.

The committee rejected a proposal by Supervisor Lawrence K. Roos that he and Mayor Cervantes each appoint five of the 10 members of the board who represent the community at large. Roos had said that he wanted to make the county a full partner in the antipoverty agency.

Calloway said that the committee had suggested permitting the county supervisor to name two of these 10 members but that Roos said he would prefer to name none in that event.

Under the present system, Cervantes names three of the board members representing the poor and Roos names the other two. These appointments must be from among nominees submitted by the Citizens Advisory Council.

Again I would interject that I do not know how many Congressmen have a voice in selecting, nominating, or picking from candidates submitted to them in the operation of this program, but it is interesting to find that in some areas this practice is followed.

Raymond Wittcoff, former board chairman of HDC, had suggested that six members be named by Cervantes, six by the advisory group and that the other six consist of the mayor, the president of the board of aldermen, the city comptroller, the county supervisor, the chairman of the county council and the mayor of one of the low-income areas of the county.

The board is to decide the matter at its next meeting.

HDC will seek \$11,879,589 from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the programs. If Congress imposes cutbacks in the war on poverty, it is doubtful that HDC will receive that much, an official cautioned.

The agency has received \$10,908,532 for these programs in the current fiscal year. A report as late as Saturday, in another newspaper article in the Post-Dispatch, indicates that the plan to let the mayor control HDC is being shelved because the board is uncertain over the requirements that Congress may set, and I for one hope the Congress will set somewhat specific requirements.

Another article published in the St. Louis Dispatch on September 14, 1967, is headed "HDC Executive Resigns; Third in 2 Weeks."

Norman P. Firnstahl, chief fiscal officer of HDC, is to leave next week to take a State Department post in Saigon.

Another who has left was Heath, a lawyer and former college instructor, who received \$22,000 a year from the antipoverty agency. The position within the new State agency pays \$19,000.

These circumstances have been cited as possible factors in the resignations at HDC. Firnstahl, whose annual salary is \$16,000 will receive substantially more money in his new position. But, I might point out, that new position is in Vietnam.

Bernstein's pay is \$24,000 a year. In an article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 9, it says:

Bernstein's \$24,000-a-year salary makes him one of the highest paid public officials in St. Louis. The mayor and superin-

tendent of public schools receive \$25,000 each. . . .

HDC and Work Opportunities Unlimited, a new agency formed by business leaders to encourage firms to hire the chronically unemployed, had requested \$30,000 in antipov-erty funds for the annual salary of the directors of that agency and \$21,996 for the associate director's salary. In each case, the business community was to match or exceed the federal contribution giving the two executives salaries in the range of \$60,000 to \$75,000.

Curtis Gatlin, director of works programs for HDC, said the intention had been to fill the two positions with high-level business executives. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington balked. It re-duced most cost elements of the program and agreed to pay no more than \$15,000 toward any single salary.

Also in an article dated September 14, 1966, it was indicated, by Richard Jacobs:

Administrative Expenses of HDC here (in St. Louis) are put at \$711,000. Of \$11,000,000 spent on poverty work, \$8,500,000 has gone for Personnel.

That is from the St. Louis Post-Dis-patch.

Finally, from a press release for OEO in Missouri, it is stated:

Interest in participating in the Economic Opportunity Program has been expressed in all 115 Missouri counties.

This is remarkable, as we have only 114 counties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call vote 310, on consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112, "Extension of Time for Filing Report of Commission on Urban Problems," I was in my office. I had answered the quorum call, and I did vote on the Library Extension Act. However, I suppose the bells in my office did not work. I was not present and I did not vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SKYHAWK BOMBERS FOR ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mc-FALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Depart-ment of State is using the Congress as an excuse for failing to meet the ad-ministration's commitment of the spring of 1966 to sell two squadrons of Doug-las A-4 Skyhawk jet bombers to Israel.

Israel made partial payment for these planes. They are especially needed by Israel today in view of that country's op-erational and accidental losses in the recent war, compounded by the Soviet resupply of jets to Egypt. France was the source of Israel's jets, but De Gaulle now refuses to send further war material to Israel.

Some concern was expressed in the Congress that the administration se-cretly financed arms sales to the Arabs through the U.S. Export-Import Bank. The State Department has seized on this to misinterpret the concern of the Con-gress and to use it as a pretext for hold-

ing back on the promised shipment of the jets to Israel. It was never the intention of the Congress to obstruct the arming of Israel. The arbitrary denial now being exercised by the State Department is masked in sophistry, cynicism, and doubletalk.

At stake is not only the security of a friendly democracy, Israel, but also the entire American security situation in the Middle East and Mediterranean. We are permitting the Soviet Union to re-coup losses of last June and are encour-aging the Arabs to further extremism by shirking our responsibility to implement the arms deal we completed last year with Israel. This is a breach of honor that the State Department must explain.

UNDER TABLE CASH ON ANTI-POVERTY GRANTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-man from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in copy-righted articles by Mr. Harry Farrell, a distinguished political reporter for the Ridder Newspapers, the San Jose News revealed on October 12 that under-the-table cash payments have been solicited by both Federal and State officials for assistance in preparing applications for Federal grants.

The documented facts presented by Mr. Farrell raise serious questions re-garding antipov-erty grants. Their im-plications are so far-reaching that they should be thoroughly investigated before Congress is asked to vote on an extension of the multibillion-dollar poverty pro-gram.

The poverty program has been pro-liferated to the point where Washington has become a supermarket for Federal taxpayers' money. Poverty money is channeled through numerous agencies and all too often the manner in which it is disbursed is questionable. The Harry Farrell articles in the San Jose News point out two such situations. One of them, involving a former official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has led to an FBI investigation.

Mr. Speaker, before the Education and Labor Committee favorably reports the bill to extend the war on poverty, the in-dividuals mentioned in the San Jose News articles should be questioned under oath. HEW and OEO officials should also be thoroughly questioned.

Mr. Speaker, because this situation is so serious I shall include as part of my remarks the three articles which ap-peared in the San Jose News on Octo-ber 12:

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

PAYOFFS ON FEDERAL, STATE LEVEL—UNDER TABLE CASH FOR ANTIPOVERTY GRANTS

(By Harry Farrell)

The FBI and Gov. Ronald Reagan's office have launched twin investigations of under-the-table cash payments solicited by govern-ment bureaucrats to guarantee or expedite job training grants.

The Alameda County district attorney's office has also been alerted.

Similar cases are being probed at both state and federal level, involving grant ap-plications ranging from \$300,000 to the \$1 mil-lion-plus bracket.

Amounts solicited by government officials from the applicants, and paid in some cases, range from \$500 to \$3,000.

In both Washington and Sacramento these payments were termed "consultants' fees." They were supposed to cover rewriting of grant applications in a manner to facilitate their approval. In a Sacramento case, such approval was "guaranteed."

Such dealings have fed on a proliferation of state and federal programs pouring money into a wide assortment of projects for the poor, particularly in minority areas.

An independent investigation by the San Jose News, underway for two months, has produced signed statements by the persons involved, documenting these broad outlines of the situation:

The Electronics Training Laboratory of Oakland, a school seeking an \$832,000 grant to train 600 students from Negro and other deprived groups, has paid \$1,000 to John Ford, field representative of the State Job Training and Placement Council.

Ford also asked and received a \$300 per-sonal loan from the Oakland school's ad-ministrator, Dr. Carroll E. Harrington.

On Sept. 22 Ford was fired by the Coun-cil's chairman, Lt. Gov. Robert Finch, osten-sibly for falsification of his state job appli-cation to conceal a long police record. The current investigation was in its early stages at that time.

Stephen C. Brieger, consultant in govern-mental relations for the electronics school in Oakland, says he paid \$1,500 last July to Harland Randolph, then deputy chief of the Office of Equal Health Opportunity, in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The money was to cover rewriting a proposal, for which the school sought up to \$1.2 million in federal funding, to send mobile (trailer) classrooms into hard-core poverty areas. Brieger says he got no receipt for the \$1,500, which was in \$100 bills.

Randolph, interviewed Wednesday by the San Jose News Washington Bureau, admitted he had a verbal agreement with Brieger and Harrington to prepare an application for funding of their program. He would neither confirm nor deny directly that he actually received any money. Randolph, who resigned last Friday to become executive assistant to the president of a junior college in Wash-ington, said preparing such proposals was a regular "moonlighting" activity for him. He denied conflict of interest, declaring his of-ficial duties did not involve passing on grant applications.

Ford, who took the payments and loan to-talling \$1,300 from Harrington, also put the bite for \$500 last July on two officials of the San Marcos Foundation in San Jose, Victor Camacho and Tom Frontiera. They were in Sacramento seeking state-level support for a \$300,000 federal grant to establish a Mexican-American cultural and vocational center. When they hesitated at Ford's overture he told them "the name of the game is money."

"BLEW WHISTLE"

It was Camacho and Frontiera who blew the whistle on the Sacramento solicitation. Instead of paying, they reported it to a pri-vate attorney and a San Jose private inves-tigator, Sam Alvid.

After obtaining their detailed affidavits, Alvid went to Assemblyman George W. Millias, R-San Jose, and through Millias to the governor's office.

Reagan today issued the following state-ment on the matter:

"My office has received information about possible wrongdoing, concerning applications for grants from the federal government in connection with the 'war on poverty' and similar programs.

OPEN INQUIRY

"As a result of this information we have begun an administrative inquiry into those agencies that may be involved. We have re-

quested and received assistance from the appropriate law enforcement agencies.

"This administration will not tolerate any misconduct or criminal violations in any agency of state government. No crime is more reprehensible than violating the public trust, and we will take all measures to correct any improper situation we may uncover."

IN PROBE

Finch, as chairman of the Job Training and Placement Council, has participated in the Sacramento investigation from the start.

At least two other state employees, implicated by Ford in his contacts with others, have been questioned and have denied complicity.

The FBI was called into the picture last week when Brieger reported his dealing with Randolph to the office of U.S. Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel.

Brieger told Kuchel's aides that Randolph, after accepting the first \$1,500 for rewriting the Oakland school's proposal, was demanding a second payment.

"JAMMED UP"

Explaining this, Randolph told the San Jose News that in the course of his work for Brieger and Harrington, he got "jammed up" after submitting them outlines of two alternative proposals. He decided he would need the services of a researcher and someone to prepare a proposed budget, so he told the Oakland men he would need "the other money" for these purposes.

Randolph confirmed Brieger's statement that he had originally quoted a lump sum estimate of \$2,000 to \$3,000 for preparing the Oakland school's application.

A major discrepancy between the Brieger and Randolph versions of their transaction involves the representations made by Randolph.

Brieger says he understood that federal financing for the mobile training project would be "signed, sealed and delivered" when the proposal was written up.

DENIES IMPLICATION

Randolph denies absolutely that he gave any implication his fee would entail contacting other federal officers to influence approval of the project.

In neither case, in which the Oakland School paid for rewrite jobs, have they been delivered in final form.

Randolph said his own agency, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, would play no role in the Oakland school's application, which would go through the Department of Labor and possibly the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Ford, when he was ousted last month, left the state no forwarding address. Attempts to locate him this week have failed. He is believed to be in the Los Angeles area.

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

"STRICTLY CASH" PITCH—SAN JOSE MEN BALKED

The rule was "strictly cash" when two leaders of the San Marcos Foundation in San Jose were asked for \$500 to guarantee approval of a \$300,000 federal grant for a Mexican-American vocational and cultural center.

The pitch was made July 31 in Sacramento when the San Marcos men, Victor Camacho and Tom Frontiera, went there drumming up state-level backing for their project.

They encountered John Ford, at that time field representative of the State Job Training and Placement Council.

According to their affidavits, now in possession of the San Jose News and Gov. Ronald Reagan, Ford made his move during a luncheon break in their interview.

Camacho says:

"Mr. Ford invited us to lunch and was enthusiastic about our prospects for securing funds . . . On the way out of the building,

Mr. John Ford assured me that at least \$300,000 could be secured without any problem. He pointed out that we would not even have to write the proposal ourselves if we would manage to put a rough draft of our purposes and objectives in his hands. He said he would arrange to have a professional write it up in such a manner that it would go through without any problem, since our project was a 'dead ringer' for success and that he had all the proper connections and the men who could write the proposal in the necessary language required by the Washington bureaucrats. He said of course I should realize that it will cost something to get it through, and that \$500 would be plenty to cover the cost of professional services rendered. He must have seen the change in my facial expression or something like that because he was quick to point out that this was the 'name of the game.'"

This took place, according to Camacho, while Frontiera was out of earshot. But when the party arrived at Blum's restaurant half a block from the State Capitol, Ford asked Camacho if Frontiera could be trusted.

A QUESTION

Camacho said yes, and Ford "began to talk very frankly about the \$500, its purpose and the necessity for such things."

All during the discussion, one other man, "a tall, young Negro with a moustache and a good appearance" was present as well as Ford, who is also a Negro.

After some afternoon errands elsewhere in Sacramento, Camacho and Frontiera returned for another interview with Ford, at the latter's request.

ASKED CASH

According to Frontiera's version, "It was at this time that Mr. John Ford told us he wanted \$500 in cash for the putting together of such a proposal and that this money was to go to him to be given to his colleague for professional services rendered. He justified his action by stating that Negroes had undergone such treatment at the hands of other people, and that the trucking association had paid money to Assembly representatives to get certain kinds and types of legislation passed in their behalf. He demanded that this money and a rough draft of the proposal be brought to his office the following Thursday or sooner."

When Camacho and Frontiera pointed out they might have difficulty getting the money, Ford replied (according to Frontiera) "that he could not take a check and that it must be in cash and the sooner the better. He guaranteed not only that the proposal would be approved but that he had resources and contacts in the federal agencies which could achieve this in a short period of time, like three or four weeks."

Frontiera continues:

"The full implication of what this John Ford had done in requesting funds took hold while I was still in his office, and so at this time I proceeded to point out to him that this activity seemed unusual if not illegal and that he not only was jeopardizing his position but that he was creating a problem for the Negro communities. He thanked me for my concern by pointing out that they had paid all their lives and the name of the game was 'money.'"

As Frontiera and Camacho left, they set up another appointment with Ford for the following Thursday.

Before keeping it, they consulted a private San Jose attorney, who advised them to keep the appointment but pay no money, and try to learn more about the proposition. The attorney went along.

At this meeting, according to Camacho, Ford "was visibly disappointed that we did not have the money, but I don't think he mentioned the money in front of the lawyer. There was another gentleman, a tall Negro

with John Ford. When he saw that we were not going to give him money, he began to get nervous and excused himself. John Ford invited us to lunch and at the first opportunity he took me aside and let me know that he was disappointed that we had not brought the money."

After the whole story was in the hands of the governor's office, another meeting between Frontiera and Ford was set up Sept. 8. Frontiera asked the name of the "expert" who would write up the San Marcos proposal if the \$500 were paid.

Ford replied that the "expert" requested anonymity, implying he was a civil service worker who could get in trouble under the Hatch Act provisions curbing political activity.

Ford claimed to have connections in the office of Sargent Shriver, head of the War on Poverty; in other federal departments, and with congressmen and senators.

No further meetings were held.

[From the San Jose News, Oct. 12, 1967]

OAKLAND SCHOOL PAID \$1,300, GOT NOTHING

Details of a transaction by which the Electronics Training School in Oakland paid \$1,300 to a state official, in a fruitless effort to win an \$832,000 training grant, were disclosed today by the school's administrator Dr. Carroll E. Harrington.

The grant would have financed tools, equipment and administration for a project of training 600 students, primarily from Negro and other minority groups. Harrington sought the money from the State Division of Vocation Rehabilitation and was turned down verbally.

Several days later, according to Harrington, he was visited by John Ford, then a \$988-a-month field representative for the California Job Training and Placement Council. This is the official agency which coordinates all government training programs.

Ford, who has since been fired, looked at Harrington's rejected proposal and said it was a "natural" for assistance through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Harrington remembers a luncheon at which he and his aide, Stephen Brieger, discussed the possibilities with Ford.

In a signed statement Harrington recalls:

"We were talking about how a proposal ever gets through. John said the right people have to write the thing. He said the proposal had to be rewritten . . . and there would only be reasonable cost—about \$500. Somebody in — — —'s office in Sacramento (a certain state agency) would do it. Then I said, 'No more nonsense, now, what's it going to cost to get this through?' That's when he started the salt and pepper routine. He arranged four salt and pepper shakers on the table. He put one of them back by itself and said, 'This is — — — This is the big man.' Then he arranged three or four other shakers (in front of the 'big man') and said, 'These are watchdogs. You've got to buy these men off so they'll look the other way, and you can get to the big man.' We never got an answer on how much it would cost to get our project through."

Harrington was assured by Ford that he personally didn't work that way. But later Ford took a copy of the school's project proposal and left. Several days later we returned and said \$500 would be needed to rewrite it.

"I gave him five \$100 bills," Harrington says. "You shouldn't deal with this kind of guy, but it seemed at the time believable. I asked John several times during the following month what had happened to the proposal, and he evaded. He said it was being worked on and looked awfully good, but he was going to have to have some more money for the writing. I gave him another \$500—five \$100 bills. We borrowed the money, against the corporation (the school)."

"He (Ford) said, 'You know this isn't my money. But I'm really hurting. Can you let me have \$300 more in cash to take care of my personal problems. . . I have an illegitimate child.' He said he needed the money to go to court and pay lawyers. So I gave him \$300, which was to be repaid from his paycheck. This tended to make the other (money dealings) look legitimate."

Harrington then told how Ford, using the prestige of his state job, gained entree to numerous high state and federal officials for the electronics school leaders. Ford took Harrington to Los Angeles for an interview with H. C. (Chad) McClellan, whose private efforts to create jobs in Watts and elsewhere have been highly lauded by Gov. Ronald Reagan. With Ford, Harrington also visited procurement officials at McClellan Air Force base.

"John was well connected," Harrington says. "No one ever denied him in his presence." But he adds, "to this day I have never received a written proposal for the skills potential project, for which I paid \$1,000 in consultant fees to Ford, and the proposal has never been approved. I don't know where it is. I wrote John off as a dead loss in the middle of September."

THE U.S. ECONOMY TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the most worrisome and potentially dangerous problem facing this Nation today is not the war in Vietnam nor the crime and riots. It is the state of our economy—\$141 billion in fiscal year 1968 appropriations and actual expenditures of \$172 billion; a predicted \$30 billion deficit, with consequent problems of inflation, and high interest rates at the same time we are facing a possible recession, and a continuing drain in our gold reserves, now down to \$13.1 billion from \$23 billion in December 1957, while our balance-of-payments deficit worsens because potential foreign claims against our \$13.1 billion in gold are \$30 billion, as compared to \$16 billion in claims against \$23 billion in 1957.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Our present fiscal situation has been brought about by the Johnson administration's unrestrained spending policy of guns and butter during a war whose costs are now running more than \$2 billion a month and are still rising. There has been a political unwillingness to take the necessary steps to maintain economic balance.

While the President has argued that the rising costs of the Vietnam war are the primary—even sole—cause of the expected fiscal year 1968 deficit of \$30 billion, the facts are that two-thirds of the \$28.3 billion increase in Federal spending from calendar 1963—at the beginning of which we had only 16,000 Americans in Vietnam—to 1966 was accounted for by nondefense spending. And over half of the proposed \$37 billion increase in spending from fiscal 1966 to fiscal 1968 will be in nondefense programs. In fiscal 1960, the Federal appropriation budget was \$76.5 billion but trust funds and money in the pipeline meant Government spent a total of \$94.3 billion. In the past 8 years these amounts

have doubled to a total of \$141 billion appropriated and \$172.4 billion actually expended.

COSTLY DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

In 1965, Democratic-controlled administration and congressional action produced some 300 new and expanded programs for Federal services and Federal aids. That was a Kennedy-Johnson high in new starts, but the pace had been building from 1961 through 1964. The second session of the 89th Congress in 1966 saw the number of new programs

slacken only slightly. This year has seen some more restraint, but the Federal Government is still recommending and obtaining approval of some new programs of questionable priority.

The Kennedy-Johnson impact on total Federal spending has been staggering to our economy. The funding of these new and experimental programs has increased cash outlays for fiscal year 1968 by as much as \$78 billion, or almost 80 percent, from fiscal 1960. Sixty percent of this increase is in nondefense areas.

Year	Defense		Nondefense		Total	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1960.....	\$45.9	48.7	\$48.4	51.3	\$94.3	100
Increase.....	4.9	17.4 (10.6)	23.2	82.6 (47.9)	28.1	100 (29.8)
1965.....	50.8	41.5	71.6	58.5	122.4	100
Increase.....	26.0	52.0 (51.2)	24.0	48.0 (33.5)	50.0	100 (48.5)
1968.....	76.8	44.5	95.6	55.5	172.4	100
Total increase.....	30.9	39.6 (67.3)	47.2	60.4 (97.5)	78.1	100 (82.8)

For the past 35 years, our Nation's Federal Government also has been committed to a policy of planning and management of the Nation's economy. This approach is a natural outgrowth of Keynesian economics which argues that booms and busts can be eliminated or ameliorated by applying monetary and fiscal stimulations when the economy is lagging and restraints when the economy is booming.

KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS TAKES GUTS

I shall not argue the economic validity of the Keynesian theory. But I must observe that the successful practice of the theory requires a highly developed sense of timing by economically knowledgeable and politically courageous men. The system does not work automatically.

It has been shrewdly observed that, as in love and humor, timing is everything in politics. But that is also true in Keynesian economics—and sometimes Keynesian economic timing and political timing conflict. It is much easier politically for a politician to undertake a deficit spending program to stimulate the economy than it is politically for a politician to reduce spending and provide surpluses to pay off that debt and dampen a booming economy.

That is why a distinction must be drawn in every circumstance in a managed economy between what the Federal Government should do for the benefit of the economy and what it is really likely to do as a result of political considerations and other factors.

For every \$5 the present administration has been given in tax revenues, it has spent \$6. I see no reason to anticipate that such reckless practices would not continue with the additional tax revenues the Congress might give President Johnson in response to his 10-percent surtax request.

Last year the President made a much-advertised announcement that \$3 billion would be cut from Federal expenditures. Much of the cutting was aimed at deferment in automatic trust fund spending programs such as highways. Already authorized and appropriated new programs were not threatened as much. But when all the cuts were finally made, they amounted to less than \$300 million and

only \$19 million of that \$300 million actually reverted to the Federal Treasury. The rest of it remained in the \$50 billion carryover obligational authority—which the administration could spend later as it saw fit.

This \$50 million obligational authority comes from automatic trust fund operations—such as gasoline taxes for highways—or from funds which Congress has previously appropriated but which have not been spent as yet by the administration—but which can, under the law, be spent at any time. A 10-percent surtax increase might only encourage the present administration to spend more promptly.

SPENDING, APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

It can be seen clearly from this extensive carryover obligational authority that the long-range problem facing our Nation is really multiple: Whether or not the President will spend the congressionally appropriated funds and trust funds which have already been obligated and he now has available to spend; whether or not the Congress will curb the appropriation of money for administrative expenditures; and finally, whether the administration, Congress and the American people will have the good sense to cut back on authorizations for existing programs and proposals for new programs.

FEDERAL REVENUES NOT CONSIDERED

In the past few years, there has been only incidental consideration relating expenditures, appropriations, authorizations, and program proposals to Federal revenues and to the tax policy which should finance them by producing those revenues. Deficit financing in boom times has been considered fully acceptable.

Continual deficits were defended inaccurately as a part of the Keynesian theory. And besides, it appeared that the economy would continue to expand so much faster than Federal spending so that increasing Federal revenues would result from the same or lowered rates of taxation and would eventually absorb the deficits. Indeed, this reversal did start to occur briefly when income taxes were cut during the Kennedy administration. But it did not last long enough

to eliminate deficits. Federal spending began to outstrip Federal revenues again; and growing deficits brought sharp increases, rather than decreases, in the total Federal debt. And significantly, interest on the Federal debt started to push interest rates in the open market.

In an unimaginative traditional reaction, the Democratic administration predictably tackled the problem with continued increases in Federal spending and further manipulations of tax schedules.

TAX CHANGES LOSE IMPACT

In the last 5 years, frequent tax changes, up and down, general and selective, have confused those planning long-range investments or short-range purchasing and production decisions. This tended to reduce the influence of tax policy on the total economy—particularly when such policies are inconsistent in timing or in relationship to other fiscal steps. In such cases where Federal spending continues while deficits grow worse and interest rates climb, it indicates that the Federal Government is saying one thing to the private sector and doing another itself.

Thus, the present administration has a record of inconsistency, bad timing, and demagoguery which has destroyed the confidence of many in the Congress and the public. This confidence in our administration is absolutely necessary if its economic leadership is to be effective and successful.

ECONOMIC PREDICTIONS DOUBTED

Another problem facing the Ways and Means Committee in its consideration of the President's tax proposal has been inability or unwillingness on the part of the administration to give the Congress reliable figures or estimates of Federal revenues and expenditures. The administration has twice in 18 months deliberately or accidentally understated estimated expenditures and thus has avoided the congressional cuts in appropriation requests which would most likely have occurred if the true facts were known.

In his January 1967, budget message, the President predicted a deficit for fiscal year 1968 of \$8.1 billion. This was later revised upwards by the Secretary of the Treasury to \$11 billion and then to \$13.5 billion.

Finally, in the President's August 3 tax message he advised that the total deficit for fiscal 1968 would be over \$29 billion.

It is no wonder that administration predictions about the future of the economy can be questioned.

Republicans had warned the deficit would be this large as early as January, when the President's budget was first available for study. However, the administration continued to deny it until August.

NEED SOUND ECONOMIC PREDICTIONS

In designing Federal actions to influence the economy, we must not only have an appreciation for history, but we must also know what the economy is doing now and what it is likely to do in the future.

The administration is forecasting a sharp up-turn in the second half of this year and a rapid expansion of the economy in 1968.

But I subscribe to the views of some economists testifying before the Ways and Means Committee who do not give as confident a picture.

Raymond J. Saulnier, former economic adviser to President Eisenhower, now professor of economics at Columbia University, told the committee he feels the advance in the economy will continue to be relatively slow over the rest of this year and in 1968, as well. In fact, he expects the economy to move in "a rather bumpy fashion." In his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Saulnier advised that the economic indicators show the economy has been in a weak recovery phase for 4 to 5 months, giving a lackluster performance to date.

According to the Wall Street Journal, the "coincident" indicators—which are supposed to show where the economy is standing right now, not where it is heading—have shown recent improvement, according to observers. The coincident indicators moving up now are industrial production, retail sales, and personal income.

LEADING INDICATORS DOWN

However, some of the "leading" indicators—which economists regard as foreshadowing the future trend of the economy—have been pointing downward. These are:

New factory orders for durable goods; contracts for new orders for plants and equipment; job placements in nonagricultural industries; net new business formations; net change in consumer installment debt; and ratio of prices to unit labor costs in manufacturing.

And the other leading indicators which have been pointing upward may not be indicating what they appear to be saying. These include:

Average workweek of production workers—could be the result of caution in adding to present labor forces or shortages in labor as a result of the war in Vietnam; change in the book value of manufacturing and trade inventories—could be only the result of recent price increases in inventoried goods; corporate profits after taxes—could be the temporary result of recent price increases in anticipation of cost increases; and stock prices—are the traditional hedge against inflation and not always the best indicator of future events.

COSTS CONTINUE TO RISE

Meanwhile, the cost of living continues its rise, with predictions now that the total increase for the full year may be 3 percent.

The rise in the cost of living amounted to 3.3 percent last year. This keeps the pressure on for wage increases. And so, where the cost of living goes up, so does the cost of doing business.

Of more concern to Government economists is the jump in the wholesale price index, which will likely mean a sharper future inflationary increase. This rise is attributed to increased prices for industrial commodities, and the present indications are that the rise will continue.

Last week, the price on sulfuric acid, the most widely used chemical in the United States, jumped by \$2.25 to \$3 a ton.

Also, nickel-bearing copper and brass

alloys became the second class of products to undergo price increases as a result of sharply higher nickel prices. Prices for the alloys were boosted by 8½ cents a pound on nickel content. Prices of stainless and other nickel-dependent steels were raised by several producers earlier in the week.

I feel these facts demonstrate clearly that prices are now rising from a cost-push inflation. This type of inflation generally occurs because wages, raw materials, and other costs—such as taxes and interest—increase faster than the increase in productivity. In turn, these increased production costs lead to increased prices.

The analysts now fear that, once factory-level prices cease to be balanced off by production efficiency price cuts, a faster upward trend in consumer prices and wages will result.

PRODUCTIVITY INCREASE NOT ENOUGH

Economic adviser Gardner Ackley has reported that average hourly labor costs in the private economy rose in the first 6 months of this year at an annual rate in excess of 6 percent. This is almost twice the rate at which productivity has been improving. So the result of this is in the past 12 months, unit production costs have gone up by more than 4 percent.

When one adds the factor of shortage of skilled labor—and in the face of unused plant capacity in many industries—it is difficult to see how further increased production volume could lower unit costs. This is particularly true when high interest rates encourage savings and discourage consumer spending and even spending for further plant and equipment investment in industries producing to capacity or those hoping to reduce costs by automation. And now potential tax increases threaten to absorb any possible future increases in profits which could pay off higher modernization expenses.

COST-PUSH OR DEMAND-PULL?

Some observers feel that the stage is set for the addition of demand-pull inflation, where we will have an excess of purchasing power chasing too few goods.

It is not unusual that anticipation of higher prices later can stimulate a wave of buying when there is excess purchasing power available. But, the question is whether higher wages will be going into such inflation-stimulated purchases or into high interest rate savings or will be fully absorbed by already higher prices.

If there were actual consumer goods shortages resulting from the war in Vietnam or industrial strikes, I would be more likely to see stimulated buying as the culprit in our present dilemma. My guess, however, is that the present dollar figures on increases in retail sales may relate more to increased prices per item sold than to any increase in numbers of items moving. Present unused plant capacity would tend to emphasize costs as the cause of those price increases, rather than demand.

TAXES AFFECT COSTS AND DEMAND

Based on the proposed Federal tax hikes plus State and local tax increases, the rise in total tax collection is estimated at \$14.5 billion this year and a

record \$23.5 billion in 1968, a total of \$38 billion in 2 years. Out of a family income of \$10,000, roughly \$3,000 is drained off in taxes of some kind, both direct and indirect, open and hidden.

Tax increases, therefore, not only affect the cost of goods and their prices, but influence the ability of the consumer to spend. A further tax increase now might not only dampen any boom, but throw our Nation into a steep recession. At the same time, corporations and individuals are straining under heavy loads of debt. To further increase Federal taxes at this time might be the straw that breaks the camel's back and leads us from boom to bust.

Federal deficit financing is just as damaging to the prospects of the economy, of course, because it tends to push interest rates up and also pyramid costs for those who must pay existing or increasing taxes. While higher interest rates may be preferable to higher taxes, the strangling effect of record interest rates in 1966 shut down the housing industry and threatened durable consumer goods sales and production to the extent that this thermostatic regulator seemed about to stop the economy cold.

While reduced demand will undoubtedly result from sharp reductions in Federal spending and this could slow production, it may also allow prices to ease and costs of labor and commodities to reduce as supplies of labor and material become more readily available. Dangers to the economy exist in reducing Federal spending, too, of course. But the dangers do not seem as formidable to the total condition of the economy as do either a tax increase or further deficit spending.

OTHER WAYS TO CONTROL ECONOMY

But what are the other tools available to us in the present financial crisis?

A public sentiment persuasion—a kind of combination economics and politics—has been used for the past few years. In 1962, the administration began talking about a 3.2 percent wage-price increase guidepost. This tool to control inflationary increases seems to have been given a quiet burial in the face of a 4.9 percent airline strike settlement last year, the recent 6-percent rail strike board recommendations, construction industry and other recent wage settlements, and the current demands of the United Auto Workers.

Another anti-inflationary tool used by the administration in the past has been the sale of assets—strategic materials from Government stockpiles—to restrain price increases. This method was used most recently to discourage hikes in aluminum and copper prices. However, such sales are of small value as general tools for inflation control because of the limited number of products stockpiled by the Federal Government. In the case of recent increases in steel prices, for instance, the Government could only voice its displeasure since it has no steel to sell.

Another minor tool of the Federal Government is its authority to increase the margin requirement on the purchase of stocks by investors. Stock prices dropped recently as a rumor swept through the exchange that an increase in the margin requirement to 100 percent was being

contemplated by the Government. Should that step be taken, no inflation control flexibility will remain in this area, of course.

Two other controls which might be used in the extremity are direct controls over wages and prices, such as those instituted in World War II, and controls on consumer credit and other forms of credit. In each case, such steps have merely held the lid on for a later blow while permitting black-market illegalities to be encouraged by restraints unnatural to our free political and free economic system. They would represent steps toward control in the economic area which the Federal Government has not had the courage to take in the political area—even to declaring the traditional state of war.

MONETARY CONTROL LIMITS

The two major tools of the Federal Government to restrain inflation are monetary policy and fiscal policy. What the Federal Government does about interest rates and the amount of borrowing the Government must do to finance its operations can be significant. The need for Federal borrowing might be reduced by a tax increase which would increase its income, or by a spending reduction. Of the two, a spending reduction would be most potent because it does not carry the possibility that individual taxpayers might have to increase their borrowing because of the tax increase.

To again quote economist Saulnier: An adequate monetary policy may not now be possible.

The only policy options open at this stage of the game are fiscal. Federal monetary policies must be committed by present circumstances to continued ease of money. If money were to take a turn to tightness, the result would be to accelerate interest rates above the current near-record rate at which they are currently charged. To stir the money markets into turbulence—now called “disintermediation”—and reverse the revival of the housing industry and to depress other consumer durable industries, is extremely dangerous.

DEFICITS DO MATTER

Deficits do matter because they can compromise monetary policies with reference to fiscal matters. I have already suggested that further taxes could be as dangerous as higher interest rates. Therefore, the only remaining solution is drastically reduced Federal expenditures which can make available resources for the private sector of the economy—both freed up capital, manpower, and plant capacity to compete for consumer disposable income in the hope of making a profit and being able to pay present taxes and interest and costs.

Now, the question is where can we cut Federal expenditures and how?

SPENDING CUT PROPOSALS

WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, says spending cuts should be at least \$10 billion. TOM CURTIS, the second ranking Republican member on the committee, asks \$15 billion. The administration says that only \$21 billion of the nondefense spending are susceptible to any reduction.

The biggest nondefense expenditure item in fiscal year 1968 is the interest on the Federal debt, \$14.2 billion; and the administration says this amount may have to be increased by \$700 million.

AGRICULTURE: \$2 BILLION?

Agriculture is the second biggest item. It has been suggested that the price support program in wheat and feed grains, where surpluses have almost all been eliminated, could be cut. Legislation for this purpose is pending in Congress and the estimated needed savings would be \$2 billion per year.

SPACE: \$1 BILLION?

The space program, during the Eisenhower administration, was expected to cost \$1.8 billion annually. We are now spending over \$5 billion a year—much of it in costly crash programs. A stretch-out in this program would save \$1 billion a year.

FOREIGN AID: \$2 BILLION?

In 1963, the Clay Commission, established by President Kennedy to study our foreign aid program, recommended that spending in this area be cut to \$1.8 billion annually. However, the administration has continued to call for large appropriations—\$3.4 billion for this fiscal year—in spite of the fact that there is an estimated \$5 billion in the pipeline waiting to be spent.

Along with six troop divisions in Western Europe which cost an annual \$2 billion, the foreign aid program adversely affects the balance of payments. Two billion dollars could be saved in this area.

PUBLIC WORKS: \$1 BILLION?

The Democrat-controlled Senate reported out a \$4.7 billion public works bill providing \$1.4 billion for civil works projects and 50 new construction starts—instead of the 23 approved by the House. An additional \$1 million was added, for instance, to repair the damage of the recent hurricane on the intercoastal waterways in Texas.

The White House has also been successful in getting the Senate to restore House cuts in the demonstration cities and the rent supplements program.

At least \$1 billion could be saved in public works and perhaps another half billion in programs for the cities, if such savings were really vital.

DEFENSE: \$2 BILLION?

Military affairs experts suggest that \$1 billion in military construction programs might be deferred as well as \$1 billion in defense expenditures not related to Vietnam.

The Federal Government is spending an estimated \$15 billion on research and development and another \$15.3 billion in other contracts which might be susceptible to some cancellations or deferments.

GEORGE MAHON, the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has suggested that \$1 billion might be saved by ignoring anticipated Federal employees' pay raises which the House has approved, since wages paid to Federal workers are now running in excess of \$8 billion a year.

These are just a few of the major areas where Federal spending cuts are possible. Whether or not they are desirable in

these areas is a judgment the President, the Congress, and/or the American people must make. Spending cuts, like a tax increase or rampant inflation, will hurt someone. That makes it clear that the promises might better not have been made originally and the programs undertaken—because someone will feel the political repercussions. But, there is no question that, in some way, Americans are going to have to pay the price for the administration's guns and butter philosophy.

Representative JOHN BYRNES, a Wisconsin Republican and ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a recent speech before the American Bankers Association, called for the establishment of a blue ribbon commission to evaluate Federal programs and activities and their projected operation with a view to determining their effectiveness in relation to their cost. The idea would be to determine whether the Federal programs should be undertaken or continued and on what level. It would also be called upon to recommend a definite priority in the allocation of Federal funds. I have always been under the impression this was a routine continuing job of the executive branch of the Government.

In addition, a new Hoover Commission to study possible savings in operation of the Federal Government has been urged by Republicans. And the Council of State Chambers of Commerce has suggested the establishment of a joint committee to advise on appropriations.

All of which brings me to an August 1869, issue of the Urbana Union, one of the predecessors of the newspaper I publish in Urbana. Down in the right-hand corner was this homely advice:

Let your expenses be such as to leave a balance in your pocketbook. Ready money is a friend in need.

Despite the new economics, this apparently is one of the unalterable facts of life.

CELEBRATION FOR COMPLETION OF INSURANCE ON \$1½ BILLION WORTH OF COOPERATIVE HOUSING

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a very important event which happened here in our Capitol on Friday, the 18th of August 1967. A luncheon was held in the Vandenberg Room on the Senate side to celebrate the accomplishments achieved under the cooperative section of the National Housing Act.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, who sponsored the legislation in the Senate, and I, talked on this occasion, not only about the achievements to date, but also some of the problems

and objectives facing us in the future as we develop larger programs to meet the needs for housing for middle- and low-income families.

The luncheon meeting was sponsored by the Foundation for Cooperative Housing and the Leisure World Foundation. These two organizations are the largest nonprofit bodies developing cooperative housing in the United States, under section 213 of the National Housing Act.

Three projects initiated by these two organizations, which had their mortgage closings in August, pushed the total over the \$1½ billion mark.

The luncheon meeting and celebration brought together officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Housing Administration, the White House, and Senate and House staff members as well as representatives and trustees of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing and the Leisure World Foundation.

Wallace Campbell, president of the Foundation for Cooperative Housing, served as chairman of the luncheon session. I would like the permission of the House to insert in the Record here, a full text of the speeches made on this important occasion.

May I add my own comment that democratic homeownership on a nonprofit basis provided to residents of cooperative housing projects is one of the finest forms of democracy applied to the daily life of the people of the United States. We in the House and Senate are proud of what has been accomplished under this program.

REMARKS BY WINSLOW CARLTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FOUNDATION FOR COOPERATIVE HOUSING, FRIDAY, AUGUST 18, 1967

The Foundation for Cooperative Housing is delighted to join with the Leisure World Foundation as co-hosts for today's celebration. As you all know we are gathered here to mark the completion of FHA insurance on \$1½ billion worth of cooperative housing written under Section 213 of the National Housing Act.

We are honored to have with us today Senator John Sparkman who may well be referred to as "the Father of 213". John Sparkman participated in the study tour of cooperative housing in Scandinavia in 1948. He introduced the "Middle Income Housing" bill in the Senate in 1949. And, carried leadership in the Senate in the development of what is now Section 213 of the National Housing Act.

We are happy to honor also Congressman Wright Patman, Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency who as early as 1946 introduced legislation for cooperative housing. The stream of actions initiated by Senator Sparkman and Congressman Patman coincided in the legislation which we have on the books today.

Congressman Patman also has the distinction of being the man who set the 3% figure for interest on Section 221(d)(3) housing loans. We'll hear more about that this noon I'm sure.

We are also delighted to have with us Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of FHA, Philip N. Brownstein, Congressman Barrett and other distinguished guests as well as our co-hosts.

The Foundation for Cooperative Housing has been actively engaged in the development of cooperative housing just as long

as FHA has been in this field. The Foundation, as a matter of fact, came into being to help groups of consumers take advantage of the new legislation which became effective in 1950. Within two years we had decided that we needed an operating company and the result was FCH Company which has recently changed its name to FCH Services to more accurately reflect the nature of its work.

I could make a long story of what we have accomplished during these last 19 years. FCH has been able to organize more than \$350 million of cooperative housing. The great bulk of this, of course, has been developed under FHA insurance—part of it under Section 213 and part a new and growing program under 221(d)(3).

The work of the Foundation and FCH Services, I can say, is one of the modern miracles of our present generation. We've had a hard working staff in FCH Services under the direction and guiding genius of Roger Willcox, who have made cooperative housing projects work so successfully.

In addition to Roger and his staff, FCH wants also to pay tribute to the statesmanship of David L. Krooth, one of the great figures in American housing, and to his partner Norman S. Altman and the firm of Krooth & Altman who have been associated counsel with FCH in all of our cooperative housing projects since 1953.

There are only two things which I will take time to mention today. First, that of the 150 projects sponsored by Trustees of the Foundation and served by FCH Services and insured by FHA, we have not had one single default in 221(d)(3) and a better repayment record of cooperative mortgages under 213 than any other market rate program under FHA.

Second, and with this I will close my speech, is that we have recently had a demonstration of the values of cooperative homeownership that is really outstanding. All of us remember vividly the riots in Detroit. As you know, Detroit is the center of FCH's most important activity. We are sorry that Wendell Addington is on vacation and couldn't be here today to hear this. In Detroit during the riots there were three of our projects in the heart of the riot-torn section of Detroit. Six additional projects were within a stone's throw of the riot area. During that period each of the cooperatives set up its own defense committee. These were integrated committees with black and white members on duty at all times, 24 hours a day. They were able to tell any of the mobs that coursed back and forth in front of these apartments that these were their own. There was no landlord involved, that the projects were owned by the residents as a cooperative and that they should not be subjected to burning or bombing.

These defense committees, defending their own cooperative homes, were completely successful in all of the FCH projects in the Detroit area. There was not a single window broken, no looting or any incendiary episode in those days of strife.

We are proud of the impact of cooperative homeownership demonstrated in this crisis.

It is our feeling that we have just made a beginning with 213 and 221(d)(3) and that tremendous amounts can be done as we stimulate more and more consumers in the United States to achieve homeownership through cooperatives. To accomplish this of course, we need the continued, enthusiastic support of HUD and FHA. We are delighted that Secretary Weaver and Commissioner Brownstein could be with us today for this historic celebration.

Thank you very much.

Now may I present to you Assistant Secretary of HUD and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, Philip Brownstein.

Mr. BROWNSTEIN. "Thank you, Wally."

"Senator Sparkman, Congressman Patman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary.

"My personal advocacy of cooperative housing is, I believe, best demonstrated by the fact that I live in a coop with Dave Krooth and Wally Campbell. As a matter of fact when Wally doesn't like what I've done on that particular day, he just beats on my wall. Because he's my next-door neighbor.

I'm delighted to be here to celebrate this milestone in the life of 213. The record has, indeed, been an outstanding one, and I think it demonstrates the value of cooperative housing.

"The D-3 program, I think, further emphasized this, and we are hopeful that as we proceed with the rent supplement program, we will see cooperative housing for low-income people as well as moderate.

"Again, it's my pleasure to be here with you."

Secretary WEAVER. "Thank you, Wally.

"Mr. Sparkman, Chairman, Friends.

"You know, it almost seems as though I'm coming to one of those meetings which we used to get together. I'm happy to be here for several reasons. In the first place, I was just about to institute a 'Be Fair to FHA Week'. If you've been reading the papers recently and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, even, you will find that FHA has been in for a few bumps recently, so I thought it would be well to give the other side of the picture, but this is being done today in a more subtle way, so I'm delighted that this starts off the week.

"Also, I'd like to say that Fitz and Nat didn't do all the things we asked them to do and that's why I have to work so hard now.

"I am pleased to be able to join you today in marking this important though unused milestone. As Senator Sparkman and Congressman Patman know so well, there are many occasions when public officials are asked to help launch a new program, break ground, or lay a cornerstone, or open a new building. In my business, I was even called upon recently to help in celebrating a hole in the roof. That was the occasion when we cut a hole through an entire tenement building on the lower east side of New York City in order to demonstrate that we could get in there and rehabilitate the entire interior within the period of only 48 hours. I'm happy to say that we've now had another group going in and they're going to be a little more economy-minded. They're going to take 20 days.

"As I noted on that occasion, it's pretty fast work, and it was the first time in my experience with construction that a hole in the roof called for a public celebration. But most important, we hope it is only the first of many, many more such occasions.

"Today we are marking the fact that our FHA programs have reached one and a half billion dollars in mortgage insurance for cooperative housing. I couldn't help thinking about that song about a million dollar baby, and I think how small she was as compared to this. That's a lot of money. I mean the billion and a half.

"But we know that this too is only a step, though an important one, and a much longer road towards the destination of decent, adequate housing for all Americans. The significant point to be marked today is not the one and a half billion dollars, but the fact that the money represents housing for 115,000 families, almost a half million people. Far more important, it represents home ownership with all the privileges and advantages that come with a tangible investment in your own future, and the intangible pride of owning your own dwelling, and it is restricted to those that can carry out home ownership successfully.

"Home ownership, as you know, is receiving considerable attention today in the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to fulfill its mission. In our cooperative housing program, we observe

with considerable pride that home ownership has been an active interest in ours for a long time, since 1951, in fact, when the first cooperative housing mortgage insurance was written, on a 288-unit project in New York City. We believe that we can say that we observed one of the advantages of this pride in home ownership just the other day in Detroit, as Winslow Carlton has referred to. And in that unhappy city, several of our cooperative buildings, situated in the heart of the riot area, were untouched by the tragic violence around them, and I think this is a tribute, sort of an unearned fringe benefit that none of us had anticipated.

"No one can be certain, but we all believe we see here what it can mean when the residents themselves have a deep and genuine investment, not only in money, but of interest and identification in their own dwelling. The movement for cooperative housing in the United States has been important for many of our goals in the Department. It has helped us reach a wide range of income levels. One-third of our 221-D-3, below the market interest rate projects, are now in cooperatives. We're exploring cooperatives in the rent supplement program and many cooperatives help fulfill our aims in urban renewal. Only last week we had the demonstration of how cooperatives can be creative and effective in the very difficult process of rehabilitation for moderate income families.

"All of our cooperative housing efforts have important economic advantages for enhancing the potential of families to acquire housing is the closing costs, in the comparatively low transfer cost, and in the tax advantages. And, of course, many of the cooperative projects we are assisting have attracted the kinds of families who are strongly dedicated to the goal of equal opportunity of housing for all Americans. We do not say that cooperative ownership is all, or even most, of what we have to do in this nation to provide all the housing we need, but it is one of the roads to our destination, and we are interested in every road that will take us there.

"That is why I am happy to be with you today, to share this celebration of a more or less financial birthday party.

"Thank you."

Senator SPARKMAN. "You know, I'd speak ahead of Wright Patman anytime to get that. . . (laughter.) Well, I should say this, Wright spent his entire morning testifying before my Committee, and he testified with great eloquence, you can bet on that, and convincing eloquence, from what I hear. I was not able to be there. It was a Subcommittee of my Committee.

"But I'm always glad to be on this program. I've enjoyed the remarks that have been made by Oakley Hunter, by Phil Brownstein, by Bob Weaver, and I'm anticipating the remarks of Wright Patman, as well as those I'm going to make.

"I think this is a great occasion. I think it's a fine idea that someone had. We had another speaker Winslow Carlton. I enjoyed his remarks, too, as our first speaker, our opening speaker.

"I think it's just fine, the idea that somebody had. Wally Campbell got to work on it. I was intrigued when he told me several days ago. (Sound of Congressional Bell).

"Now, if memory serves me right, Wally, and I think I'm right on this, it was in 1949 that we went to the Scandinavian countries. We put through perhaps the most massive piece of housing legislation that we've ever had in 1949, what is now considered the basic housing legislation, so far as I'm concerned. We put that bill through in 1949 and right after Congress adjourned my Subcommittee, at least five Senators who were on my Subcommittee on Housing, went to Europe, first to England, and then to Norway, and then to Sweden and down to Denmark, and into Holland, to study housing. And then over to France, by the way. I'd like to say Paris but

I'm afraid you'd think we weren't studying housing. France was not doing any building, as you know, but the other countries were doing building. They were building lots of houses, and we went to see how they were doing it.

"I'll tell you one little experience. Senator Bricker came back convinced that a 50-year mortgage would do, but we had to compromise it down to 40. We were in a bank talking to some bankers in Oslo—in Stockholm, no, it was Oslo—in Oslo, and they were talking about different types of mortgages that they've had. They didn't call them mortgages. But first lien, and second, third, and probably the fourth. It's strange, the more subordinate the lien became, the longer the terms. As I recall, the most subordinate of all mortgages, the bank would take on for a hundred years—a *hundred-year mortgage*! Somebody in my group whistled and said, a hundred years!! And the president of the bank, unmoved, said, why, certainly, why not. He said I can show you houses right here in the city that are 800 years old. Why shouldn't we take hundred year mortgages?

"There is an element of reality there. I think we have come around to a more realistic attitude ourselves with reference to the length of life of our houses. You know back in 1927 I built a house, I guess I was the craziest person on earth, because I had no idea how I was going to pay for that house. I think maybe I had about \$1,500 to go into it, and I didn't know where the rest was coming from. I just assumed I could borrow it from somebody. But about the time the house got finished, I got to thinking about it pretty seriously and a friend of mine who was with the Equitable Life Assurance Society said, I can lend you that money, and I bought one of those mortgages, and I thought it was the most liberal mortgage in the world. They just charge me six percent interest, and they gave me a long term, ten years, payable monthly. That was a long time in those days, but we've become more realistic as time has gone on, and I think we have better legislation as a result.

"Now, I've got a prepared speech here, but I'm not going to give all of it. I just want to mention we came back from our trip to Europe fully sold on the idea of cooperative housing, and in 1950 I introduced the middle income cooperative housing bill. We got it through the Senate Committee. We reported it to the Senate and my recollection is we lost by either three or four votes. By the way, I may not be entirely correct on this, but the best I can remember at this time was that the only bill that the Senate Committee has reported favorably since I've been on it, nearly 21 years, that did not pass the Senate. Now, some of them didn't pass Wright Patman's Committee (laughter), because he's pretty good at screening himself, but it did pass the Senate. But this bill failed by three or four votes, and it was on that occasion that I offered them a substitute amendment, an amendment in the form of a substitute. That was accepted by the Senate and it went to the House, became law and that became Section 213. That's how Section 213 was born. It really came out of a trip that our Subcommittee made to Europe.

"It's been an interesting experience.

"Most of my speech deals with statistics, starting with the fact that it's a billion and a half dollars. You know, when I came to Congress nearly 31 years ago, I didn't know what a million dollars was, and I'm not sure that I know yet, but I did learn to talk in terms of millions. In recent years I've learned to talk in terms of billions. Back several months ago I got nearly scared to death one day when I picked up a newspaper and read a column by one of my favorite economic writers, Sylvia Porter. She said that we are becoming a trillion dollar nation. I thought, my goodness, what in the world are we moving into? She had some pretty convincing

arguments. She based it on personal income. I said to myself, look here, our gross national product is pushing toward a trillion dollars.

"Then the Joint Economic Committee, of which Wright Patman and I are both members, and have been ever since it was established (we're the only two original members left on it) put out a study. It was a staff study, but it was a very interesting study, that showed that if we move along like we're moving now at the same growth rate, the same development rate and the same spending rate, in 1975 the gross national product of the United States will be \$1350 billion. That's a trillion 350 billion dollars.

"You know, shortly after this trillion dollar column came out, I saw a cartoon. One fellow talking to the other one, talking about the trillion, said, for mercy sake, don't let the planners know what comes after a trillion (laughter)! But you know, there was another projection that was interesting, and that dealt with the budget. In the year 1975, if we continue on this same scale, the budget will have between \$45 and 50 billion surplus. One time I told this story about the cartoon, and somebody said don't tell them about this budget surplus. So there are lots of figures. The billion and a half dollars of cooperative housing represents a big element. But beyond that, the success that this program has had has been outstanding. In fact, the success of nearly all of our programs has been outstanding. The success of the overall program has been outstanding.

"I brag often about the amount of money you in FHA and Bob Weaver and the people are making for us, and Fanny Mae coupled with it. It is tremendous. I join in any program that can produce housing and particularly housing that American families can call their own. You know, I take a great deal of delight in thinking that at the end of World War I we had only about 35 percent home owners. The rest were tenants. Today, it's almost exactly the reverse. We're working hard now over in our Subcommittee and in our Committee to get out a bill with several little things in it. Mr. Secretary, you're not even supposed to know about these things, because they didn't come through your mill. But we're trying to step up home ownership through the use of existing legislation that's capable of expanding and extending and amending. We're trying very hard to make home ownership especially applicable to the low-income people. That is where our great need is. And we're going to keep on.

"Thank you very much for this occasion. I want to say a word about these people. I know Oakley Hunter. I knew him when he was in the House of Representatives, and I knew him when he was with the housing agency. I've known him with his Leisure World. I understand he's not much of a leisurely man, but he does have a great and tremendous undertaking. I've had the privilege of visiting the one in California, but not the one here.

"I've known the work of Wally Campbell of course, down through the years, and David Krooth and all of these people, and I'm grateful to you, Wally, and to you, Fitz, representing your organization, and to you, Oakley, representing yours, for this very fine and interesting meeting, and I'm delighted to be with all of you, and I shall now take my seat and hear the eloquence of my good friend, and I mean good friend, Wright Patman."

Congressman PATMAN. "Mr. Chairman, Senator Sparkman, Dr. Weaver, and other distinguished guests, and guests of honor.

"First I want to comment on what Senator Sparkman said. I have benefited greatly by being associated with Senator Sparkman. He was in the House of Representatives when I first knew him, and I found him to be a loyal, dedicated person, working always in the public interest, and that's my test of a

person in public life—whether he puts the public interest first. Senator Sparkman always has. As he said a while ago, we were the last remaining and we were the first to be selected for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Calling it the Joint Committee on the Economic Report led to some confusion, however, so we changed it to the Joint Economic Committee. I consider that a very valuable Committee and Senator Sparkman has made many great contributions to our country through the Joint Economic Committee as well as through the other Committees on which he has served. It's my pleasure to have been associated with Senator Sparkman for these many reasons. He's been so helpful to me, and I appreciate the fine work that he has done.

"Now, Wally Campbell is truly imaginative. His active imagination led to this fine meeting here today with people who are dedicated public servants, and who are truly working for the public interest.

"You know, if you work for the public interest, that we all have the same chance, the same opportunities; our children all have the same opportunities. But if they work harder to get ahead, or to get a better education, or if they have a little of this imagining, they're entitled to success, because they're working in the right direction. I've often said that people like Wally should have a degree in *imagineering*. Engineering and its related professions are very important, but someone must effectively carry out the plans that they propose, and that's where the imagineer comes in. There should be a good degree in "imagineering," and I think that Wally Campbell is entitled one because he's done so much fine imagineering in his life.

"I never have to look back with your people, people who are in the public housing group and cooperative housing, in particular. I've never known one who was disloyal to the cause of service to the public interest. I depend on you even more than you know, and I never cease to be grateful to Wally Campbell and his associates for their guidance and advice to the Banking and Currency Committee, especially on housing legislation, and cooperative housing in particular.

"Service in Congress, as John would tell you, is the most challenging service one could be associated with. There is so much responsibility. It's my view that a Congressman, instead of being just a Congressman who answers his constituents, must keep the public informed on the nature of pending bills and other such matters. He must be a watchman for the people. Being a watchman, he will see the evil things which come up against the public interest. He should sometimes even find himself on the side opposite to his constituents. I think that happens often, and understandably so, because a member of Congress is in a position to have better information and more knowledge, because he's in the center of government and they're not. I've given that explanation several times. So far, I've gotten by with it. (laughter). In other words, every member of Congress should be an Ombudsman. There's no reason to create an Ombudsman, for we've 435 of them in the House and a hundred in the Senate. That's 535 Ombudsmen we have already. We don't need anymore. The place is crowded already.

"You know, the other day I had an old constituent in my office. He asked me how long I have been in Congress, and I said, "Well, I've been here 39 years. I was elected to my 20th term last fall." And I said, "but it doesn't seem like even seven years." And I told the truth. It doesn't seem like even seven years, because I've been busy and I've worked hard. I guess I'm what you'd call an eager beaver, anxious to do things, to be helpful to the country, and I'm just too busy to think about the time passing. Furthermore, there are so many smart people in Congress that I've had to work two or three

hours a day to keep up with them. That's the reason it doesn't seem like I've been here very long.

"I'm glad to know about Leisure World. I'm glad to know that you're eligible at 50 years of age. So I'm glad to know I'll be eligible when I retire.

"I suspect that if I were to announce my retirement, I'd have lots of support for it. I know I'd have tremendous support. In fact there are a lot of people in my District who would say that I could make more money right now if I retired. And I suspect I could, more than the salary I draw. But at the same time, I wouldn't be happy. I feel that I'm in something now that I know a little about, and out of which I receive a great deal of pleasure.

"Now I'm going to use that sentence, John. My colleague, Senator John Sparkman, has talked eloquently (laughter). I predicted all along what he'd say about the housing program under Section 213. This is a very fine program, and I'm proud to have played a part, a small part, in bringing it into being. Since, I'm so much younger, I'd like to take a few minutes to talk about a newer program, one that John Sparkman, Congressman Barrett, and others of us, see as the best program that exists to meet the crisis of our cities. Bill Barrett wanted me to tell you that he's awfully sorry he couldn't be here. Bill is one of the finest and greatest men in our Congress, and he's chairing the Subcommittee on Housing. He does a wonderful job. He and John Sparkman have done more than almost any two members that I know. This new program, 221(d)(3), wasn't enacted until 1961, six years ago. Like most new programs, it had a long start-up period. In the fall of 1964, when the interest rates were jumping, I asked the public interest group what the interest rate should be. Since nobody would risk an answer, I said, "How about three percent?" My colleagues on the House Committee agreed. The Senate agreed. So we now have a three percent, 40 year program, with authority from the Congress to build 40,000 units a year. Here is a program that really works for people that would otherwise be in that forgotten family gap, those who are too well off or too independent for Public Housing; yet too poor to buy a decent home in the normal market. The initials BMIR in FHA lingo mean Below Market Interest Rate. This rate saves the average BMIR family about \$23 per month for his home. If you are making \$100 a week and feeding a family of four, a \$23 month difference on your housing charges makes a decent home possible. The beauty about 221(d)(3) cooperatives is that if a family's income goes up, it isn't evicted and forced to live in a different and perhaps less desirable location. Instead, its carrying charges rise, and the family begins to pay the market interest rate, while remaining in its cooperative home.

"The latest figures show a good beginning on below-market interest rate cooperatives. As of June 30, 1967, the FHA reported mortgages insured (at no cost) of \$190 million. This was for 140 cooperative projects serving 13,500 families. Commitments were outstanding for 26 additional cooperative projects, with 1,691 units valued at \$25 million. Ninety-eight more cooperative projects for 6500 families valued at \$100 million were in application stage. On completion this would involve a total of \$315 million. It's interesting to note that about 33 percent of all 221(d)(3) projects are co-ops. They're providing home ownership for moderate income families.

"This leads me to three specific points I'd like to make as we celebrate. First, when the 221(d)(3) program was faced with rising interest rates due to increases in the rates on federal borrowing, I took the initiative to recommend a fixed interest rate of three percent for this program. I'm pleased that the

Congress adopted that amendment. The favorable experience of this program confirms the wisdom of that Congressional action because the three percent interest rate was an essential ingredient in insuring the continued success of this program in meeting the needs of moderate income families.

"Now, I think the time has come to accept the recommendations of many of the public interest organizations that we allow a graduated interest rate down to zero in order to provide housing for families whose incomes are lower than those who can afford the three percent rate. These are families who are not eligible for public housing or rent supplements, so that they are in a gap between existing programs. We could fill that gap, particularly to help bring cooperative ownership to more families who are in the lower income group.

"Second, the cooperative program under 221(d)(3) has achieved a remarkable record; almost a third of the (d)(3) housing program provides cooperative home ownership. *There has not been a single default in any cooperative mortgage under this program.* Isn't that a wonderful record? This shows that moderate income families will assume responsibilities when they are afforded the opportunity to own their own home through a cooperative. Moreover, the cooperative communities have been better-maintained and have produced a better environment than rental projects. This is due to pride and responsibilities that cooperative ownership inspires. It's also due to the environment and the participation of the people in their own community affairs.

"Third, we are all dismayed by the recent riots in our cities, which erupted from social unrest and discontent among the underprivileged living in slum areas. Everyone agrees that bad housing is one of the causes of the social unrest and discontent. We should act now to take more vigorous steps in providing good homes and neighborhoods in our cities. The 221(d)(3) program can materially help. The Administration should accelerate the rate of production of housing under this program and speed up its operations that are to meet the critical needs. This includes the full use of all of the money the Congress has made available.

"I've heard very disturbing reports from many parts of the country that progress is being delayed because funds are not being allocated for necessary housing. Even though the Congress has authorized the funds and the President's budget contemplates a program this year of \$500 million for 221(d)(3) projects, I'm advised that only \$200 million has been made available and that allocations are being cut back and delayed. This should be corrected immediately. I see no justification for slowing down a program which is so important in meeting the critical problems of our cities. I urge that immediate action be taken to assure the full use of the money authorized by the Congress. Allocations should be made now based upon the full amount of money which has been authorized.

"Now, I want to say a few words to you about a subject of mine which, of course, many of you heard me talk about before. Just briefly, I'll tell you about it.

"Just the other day I made two speeches in the Record to show what's happened on the high interest rate and how it has adversely affected every person in America. In those speeches, I point out that in 14 years beginning in 1939—when the war was first commenced in Europe and when we were being affected by it—until 1952, with the Federal Reserve Board, working with the President of the United States (who is elected by all the people, and, the Constitution says, who shall execute all the laws) the interest was very low.

"Now, I'm not claiming any credit for that and others are not either. In the beginning of World War II, at about 1940, when we were seeing ourselves becoming involved in it,

some of us, including Jerry Voorhis and Senator Robert L. Owens, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. We insisted that we have a different war budget, that we could set aside the cost of the war and have the Federal Reserve finance it without interest by paying two and a half percent a year for 40 years. Then the future generations would pay part of it and there'd be no interest, and we'd be sure and pay it back.

"Well, it made an impression, I'm sure, with the Ways and Means Committee. We didn't get what we were seeking, but there was an effort made to keep interest rates down to two and a half percent. And, if you'll notice, during those 14 years the two and a half percent rate was never exceeded. Long-term government bonds averaged 2.36 during that time. Now, during that time, we had long lines of unemployment. We had depression. We had recession. We had inflation. We had everything that was bad. And we had war and everything else. We had everything bad that could affect the rate of money interest. Yet they kept it under two and a half percent. And, if they could do it during that time, they can do it at anytime! Of course they can, we all know that!

"And when I thought of 14 years parallel to that from early 1953 to the end of 1966—I show the rates there for every year. When the Republicans came in—early in 1953—we delivered to them a policy of keeping interest rates below two and a half percent. In fact, after Mr. Eisenhower took the oath of office on January the 20th, they had some long-term bonds sold at two and three-eighths percent. Then they had another bid issue, at two and a half percent, which shows we delivered the policy to them in good shape. Then they began. You know, Mr. Humphrey wanted an issue of a billion dollars or two for no reason on earth except to raise the rates three and a quarter percent. They didn't even need the money; they had several times that much in the treasury, but they commenced right then raising the interest on the money. Today, you notice that during those last 14 years the interest rate has more than doubled in most instances. I show that if we had maintained the rates as they were during the Roosevelt-Truman times, during those first 14 years, the hardest years in history—no nation on earth suffered more than we suffered during that time from inflation, deflation, depression, everything else—if we'd kept those rates, we would have saved \$211 billion in interest on all the public debt and the private debt as well. On the national debt, we would have saved enormous amounts. And today, instead of paying \$14.2 billion a year interest on the national debt, we would be paying just about half that much. Last year, we paid \$36 billion (more) in interest than we would have paid. That would have paid for two and a half million houses, at \$15,000 each.

"Now, if we'd have saved all that money during the last 14 years, we'd have saved enough money to have built 14 million houses at \$15,000 each. The reason we haven't the money for poverty programs and the good, necessary, constructive programs that we have on the statute books today is because of high interest. We're not going to get this country back into shape until we reverse that trend and restore interest rates to a fair level.

"The theory that money will trickle down from the top to the bottom doesn't work. Mr. Hoover tried that, John, you remember, and found out that it didn't trickle down.

"I would help the poor people, the low income groups. In 1964 we reduced the excise taxes. When we leave more money with the poor people to spend, they spend it. It goes into the channels of distribution immediately, and travels through about 50 transactions a year on the average. Now, every transaction will generate a little income tax. That's the reason that, when we reduced the

excise taxes, for every billion so reduced, we received a billion and a half dollars in taxes. That doesn't apply across the board, of course, but for the lower income groups, it does, and that's something we should keep in mind.

"Now see what happens if you start the other way and pour money in at the top through unnecessary, excessive and usurious interest. Rather than trickling down through the economy, it just goes into somebody's bank vault. It doesn't trickle down. So if you want to help this country, you have to help the low income groups, and everybody gets the benefit of that money. It eventually goes to the top, but it helps everyone along the way.

"So I appreciate people who are interested in cooperatives, for they are helping those who need it most. I feel highly honored to have been invited here, and I want to thank you gentlemen who made it possible. It's a pleasure to work with you shoulder-to-shoulder and to cooperate with you in every way in the public interest, for it is always in the public interest that you are working.

"Thank you."

REPUBLICANS REMAIN SILENT ON INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party obviously plans to play a most dangerous game of partisan politics with our economy.

Apparently, not even the serious demands of the Vietnamese war are enough to deter the GOP from its reckless course.

The true nature of this political game was revealed by Joseph Kraft, a widely respected columnist, in the Washington Post of Thursday, October 5. This column, headlined "Republicans Seek To Blame Democrats for Any Inflation," makes it clear that the GOP plans to hoodwink the American public as part of its campaign for 1968. Mr. Speaker, I place this column in the RECORD:

REPUBLICANS SEEK TO BLAME DEMOCRATS FOR ANY INFLATION

(By Joseph Kraft)

Watching the last inning of the first game of the World Series, President Johnson yesterday pulled from his pocket a slip of paper showing the rise of interest rates in the past year. That little slip of paper expresses the true nature of the fight in Congress over the President's proposal for a tax increase.

Basically the Republicans are hoping to delay the tax increase to the point of assuring a stiff dose of inflation bound to be blamed on the Democrats.

To understand what this is all about, it is first necessary to develop a sense of the way the country lines up around the proposal for a tax increase. The overwhelming evidence is that most of the country is bitterly against the tax rise.

The one big exception is the business community. Having been won over to the new economics in the past few years, business leaders have declared themselves almost unanimous for higher taxes as an anti-inflationary measure.

In this situation, the tax increase proposal presented a real danger to the Republicans. What cynics call the Dartmouth

College wing of the party—its most serious members who pride themselves on their sense of responsibility and who have belatedly developed a dim understanding of the new economics—was apt to follow the business leadership in supporting the tax increase despite its unpopularity.

That would not only split them off from the more orthodox Republicans opposed to most tax increases and all new spending. It would put at least part of the Republican Party in the position of doing the President's dirty work for him.

To head off that eventuality, the Republican leadership in the House developed the strategy of linking support for the tax increase with action by the Administration to cut back spending on a massive scale. Thus the Dartmouth College wing of the Party could come out for the tax increase provided the Administration agreed to pare down spending by from \$5 to \$7 billion.

The Administration refused the gambit, trying instead to win over Republican votes by emphasizing programs that would have to be scrapped if spending was cut. But on two test votes, the Republicans in the House stood solidly behind the principle of tying tax increases to spending decreases.

A large number of Southern Democrats found that package attractive also. As yet there is no majority in the House Ways and Means Committee for the tax increase. Accordingly, the Committee voted to put the tax increase aside until the matter of spending cuts and a tax increase had been thrashed out.

In the long run, the Administration is apt to get a tax increase without drastic cuts in expenditures. The serious danger of inflation makes a compelling case.

But Republicans can now vote any way they please on the tax increase, asserting that the party took its big stand on cuts in spending. And already they are setting their sights on bigger game.

They are beginning to tick off more in sorrow than in anger, the numerous warnings they have issued to the Administration on the matter of inflation. In a major floor speech Tuesday, John Byrnes of Wisconsin, minority spokesman on taxes in the House, listed in laborious detail five such occasions running from February, 1966 through June, 1967.

Behind this emphasis is an obvious tactic. The Republicans believe they can now head off any tax increase until next year. By that time it will probably be too late to damp down inflationary forces. And so the Republicans are getting ready to tag the Democrats with the blame for the heady dose of inflation that is on the way.

Mr. Speaker, with all of their ballyhoo about "taxes and inflation," the Republicans maintain a deafening silence about the prime factor behind our fiscal difficulties—high interest rates.

Why are the Republican speechmakers unable to discuss interest rates?

Why are they silent if indeed they are concerned about inflation?

The reasons, of course, are well known here in the Congress. The truth is that the Republicans have consistently supported a Federal Reserve System that believes in higher and higher interest rates. The Federal Reserve System, which has created our fantastically high interest rates, has no greater friend in the Congress than the Republican Party.

Whenever anyone in this House dares to attack the Federal Reserve, he can be sure that someone on the minority side will come to its defense. It is an automatic response. Defense of the Federal Reserve and its high interest policies

apparently are part of the GOP handbook.

Mr. Speaker, this is what makes the Republican cries about inflation so hypocritical. Where was the Republican concern when the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates 37½ percent in December 1965?

This interest rate increase—about which our GOP friends remained so silent—raised the cost of all goods and services in the country. This interest rate increase crept into every item that the housewife, the worker, the farmer, and the businessman must buy.

Unfortunately, our Consumer Price Indexes do not provide sufficient information on the full impact of interest rates. Yet, from what little information is provided, it is obvious that high interest rates have been a big factor in the rise of the Consumer Price Index over the past 2 years.

This is the same Consumer Price Index over which our Republican friends worried so much. Yet, they just cannot bring themselves to mention interest rates.

Fortunately, many economists and news publications are beginning to call attention to the role of interest rates in forcing prices upward.

In the October 7 issue of the New Republic magazine, two research assistants from the Brookings Institution—Martin Carnoy and Dennis Mueller—place much of the blame for rising prices on high interest rates. I quote from this article:

Over a quarter of the rise in the consumer price index during 1966 can be accounted for by the rise in medical costs and the rise in interest, property insurance and taxes. Mortgage interest rates rose 12.4 per cent. The fact that a tight money policy, which is intended to curb inflation, may result in a large increase in the consumer price index because of the rise in consumer borrowing costs would be alarming to anyone less devoted to restrictive monetary policy than Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board. In retrospect, one can argue that the Board overreacted in its efforts to cool off the economy in 1966, and thereby brought about the distortions economists fear will come again if we do not have a tax increase. However, there is nothing in the "new economics" which says that bad monetary policy has to be accepted as a "fact of life" and countered with bad fiscal policy. In short, the record suggests that a tax increase would have done much less to avoid the price rise of last year than its proponents would have us believe, and that many of the distortions they fear lie ahead could be avoided by a more enlightened monetary policy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our Republican colleagues will start telling the American people the full truth and that they will halt their demagogic half-truths about inflation. The American people will not be as easily fooled as the Republican propagandists apparently believe. The American people will not ignore the fact that it has been the Republican Party that has time and again defended the Federal Reserve and has blocked meaningful reform of our monetary system. With this record, the Republican charges about high prices and inflation rings of nothing more than election year bombast.

To make a real issue out of inflation,

the Republicans will have to talk about interest rates. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject on which the GOP cannot stand the glare of the public spotlight. Their record is simply too bad and too obvious.

Likewise, the Republicans have made much noise about deficits in the Federal budget. To listen to the Republican speeches, there is much concern about spending.

Here again, our GOP friends remain silent on the role of high interest rates in the budgetmaking process. Never do we hear them mention the fact that interest charges make up the second largest item in the Federal budget—second only to expenditures for national defense.

Why do the Republicans not talk about ways in which the whopping \$14.2 billion in interest charges on the national debt in this fiscal year can be reduced?

Actually, more than \$6.7 billion of this sum is excessive interest charges. If interest rates had been kept at the levels existing when President Truman went out of office in 1952, we would be paying only \$7.5 billion in interest on the national debt this year instead of \$14.2 billion.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, interest charges on our public debt have gone up 105 percent since 1952, while the debt itself has risen only 27 percent. If the Republicans truly want to end deficits and reduce spending, let them start with interest rates. This is where the big spending comes. And there is absolutely nothing to show for it other than bigger and bigger profits for the handful of moneylenders.

Mr. Speaker, if the loyal opposition would be willing to give up its longtime friendship with the big banking industry and the Federal Reserve, then we might see some progress on the question of budgets, inflation, and high interest rates.

PRESIDENT OPENS NATIONAL CO-OP MONTH

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, few times in the history of this country has the cooperative movement had a better friend than President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

President Johnson has always worked closely with cooperatives, both in Texas and at the national level. In fact, President Johnson was the prime mover behind the formation of the Pedernales Electric Co-op in his home area near Johnson City back in the 1930's.

On Wednesday, October 4, the President officially opened National Co-Op Month at the Department of Agriculture. In his remarks, President Johnson once again demonstrated his deep knowledge and close affection for the cooperatives which have done so much for this

country and particularly for our farm and rural citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I place the President's remarks in the RECORD:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CO-OP CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 4, 1967, OFFICIAL OPENING OF CO-OP MONTH

Secretary Freeman and Secretary Wirtz, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate very much your welcome. My coming here brought a great deal of enthusiasm from my cabinet. They were all rather insistent that I come early and stay late because we have a cabinet meeting scheduled at 12 o'clock. And some of them want to put it off as long as they can.

It was about 100 years ago when a visitor to our very young country at that time commented on what he believed to be a remarkable American trait:

Tocqueville said that "The Americans make associations to give entertainment, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries . . . Wherever at the head of some new undertaking you see the Government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure there to find an association."

Well, now today, as we meet here this morning, those associations have pervaded every facet of our American life. Some of the best of these associations are referred to today as cooperatives and I have observed in my years of public life that the cooperatives represent some of the best in America.

They represent initiative at its most creative—groups of people joining together for a common goal, combining their labor together to bring themselves what we all seek most, a better way of life.

They represent a deep belief in the potential of our country, in the future of America as a land where we want to see no one go hungry, or lack for medical care or clothes, or be driven off his land.

In the past 3 years, I am told that 133 cooperative credit unions have been organized by low-income families in depressed rural areas as well as the city slums.

These credit unions are offering fair rates of interest. They are trying to lead and to teach our people how to save, and they are helping them take the first steps toward responsibility and ultimately toward financial independence.

In Clarksdale, Mississippi, for example, a young mother came to the credit union with a problem. She had bought a stove and had agreed to pay \$17 a month on it—one-third of her total income. The credit union officer showed her that she was paying 35 percent interest. The credit union loaned her the money to pay for the stove, and now she is making payments that she can afford although it's rather high but it's 12 percent interest.

Smart farmers are banding together in cooperatives to market their crops, to get fair credit, to buy supplies.

Near Sunset, La., a co-op was formed to market sweetpotatoes. Year before last, the average net income was \$2,300. Last season, the co-op got the farmer \$900 more for his potatoes. That \$900 pulled him up barely across the poverty threshold into our more affluent American society.

These cooperatives are holding open the door of economic opportunity to the family farmer. They are making it possible for some of them to stay on the farm, rather than to be forced to migrate to a distant and alien city.

In eastern Ohio, 120 farm families were ready to call it quits. Their hills were covered with brush—no fit pasture for their livestock. As a last-ditch effort, they organized a co-op, they borrowed money, they bought two bulldozers, a heavy disk, and a seeder, and then they seeded their land.

And now these families are trying to stick it out. They are on their way, I believe, to a satisfying and rewarding life.

Cooperatives in cities are assuring more Americans proper medical treatment. Members of the Seattle health cooperative prepay their doctors, so they aren't reluctant to consult them early and often. As a result of this preventive medicine, the co-op members spend less than half the number of days in the hospital as other Seattle residents.

Cooperatives are instilling a sense of belonging, a sense of proprietorship, a sense of responsibility in all of our citizens. And during the riots in Detroit, two racially integrated housing cooperatives in the center of the burned area were patrolled by their co-op members. And not a windowpane was shattered, and not a building was burned.

So I am glad to be able to take this time this morning to come here to salute you and to participate with you in recognizing and in celebrating Co-op Month of 1967. The cooperatives play a vital part in building a better land, in building a better country, in building a better America.

"The highest and the best form of efficiency," as Woodrow Wilson once said, "is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

And we get spontaneous cooperation nowhere better than we get it from a co-op. And it leads in many directions and to a better spiritual life, and better health, and better education, and better bodies, and better minds. We join them because we want to get more for our dollar when we buy and we want to get more for our product when we sell. And when we borrow we want to get it at as low a rate as possible.

And all of those things motivate us to belong to it. But after we do belong there are many fringe benefits. And from those fringe benefits come a stronger country and a better country. And with all of our martyrdom and all of our complaints and with all of our sufferings and our inconveniences and our discriminations and our setbacks and our reverses and our frustrations, I think that all of us have good enough judgment to know that we are on the way, that we are moving, that we are getting better every day and things are really relative, after all.

And where is the society, where is the plot of land, where is the form of government that you would like to exchange on even terms for ours?

And sometimes our country is like our family. We reserve the right to express ourselves quite freely but when we come to finding someone better, in the kitchen or a son or a daughter that we would like to trade for someone else, it's another matter.

So I say to you that I am very proud of the cooperative movement in this country. And not just what it gives us in immediate dollar benefits but in the fringe benefits that have contributed a great deal, I think, to making this Nation and this system the envy of all the world.

And go back, and get with it, and keep at it. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE OF BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP OF BANK STOCK WILL BE REQUIRED BY AGENCY RULES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in October 1964, the Subcommittee on Domestic Fi-

nance of your Committee on Banking and Currency published a document entitled "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System." The purpose of this publication was to provide the Congress with necessary information on bank ownership and control in order that free competition in the industry be maintained.

So-called chain banking and stockholder and management interlocks among banks, and between banks and other businesses, pose a real threat to effective competition in this most vital area of our free enterprise economy.

The 1964 study followed two reports on chain banking and bank holding companies, pursuant to a committee resolution. More recent resolutions resulted in the publication of additional studies in the same general area of bank ownership and control, and changes in control.

A most nagging problem with respect to fulfilling our continuing committee responsibilities to support free and effective competition in banking has been the lack of adequate information with respect to the actual ownership and control of our banks. For example, my letter of transmittal contained in the 1964 publication on the 20 largest stockholders of member banks contains the following comment:

It is obvious that disclosure even of the 20 largest stockholders of record in each member bank does not provide an accurate measurement of the extent of chain banking in the United States. First of all, the same individuals or groups of individuals do not always appear by the same designations on stockholder lists of the various banks in which they are security holders. Secondly, membership in the same family is not always clearly ascertainable from stockholder lists. Also, stock may be held in trust accounts, or registered in "street name" or in the name of a bank nominee without indication of the identity of the beneficial owners. In short, even the most careful analysis of the stockholder lists provides at best an educated guess of the true extent of chain banking. Without question, therefore, chain banking is certainly more widespread than the present data indicate.

Because of the studies done by the Banking and Currency Committee, I was most interested when the Federal banking supervisory agencies issued their rules and regulations pursuant to 1964 amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 bringing the larger banks under its public disclosure provisions. However, the disclosure regulation promulgated by the Comptroller of the Currency was so inadequate to protect the interests of minority stockholders that I was compelled to publicly charge on June 29, 1965 that this lack of disclosure was contrary to the intent of Congress and deserved congressional disapproval.

Along with many other legal and policy changes wrought in that office since my criticisms were first aired, I particularly welcome the Comptroller's proposed regulation to beef up disclosure of beneficial ownership of bank stock by including the reporting of family-held stock as well as stock held in an individual capacity by an "insider." The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have issued similar

regulations as well. While we still have a long way to go before we can definitely ascertain the ownership and control patterns of all 14,000 federally insured banks, this regulation, when finally adopted, will represent a modest but, nevertheless, constructive step.

DUTCH PROPOSE GLOBAL AID PLAN

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, speaking before the U.N. General Assembly last week, Netherlands Foreign Minister Joseph M. A. H. Luns called for "cooperation between developed and developing countries," saying that—

In a world where poverty is rampant security treaties are not enough, because poverty is just as explosive as the atom bomb.

As we approach consideration of the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, we might all take into account Mr. Luns' proposals for increased aid by all capital-exporting countries, and his announcement that the Netherlands' foreign aid program in calendar 1968 will amount to three-fourths of 1 percent of the Dutch GNP. Our own program for fiscal 1968 will amount to less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the American GNP. I include in the RECORD, for the perusal of my colleagues, the New York Times article summarizing the Dutch proposals:

DUTCH, AT U.N., ASK GLOBAL AID PLAN—URGE RICH AND POOR NATIONS TO COORDINATE EFFORTS

(By Juan de Onis)

UNITED NATIONS N.Y., October 3.—The Netherlands proposed today that the United Nations adopt an international development charter committing rich and poor countries to a global plan against poverty.

Foreign Minister Joseph M.A.H. Luns, speaking for the Netherlands in the General Assembly, coupled his call for the formulation of an international development strategy with an announcement of an expanded foreign-aid program by the Netherlands.

Mr. Luns said that, more than midway in the United Nations Development Decade, which ends in 1970, there was an apparent "stagnation in world prosperity" and a growing gap in economic levels between rich and poor countries.

Although the Netherlands is a relatively small country, it forms part of the group of capital-exporting countries that provide development funds from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, also known as the World Bank, the United Nations and their affiliated financial and technical organs, as well as direct aid programs.

PROPOSALS HELD CONSTRUCTIVE

The proposals put forward by Mr. Luns were seen as a constructive response to growing pressure from the developing countries for firm commitments from the wealthier nations to expand their development financing.

In effect, the Netherlands called on all the capital-exporting countries, led by the United States, to coordinate their foreign-

aid programs, adjusting external financial and technical assistance to national development plans.

The present dispersion of foreign-aid efforts was criticized yesterday by Philippe de Seynes, UN Under Secretary for Economic and Financial Affairs. He said the developing countries had little economic bargaining power and could not force the rich nations to cooperate. But, he said cooperation would be the way to make the most of available aid funds.

In the beginning of the Development Decade, there was an increase in capital transfers from the rich to the poor countries, particularly by the United States, which began such programs as the Alliance for Progress for Latin-American development.

FLOW OF FUNDS SLACKENING

But since 1965, there have been warnings from many quarters that the net flow of development funds was slackening. George Woods, president of the World Bank, has said that there are many projects that are technically and financially sound, but are stalled for lack of long-term development capital.

Mr. Woods has proposed that the capital-exporting countries supply \$1-billion to replenish the long-term loan funds of the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank that makes loans for up to 50 years without interest.

This is now being studied by the United States, which would provide 40 per cent of the funds, and the other developed countries. Mr. Luns said the Netherlands was prepared to put up her share.

The Dutch proposals on international development planning were outlined in a memorandum circulated after Mr. Luns spoke. They reflect the thinking of Jan Tinbergen, a Dutch economist who has been chairman of the United Nations Committee on Development Planning.

The memorandum proposed that a United Nations Development Charter and steps for a global-development strategy be prepared for submission to the General Assembly and serve as the basis for a second United Nations Development Decade, beginning in 1970.

The Netherlands' foreign-aid program, which was submitted to the Dutch Parliament last week, requests appropriations equivalent to \$149-million for next year, compared with \$125-million this year.

The 1968 level would represent a foreign-aid outlay equal to three-quarters of 1 per cent of the Dutch gross national product. Under a four-year plan, this would rise to 1 per cent in the last year. This was the level recommended by the United Nations Development decade for all the capital-exporting countries.

Recent United Nations studies indicate that the average level of foreign-aid outlay of all the developed countries last year was little more than seven-tenths of 1 per cent.

LEGISLATIVE POSITION OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of John F. Nave, former national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., I am inserting in the RECORD the legislative

position of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States with reference to the President's message of January 31, 1967, on veterans and veterans' affairs.

On May 24, 1967, I introduced in the Congress H.R. 10308 to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims.

This bill has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary and I am looking forward to the day when favorable action will be taken.

The legislative position of the Italian American War Veterans follows:

ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,

Syracuse, N.Y., 12303, July 26, 1967.

Subject: Legislative Position of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated, in reference to the President's Message of 31 January 1967 on veterans and veterans' affairs.

To: The Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and Veterans Advisory Commission, Washington, D.C.

The Italian American War Veterans of the United States firmly believe that the national health, welfare and safety of the country depends largely on the well balanced distribution of tax dollars to carry on the necessary functions and duties of government. In addition, that these tax dollars be spent wisely with maximum gain and minimum waste. Because the Veterans Administration is allotted for expenditure, next to the Defense Department, one of the highest sums of money in the Federal Government, it becomes a valid area for proper re-evaluation of how it spends the taxpayers' funds.

Of necessity, we believe the Congress must past legislation enacting certain reforms. Since the veterans' and survivor of veterans' population is ever increasing, we hesitate in stipulating that we can propose or advance solutions to all problems now or hereafter prevalent by way of the legislative machinery. However, based upon experience and talks throughout the country, we feel certain areas of improvements can be advocated and set forth pertaining to the Veterans Administration, veterans' and survivors of veterans.

Some of these are as follows:

1. *Secretary of Veterans Affairs:* Because the veterans' and survivor of veterans' population now makes up a very substantial portion of the American population, and the tax dollars spent in the administration of veterans' affairs is one of the highest in the Federal Budget, the Veterans' Administration should be elevated from an independent federal agency to cabinet status, and the title of "Administrator of Veterans Affairs" be changed to "Secretary of Veterans Affairs." With cabinet status not only is the veteran dignified but also the agency that administers his affairs.

2. *United States Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee:* The United States Senate should have a Senate Affairs Committee to which all legislation on veterans should go, instead of the several now involved. Not only is this better for morale, but we believe that the taxpayer stands to benefit. The President and VA Administrator should so recommend to the Congress.

3. *Court of Veterans' Appeal:* All veterans and their survivors should be entitled to appeal or direct their grievances, cases, or complaints to a final court of law specifically set up for them, under judicial rather than administrative or executive machinery. We believe the veterans, their survivors, and the Legislative (Congress) and Executive (Veterans' Administration) Branches of the federal government will stand to gain a great

deal more than would be lost with such a Court of Veterans' Appeal being instituted and operated. We have precedent in that the taxpayer has his Tax Court, the serviceman his Court of Military Appeals, and the importers and investors their Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Such a Court of Veterans' Appeals should be staffed with as many Commissioners as possible to expedite such a Court's workload.

4. *Veterans' Administration Service and Supply Center:* Services and supplies make up the important lifeline of the Veterans' Administration. Thus, these services and supplies should have a proper geographical location somewhere in the United States, other than Washington, D.C., where ample space is available to concentrate them for better efficiency and administration. It would be a headquarters and place designed to be an important adjunct to the Veterans' Administration and all the plants, facilities, and other matters under its control and jurisdiction, as well as for the veterans themselves.

The following, to mention a few, could be located in this Veterans' Administration Service and Supply Center:

(A) Research, Data, and Development Center.

(B) School for Trades and Skills vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same.

(C) Administrative School vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same.

(D) Professional Schools vital or necessary for Veterans' Administration, or assist in same. Involves medicine, dentistry, nursing, prostheses, and others allied or needed.

(E) Supply Depot Central area from which needed supplies could be had or gathered when appropriate or desired. Other.

(F) Insurance Administration Center: All Veterans' Administration Insurance Programs be administered from this center.

(G) Hospital Administration Center: All hospital programs be administered from this center.

(H) Compensation and Pension Administration Center: All compensation and Pension be administered from this center.

(I) Educational Administration Center: All veterans' educational programs be administered from this center.

(J) Records Center: All veterans' records be centered here.

(K) Rehabilitation Center: All rehabilitation programs be centered here for administration.

(L) Capitol Construction Administrative Center: Formulate the projects, facilities and plants that would have to be built or put up and maintained in accordance with the present and future needs, or projected needs. Engineers, planners and allied professions and workers would form an integral part of this center.

(M) Other service, supply, or miscellaneous center or matter needed or desired.

5. *Permanent Career Force:* Stability of employment should be encouraged through some kind of permanent career program for the professions, trades, and skills constantly or everlastingly needed by the Veterans' Administration. However, safeguards that efficiency and high operational standards will be maintained is very essential to such a program. While some kind of security is essential for a good professional and labor market, over-security can lead to inefficiency and bureaucratic waste. The Administrator or Veterans' Administration should be given a wider latitude of freedom in this area than that now noted under Civil Service Administration. For example, such bureaucratic pitfalls as "red tape", "buck passing", and the like should be kept to a minimum.

6. *Permanent Veterans' Advisory Commission:* Such a commission could prove important as to the needs and desires of veterans, as well as veterans' organizations formed for

these purposes. It should have expanded powers and privileges than it now has under a temporary set up pursuant to President's Message of 31 January 1967. Also, by law it should be based upon a non-profit and non-political basis with ability and merit superceding political considerations.

7. *Utilization and Co-operation of Veterans' Organizations and Posts:* The thousands of veterans' organizations and posts throughout the country can offer much more assistance and personnel for veterans' work. Unfortunately, the rigid policy of the Veterans' Administration to recognize only certain groups under 38 U.S.C. 3402 is both harmful and frustrating. It is discriminating as it denies a veteran his right of choice—one of the freedoms he has constantly fought for. Also, it indicates that the Veterans' Administration cannot flex with the times, since this rigid policy has been maintained for over twenty years.

38 U.S.C. 3402 should be changed so that the Veterans' Administration can recognize veterans' organizations and posts, not only on a national basis, but also on a regional, statewide, and local basis. Thus, instead of inviting wrath and complaints from the smaller groups, the Veterans' Administration will be eliciting their co-operation in the limited areas in which they can function.

Our federal government as a matter of policy in other areas of endeavor fights or controls "bigness" with Anti-Trust Laws, Fair Trade Laws, Establishment of Small Business Agency, and the like.

However, the Veterans' Administration under 38 U.S.C. 3402 sides with "bigness" and encourages "monopolies" in matters relating to veterans' organizations. This policy is adverse to the country's national health, welfare and safety, and should be reversed immediately.

There is nothing wrong with "smallness" as thousands of American veterans refuse to join or be part of "big" veterans' organizations, and will only join smaller groups or none at all.

In addition, we have in the United States of America certain internationalized types of veterans' organizations, such as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, which are 100% American without any reservations whatsoever. They are helping to fight communism, fascism, and other un-American activities both at home and abroad, and especially in the country of antecedency.

For example, in 1948 the Italian American War Veterans of the United States helped to spearhead a drive to defeat communism in Italy. A communist takeover would have meant not only a loss of a friendly nation for the United States, but also a great increase in taxpayer dollars for more defense. Italy stayed with freedom and democracy. However, thousands of letters, packages, and communications were sent overseas to win this battle for freedom and democracy over communism. Only an organization like the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, and its allied groups, were prepared to perform such a feat. And they did it.

Ironically, since 1948 every federal agency administering laws involving veterans' organizations, or under which veterans' organizations may be granted certain rights and privileges, such as the Department of Defense, Internal Revenue Service, Patent Office, Register of Copyrights, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the United States Civil Service Commission, has recognized the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, *except* the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration should take serious note that in the United States of America we have internationalized types of veterans' organizations, such as (1) Italian American War Veterans of the United States, (2) Franco-American War Veterans, (3) Polish American War Veterans, (4) Irish American War Veterans, (5) British American

War Veterans, (6) Jewish American War Veterans, (7) Catholic American War Veterans, and others. They are all 100% American, also.

Save for Poland the other countries of antecedency have no communist takeover. Yet, in Poland if elections could be held the Polish American War Veterans could play a great role in trying to get that country on the side of freedom and democracy.

On the other hand, we have no similar veterans' groups, such as Cuban American War Veterans, Latin-American War Veterans, Asiatic American War Veterans, and the United States finds communism in Cuba, parts of Latin-America, and fighting a war in South Viet Nam in Asia, as Korea a decade ago. In the meantime billions of American Tax Dollars are being spent to fight communist warfare throughout the world.

The Veterans' Administration remains in adamant to this important fact, and in so doing eroding the goodwill of many of the Internationalized types of veterans' organizations. Instead of being discouraged, these groups should be encouraged by the Veterans' Administration.

International types of veterans' groups by keeping the goodwill of countries of antecedency save millions of American Tax Dollars for defense, and in addition encourage peace and prosperity with them. It is an undeniable fact that certain people to people approach amongst members of the world community has distinct advantages over government to government one.

8. *Permanent Commission to revise and overhaul the Veterans' Administration periodically—at least once every ten years:* A permanent commission to revise and overhaul the Veterans' Administration periodically—at least once every ten years or so on the basis of needs and findings should be set up. Such a commission should be independent and free from any interference from officials or hierarchy of the Veterans' Administration, although their recommendations, suggestions, and co-operation should not only be solicited but also encouraged.

As we indicated in the beginning, we do not propose or advance solutions to all problems now or hereafter prevalent. It would involve a task force for such an undertaking, and then we would at the conclusion even have reservations. However, we can within our experiences and undertakings set forth certain recommendations and suggestions, coupled with those of other similar interested veterans' groups, we hope, make way for improvements and advancements in the administration of veterans' affairs by the Veterans' Administration.

In concluding this legislative position we trust a valid contribution has been made pursuant to the President's Message of 31 January 1967 on veterans and veterans' affairs. We have tried to remain objective, and keep always in mind the patriotic attitude that the national health, welfare and safety came above every other consideration.

JOHN F. NAVE,
Past National Commander.

BUSINESS AID IN SLUM RIDDANCE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the recent commitment of \$1 billion by life insurance companies to rehabilitate our slum areas stands as a precedent for improved Government-business relations. Also, it

provides us with an alternative for solving the problems of our cities.

Too long this country has witnessed a struggle between Government and business—the loser consistently being the less fortunate members of our society. Now President Johnson has turned this age-old struggle into a working and profitable partnership. The President has, in effect, admitted to business that the Government is unable to solve all the problems of our cities and that we need the assistance of private enterprise. And he has offered realistic incentives to encourage this assistance. At the same time he has reminded business of their responsibility to our cities. He has asked business to turn their attentions to the social as well as the profit ledger.

This rather simple approach has worked remarkably well. It is the kind of straight talk that is long overdue. I believe President Johnson and private industry should be commended for their attempts to forge Government-business alliance and to devote their resources to rehabilitation of our cities.

So that my colleagues might become aware of the warm response such efforts have generated, I include a Miami Herald editorial in the RECORD:

BUSINESSLIKE SLUM RIDDANCE

The most heartening action to date toward ridding America's big cities of slums is the pledge of \$1 billion for mortgages there.

This isn't tax money. It is cash in the hands of 348 insurance companies. Each is putting up its share in proportion to its assets.

President Johnson announced the "historic contribution" after talking to spokesmen for the insurance industry in the White House.

The "contribution" is that the lenders presumably will earn less interest on this \$1 billion than if they invested it outside slums. It will go mainly into housing eligible for guarantees from the Federal Housing Administration, which has a ceiling on the interest rate for some of the loans which it insures.

In the past, insurance companies have shied from lending on mortgages in "high-risk" neighborhoods such as slums. The FHA underwriting will minimize the risk of the \$1 billion.

Plans for the venture were an open secret for several weeks. The Magazine of Wall Street in mid-August, for example, predicted "It now seems likely that such measures will lean heavily on private enterprise as a source of financing and management of rehabilitation programs rather than on direct federal aid."

Apart from the FHA insurance, the lending of the \$1 billion will be straight business. Each mortgage will be a person-to-person transaction between the borrower and the insurance company. The money is being offered to help breadwinners buy their own homes as well as to finance construction or renovation of other residential property now in slumlike condition.

Treating each mortgage on its merits is in the sound tradition of our profit-and-loss system. The experience should be as beneficial to slum-dwellers as to lenders.

Best of all this \$1 billion proves that keen minds are zeroing in on our nation's No. One domestic problem.

AUTO-ON-TRAIN OPERATIONS

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. Speaker, few appropriations this year will create greater interest or be of more importance than the appropriations for the Department of Transportation. This is, of course, the first year that the Department of Transportation has come up for appropriations. These appropriations total more than \$1.5 billion. The magnitude of tasks confronting the Department in aviation, highway construction, highway and motor vehicle safety, the Coast Guard, and railroad matters is staggering. The Department can well use every dollar the Congress is able to appropriate.

At this time, however, I would like to voice my regret at the deletion by the Appropriations Committee, the House, and the conference committee of the \$3,511,000 requested for auto-on-train operations. This is an expenditure which could well have beneficial effects in the long run far exceeding this three and a half million dollar figure. This amount is needed to complete a project started in fiscal year 1967 which is estimated to cost under \$7.4 million. In brief outline, this is a demonstration project to be carried on jointly by the Department of Transportation and the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad between Washington, D.C., and Jacksonville, Fla., which will permit the transport aboard rail cars of automobiles with drivers and passengers, utilizing the automobiles for seating facilities aboard the rail cars.

The 760-mile-long-trip would cost about \$100 per car with passengers. Food services also would be provided. A survey of cars from the Northeast entering Florida last October indicated that about 40 percent of those cars, their drivers and passengers would be glad to avail themselves of this service.

Even if this estimate proves to be overly optimistic, I am firmly convinced that this kind of project should be given every possible encouragement.

The problems of highway congestion and the tragedies of highway accidents, injuries, and fatalities become more acute every year. Travel between the Northeast and Florida is understandably becoming more and more popular. With the trend toward longer vacations and higher incomes, we can confidently expect an ever increasing number of persons wanting to spend part of their vacation in Florida. Others will come there to retire. The trade up and down the eastern seaboard is bound to expand.

This new method of travel will appeal to thousands who want the mobility of their own automobiles in Florida but who understandably find a drive of about 800 miles both tiring and time consuming. A price of \$100 would be a bargain for many a family to get to Florida without the tedium, the confinement, the tension of driving for 2 days.

We should also look upon this expenditure as a pilot project which may well be feasible in many other areas of

the country. Builtup areas from Los Angeles to Seattle, from Miami to Boston, from New York to Kansas City might all benefit from having this kind of service available. No doubt, with experience, modifications will be taken place.

But it is little short of insanity to keep building more and more roads, crowding them with more and more cars, creating ever new hazards, without looking into feasible alternatives. Here is one such alternative which is most promising and which should be given a full and fair trial.

It was, in my judgment, quite unreasonable for the House report on the appropriations bill to say that—

If the project is economically feasible, there is no reason why private industry cannot proceed with it.

Unless we in the Congress are willing to face the facts of transport needs and potential and assume some of the risks of innovation, we will find ourselves in an ever increasing mess of congestion, economic waste, and rising accident and death rates.

I regret most sincerely that the conference did not retain the \$2 million approved by the Senate for this purpose and give us an opportunity to remedy the shortsightedness of our earlier vote in the House.

CLOSING THE TRAVEL GAP

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of September 27 and a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference on September 13 make telling points concerning the travel gap—the difference between what Americans spend in foreign countries through travel and tourism and what visitors from other lands spend in America. This year, the travel gap is almost \$2 billion, and this deficit worsens our international balance-of-payments position. The average visitor to this country spends more than \$400 here, so there is a great economic potential in expanding travel to this country. Other countries are well aware of the gold to be found in tourism. The Governments of Mexico, France, Spain, Canada, and Greece each spend far more every year to promote travel than the Government of the United States spends through the U.S. Travel Service. This Government agency plays a key role in President Johnson's efforts to solve our balance-of-payments problem. With so much at stake, it is false economy to clamp a lid on the promotional activities of the travel service. As the editorial points out, an assault on the travel gap is worth more of an effort than we are now making. Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial and the Governors' resolution in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Sept. 27, 1967]

TRAVEL GAP

The number of foreign travelers visiting the United States has shown a 30 percent increase this year over the like period in 1966. John Black, director of the U.S. Travel Service, now estimates 1.5 million foreigners will tour this country in 1967.

That's a pretty good showing, considering the incredibly small amount Congress is willing to appropriate for attracting visitors here. Last year the Service operated on a budget of \$3 million. By contrast, France spent \$5 million to lure tourists, Mexico spent \$7 million, Spain and Canada \$10 million apiece. Even tiny Greece spends more than we do on this item.

This is a strange way to deal with the balance of payments problem. The average foreigner spends between \$400 and \$450 on his American visit. What better way to offset the dollar drain than to make this nation a more attractive goal for globe-trotters?

Several imaginative ideas were put forth earlier this year by Winthrop Knowlton, assistant secretary of the Treasury, for encouraging such travel. Why not publish a comprehensive guide book for the United States, for example, translated into a variety of foreign languages?

Why can't we develop a system of certified guides, Knowlton asks, using American students proficient in foreign languages? Why can't we fill the thousands of empty university dormitory beds at vacation time, providing revenues for colleges and low cost lodgings for foreign students? Why not a "scientific Disneyland" to promote exports?

It would take money to do all these things. But surely an assault on the estimated \$2 billion "travel gap"—meaning the difference between what American tourists spend abroad and the smaller total spent here by foreigners—is worth more of an effort than we are now making.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL SERVICE

Whereas, the Southern States are engaged in a cooperative effort for travel promotion; and

Whereas, the emerging international markets will play a vital role in achieving growth of travel in the South; and

Whereas, the United States Travel Service is engaged in an outstanding program of promotion and information aimed at developing these international markets:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Southern Governors' Conference urge the Congress to continue to support the programs of the United States Travel Service at the highest possible and practical level.

AN INTERNATIONAL APPROACH TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of participating with the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in the presentation in Miami Beach of a pioneer booklet entitled "You and the Law" and designed to inform persons arrested on misdemeanor charges of their rights under the law. This booklet promises to be extremely helpful in our lower courts, not only in my area, but I believe eventually throughout the Nation.

The young man who prepared this booklet as a staff attorney for the lawyers' committee, Mr. Harvey Friedman, is a very able young lawyer from my area and I think a very promising young man in the much neglected field of the administration of criminal justice in our municipal and other lower courts.

Mr. Friedman has served as a consultant in the Office of Economic Opportunity and as a consultant to the Dade County, Fla., bar's committee on crime control and the administration of justice. Recently he pursued his interest in this subject beyond the borders of our country while on a trip to Europe.

During his trip he explored an intriguing idea for an international institution to make cross-cultural studies of the administration of criminal justice at the lower levels. He outlined this proposal to me in a letter upon his return and I insert that letter in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues who also may have an interest in this subject:

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1967.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: I want to take this opportunity to report to you on my recent tour abroad during which I had the opportunity, through your courtesy, to interview officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice. Since that tour, I am more than ever confirmed in my belief that new research and study efforts are in order if we are to resolve effectively the problems which beset the system for the administration of criminal justice in our nation.

I have initiated discussions with interested parties abroad concerning a multi-national approach in undertaking comparative studies of criminal justice systems. The response was extremely favorable, and while at this time it would be premature to detail these discussions, I would like to set out in general terms the concepts which were developed.

In my work in police-community relations, I have constantly been searching for new approaches; for new approaches must be sought in dealing with police and community conflicts in the nation's urban centers. Judging by recent chaotic events, the old approaches seem to have completely failed, especially where there has been reliance solely on artificial and contrived devices intended for the diminution of tensions between the police and the community.

Where such devices are not grounded in solid research and based on their reliability but rather are employed in the frenzy to resolve police and community tensions, then they invariably fail.

Programs which can be readily and expeditiously implemented must not therefore be the only goal, especially where such programs are but the product of premonition and hunch.

In this connection I would bring to your attention a fact cited by The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its report, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*:

"The Nation spends more than \$4 billion annually on the criminal justice system alone. Yet the expenditure for the kinds of descriptive, operational, and evaluative research that are the obvious prerequisites for a rational program of crime control is negligible. Almost every industry makes a significant investment in research each year. Approximately 15% of the Defense Depart-

ment's annual budget is allocated to research. While different fields call for different levels of research, it is worth noting that research commends only a small fraction of 1 percent of the total expenditure for crime control." (P. 273)

It becomes obvious that an immediate effort must be made to augment our research efforts in this area.

More than this, any such augmented effort must be far more comprehensive than merely dealing with the tensions and immediate problems evoked by police and community relations. It is obvious that the crisis which is observed today in the Nation's urban centers far transcends the scope of such a traditional and circumscribed venture. It is the entire system of criminal justice which must be the target of a national and comprehensive research plan. For the police structure is so interwoven within that system, both in fact and in the minds of the community, that to extricate it therefrom is a sheer impossibility.

The present day approach throughout this nation in studying the system of criminal justice is to make comparative studies of such systems operating in urban areas almost all of which are cursed with the same or similar problems. Such studies are made through on-site visits, through conferences, and through the dissemination of literature. The problem lies in the fact that those making the visits, those attending the conferences, and those writing and reading the literature all have the same or similar backgrounds and dwell in the same or similar setting. Such approaches therefore have mostly failed to bring about any really valuable or profitable insights mainly because they have failed to provide the necessary perspective from which to clearly examine the problems at hand. What is needed then is to be able to step back from this setting and view it from another perspective.

With these factors in mind, I want to set forth for your consideration the concept of developing an international setting from which to examine the system for the administration of criminal justice in our own nation and in others. Specifically this would herald a new and more intensive research effort in the nature of a multi-national undertaking. The cornerstone of this proposal would be the establishment of an international institute for the express purpose of conducting cross-cultural and in-depth studies of the various systems of criminal justice and with special emphasis on community relations vis a vis the particular system.

Such an undertaking would be organized on a joint basis between participating nations at a non-governmental level. It would be multi-disciplinary in approach in that it would freely embrace all those disciplines which could in any way contribute to understanding or bringing about a resolution of the problems faced by the parties.

The task of the institute, in essence, would be to make comparative studies of the problems faced by each of the participating parties. The work of the institute would be codified in a journal produced and disseminated on a regular basis. This then would herald the establishment of an international dialogue in an area where such dialogue has as yet not been attempted and where such might prove highly profitable.

The motivation for other parties joining into such an undertaking may not be immediately obvious; but from my discussions abroad, such motivation does exist. The United States is not the only nation beleaguered by problems in this area.

What is set out herein is in the nature only of the presentation of a series of possibilities. It is but a cornerstone from which to build. It will be the task of the participating parties to mold this idea into the practical and acceptable forms which will best benefit all concerned.

I am moving forward with the development of this idea, and I will keep you notified as to my progress.

Sincerely,

HARVEY FRIEDMAN.

PAUL SOUTHWICK LEAVES PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS, Mr. Speaker, public service is a high calling, because its function is to serve the people, and this purpose demands the best and most highly motivated individuals. One such person recently left public service, and I should like to note the occasion for the benefit of my colleagues, many of whom came to know this man in the course of conducting the public business in this body. Paul Southwick has resigned his position as special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce for congressional relations. In making the announcement, Secretary Trowbridge cited Paul Southwick's outstanding contributions in connection with a broad spectrum of landmark legislation; public works and economic development, highway beautification, high-speed ground transportation, the law establishing the Department of Transportation, auto and highway safety; and Fair Packaging and Labeling. Anyone who helped in the enactment of these laws can take a genuine pride in his service to the public.

I came to know and appreciate Paul Southwick's wide range of talents and his deep sense of public service some 10 years ago when he was a staff member of the Government Information Subcommittee, of which I was chairman. A cum laude graduate of Harvard in 1943, Paul worked as a reporter for both United Press and Associated Press. He later served as administrative assistant to the late Senator Long, of Hawaii.

In the executive branch of Government, Paul Southwick was Deputy Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Commerce Department, and a special assistant in the White House to both President Kennedy and President Johnson, before returning to the Department of Commerce in 1965.

I understand that Paul is joining the Washington firm of Newmyer Associates. In hiring Paul Southwick, his new employers are getting more than a highly qualified executive—they are also getting a wise and good man.

WILL SUCCESS SPOIL AMERICAN CIVILIZATION?

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently in Detroit, Peter B. Clark, president and publisher of the Detroit News, delivered an address to a group of corporation executives in which he asked: "Will Success Spoil American Civilization?"

In his speech, he discusses the major advances that America has made in the past generation, and shows how this, paradoxically, appears to be working against us.

Of youth, Mr. Clark says:

We have created an energetic, idealistic, and well-informed generation . . . We have largely liberated them from the struggle to obtain material goods; they have turned part of their newly liberated energies against us.

He discusses the new respect for intellectuals, but this new respect serves to amplify their criticism. He cites impressive gains in civil rights, but says this serves to sharpen the dissatisfaction of those on the low rungs of society. He discusses television and how it speeds communications. At the same time, its picture often warps reality. Of particular interest is television's promotion of "quick politics" in which more people draw conclusions before they have enough facts.

Clark says:

The cumulative effect of all this is to produce an enormous amount of social criticism. Critics will discover new things to criticize faster than we can discover new solutions.

God forbid that we should ever accept existing injustices, or relax our determination to right wrongs, redress grievances, make certain that everyone is treated equally and with justice.

But he differentiates between constructive criticism and destructive criticism. Excesses of destructive criticism create "public hypochondria."

He concludes:

The mood is, to some unknown extent, destructive of all our political institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress daily have to struggle with the consequences of all the things Mr. Clark discusses. I recommend this perceptive speech, "Will Success Spoil American Civilization?" to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD: WILL SUCCESS SPOIL AMERICAN CIVILIZATION?

(By Peter B. Clark, September 26, 1967)

Everyone takes it for granted that business corporations will give money to civic, educational, welfare and charitable activities. As businessmen, we take it for granted too and assume that we know why we do it. Thus, especially in recent years, we have devoted a great deal of attention to the technique of contributing. How shall we select recipients? How shall we allocate scarce resources among competing claimants? How shall we organize our companies and committees to make these decisions?

Our increasing professionalization, and the increasing pressures to rationalize what we do, have increased this preoccupation with technique.¹

I believe that the shift of business attention from the motive for giving to the technique of giving has gone too far. I submit

¹ See, for example, Leo J. Shapiro, *Company Giving*, Chicago: Survey Press, 1960.

that business must now reconsider very carefully just *why* it contributes anything to anyone. I submit that big changes in the country require big changes in business thinking about contributions—and perhaps about other things as well. The changes in the country have created some new challenges to the system of business itself.

My basic point is this: American life has improved dramatically since World War II; yet the very improvements have produced difficult new problems. A better material life and other improvements we had assumed would represent "progress" have stimulated profoundly negative attitudes about many aspects of our life, including business.

Among the improvements are these: First, a great and continuing prosperity; second, a huge increase in the number of young people being educated in colleges; third, a notable enhancement of the respect given to intellectuals; fourth, a significant improvement in the condition of many American Negroes; and fifth, the arrival of television.

It is as if a new miracle drug had been invented which cured the worrisome old diseases, but which, when tested, also produced unpredicted side effects. Our problem is certainly not to get back the old diseases; it is to retain the wonder drug's curative powers, but discover how to eliminate its damaging new symptoms.

I

Let us look at each of the changes in perspective. First the post-war prosperity and, especially, its effects upon that huge generation of post-war young people which we take so seriously.

Personal income has soared from under \$200 billion in 1945 to over \$600 billion now. For nineteen of the twenty-one years, 1945-1966, *per capita income* was substantially higher than it was the year before. To put it another way, almost every year in the life of a 21-year-old has been economically better than the one before.

This almost unbroken post-war prosperity has produced the freest, healthiest, and most knowledgeable young Americans ever. They enjoy the greatest imaginable range of choice: They can work or not; study or not; travel or not. For at least hundreds of thousands, the opportunity to go on even to graduate schools exists merely for the asking. The contrast between the standard of living of a young person today and a young person of a hundred years ago is almost too great to grasp.

Yet, despite this, or in my opinion, partly because of it, today's young person also often seems to be bored, restless, and discontented with "the way things are". The great depression of the 'thirties is no more than textbook history to him. His striking idealism is seldom tempered by the classic discipline of economic necessity. Many of his free choices are, in a general sense of the word, costless. Decisions which cost nothing teach little.

Young people react to our prosperity (and also to a highly permissive upbringing) in a variety of ways. In some cases, as money becomes easier to get, its value as an incentive declines drastically. As some youngsters conclude that incomes are virtually assured, they lose interest in organizing their lives to earn incomes. One articulate young member of the "new left" said: "Now we're on the threshold of abundance. It is no longer a struggle to survive. Up to now we have had sort of a fixation on income. Now we need other things for motivation."

Businessmen encounter this attitude when they try to recruit bright college people. Some surveys indicate that 80% of today's graduates would prefer an academic or government career to a business career. The Peace Corps demonstrates how attractive low-paying but idealistically-motivated jobs are for youth. To many of them business is not where the action is.

But far more important than difficulties in business recruiting is the fact that continuing prosperity has somehow made it easy, and actually fashionable, to ridicule a "materialistic" society and its alleged lack of "quality." A few prosperous youngsters even feel resentment or guilt about their material possessions. Some (the "hippies") solve their problem by abandoning their possessions; others (the "new left") attack the economic system which produces the possessions. In their collective desire to remake the society, they ignore the extraordinary individual freedom each enjoys.

The politicians and economists who set the goal of, and invented the means for, continued prosperity failed to predict its effects upon people. (Probably this is because they did know the awful consequences of continued poverty.) No one really knows today what the effects of continued affluence are. But we do not have to look just at "hippies," or "peaceniks," or LSD to know that we have somehow failed to prepare our youth for continued affluence. We have created an energetic, idealistic, and well-informed generation. But abundance has also produced a deeply critical generation. Some members of it act as if they did not really believe in what we have done. We have largely liberated them from the struggle to obtain material goods; they have turned part of their newly liberated energies against us.

This leads to the second great change: The vast increase in college education. In 1945 about 1,000,000 people were enrolled in institutions of higher education. In 1965 there were 5,570,000 and the growth rate is going up. (Most business firms experience difficulties if they grow, say, 50%. Consider the organizational and personnel difficulties of a 500% growth.)

Most American parents probably want their children to attend college. Surely, it is desirable to stimulate young people to seek the greatest possible education that they are capable of absorbing.

Even so, anyone who carefully reads his newspaper knows that in this decade college campuses are producing even more than their normal share of tumult. When you suddenly release young people from parental restraints and throw them into huge, anonymous masses, it is not surprising that a few of them cluster into groups which share both loneliness and extreme behavior.

But extreme attitudes also result from the fact that the students are, on the average, different people than they used to be. They are not the same as the essentially middle-class, fun-seeking youngsters of the 'twenties; certainly not the same as the earnest, no-nonsense veterans of the 'forties and 'fifties, eager to make up for lost time and earn a living; they are not even the same as the disillusioned students of the 'thirties, some of whom felt betrayed by business failure. The five-fold explosion of post-war higher education has filled large campuses with something like a cross-section of the present American population. Students come from all income levels, all conditions of life, all educational levels, and they come with all attitudes. We should have expected a striking change in campus behavior.

But it is important to realize that their professors and the ideas of teaching have not changed very much. A teaching method that was invented years ago, perhaps in order to capture the attention of stubbornly uninterested students, is still being used today. One indirect result is the increase of various forms of campus radicalism. Let me explain what I mean.

The teaching method is systematic criticism—especially of political, economic and social matters. It involves carefully taking apart, analyzing, and challenging every part of accepted American economics, governmental processes, and social relationships. The method tends, naturally, to be icono-

clastic. Long-accepted values (like patriotism and respect for constituted authority) are called into question, traditional national heroes are re-examined, basic constitutional procedures are dissected, and cherished historical beliefs are dissolved under the harsh light of analytical intelligence.

When done by a skillful professor, this is a splendid way to stimulate student curiosity. It motivates the student to ask his own questions and to learn how to find his own answers.

At some early time, when most college students were supposed to have been the complacent offspring of the unchallenged rich, the method presumably was totally appropriate. The main problem then was to induce students to ask any real questions or to undertake any serious analysis of their own. It is said that they were not very analytical, were ambitious just to get good jobs, were quietly patriotic without thinking why, were mostly interested in their purely private lives, and keenly enjoyed the high-spirited antics of campus personal life. Professors believed that students had to be jarred into thinking, for their own good. (And maybe a slightly resentful professor or two found some pleasure in challenging all the beliefs of students more prosperous than he.)

Students used to come from homes filled with strong convictions. They arrived at college reflecting the conservative attitudes of their essentially conservative parents. They also brought little curiosity and few facts.

But at least some students are quite different now. They arrive brimming with facts, they show impressive curiosity, some intensity, and a desire to do something. But they do not believe in much of anything. They bring idealism but little substance of belief. They do not go to college with self-satisfied assumptions about the value of the status quo. If anything, they tend to be critical of it.

When restless students who do not believe in the traditional ways of doing things are exposed to professors who systematically question the traditional ways, the results are predictable. We see the results among the students on the biggest campuses: Some extreme radicalism, quite a bit of philosophical anarchism, a great deal of cynicism, and an enormous amount of criticism. We see students striving to become "committed" to some new and, as yet, unknown social or political cause, perhaps because they do not accept the old causes. This rebellion in sheepskin clothing raises real and serious questions: Has pure critical intelligence gotten out of balance with traditional moral beliefs? Is it possible to accept on faith at least some basic premises and some fundamental restraints?

II

The rapid college expansion helps partly to account for the third change—the significant increase in the respect Americans now give to intellectuals. Merely comparing the average 1950 professorial salary of \$5,310 with that of \$11,265 today gives evidence of this increase. More to the point, compare the front pages of 1937 newspapers with those of 1967. The amount of space given to professors, writers, poets, historians, scientists, and others who may properly be called intellectuals has increased spectacularly. This comparison marks a basic change in the way the country thinks.

This rise of intellectuals to public prominence was helped by the very tangible contributions that scientists made to World War II weaponry. Nuclear weapons, radar, jet aircraft, and other startling devices were the direct products of theoretical scientists whose pre-war careers the public viewed skeptically when the public noticed them at all. Mass media quickly discovered that war scientists made good copy. The popularization of intellectuals was underway. It has

continued ever since and, of course, broadened rapidly to include men working in many fields other than science.

No reasonable person can deny that high intelligence is better than low intelligence, that mental training is socially useful, or that the best products of human cerebration are preferable to unthinking mediocrity. Because these things cannot be denied, many Americans have long urged that more respect and attention really ought to be given to intellectuals.

But perhaps the people who urged this did not fully realize what the change might mean. For intellectuals are not simply people who are smarter or better educated than other people (in fact, they are sometimes neither). Intellectuals are people who do particular kinds of work and who, therefore, have had particular kinds of training and job experiences. They frequently share opinions and think of themselves as belonging to a unique group. Sometimes they even display a very human desire to gain practical political power.²

The intellectual's product is ideas. If we reflect on it, we realize that in respect to human affairs his ideas are very often new criticisms of the social, economic and political status quo. In the nature of the case, his ideas must be new if they are to be salable to colleagues, to students, or to academic publications. There is little demand, especially in the popularized academic marketplace, for a carefully balanced restatement of an argument which is correct but old. Except in the physical sciences, it is unfortunately not always required that a man's ideas be rigorously tested and proven correct in the crucible of experience.

There are many reasons why the new ideas he creates are so often criticisms of the human status quo. To attack an alleged evil attracts attention and sympathy, it increases personal influence, and it appears to result from a very good motive—the desire to make life better. Finally, just as James Bond was licensed to kill, everyone knows that the intellectual is licensed to criticize.

The late Harvard economist, Joseph Schumpeter, wrote that the intellectual group in general "cannot help nibbling, because it lives on criticism and its whole position depends on criticism that stings" . . .³

The enhanced respect given to the intellectual has had real public consequences. First, because he is listened to more and since his basic product is criticism, Americans are hearing more criticism of their society. In newspapers, television, magazines, books, and on campuses, professors and other writers declaim on the shortcomings of American life, American foreign policy, American business, and, indeed, American morality.

Second, there are now so many intellec-

² An excellent recent discussion of this possibility is Irving Kristol, "American Intellectuals and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, July 1967, pp. 594-609.

³ Joseph Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York: Harper, 1947 p. 151. See, in general, his discussion of "The Sociology of the Intellectual," p. 145f. Professor Edward C. Banfield has observed that "The premium of scholarship for a professor is all too often originality—not correctness. A politician or businessman must pay a price for being wrong; the academic never does. The college professor has no knowledge of what people want now, or what they are going to want; he deals in generalities, and there is no way of applying a general theory to a unique event. I think it's a national tragedy that people in decision-making roles turn over to intellectuals or computers the right to make decisions. And it's bad for scholarship, too. A good professor is a bastard perverse enough to think about what he thinks is important, not what government thinks is important." *Life*, June 6, 1967, p. 57.

tuals, or would-be intellectuals, that they have become a political constituency in the same sense, for example, that ethnic groups, religious groups, and veterans' organizations are. Politicians consciously try to win votes among them, just as they do among Poles, or Baptists, or American Legionnaires. Some politicians tailor their programs and planks to the beliefs and wishes of intellectuals. Politicians also remember that television producers and newspaper editorial writers now listen carefully to intellectuals.

Third, and partly for this reason, politicians are recruiting more intellectuals out of academic life and placing them in government operating positions. However they may perform in these jobs, the long-run effect is to lend additional weight to the general intellectual criticisms of "the way things are".

The fourth change I wish to treat is the improvement in the lives of many American Negroes. While it remains significantly below that of whites, their average per capita income has at least doubled since 1945. The civil rights movement, successive federal civil rights laws, and a combination of very practical political and economic pressures have helped many Negroes.

All reasonable people have sought to improve the Negro's condition. The painful irony of the Negro's situation is this: Improvements have replaced hopelessness with hope, hope has stimulated action, but some of that action has, in the last three years, been directed against the very system that produced the improvements.

The civil rights movement had at least three shortcomings. At its high point, it was essentially a Southern activity, aimed at correcting perceived injustices in the South. While much of the federal legislation it produced was politically popular with Northern Negroes, it had practical effect only in parts of the South.

Second, the goals of the movement were largely middle-class goals. Middle-class Negroes who already had jobs and homes tried to achieve some of the amenities of American life: Better education, the dignity that would come from integration, the right to form an effective voting bloc.

These objectives did not mean very much to some of the poorest Negroes in the Northern cities. They did not have decent jobs or decent housing, and whether they knew it or not, their greatest immediate need was money.

After the original goals of the movement had been achieved, it began to lose momentum. Some middle-class Negroes lost interest. Many of them, and certainly most whites, enjoyed increasing prosperity through the 'sixties.

Third, the civil rights movement broke old laws as it tried to force passage of new laws. While the tactic worked, it did little to increase respect for the idea of obeying the law.

Thus, maybe in the eyes of the poorest Negroes, things began to look something like this: Everyone was getting richer except them, whites and middle-class Negroes did not care about them, the politicians kept talking about things getting better but things never did, the civil rights movement broke some laws and it looked like that got results for some people. Maybe some other kind of direct action would get results.

We have seen the flaming manifestation of this kind of thinking in the last three summers. The old civil rights activity has largely disappeared. An entirely different kind of Negro, from an entirely different way of life, has made his presence known by looting, burning, and occasionally creating some very dangerous organizations.

The paradox was that as things got better for most people, this very fact increasingly irritated those at the bottom who did not care much about the idea of law and order anyway. It would be redundant to list

the damage that has been done to our orderly processes of government and politics.

The final change to discuss is the rise of television. The total number of television sets in the United States jumped from 10,000 in 1946 to over 74,000,000 today. While Gutenberg's revolution (the invention of movable type and, hence, of cheap printing) took several hundred years to complete, the comparable television revolution occurred in an astounding fifteen years.

It may seem surprising to give television the same weight as the other presumably far more basic social changes. But there is much hidden in Marshall McLuhan's epigram: "The medium is the message." Television is so important because it has so dramatically told Americans the stories of post-war American life (and the Vietnam War). The drama has amplified the consequences of the stories. Consider the fact that stories like these have never before been told with such great emotional power to so many people.

Television tells stories directly. The stories overwhelm television editors and newsmen. The most experienced television news editors cannot overcome the emotional impact of ten seconds of film. Mere words go unnoticed beside the films of fire hoses and police dogs turned against Alabama civil rights demonstrators, of university "teach-ins", of GI's being killed and wounded in Vietnam, or of the funeral procession of the first American president to die in the television age.

In contrast to newspaper journalism, it is far harder for a television editor to balance a story, to moderate it, or to "tell the other side." There is no way to balance the emotional impact of these ten seconds of film. The viewer says to himself, "I saw it happen." Equally dramatic pictures showing "the other side" of most stories just do not exist. The television counterpart of the newspaper copy editor cannot say, "I've seen this all before" and relegate the story to page fourteen.

But, like newspaper journalism, television journalism still must define news as that which is new, unusual, emotionally compelling, or different. Thus, the country receives powerful amplification of events that are different, unusual, strange, frightening, or bizarre.

The cumulative effect of television is huge and only beginning to be understood. Great numbers of people absorb most of their public affairs impressions from it. Television has always been the major source of breaking news in the lives of people twenty-five years old or less. Millions of Americans are daily seeing raw events immediately and starkly. The events may be only a part of a battle, a contrived civil rights demonstration, or a planned campus absurdity. But the explanation, the counter-argument, the facts that place the dramatic film in perspective are seldom available until tomorrow's program—when they, in turn, are overshadowed by tomorrow's fresh news.

I think one result is quick politics. People are quickly forming strong emotional reactions to events and to public officials. One could argue that since television, more emotionally charged opinions are held by more people on more subjects; more people draw conclusions before they have enough facts. Public passions run higher.

When asked if agitators took part in a big city riot, one experienced newspaperman replied, "Television is the agitator." He may have been right. The pictures could not show why it was happening or what it would lead to. But a summer of pictures had shown what was happening now. Maybe they moved some people out into the streets.

At a time when our domestic problems are more tangled, and our foreign affairs far more perilous, television may be inducing Amer-

icans to make increasingly hasty and oversimplified judgments.

Finally, television publicizes the results of the other changes I have mentioned.

III

The combined social changes we have considered have produced an enormous amount of social criticism. Of course, there have always been critics and generally they have helped the country to keep its balance. But it is probably safe to say that at no previous time have so many Americans—from all walks of life—been exposed to so much searching criticism of so many fundamental aspects of our civilization.

I submit that things are *not* in fact worse than ever before. In many respects they are better than ever before. I submit that what has actually happened is that more people are getting more attention when they say that things are worse. While not minimizing the very real difficulties we face, I suggest that a large part of what is wrong with America is a state of mind produced by constantly reiterated criticism.

You might ask, why talk about the critics? Why not just try to solve the problems they identify? To which I answer, of course, we must try to solve the problems. The country was built by solving problems. Most of us make our livings solving problems. But part of the basic point is that the critics make their livings criticizing. *They will always discover new things to criticize faster than we can discover new solutions.* And changing America now produces new critics at an accelerating rate.

I believe the net effect is damaging.

For example, whether or not one believes that the United States had a real choice when we committed a significant army to Vietnam in 1961, an informed man cannot deny that trying either to win that war or to negotiate a conclusion to it are made infinitely more difficult by the criticism directed against the American government by Americans. Begun by some professors and news media, then taken up by a handful of senators, the critics now even include some businessmen. Our foreign adversaries take this criticism to mean that we are irresolute and that our internal dissension can eventually force us to withdraw.

For example, whether or not one believes that the police have occasionally used excessive force, a reasonable man cannot deny that a decade of charges of "police brutality" have injured police morale, created substantial public doubt about all police work, and actually encouraged the lawless. Begun by people who sought perfectly proper goals the criticisms of police were shortly reinforced by politicians with obvious interests. Then they were echoed in the streets—where they could not help but encourage violence.

For example, whether or not one approves of every person in what the critics call the "establishment" leadership of government, business, military, church, labor and education, a thoughtful person cannot deny that many years must now pass before all Americans will confidently accept most decisions of that legitimately selected leadership. Criticism of the "power elite" or the "power structure" began as an abstract academic analysis. It merged with furious criticisms of particular men. The result grew from attacks upon named authorities to rather startling attacks upon the very idea of authority itself.

You may ask, even if all this is true, what relevance does it have for business?

I hope that the answer is clear to each of you—first as citizens and second as businessmen.

Constantly reiterated destructive criticism tends to create a national mood. Right now that mood is bad. The man who is repeatedly told he looks sick may become ill. How much

national self-analysis, unnecessary guilt feelings, and harsh criticism of fundamentals can be absorbed without producing a kind of public hypochondria?

The critical mood almost certainly cannot be turned just to the advantage of one political party against the other, or turned to the advantage of any candidate of either party against another. The mood is, to some unknown extent, destructive of all our political institutions.

Its effects almost certainly cannot be confined to domestic affairs. The strains of costly foreign engagements are, in all truth, likely to continue for many years. And make no mistake about it, our foreign opponents are using their greatest skills and energies to turn our self-criticism against us.

Therefore, whatever your personal politics, as citizens you cannot welcome the present deeply critical mood.

Secondly, and on a much less vital level, the mood of national self-criticism can be turned directly against business. It was in the 1930's and it can be again.

Examples of the transition from a generalized criticism to a concrete impact upon business are easy to find. Ralph Nader symbolized a familiar and possibly trite example. Even if one believes—as I do—that the auto industry should have given greater attention to the accident injury problem, one can legitimately question the process by which the mood of some people was converted into a law for all people.

In the 1950's several young intellectuals on the staff of Averell Harriman, then Governor of New York, developed position papers on the auto injury problem. Let one of them tell the story as he remembers it:

"By the mid-1950's it was becoming evident that this overall (government approach to auto safety) problem could not persist. A matter of considerable public interest was in the hands of incompetents or worse. Some protest was inevitable, and it arose, in the natural course of events, among a small group of professional persons—lawyers, doctors, engineers, and public officials. Articles began to appear. *Intellectuals were doing their work.*"

In 1961 he wrote: "It would not appear that the industry is particularly conscious of the fact, but the belief is well established among *intellectually influential circles* in the United States that the automobile manufacturers are essentially indifferent, and sometimes even opposed, to traffic safety measures."

The young man joined the Kennedy Administration (he later took an academic position). He spurred on the politicians, stimulated articles, encourage Nader—then a close associate—and amplified his criticisms through his many journalistic contacts. The result, we recall, was a flurry of newspaper discussion of Nader's book, the television drama of Robert Kennedy challenging Fredrick Donner, and a piece of legislation passed in a remarkable hurry.

There are informed people who believe that general public interest in the subject was actually very low at the time the bill was passed.

One does not have to be a defender of the auto industry to suggest that the hastily enacted auto safety legislation will take years to unscramble or even interpret properly. This was a classic case of a generalized criticism being transformed, through some very deft political footwork, into a law whose value honest men may question, a law which was unquestionably adverse to business, all with only a modest amount of direct public involvement. Other examples from other industries will come to your minds.

⁴Daniel P. Moynihan, "The War Against the Automobile," *The Public Interest*, Spring 1966. Emphasis added.

Professor Schumpeter, whom I quoted earlier, concluded that intellectuals would eventually destroy capitalism. He believed that intellectuals, who after all are heavily subsidized by the business system, would plant widespread public doubts about it. They would, he felt, criticize the workings and propriety of capitalism so much that the voters in western nations would eventually vote to replace the system. One does not have to accept all of his pessimistic theory to recognize the great and growing long-run political power of intellectual criticism.

IV

What can any of this have to do with business contributions to civic, educational, welfare, or charitable activities? My answer is very blunt: Because of these considerations and in its own long-range interest, business should redefine its thinking about contributions. Contributions should cease to have essentially a public relations motive. They should become explicit programs of *vigorous strategic action for business*—not merely individual actions for individual firms, but at times collective actions in response to those who challenge the business system in general.

There are three key words here: *vigorous, strategic, and action*. By action, I mean that business should make certain that its own people are on the scene when the vital decisions are being made. This does not require that businessmen hold government jobs, for voluntary civic activities still exercise a great influence upon basic social changes. Contributions of money and executive time to them establish and maintain legitimate access to the people and institutions who make the decisions. Except for direct participation in politics itself, business has no better means of influencing the social forces and the criticisms we have discussed.

The second key word is *strategic*. This suggests that the day may be gone when corporations can afford to contribute large amounts to all charitable and welfare activities. It may now be necessary to focus much more closely on those few selected activities and organizations which have the closest relationships to vital social changes. My argument suggests that nowadays the most strategically important of them include education—especially at the college and university levels—welfare and charity as they influence the attitudes of youth, and race relations activities of all kinds. If I have correctly identified the more important factors, then it may stand to reason that business should concentrate its efforts where they will count the most.

The final key word is *vigorous*. This means that businessmen will have to stop avoiding controversy. They must themselves follow their money into some of the most angry and difficult problems the country faces.

Let us be candid about it. Over the years business contributions have been quite bland. Businessmen have sought to give money to causes no one could criticize and have tried to do it in a way objectionable to no one. In the short run, and if the motive was public relations, this seemed to be good practice, for it could anger no potential customer. In the long run, however, avoiding controversy also avoided concrete results. Sometimes it meant that when the chips were down, the business representative was not present at the decisive meeting or, worse, that he remained silent.

My own research in the 1950's showed that, with a few notable exceptions, businessmen avoided race relations civic activities because they were called "too controversial." If the subject was "too controversial" then, a decade ago, what has it become now? I am convinced that business know-how and resources could have helped to prevent what has now become a crisis of sharply polarized

attitudes. What will race relations be in another ten years, especially if business executives do not study and deeply involve themselves in the problem we all share? (Study and involvement will require much catching-up. Listening to a few Negro spokesmen—whether militant or moderate—or reading a few books will not suffice.)

Another area in which businessmen should consider taking certain risks is higher education. For example, a contribution to a college might just be accompanied by the mild question: What are the broad social, economic, and political consequences of what you are teaching?

As a former professor, I can think of no single act better calculated to arouse a professor's rage than to ask him if his work is good for the country. While it is barely possible that some silent university president or a harried dean or two might secretly admit, in the privacy of a locked room, that it could be wise to evaluate what is being taught, the tenured professors would surely cry "academic freedom" and a war of words would commence. (One can imagine the headlines in some other newspaper: "*Detroit News Stifles Academic Freedom*", or "*Publisher Urges Thought Control*".)

But is this not astounding? Is it not remarkable that an activity as vital to the preservation of the nation as higher education should be regarded as almost the exclusive province of the educators? Can we imagine a lawyer saying that only he could define the substance of the law; that judges, legislators, or the public must stay away? Can we imagine a policeman saying that no civilian could question his personal interpretation of the criminal statutes?

The professor has several legitimate answers. One is that while other people provide practical services, the scholar searches for truth. Only the scholar possesses the skills and standards required to test for the truth. Now this is doubtless correct when disconfirming a theory of physics, or identifying the authorship of a sonnet. But it would be nonsense—and probably a contradiction of his own political faith—for a political scientist to declare that he had a monopoly on political truth—or on how to discover it.

Another professorial retort is that the scholar must not be harassed for expressing unpopular views. It is just here that the most difficult judgments must be made. Where is the proper boundary between what one man calls "harassment" but another man calls orderly consideration of the goals of higher education? Where is the proper balance to be struck between the scholar's unquestioned need to speculate with impunity and the nation's need for some degree of moral and social cohesiveness?

If we reconsider our own history, we recall that free public secondary education was really *invented* in the United States in order to solve a grave social problem of the 1800's. The problem was to teach masses of immigrant children something of English, of ways to make a living, and of behavior appropriate to Americans. It was a case of designing education to achieve a purpose, then recruiting people to do the educating. Contrast this case with what we sometimes see today; we begin with college professors and design courses and curricula around their professional, personal and—I must add—political interests.

By now, you have surely gotten my point. It is very controversial for a citizen to question the substance of the higher education system for which he is partly paying. But does this make sense? Would it not be worthwhile to accept the controversy once in a while?

Corporate contributions to other activities could also be followed by tough questions. When the welfare agency distributes benefits,

does it stimulate or discourage job-seeking? How do we really know? Are the recipients actually being induced to adopt middle-class standards of behavior? But is this not partly our goal? Does the program for Negro youth provoke racist attitudes as it tries to build Negro pride? Is this necessary? There are many more questions to be asked.

Like most Americans, business people have tended not only to avoid controversy but to defer to "experts". In the matters we have considered, this has meant that they have often abandoned their own judgments in favor of those who appeared to possess superior technical knowledge. Thus, professional welfare men, professional educators, professional civic workers, and professional community relations people have guided the substance of programs vital to all of us.

Now a healthy respect for expertise is certainly wise. Surely professional experts are best able to provide technical knowledge of technical matters.

However, business deference to experts in social, economic, and political matters has sometimes gone beyond delegation to abdication. At times businessmen defer to the experts when what is really needed is their own judgment, wisdom, prudence, or a general sense of purpose, direction and propriety.

While it is probably true that only a chemist, for example, is qualified to predict what will happen when two reagents are mixed, it is manifestly not true that only an academic sociologist is qualified to express a preference about what *should* happen in a difficult social problem. Quite the contrary, a strong case can be made that people best qualified to set goals for a community are the people most intimately involved in its daily practical life. Obviously it would be arrogant nonsense to suggest that this group is composed solely of businessmen. It includes executives of all sorts: Politicians, government officials, trade union officers, interest group executives, educational administrators, and many more. But it would be equal nonsense to accept the idea that somehow businessmen are not qualified to play a vital part in the question-asking and goal-setting process. They should not retreat from the controversy that really active participation and questioning would produce.

It is time to start asking the questions no one asks. It is time to stop assuming that someone else knows more about what is good for your community than you do.

v

We have seen that unequal prosperity, huge college enrollments, growing respect for intellectuals, improvements for Negroes, and television have combined to produce a national mood of self-criticism. We have suggested that too much self-criticism can be injurious. We have implied that if the critics and their criticisms are put into proper perspective, and if enough time can elapse, men of good will can solve the problems we face.

At a time in our history when people seem closer to anger, more prone to disagree, and when they are more critical of each other than ever before, we need leadership at least as much as we need criticism. We need people who can calmly synthesize reasoned actions as much as we need analysts of theories. *We need men who can do much more than take ideas apart; we need men who can get people together.*

Businessmen are not, of course, the only ones who fit this description. But they are among those who fit it. Human leadership remains one of the highest of the arts. The successful businessman surely knows something of that art. There is much more he can do in our joint effort to build better communities and a better nation.

THE 1967 SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Prof. Helen M. Wallace, chairman of the division of maternal and child health at the University of California in Berkeley, commenting on the provisions of H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

I feel her comments deserve careful consideration for she is deeply interested and highly qualified in the public health field. In addition to her services at the university, Professor Wallace has served in administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children in the New York City Health Department and for the U.S. Children's Bureau. She has also been active in the American Public Health Association.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Wallace both compliments and constructively criticizes this legislation. I commend her letter to our colleagues' attention by inserting it in the Record at this point.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, Berkeley, Calif., September 26 1967.

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to some proposed federal legislation and some federal reorganization of services for mothers and children.

My background is relevant to the comments in this letter. I am a certified specialist in both Pediatrics and Public Health. I worked for twelve years in key administrative positions in local programs for mothers and children, including handicapped children, in the New York City Health Department. I have been the Chairman of the Department of Preventive Medicine in a medical school in New York City. I was at one time on the staff of the U.S. Children's Bureau. I have held elective and appointive positions in the American Public Health Association, and have served on advisory committees to programs in the federal government and to a number of voluntary agencies serving the handicapped.

My specific comments for your consideration are as follows:

1. H.R. 12080 has a number of desirable features in it

(a) The provisions of additional funds for the extension and improvement of general health services for mothers and children.

(b) The consolidating into a single program of the programs for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children, and the eventual inclusion of Programs of Maternity and Infant Care, of Children and Youth, and for Dental Care.

(c) The support of programs designed to recruit and train professional personnel, and subprofessional aides.

(d) The support of programs of research in the field of Maternal and Child Health and to Crippled Children. Training of competent personnel to conduct such research is essential.

(e) The emphasis on training for productive employment of adult family members receiving public assistance.

(f) The provision of day care for children of working mothers.

H.R. 12080 does have several detrimental provisions or limitations in it, which need further consideration:

1. The fact that it combines appropriations for maternal and child health and crippled childrens programs, while the recent reorganization within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare separates the administration of these programs.

2. There is need to require that steps be taken to assure *high quality* care of children and youth under Title 19 programs. Our observations indicate that while the cost of Title 19 programs is likely to increase, there have been no safeguards developed to assure that the children and youth will receive the kinds and quality of services needed, such as has been provided in the past by the Crippled Children Programs under the Childrens Bureau.

3. The restriction in the latest draft of H.R. 12080, placing a limitation on the proportion of children who can be included in AFDC (Aid To Families With Dependent Children) Programs. If we truly believe that children represent the future of our country, it is inconceivable that some of the children from the most deprived families requiring the most assistance will be intentionally prevented from securing it.

The situation in regard to the reorganization of federal services for mothers and children is even more distressing.

1. I believe that MCH (Maternal and Child Health) and CC (Crippled Childrens) Services are inseparable at the *local* level, where one delivers care to mothers and children. MCH and CC Services are intertwined to primary and secondary prevention, in providing continuous health supervision to stimulate case finding of handicapped children and in providing continuous health supervision to provide long term care of handicapped children. Also, school health services provide health care to "well children", children suspected of health problems, and handicapped children. To separate MCH and CC Services means the likelihood of fragmentation and some duplication.

2. I believe at the federal level there is need for one strong centralized agency which will be the health and social agency for mothers and children, and will be the spokesman for mothers and children of our country. I believe that the reorganization will weaken rather than strengthen this.

3. I believe that the reorganization at the federal level is practically impossible to implement at state and local levels. For example, in 34 States of our Country, CC (Crippled Childrens) Programs are located in and administered by State health departments. In most of these, the State MCH Director is also the State CC Director. How can one possibly anticipate a smooth functioning of state and local programs, under this proposed reorganization?

I understand that these questions and issues have evoked a large number of reactions and responses from all parts of our country. Based on this, it would appear that much more thought, deliberation, and study of these and other aspects are strongly indicated before any further decisions are made. If I can be of any service in regard to this, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,

HELEN M. WALLACE, M.D.,
Professor and Chairman, Division of
Maternal and Civil Health.

ARAB NATIONS COMMITTING ATROCITIES AGAINST JEWS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. FARBEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBEIN. Mr. Speaker, while the chiefs of the Arab nations complain piteously of the fate that has befallen them as a consequence of their own aggression, they are themselves committing atrocities against mankind, the likes of which the world has not seen since the days of Nazi Germany. The Arabs are taking out their frustrations against the Jewish minorities that live in their own countries. The victims are Jews who had absolutely nothing to do with the recent Arab-Israeli war. I feel that our own Government has given insufficient attention to this inhuman behavior. In an effort to be fair to all the parties in the recent war, our Government has somehow seen fit to pay no attention to the atrocities committed by one of the parties.

I am inserting into the RECORD a report of the statement from the Chief Rabbinate of Israel which describes this brutality, and I implore our Government to come to the aid of these innocent Jews, so that they may once again live in peace.

The Chief Rabbinate of Israel appealed today "to the conscience of all mankind" to demand an end to "the reign of black terror" that has been unleashed against the Jews in several Arab countries and for which the governments of those countries are held directly responsible.

The appeal, signed by Chief Rabbi Isser Untermann, will be distributed to thousands of churchmen, public figures and heads of humanitarian agencies. It details the "daily torture, beatings and humiliations" suffered by Jewish citizens of the Arab countries, often at the hands of former Nazis.

"All Jewish men in Egypt have been imprisoned, including the seriously ill," the Chief Rabbinate declared. "In Cairo harsh restrictions have been imposed upon Jews who have not been imprisoned. Those that are imprisoned have had their hands and ribs broken, their hair shaven and their eyebrows pulled out. In some cases they are in the custody of ex-Nazis who have found a haven in Egypt."

"Synagogues have been seized and prayers proscribed. The Chief Rabbi of Alexandria is in prison and Cairo's Chief Rabbi is under house arrest as is the president of the Ashkenazi Jewish community. In Syria, Jewish quarters have been attacked by mobs and a curfew has been imposed on the ghettos which are threatened with starvation. Damascus Jews have been thrown out of their homes which have been given to Palestinians. In Iraq, dozens of Jews have been arrested on trumped up charges of spying for Israel and police have extorted money from Jews. The secret police has begun to threaten Jews with expropriating and murder."

"The severe loss of life, liberty and property sustained by Jews," the Chief Rabbinate's statement continued, "are the direct result of governmental responsibility. Attempts by international agencies to halt or at least modify the reign of terror have been contemptuously rebuffed by the Arab governments concerned. Therefore," the Chief Rabbinate stated, "we direct this passionate appeal from Jerusalem to the conscience of all mankind to raise its voice and demand instant action to stamp out this inhuman, cruel and uncivilized wave of oppression directed against our people by governments that give lip-service to the United Nations Charter."

THE FREEZING OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AND CIVILIAN CONSTRUCTION AWARDS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, the actions by the Department of Defense which froze military construction contracts and the order from the Secretary of the Army which froze civilian construction awards affects every Member of this distinguished body.

For that reason, I would like to present in detail the facts which I brought out at a press conference on Wednesday, October 11, relative to this issue.

I called the press conference as a result of the colloquy which occurred between Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and me when he testified before the House Armed Services Committee last Tuesday to explain why these contracts have been frozen.

I insert here in the RECORD the content of my press conference which will speak for itself, beginning with my statement:

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

STATEMENT OF F. EDWARD HEBERT, DEMOCRAT OF LOUISIANA

Ladies and Gentlemen: Yesterday, during the appearance of Secretary McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee, I engaged in a colloquy with the Secretary in which I stated that the Secretary "by a devious approach, gave instructions to the Corps of Engineers relating to civil works projects." (P. 24)

These instructions resulted in the suspension until further notice of all contract awards on new civil works construction.

Secretary McNamara flatly contradicted my statement and challenged me to present any evidence which would support my allegation.

Secretary McNamara disclaimed any knowledge whatsoever of the suspension order on the public works program by saying—"I don't have the authority to take such action. I am not responsible for it."

The Secretary further stated that the field of civil works not only lies outside his area of responsibility but is one "entirely outside of my field, under law . . . I have no legal responsibility for it and no knowledge and experience with respect to it." "In the seven years I have never discussed the civil functions with any Secretary of the Army. . . . The law is very clear. The Secretary of Defense has no responsibility in that area. I pay no attention to it."

In short, the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any legal responsibility in this area and therefore maintained that he was totally unaware of this action by the Secretary of the Army and said—

"The first I knew of action in that field was when I read it in the newspaper."

Now, I wish to point out why I reached what I consider an all together "reasonable conclusion" that the Secretary of Defense was a party to this public works action.

(a) Contrary to the categorical statements of Secretary McNamara, he is not precluded by law from jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Secretary of the Army. As a mat-

ter of fact, quite the contrary is true. In that connection, I would like to read a legal opinion relative to the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense:

"NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

"Washington, D.C., March 27, 1953.

"Legal opinion re the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense

"At your request, we have considered the scope, quality and degree of the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to all officers, organizations and agencies of the Department of Defense, including the respective Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all other officials, officers and personnel of the Department as a whole and of all constituent parts thereof.

"We have examined all pertinent statutes, the legislative hearings, debates and reports leading up to the enactment of the National Security Act and to the subsequent amendments thereof, basic documents in the delineation of responsibilities within the Department, such as the Key West and Newport papers, numerous studies, opinions, reports and commentaries on the subject matter and various views on the operation of the Department by individuals familiar therewith, including the letter to the President by Secretary Lovett of November 18, 1952.

"Conclusion

"In our opinion, the Secretary of Defense now has by statute full and complete authority, subject only to the President and certain specific restrictions subsequently herein listed, over the Department of Defense, all its agencies, subdivisions, and personnel. To make this statement perfectly plain, there are no separately administered preserves in the Department of Defense. The Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all officers and agencies and all other personnel of the Department are 'under' the Secretary of Defense. Congress has delegated to the Secretary of Defense not only all the authority and power normally given the head of an executive department, but Congress has, in addition, expressly given the Secretary of Defense even greater power when it made the Secretary of Defense 'the principal Assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense.'

"To repeat, subject to the President and certain express prohibitions against specifically described actions on the part of the Secretary as contained in the National Security Act, as amended, the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense is complete and supreme. It blankets all agencies and all organizations within the Department; it is superior to the power of all other officers thereof; it extends to all affairs and all activities of the Department; and all other authorities and responsibilities must be exercised in consonance therewith.

"Discussion

"It is always possible for individuals who do not agree with the purposes and intent of a statute to engage in semantic sophistry and to try to squeeze unintended meanings out of words. Many have done so in connection with the power and authority of the Secretary of Defense. Statutory interpretation is not an esoteric pursuit reserved for word-splitters. It is not a game of words. It involves nothing more than a straightforward and direct effort to ascertain the intent of the lawmakers. With respect to the National Security Act, the congressional intent is clear and unmistakable. Nothing more is necessary.

"Since this congressional intent is clear, word splitting should be stopped. It is most difficult, perhaps impossible, to write law so as to preclude the possibility of some indi-

vidual bent upon intellectual gymnastics from raising some semantic argument. The courts have repeatedly disregarded that approach and sought the statutory intent.

"The National Security Act clearly establishes and determines that the power of the Secretary of Defense is of the highest order of magnitude in the Department of Defense. The law does this in such manner and with such finality as to eliminate any reasonable doubt. The statute accomplishes this in three ways.

"First, the law designates the Secretary of Defense as the 'head of an executive department of the Government.' This phrase 'head of an executive department of the Government' was not a chance expression. It is a phrase of 'legal art.' Since July 28, 1789, this terminology has always been used by Congress in the statutes defining the responsibility and authority of the chief officer of each executive department. The phrase 'head of an executive department of the Government' describes the highest order of authority and responsibility in an executive department. In the vernacular, this phrase means 'boss.' For instance, the complete authority of the Attorney General of the United States over the Department of Justice depends on this phrase alone.

"This phrase 'head of the department' carries with it in tradition and in law certain well-recognized connotations. By custom and by usage the 'head of the executive department' is a member of the Cabinet of the President, and as such, is the officer of the department most closely associated with the source of supreme power. In law, the 'head of the executive department' is the one, among all officers in the entire establishment, who may prescribe regulations for the governance of the whole department. The basic statute of 1789 provides that the 'head of the department' (and this refers to all departments) has the power to: 'prescribe regulations for the government of the department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it.'

"Such regulations, when not contrary to a specific prohibition of law, of themselves have the force and effect of law. Therefore, the regulations of the head of the department legally bind under oath all officers and employees of the department of whatsoever authority, rank, or station. This right to govern the department appertains to no other officer save the one designated as the 'head.' In the Department of Defense only the Secretary of Defense by law is 'the head thereof' and has the general right to govern the Department of Defense.

"Second, the National Security Act, as amended, specifically states that the Secretary of Defense shall have 'direction, authority and control over the Department of Defense.' Originally, the statute contained the word 'general' in front of these three words of command. In the period 1947-49, this word 'general' was seized upon by some to argue that the drafters of the statute had intended to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense. Such argument was obviously without substance, but to make their intent doubly clear, Congress in 1949 struck out the word 'general.' The words 'direction, authority and control' are clear enough by themselves, but to make doubt impossible, Chairman Vinson, of the House Armed Services Committee, stated in the congressional debates as follows:

"This sentence giving the Secretary direction, authority and control is the heart of this legislation. * * * In order that there can be no doubt as to what direction, authority and control mean, I want to give you their meaning.

"Direction means the act of governing, management, superintends.

"Authority means legal power; a right to command; the right and power of a public officer to require obedience to his order lawfully issued in the scope of his public duties.

"Control means power or authority to manage, to direct, superintend, regulate, direct, govern, administer, or oversee.

"So under this law the Secretary of Defense is to have clear-cut authority to run the Department of Defense."

"After such legislative history, can anyone honestly doubt the congressional intent? If the Secretary of Defense has the power to 'govern, manage and superintend'; if he has the 'legal power to command and to require obedience to his lawful commands'; if he has the power to 'regulate, to administer and to oversee'; and if this power is specifically by its terms extended throughout the Department of Defense, as it is, then, the Secretary of Defense has supreme authority in the Department of Defense and his power is of the highest order of magnitude therein.

"Third, Congress in the National Security Act made the Secretary of Defense 'the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense.' These are words of potent authority, for, the President under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief. And, the Secretary of Defense is thus made the Commander in Chief's deputy in all matters relating to the Department. The legislative history of this provision also shows beyond the possibility of challenge that Congress was well aware of the distinctive constitutional command relationships between the President and certain officers in the Department of Defense. Under this power, then, the Secretary of Defense is the highest military officer of the Department.

"The fact that statutes have been passed subsequent to the 1949 amendments to the National Security Act which statutes confer specific authorities on a Secretary of a particular military department or other subordinate officer of the Department does not detract from the supreme authority of the Secretary of Defense. Once supreme authority is established it need not be repeatedly mentioned. On the contrary, it would require a most specific and emphatic statement to restrict or detract from the supreme authority conferred on the Secretary of Defense in the basic statute, the National Security Act, as amended.

"Limitations on the supreme power of the Secretary of Defense are few and are specifically cataloged in the National Security Act. They are—

"(1) The Secretary of Defense may not exercise his power so as to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate the combatant functions of the military services. The scope and definition of what is meant by 'combatant function' are carefully spelled out in the law. Congress did not intend that such scope be enlarged or diminished by reading into the statute what is not specifically there.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense may not indirectly accomplish what is directly forbidden in the first paragraph by either:

"(a) detailing or assigning personnel, or

"(b) directing the expenditure of funds.

"(3) The Secretary of Defense cannot merge the three military departments or deprive the Secretaries of those departments of their legal right to administer their organizations, subject to his power and authority.

"This prohibition is reinforced by the affirmative provision that 'the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be separately administered by their respective Secretaries under the direction, authority and control of the Secretary of Defense.' The argument that the words 'separately administered' detract from the 'direction, authority, and control' of the Secretary of Defense is without substance on its face and obviously is contrary to congressional intent.

"Separately administered' simply means that the Secretary of Defense cannot exercise his supreme power so as to destroy the separate entities of the three military departments, or deny them the right to operate in the spheres assigned to them by the law, or deprive their respective Secretaries of their top administrative position over their respective departments.

"(4) The Secretary of Defense cannot use his legal power to establish a single commander of all the Armed Forces; an operating military supreme command over the Armed Forces; or a supreme Armed Forces general staff. This prohibition on the exercise of the Secretary's power and authority is expressed in two places in the National Security Act. It is provided for in the preamble to the statute and in a phrase to the effect that the Secretary may not 'establish a military staff.'

"The legislative history of the statute shows unmistakably that the prohibition 'he shall not establish a military staff' was never intended by the Congress to operate as a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Defense to establish in his own office such staff units or agencies as he felt might be necessary to assist him in carrying out any responsibilities to him under law. The Secretary of Defense has full power, expressly granted in the law, to set up such units and to staff them with either civilian or military personnel as he chooses. Everyone familiar with the background and legislative history of the National Security Act knows just what Congress meant by the term 'military staff.' The general staff type of military control, as it existed in Germany, has been explained, defined, and attacked in Congress often enough. That form of military staff is completely different from the employment by the Secretary of assistants, either as individuals or grouped into organized units, to advise and assist him. There is no limitation upon the type of problem or subject matter which the Secretary may assign to such assistants or units. Such problems, in the Secretary's discretion, may involve engineering, standardization, weapons evaluation, program review, physical audits and inspections, or whatever else the Secretary may choose.

"(5) The Secretary of Defense may not transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate a specific function assigned by the National Security Act or some other law to another officer or organizational segment of the Department, unless he first reports his intended action to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress. It should be noted that only a report, not prior approval, is required.

"This language clearly presupposes that the Secretary of Defense, as head of the Department of Defense, has the authority to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate functions within the Department, as long as the Secretary does not violate one of the above specified limitations upon his general power.

"(6) The following provision of the law is not really a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Defense, namely the provision that nothing in the statute shall be construed: 'to prevent a Secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress, on his own initiative, after first so informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.'

"This provision needs no further elaboration.

"The six foregoing limitations are all the specific restrictions placed upon the supreme power of the Secretary of Defense to exercise full and complete control over the Department of Defense.

"There remains for discussion only one further question. Does the fact that various laws, some passed after the enactment of the National Security Act, vest specific statutory authorities in subordinate officers of the

Department in any way impair the supreme authority of the Secretary of Defense.

"These laws vesting specific statutory authorities in subordinate officers of the Department in no way impair the supreme authority of the Secretary over the Department. This is true irrespective of the time of passage of such laws.

"General provisions of supreme authority do not have to be repeated. As each executive department of the Federal Government has its own statutory head, its own internal administrative command structure, its separate statutory authorities, duties, and responsibilities and its individual traditions, customs, and usages, so also has the Department of Defense been cut from the same cloth. Presidential executive power flows over the separate independent departments and establishments of the Federal Government, is superior to, yet permeates the whole. So also the executive authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense flows over the agencies and organizations of the Department of Defense. No one at this date in our constitutional history would seriously advance the argument that because specific laws vest particular duties and responsibilities in the heads of executive departments, therefore the President does not have and cannot exercise supreme executive power over the entire fabric. The power of the Secretary of Defense is in the same relative position.

"In the study of the theory of executive power in the Government, it is quite normal and customary to find that powers of different magnitude are frequently exercised in the same area at the same time. This is true even though the power of one order of magnitude is derived from a specific law, whereas the power of the higher order of magnitude relies upon the words of general import or even upon the structure of the organization itself. There is nothing inherently strange, alien, or difficult in the concept of orders of magnitude in executive power in the Federal Government. Such orders do not mutually exclude each other nor do they operate in specific corners or tiny segments. They operate together. The higher order, however, when it is exercised in a given area, is supreme and overrides the lower order. Insofar as the power of the Secretary of Defense is concerned, there is no legal significance in the fact that various laws have been enacted from time to time vesting specific authorities in subordinate officers of the Department. The time of passage of these laws is of no importance.

"Summary

"To summarize, we are of the opinion that the National Security Act, as amended, grants to the Secretary of Defense supreme power and authority to run the affairs of the Department of Defense and all its organizations and agencies. We believe that the power of the Secretary of Defense extends to all matters arising in the Department of whatsoever kind or nature; that the statute provides that the power and authority of the Secretary are superior to the authorities possessed by any other official, officer, or member of the Department; that the Secretary's power in the Department is the superior power irrespective of when or how any other individual's power was derived. The limitations on the exercise of the Secretary's power are only six and they are specifically defined. These limitations have been discussed in detail herein. We do not believe they were intended by the Congress to go beyond what we have outlined.

"H. STRUVE HENSEL,

"Counsel for the Committee on Department of Defense Organization,

"ROGER KENT,

"General Counsel,

"FRANK X. BROWN,

"Assistant General Counsel (Departmental Programs)."

(b) The Secretary of Defense himself had previously acknowledged the existence of his responsibilities in this area by specifically delegating to the Secretary of the Army the "civil functions activities of the Corps of Engineers."

I will now read the Secretary's memorandum dated May 9, 1961:

"THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

"Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

"Memorandum for: Secretary of the Army.

"Subject: Delegation of Authority for Administration of Civil Functions Activities, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army.

"Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Defense by Section 202(f) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and Section 5 of Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, the authorities and functions vested in the Secretary of Defense by law, including Title IV, National Security Act of 1947, as amended, relating to the Civil Functions Activities of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, are hereby delegated to the Secretary of the Army.

"ROBERT S. McNAMARA."

(c) The news release to the Press announcing the action of the Secretary of the Army suspending civil works construction was issued through the Department of Defense.

I now present this release:

"OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY

OF DEFENSE (PUBLIC AFFAIRS),

"Washington, D.C., October 5, 1967.

"NEWS RELEASE

"The following information concerns U.S. Army Engineers Civil Works functions only.

"At the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers has directed all Division Engineers to suspend advertising and award of all new civil works construction until further notice.

"The order is effective immediately.

"Bids will not be opened until further notice on work which already has been advertised. Where bids have been opened, contractors will be asked to extend acceptance dates until October 23. New commitments in civil works research and development and new civil works hiring also will be suspended.

"The suspension does not affect operation and maintenance.

"No dollar figures or lists of locations affected are available immediately."

CONCLUSION

In summary, I think you will agree with me that any reasonable man would conclude that the Secretary of the Army would certainly apprise the Secretary of Defense of a pending action of this magnitude since it is clear that the Secretary of Defense, regardless of his delegation of authority, continues to have ultimate responsibility and concern with this subject matter.

In short, the Secretary of Defense can disclaim any knowledge of this action, but he certainly can not disclaim responsibility for it.

TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of this body an editorial which appeared in the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser, ex-

pressing the reaction of that newspaper to a recent action of the House Appropriations Committee. I think Members of this body should be aware that in the northeast corridor there is a great concern about the improvement of ground transportation and the need for the Federal Government to support research and development to find new solutions for its improvement.

STRANGE "ECONOMIZING"

The cries for economy in Congress take on an ironic sound in the aftermath of the Senate's action approving \$142 million to subsidize the development of a supersonic transport plane. Earlier the House, where the budget-cutters are even more vociferous, had approved the same sum.

The SST, in the words of one of its critics, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., will permit "one percent of our population to get to Paris in four hours instead of six." And the sonic boom it will create will probably limit its use to over-water routes exclusively. Nevertheless, Boeing Aircraft, the plane's developer, wants it; a host of potential subcontractors want it; the airlines want it; and the Johnson administration and Congress persist in pouring money into it.

The same bill included funds for a far more significant—and far less costly—program than the SST. This is the high-speed ground transportation research program, which seeks to find ways of moving large numbers of people swiftly and efficiently on the surface, thereby helping relieve the urban areas of the growing congestion of auto traffic below and commercial air traffic overhead. To the Senate's credit, it voted to restore all but \$1.7 million of the \$8.3 million slashed from this program by the House, although it is too bad the Senate could not bring itself to fully fund the intriguing auto-train demonstration project.

A share of the credit for the Senate's action goes to New Jersey Transportation Commissioner David J. Goldberg, who delivered a personal plea for the fund restoration before a Senate appropriations subcommittee. It is important now that, in the House-Senate conference on the appropriations bill, the Senate conferees insist on retaining the ground-transit funds. To cut them—while retaining the \$142 million for the SST—would constitute an incredible botching of priorities.

SHE GIVES POVERTY RACKET A MORE SUNNY VISTA

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a truly heartening and revealing story about a VISTA project in the Nashville, Tenn., area appeared in the Minneapolis Star on October 12, and I would like to share it with my distinguished colleagues. One of the young VISTA volunteers discussed in the article is Miss Joyce Hewitt, of Walnut Grove, Minn. As described by the Star's editorial editor, George L. Peterson, Miss Hewitt—known as "Sunny" to her poverty neighborhood friends—is making a meaningful personal contribution to success in the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many of my colleagues, including those who harbor

the notion that antipoverty projects contribute to violence, will take the trouble to read Mr. Peterson's excellent article, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

SHE GIVES POVERTY POCKET A MORE SUNNY VISTA

(By George L. Peterson)

NASHVILLE, TENN.—When the Vista girl from Minnesota, clad in a yellow outfit and usual bright smile, rode her Honda to her assignment in a poor Negro suburb last spring the young folks asked her name.

"Joyce Hewitt," she announced.

"It don't fit," one said, and all agreed. Let's call her Sunny."

That not only fit—it stuck. So Sunny she is to 123 admiring Negro families in a pocket of poverty called Providence, just outside Nashville.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Hewitt of rural Walnut Grove, Minn., interrupted her education at the University of Minnesota (psychology and pre-med) to join VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps. She was sent to Atlanta, Ga., for indoctrination, then on to Nashville.

Soon she was joined in her Providence project by Linda Robinson, a medical secretary on a year's leave from her Philadelphia job with Scott Paper Co. Commuting from Nashville proved a time-consuming chore, so they moved into half of a double bungalow on Alice Road, a rocky path up a steep hill bordered by shacks where women sit on the porch and look into space.

What are the white girls doing in Providence? Teaching people to read and write for one thing. Mr. Gray, at age 76, could do neither. Sunny started tutoring him this summer and now he can make out simple words in his Bible, and write laboriously, "I love Jesus."

The girls prod youngsters—prone to truancy from inadequate neighborhood schools—to catch up with their classmates. Particularly ill-equipped are some of the Negro children thrust suddenly into integrated schools.

Most exciting undertaking for the entire community is a recreational center for which the cement blocks and other materials already have been gathered. Construction is scheduled for next month, mostly with donated labor, and then the activities now crowded into the girls' apartment will have permanent shelter.

Providence startled and warmed me when I spent a day with Sunny and Linda. Of the 123 families, about half have no visible fathers. Yet children abound—up to a dozen per house. Almost no one is on relief. Mothers and older girls work as domestics at \$6 a day. The men are laborers mostly, some skilled in the building trades. A few sell produce on the highway that cuts through the settlement.

Only a couple of the dwellings boast indoor plumbing, and one of these belongs to George Davis. He obviously could afford to live elsewhere but he likes the camaraderie and the rough yet attractive terrain of Providence. He and Sunny and Linda have revived the Providence Progressive Civic Club, which long had planned for the recreational center, then ran out of steam.

Mr. and Mrs. Davis were holding a fish fry to raise funds for the center. Never have I eaten better prepared food—a big slab of fish, hush puppies, French fried potatoes, cole slaw. Price: 65 cents. Davis and the girls figured they had in hand about \$400 of the \$1,500 cash needed for the wiring, plumbing and other items for the new building.

Somebody in Nashville suggested that federal funds could be found for the structure. "Nothing doing," said the club officials. The people of Providence want a stake in the center. "Then we'll be more likely to keep

things going when Sunny and Linda leave," Davis explained.

The girls are gathering books for the center. The Nashville Metropolitan Action Committee, sponsors of Sunny and Linda, will provide various programs there. "We'll need a birth control clinic," Davis told me.

That's apparent. The illegitimacy rate must be close to 50 per cent. The great fear of high school girls, and of many of the older women, is pregnancy.

Yet for all the promiscuity, Providence is a conservative, church-going community. Sunny and Linda were accepted wholeheartedly once they proved they had no connection with any Black Power movement, for above all else Providence wants peace. The place is a strange combination of pride and poverty, of hospitality and ignorance, of laughter and tears.

Do Sunny and Linda feel safe in this environment? They frequently are asked. "Never felt so well protected," they answer, almost in unison.

Men in the neighborhood have pledged guardianship. The only hint of trouble came when some white youths drove up tortuous Alice Road looking for "those Vista girls." The Negro youths soon edged them out of Providence, peacefully but firmly.

Sunny and Linda's main concern is the eventual day they must leave Providence, for the ties are strong. After only a day, I could share their sense of attachment.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN POWER-PLANT: A CLARIFICATION

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement recent newspaper accounts regarding the inability of the House and Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill for 1968 to agree on the wisdom of appropriating final, preliminary funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School public power project in Maine. I would like to make two points clear.

First, while it is true that the site of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln powerplant is in northernmost Maine, this proposed powerplant is viewed as a southern New England project for the reason that it would be built to serve the three southern New England States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

Second, while it is true that the House has refused to authorize or to appropriate funds for Dickey-Lincoln on the ground that it would provide no redeeming water resource development benefit to compensate for its inordinate cost and continuing tax loss, I and others have consistently opposed Dickey-Lincoln on the ground that it would provide these three southern New England States with high-cost power.

Mr. Speaker, in September 1965, when this House rejected the Dickey-Lincoln authorization by record vote of 207 to 185, I voted against it because the Federal agencies' figures then showed that the cost of Dickey-Lincoln's output delivered wholesale to utility systems in Connecticut would be not less than 1.4

cents per kilowatt-hour. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the cost of power delivered wholesale to purchaser systems in Connecticut, including tax costs, was 0.88 cent per kilowatt-hour.

In July 1967, when this House rejected the final Dickey-Lincoln planning appropriation by record vote of 233 to 169, I voted against it because the findings of our own, independent, committee experts showed that, if built, the cost of Dickey-Lincoln's output delivered wholesale to utility systems in Connecticut would be not less than 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour. Mr. Speaker, due to rate reductions effected by private industry in Connecticut since 1965, today the cost of power delivered wholesale to purchaser systems in Connecticut is less than 0.88 cent per kilowatt-hour. It is scheduled to decline even further in the future.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to add one final point. Many of my constituents are indignant at the prospect of having to pay increased taxes to meet the mounting cost of Government and to minimize the inflationary impact of a \$29 billion Federal deficit. I would like to take this occasion to emphasize that I will never willingly vote to require my constituents to pay increased taxes to be used to finance an economically foolish undertaking costing well over a third-of-a-billion taxpayer dollars which would provide them with high-cost power. I shall continue to oppose the Dickey-Lincoln powerplant on this as well as on the other grounds indicated.

SECRETARY RUSK'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in a press conference last week, Secretary of State Dean Rusk provided a brilliant summation of American policy in Vietnam that answers many of the criticisms and questions directed toward the administration on this urgent matter.

I would hope that those who have been clamoring for quick solutions to this war, or who have been skeptical of the administration's sincerity in trying to obtain a peaceful solution, will carefully read the Secretary's statement of last Thursday.

I hope also that those who have been calling for a bombing pause will consider the Secretary's answer that:

When people talk about a pause in the bombing, they should know that Hanoi calls a pause "an ultimatum."

I think the Secretary's statement should go a long way toward clarifying the real issues involved in the American presence in Vietnam. His statement should satisfy most reasonable Americans that the United States is conducting a responsible policy aimed at protecting South Vietnam from aggression, while pursuing every possible avenue toward a peaceful and honorable settlement.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SIGNS SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a White House ceremony, President Johnson signed into law the Small Business Act Amendments of 1967.

In remarks at this signing, the President had some profound words about the need for his tax surcharge proposal. Mr. Johnson emphasized that to the businessman a soaring interest rate "is public enemy No. 1."

He rightly noted that it is the businessman who feels high interest rates first, hardest and longest.

And while acknowledging that no businessman welcomes a tax increase and that no President relishes proposing one, the President suggested that:

Most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The President reminded us all that his tax measure "will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses, large and small, to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper."

And he concluded:

I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

Under unanimous consent I insert the full text of the President's remarks:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON SIGNING S. 1862, SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

America itself began as a small business. The first Virginia settlers came to these shores as a joint stock company.

As the Nation grew, so did the shops and factories that gave it commercial life. The earliest American dream—of being one's own boss in a land of unbounded opportunity—has remained a pillar of our economic strength.

Today, 95% of the businesses in the United States are small. They employ 4 out of every 10 of our wage earners. They provide a family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Through the Small Business Administration, your Government helps small businesses to grow and prosper. The neighborhood furniture store, the machine shop downtown, the new manufacturing plant in a depressed rural area—these and thousands of other small businesses have been given life through loans generated by the SBA.

Such loans have also helped many disadvantaged citizens take a productive role in our national life. Over 5000 men and women with the will and talents and energy for business—but blocked by poverty—have started the road to success with SBA help.

Businesses ravaged by flood or disaster have been restored.

All this has meant better products for the consumer. It has brought jobs and broader opportunities.

The bill I sign today—S. 1862—shows this Nation's faith in the future of small business.

It continues and expands the many worthwhile programs administered by SBA.

It allows SBA to make more loans from its own funds, up \$650 million to a new high of \$2.65 billion. No increase in appropriations is involved.

It extends from 10 to 15 years the repayment time for construction and renovation loans.

It improves the Small Business Investment Companies which provide a vital flow of private capital to small businesses.

It enlists the services of more retired businessmen, so that their still valuable skills and knowledge can be made available to greater numbers of small concerns.

It will help to bring more businesses and more jobs into the ghettos, through lease guarantees. This is a vital part of our new program to engage private industry in special job training programs for the hard-core unemployed.

It launches a comprehensive study of ways to protect the small businessman against criminal acts which endanger his business and often his life.

This bill, in short, strengthens the helping hand America extends to the Nation's small businessmen.

But I must point out that it becomes law at a time when the business community is imperiled by the threat of tight money.

To the businessman, a soaring interest rate is Public Enemy No. 1.

It affects all commerce, but its harshest impact falls on the little man who runs a small business.

He feels it first.

He feels it hardest.

He feels it longest.

The tax surcharge proposal now pending before the Congress can work to remove this threat.

No businessman welcomes a tax increase. No President enjoys proposing one.

But I believe that most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The tax measure I proposed last August will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses large and small to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper.

I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

When that is done, the full potential of the bill I sign today will be unlocked.

Ours is a land where individual enterprise is highly honored. And the bill recognizes that no investment pays greater dividends to the taxpayer than this—to give a man the tools with which he can shape his own success.

PABLO CASALS AND MELINA MERCOURI

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in Sunday's Washington Post that the world's greatest cellist, Pablo Casals, is going to

conduct his oratorio "The Manger" here this Saturday night. This will be his first public appearance in Washington, D.C. Paul Hume's sensitive and moving article about this great man points out that his composition is a plea for world peace and understanding among peoples.

Pablo Casals is universally admired for his magnificent artistry, but even more important, he is revered for his uncompromising stand against the oppression of people by dictatorships. He has never performed in Spain since Franco destroyed the Spanish Republic. The gift of his musical genius is not available to those who murder freedom. As Mr. Hume stated:

This magnificent man's entire life has been concerned with two things: music, and the world's unrest and injustices. In protest to what he regarded as the intolerable dictatorship of Generalissimo Franco, Casals left his homeland late in the 1930s, never to play there again. In 1917 he had turned his back on Russia, and, again in the '30s, on Germany and Italy.

When he saw many countries either turning to dictatorial regimes or recognizing Franco's rule in Spain, Casals cut himself off from nearly all of the world's great concert stages upon which he had, for half a century, been one of the towering figures of musical history.

Pablo Casals turned his back on Franco Spain, but not on his people. Franco could not make him less passionate about his beloved Catalan. Nor can the present dictators of Greece make Melina Mercouri less passionate about her people and their suffering. Stripping her of her citizenship and her property makes her no less a Greek and Casals a Catalan. America is enriched to have this great Greek woman performing in our theaters. We are also indebted to her for the devotion and tireless effort she expends in behalf of her people who are in jail, and those who will go to jail if they try to exercise any of the liberties which are the essence of democracy.

It was shocking to me to read in the same issue of the Sunday Washington Post that carried Hume's article about an interview with the present Ambassador of Greece. He said, when asked about Miss Mercouri:

The American people should be very happy—they were eager to get her and now they have her. We have plenty of actresses who are younger and better equipped than she is.

I should like to say publicly to the Ambassador that we are indeed happy to have her.

If our country had existed, I hope we would also have welcomed Socrates when he was denounced for speaking the truth. We do not censor the Greek playwrights of the Golden Age as is being done in Athens today because words like "freedom" and "liberty" might unduly excite the populace. All the world pays homage to Greek thought and culture, to the genius of the idea of democracy. I should think it would be humiliating to a Greek to know that his country's greatest men are censored, and that the birthplace of democracy has now become a prison for those who believe in it.

On a less lofty note, I am disappointed to find out that the present Greek Am-

bassador is not, least, gallant. Unfortunately, Ambassador Xanthopoulos-Palamas chose to make a snide remark unseemly to a gentleman rather than to meet the issue that Miss Mercouri raises about what has happened to her country. I do not know her age, and could care less; I am not sure what the gauche remark about "equipment" means. Miss Mercouri's years have as little to do with her artistry as do Casals', and I point out that he is 91. Miss Mercouri is a world-renowned actress. Millions of Americans consider her a beautiful woman not only in the physical sense but in her spirit, her integrity, and her devotion to freedom for her people.

Mr. Speaker, with permission granted, I place in the RECORD immediately following these remarks the thoughts of one of our most respected political commentators, Mr. Marquis Childs, regarding the current situation in Greece, from a recent column in the Washington Post. I deeply regret that the RECORD is unable to carry the great Herblock's political cartoons on the same subject.

The article follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN GREECE TODAY?

(By Marquis Childs)

What is happening in Greece today would be a farce if it were not a tragedy. Aristophanes and Sophocles might have collaborated, with some help from a far-out television script writer, to put together the scenario being played out in Athens. The military dictatorship is notorious not so much for its cruel repression as for its bumbling incompetence. And the lurching from side to side, which at times makes the operation look like a Mack Sennett comedy, causes acute dismay in our State Department. Policy in the Department is premised on the wistful belief that somehow the colonels and the generals will get the show back on a constitutional track.

Greece is in many ways a dramatic illustration of the poverty of American policy. Having put close to \$4 billion into the country to save it from communism, the end result is a dictatorship by a military junta with fascist attachments that is now saying, if you don't send more help the Communists will get us.

The colonels and the generals would have rejoiced if they could have heard the oratory on the House floor the other day. No less a luminary than L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, championed Greece as a loyal NATO ally with a commitment by the United States to Greek security.

The occasion was a measure approving loans of American war vessels to a number of countries. This is a phrase of the military aid program which like death and taxes has achieved perpetual status. The United States has on loan to Greece two destroyers and a submarine and the only conclusion from Chairman Rivers's oratory is that these vessels are essential to the defense of the West.

Voices were raised in protest, suggesting that it might be wise at least to see the direction of events in Greece and whether there was any chance for a new constitution with a deadline set for Dec. 15. Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), arguing the need for a debate on American policy toward Greece, pointed to the latest instance of the junta's folly.

Mrs. Helen Vlachos is the courageous publisher of two Athens newspapers. A conservative, she refused to publish under the censorship by the military after the coup on April 21. To publish would simply have meant

carrying the official line of the dictatorship both in the news and on the editorial page, and this in all conscience she would not do.

Two weeks ago Mrs. Vlachos talked to newspapermen in her office. She attacked the regime, charging they had failed to live up to a promise to restore freedom of the press. This interview appeared in an Italian newspaper. Later a team from CBS went to Athens to film an interview with Mrs. Vlachos for the "Face the Nation" program.

Promptly she was put under house arrest, her apartment searched by the military, the threat of trial by a military court for insulting the government held over her head and her husband, a naval hero out of World War II, also under arrest. The maximum sentence could be eight years but it is believed the outcry around the world will at last mitigate her punishment.

With the State Department privately expressing its unhappiness at this zig, the junta promptly took a zag in the other direction by releasing George Papandreou, the venerable former Premier who is one of the few figures commanding wide popular esteem.

As this was going on two prominent Greek officials—Dimitrios Galanis, governor of the Bank of Greece, and Constantine Thanos of the Ministry of Coordination—were calling on government and international loan officials to assure them that everything was lovely in Greece. Despite what they reported as an 8 per cent drop in tourism the pair presented figures to show that, thanks to the closing of the Suez Canal, receipts from Greek shipping are up and the fiscal position of the country improved. While, according to officialdom, they made no pitch for more help, 53 House members signed a letter saying that any move to restore aid would do "most serious damage" to America's position in the world.

Some Americans who were in Greece this summer are saying that the people seem happy. Gas station attendants and hotel clerks say they admire the regime. This sounds a bit like the visitors to Italy in the early days of fascism who were so pleased to find that the trains ran on time.

Military aid is a swamp that once in there is almost no way out. It creates dependencies that go on forever with the bogey of communism held up in a perpetual halloween.

FREE PRESS MEANS MUCH

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, newspapers mean a great deal to all of us. Newspapers play a vital role in thousands of communities across this great land. They provide us with a living record of events that shape the very destiny of this Nation. Newspapers keep us informed; they entertain us and enable us to enjoy the highest living and information standards in the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial published by the Sand Mountain Reporter, of Albertville, Ala., on October 12. This editorial pays tribute to our newspapers, who celebrated National Newspaper Week October 8-14. It sets forth, in excellent fashion, the importance of keeping our press free.

The editorial follows:

FREE PRESS MEANS MUCH

Newspaper Week! October 8 to 14. Probably the most impressive way for the public to learn what newspapers mean in their daily lives would be to have no papers printed during Newspaper Week—but that is not practical.

The hometown paper is the living record of what happens in the thousands of communities across the land—marriages, births, deaths, social activity, politics, school news, legal notices, advertised products to inform customers, world news, everything that enables the U.S. citizen to be familiar with the latest devices and products by which he enjoys the highest living and information standards in the world.

But over and above these material blessings, a free press, which is the background of free speech, is the average man's guarantee of personal liberty, religious freedom and protection against political and judicial persecution. Dictators are afraid of a free press, hence they have a controlled press. The people read only what their rulers wish them to read. Try imagining if you can, what it would be like to live in a country where an editor dared not print a letter criticizing the political party in power, and where an editor feared to express an adverse opinion. Think of what a free press really means to you—life, freedom from political oppression, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under our Constitution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON), for October 16 and 17, on account of official business.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for October 16 and 17, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. OLSEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of his attendance at the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations as an official member of the U.S. delegation.

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. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on October 17, 1967.

Mr. HUNGATE, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUBSER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 60 minutes, on October 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. BROWN of California.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, joint resolution, and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 362. An act for the relief of Sofia Dorr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 552. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide that committing acts dangerous to persons on board trains shall be a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 772. An act for the relief of Dr. Violeta V. Ortega Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 948. An act for the relief of Seaman Eugene Sidney Markovitz, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1147. An act for the relief of Mariana Mantzios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Dr. Brandia Don (nee Praschnik); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1440. An act to include in the prohibitions contained in section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, the transportation with unlawful intent in interstate or foreign commerce of traveler's checks bearing forged countersignatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Marguerita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrick Bellido Lliteras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Miss Amelia Sersely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1828. An act for the relief of Susan Elizabeth (Cho) Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Lisa Marie (Kim) Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1865. An act for the relief of Bertha Iturriz Archa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Ernesto Garcia y Tojar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1979. An act for the relief of Carlos Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2005. An act for the relief of Dr. Anacleto C. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2022. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Jose Ramirez DeEstenoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2023. An act for the relief of Virgilio A. Arango, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio M. Tagle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2078. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto De Jongh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Whang-Peng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2119. An act for the relief of Dr. Octavio

Suarez-Murias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2139. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Trejo Padron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2176. An act for the relief of Dr. Edgar Reinaldo Nunez Baez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2192. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2200. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2216. An act to establish a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2303. An act to provide a uniform system for fixing and adjusting the pay of employees in recognized trades or crafts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as "Spring Garden Planting Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of certain hearings of the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 12, 1967 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3973. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and the act of June 6, 1892, relating to the licensing of dentists in the District of Columbia, to exempt from the licensing requirements of such acts physicians and dentists while performing services in the employ of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General;

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, October 17, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1158. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army,

dated July 20, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Fall River Harbor, Mass. and R.I., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 31, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1159. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D.C., transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the 68th national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held October 1-6, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 240-77, (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ordered printed with illustrations.

1160. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunity for savings by adopting manufacturers' recommended preventive maintenance programs for interagency motor pool vehicles, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1161. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Boulder Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., through December 31, 1977, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1162. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract authorizing the continuance of eating and merchandising facilities for the public within the Statue of Liberty National Monument, N.Y., for a 10-year period from January 1, 1968 through December 31, 1977, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1163. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 888. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1985. An act to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8407. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raquel Maria Cruz-Flores (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Ramon Palacios Sela (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9081. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10985. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida (Rept. No. 782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7890. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Quintos Marcelo (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11472. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina; with amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEN:

H.R. 13498. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 13499. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from \$200 million to \$500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13500. A bill to amend section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to permit grants after construction is commenced for basic water and sewer facilities which qualify for such grants but cannot receive them prior to construction because of the unavailability of funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13501. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 13502. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 13503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expense incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13504. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to permit payment of unemployment or sickness benefits thereunder to individuals receiving military retired pay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13505. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 13506. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13507. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 13508. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 13509. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS (for himself and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 13510. A bill to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13512. A bill to designate the Mount Jefferson Wilderness, Willamette, Deschutes, and Mount Hood National Forests, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13513. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 13514. A bill to designate the San Gabriel Wilderness, Angeles National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13515. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13516. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1959, relating to the Palm Springs Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 888. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear programs in the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 890. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 891. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal-aid highway program is vital to the national defense, to the promotion of interstate commerce, and to the furtherance of highway safety and that the full obligational authority granted by the Congress for that program should be used; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Con. Res. 533. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H. Con. Res. 534. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 945. Resolution relating to rescission of appropriations for civil supersonic aircraft development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

289. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to a Federal flood insurance program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

290. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the exclusive jurisdiction and control by the State of Florida in the management of its fresh water resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13517. A bill for the relief of Dionisia Anselmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13518. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cesari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13519. A bill for the relief of Aristine, Helen, and Anastasia Tsatsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13520. A bill for the relief of Pureza Ruiz Languisan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to erection of certain monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

177. Also petition of the mayor and City Council of Birmingham, Ala., relative to so-called adult films shown by the television

networks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

178. Also, petition of James F. Ronan, Chestnut Hill, Mass., relative to rights under the ninth amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. Also, petition of the Common Council of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., relative to declaring Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. Also, petition of city council, city of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the building of a powerful merchant marine fleet; to the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

181. Also, petition of the American Legion, department of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., relative to the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

182. Also, petition of the city of Rio Vista, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

183. Also, petition of the city of Sonoma, Calif., relative to a plan of tax sharing between Federal and local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Assistance for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the last 5 years have seen a historic emergence of mental retardation and the mentally retarded from isolation and public indifference. With their emergence from shame and misunderstanding have come great strides forward in helping the mentally retarded and his family. A condition considered inborn and irremedial until just recently, we now know that mental retardation can be ameliorated or aggravated, depending on such varied factors as conditions of pregnancy and socioeconomic environment of the child. It can even be avoided.

In 1966 President Johnson established a Committee on Mental Retardation whose findings have just been distributed. I was pleased to read of the successes in this field since the early 1960's.

Among these accomplishments are:

All 50 States—plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—now have a written plan for providing comprehensive services for the retarded.

Industry and Government are successfully using trained mentally retarded workers in such capacities as messengers, launderers, cleaning crews and assemblyline workers. Over 3,000 mentally retarded are now working in 39 Federal agencies. Only 3 years ago all such workers were barred from Federal employment through examination procedures.

State action has been a significant factor in the progress of prevention and treatment of conditions that can lead to retardation. Thirty-eight States now have laws prescribing tests for phenylketonuria for all newborn infants. Nearly all of the 50 States are conducting anti-measles campaigns. In one year alone, the number of measles cases have been halved.

Under the authority of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community

Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Federal, State, and private sources have combined to fund 12 mental retardation research centers, 14 university-affiliated, and 175 community facilities at a total cost of some \$190 million.

Many of the 77,000 mentally retarded children of the U.S. Armed Forces members are now able to receive help under the authority of amendments to the Dependents' Medical Care Act enacted by Congress in 1966.

Privately sponsored day care and recreational programs for the retarded are now available in many parts of the Nation. Local and State associations for retarded children alone sponsor over 300 day camps and 150 residential camps as well as more than 1,000 other recreational and social group programs.

Whereas in 1953 we had no special classes for the educable and trainable, we now have some 52,000 classes serving 677,000 pupils.

In 1963, some 6,000 mentally retarded were rehabilitated. This number is rapidly increasing. By 1967 it had increased to 19,000.

A new, truly promising program initiated in 1965 is the foster grandparent program. Here, older retired persons give their care and guidance to institutionalized children with remarkable results.

Mr. Speaker, life for the mentally retarded has taken on new promise since Congress passed major legislation in their behalf not quite 4 years ago. Over \$400 million a year is now appropriated for Federal programs benefiting the retarded. More than twice that amount is spent each year by the States, localities, and private citizen organizations. The result has been an extraordinary growth in the services which the mentally retarded and their families may call upon—an extraordinary growth in the hope that they may lead relatively normal and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, the millions of people who have put their energies and abilities into these programs deserve our gratitude and praise. Only through their efforts could such great advances have been made in so short a time. They—abetted by new forces—will continue to strive for the benefit of those afflicted by mental retardation. It is my hope that the next 5 years will bring more prog-

ress on the ratio of that made in these preceding 5.

Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding military man who made many valuable contributions to his country's welfare as well as to the welfare of New Orleans, which is in my congressional district.

Maj. Gen. Edward S. Bres, Sr., retired from the Army, died of a heart attack on September 24 in Bogotá, Colombia, where he was vacationing.

For me, it was not only the loss of a valuable citizen, but the loss of a dear friend. I served as a member of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission. General Bres was chairman, and he did an outstanding job in promoting and guiding this event to a successful conclusion after his appointment by President Kennedy in 1963.

A graduate of my alma mater, Tulane University, General Bres served as an Army engineer and general staff officer before his retirement in 1950. During World War II he served as deputy chief engineer and chief of the engineering project which rehabilitated the port at Darwin, Calif. He also was chief of the Joint Services Theater Liaison Group in San Francisco.

Toward war's end, he became chief of Reserve and ROTC affairs and his final Army service was with the personnel board.

General Bres had many friends here in Washington as well as business interests, and for that reason maintained a home here and a home in New Orleans.

He was a military and a civic leader. His passing is a great loss to this country and to the city of New Orleans, but his accomplishments will linger on.

My sympathy is extended to the members of his family on the loss of this fine individual. I am proud to say that he was my friend.