PRISONERS OF THEIR SKIN

"When I consider how my life is spent," thus, Milton begins his sonnet of his "Blindness". It is a pitiless thing to ask a man to consider how his life is spent. That is why, to me, Milton's line is one of the most poignant I have read. It is like asking a man to wrap himself in guilt, to tear himself apart with the rapiers of self-accusation, for who among us has been, without pause, on the side of the angels? A man must make his way, fulfill his ambitions, seek love and laughter, provide the bread, all for his own sweet sake. What more? Must we pick up each day and throw over our back like peddlers of old the bundle of the world's woes? War, poverty, crime, disease, illiteracy, woes thousands of miles away and woes just around the corner? No wonder, then, we seek the "island in the sun". Each morning the troubles removed from our own thresholds press in upon us.

Well, what do you do? Retreat with a shrug and a muttered "plague on all your houses?" Certainly there is an arguable premise that having lived our own lives responsibly and with a degree of integrity, we have discharged our obligation toward God and man, but there is an equally arguable premise that the dimensions of our lives are as flexible as time itself and that our hearts and minds will remain unsatisfied if we keep them rigidly in place to concern ourselves with that only which touches on our personal selves.

I think the key word in the second premise is "unsatisfied". In the final analysis, if we choose the road of participation we do an essentially selfish act lest we walk through the days of our lives forever hungry, our spirits starving on an island of isolation. There are so many needs in the world, can we try to fill them all? No, of course not. The answer lies in selectivity. We choose to attack that evil which shakes our conscience most, one or two or even three, as our capacities permit.

Being city born and city bred, I, for one, find I am most responsive to the anguish prevalent in the city streets. How could we have permitted this to happen? This ugliness in parts of our cities; this mass huddling in poverty in our ghettos, this forcing of a part of our people to be prisoners of their skin? I remember last Congress when the open housing provision of the Civil Rights Act came before the Judiciary Committee, of which I have the privilege to be Chairman, white people throughout the country shrank away from commitments they had made to civil rights. Mind you, this was before the multiple riots. When the finger was pointed sharply at the South, as it was in the 1964 civil rights proposals, we Northerners were vigorous, articulate and organized in support of these proposals. Religious groups, labor groups, professional groups—just name them and there they were demanding the passage of the 1964 package. In 1964, in response to that push, the civil rights legislation was enacted into law.

Contrast that with what happened in 1965 when the open housing proposal was unveiled. Silence. Silence from religious groups, the labor groups, the professional groups, etc. All we heard were the anguished cries of a "man's home is his castle". They were busy people, people like the real estate brokers, the builders, the landlords, and their white tenants. I cannot measure for you the dismay among the Members of the House when the open housing proposal was unveiled. Which weighed more heavily upon them—conscience or votes? I am proud of the House of Representatives because conscience won. The bill passed the House; it died in the Senate.

A new phrase gained currency—"white backlash". Do not be mistaken, there is white backlash and this is the major tragedy of our cities. We tell our Negro residents, "This is the line beyond which you shall not pass". Why? Because you are black, that's why. Does it amount to more than that? There are those who would say, "Yes, it does." The Negro is crime prone, irresponsible, illiterate, etc. What he is is dictated so, were we to have open housing economics would determine where the Negro seeks entry. The landlord screens out the white undesirable, just so can he screen out the Negro undesirable. As all economic groups do among the white citizenry of our country, the Negro will seek his own economic and social level. What is this all-pervasive fear? The point must be made over and over again. No man, woman or child shall be deprived of the equality of opportunity in any area of human activity only because of the color of his skin. I have said repeatedly, a man can change his religion, can change his wife, his profession, his trade, but no man can change the color of his skin. Yet, that is what we charged him with; accused, he stands before us, accused of not being white. And he cannot purge himself of the accusation. He cannot remove his guilt. He cannot become white.

There is, as has been said, "white flight to avoid the black flight".

What have been the economic and social consequences to those of us who live in the cities?

(1) A narrowing of cities' tax base as the middle class moves to the suburbs. Thus, where the tax money is most needed there is less of it.

(2) The further degradation of schools and housing.

(3) An island of glittering high rise office buildings with an inner rim of factories and filth and an outer rim of ghettos. I am reminded of a passage in Matthew noting our concern with making clean "the outside of the cup", assuming that such attention makes the "inside" clean as well.

(4) Highways glutted in the morning and in the evening, ingress and egress blocked for miles.

(5) A deepening and dangerous frustration on the part of city dwellers with the consequent increase in crime and violence.

These are all demonstrable facts. Just look. Look and see.

Mind you, I do not hold at all that no responsibility lies with the slum dwellers. Law and order are as necessary for him as it is for all inhabitants of this land. Riots are a form of self-indulgence and ultimately boomerangs. That we understand the reasons for the riots is important. That we do not use the *reasons* for *excuses* is equally as important.

I want to state this at this point because I do not want you to believe that I am an apologist for these riots. That is another subject and would take more time than you have to give me this evening. What I have endeavored to do is to underscore our responsibility. Our responsibility goes much deeper than economic deprivation. Economic deprivation of the slum dweller is one aspect Far greater is the self-respect for which the Negro in the ghetto has been robbed. His *social poverty* is shaped by our attitudes. From morning until night the Negro is rebuffed and humiliated. For the most part, these are not conscious acts on the part of white people. This is the greater tragedy. Unions fight to get the Negro out. This is more than economic jealousy. In the offices and in the stores, white personnel is preferred. But police brutality does exist.

You need only watch the performances in the clinics of our hospitals to note the difference in attitudes. You see those attitudes take shape in our subways, in our streets, in our restaurants, and in our theatres. We fear and are feared, and, yes, we hate and are hated.

It may seem to many of you that the civil rights bill, which I introduced, H.R. 5700, has lain dormant before the Committee. It has not. Because of a sullen climate which surrounds the phrase "civil rights", the Committee on the Judiciary has been acting on the bill piecemeal. One provision, the extension of the Civil Rights Commission passed the House, passed the Senate with an amendment. A conference may be necessary thereon. The protection of civil rights workers, another portion of the bill, was acted on favorably by the Committee and by the House of Representatives and has undergone many changes in the Senate. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported it out after a long fight and by a majority of one, though in pretty good shape. Report of the Committee will be filed by midnight tonight. I am not hopeful that it will be taken up on the floor of the Senate this session because there is a very definite threat of filibuster.

Two other sections of the bill on jury reform are now being actively processed by a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, and I have every reason to hope that this reform will be acted upon by both the House and the Senate. Two provisions remain untouched; namely, enforcement rights for the Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and open housing. You can well understand the reluctance of the House membership to act when having fought with moments of great bitterness for the open housing section only to have it killed in the Senate. It is now the feeling of the House membership that the Senate act first, lest once again the House engage in a futile exercise.

I frankly foresee no action on either of these two provisions for the simplest of reasons. The majority of our electorate is against it. Maybe some day we shall awaken to the old truths: "As we sow, so shall we reap."

Civil rights is not minority rights. It is rights up and among the major issues that plague all of us. Civil rights is not the march of the minority towards fulfillment of the American ideal; it is everybody's march. That realization will come sooner or later. If later, we shall have had to pay a merciless price for it.

Thus, you see I am totally committed. I do not ask that you make this the object of your commitment, nor do I ask that your commitment be total. I do not have that right. I can only suggest that the disengaged life is barren. The way to fulfillment is your choice. I hope you will choose.

Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Pickett Wesberry, D.D., LL.D., pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance.—Psalm 33: 12.

O God of all power and might, maker and ruler of men, whose invisible hand may be traced in the shaping of our Nation, we praise Thee this day for free and representative government.

We commend our Nation to the guidance of Thy wisdom and the keeping of Thy love.

May these whom the people of the various States have chosen to serve them serve Thee in honesty of purpose and uprightness of life, remembering always their answerableness to the people and their accountability to the people's God.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Uphold by Thy gracious omnipotent hand the President of the United States, the honored Speaker of the House, and each of these Thy servants.

With a love that makes for beauty and truth, a devotion to Thy ways of righteousness, and led by Thy Holy Spirit, may they help establish legislation to govern our Nation according to the laws of Thy kingdom which is from everlasting unto everlasting.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13048. An act to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 162. An act to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements;

H.R. 6418. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6430. An act to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 536) entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian school lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of $3.75 per acre to the Federal Government," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. FANNIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 830. An act to prohibit age discrimination in employment;

S. 1946. An act to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes;

S. 2029. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than 500;

S. 2330. An act declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States;

S. 2419. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. 2514. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District compact.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce the death of former Speaker of the House and former Vice President of the United States, John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, Tex.

Born November 22, 1868, Mr. Garner lacked only 15 days of reaching the age of 99 at the time of his death. He enjoyed fairly good health and was mentally alert right up to the end. He lived longer than any other Vice President, or than any former President.

John Garner was one of the truly great men who appeared on the American scene during the 20th century.

He was born in a log cabin in Red River County, Tex., 3 years after President Lincoln was shot. His early life was amid hardships and privations on the wild frontier. It was the age of the outlaws and gunslingers, and the Indians were being driven to the reservations.

Garner's early education was limited, but he possessed an active and inquisitive mind. He studied law and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1890. His first political office was that of county judge of Uvalde County, while Grover Cleveland was still President.

After serving two terms in the Texas Legislature Mr. Garner came to Congress in 1902, where he served with great distinction for 30 years. He was elected Speaker in 1931, became Vice President on March 3, 1933, and was reelected in 1936. He opposed the third term, bade Washington adieu, and boarded a train for his home in Uvalde, never to return to the Capital City.

During my many visits with Mr. Garner in recent years, he was often nostalgic in recalling the days he spent in the House of Representatives and as Vice President. He often spoke of JOHN MCCORMACK, EMANUEL CELLER, Lew Deschler, Carl Vinson, and others. He seemed very fond of Deschler, the Parliamentarian, and was always concerned about the well-being of all his old friends of bygone days.

Above all, Garner cherished his days as Speaker. He once quipped that when he switched from Speaker to Vice President, it "was the only demotion I ever had."

Mr. Speaker, there is no way of measuring the full value of the public service which was rendered to the American people and to our way of life by this great American. He stood as a symbol of stability and rugged character. In his legislative battles he asked no quarter and gave none. In debate and in conference his chief weapons were reason, logic, and commonsense, always respecting the public interest.

Mr. Garner belonged to the old school of rugged individuals who believed in the principle of balancing the ledger on Saturday nights. "Cut down on the spending," was the title of a feature article on Garner when his picture appeared on the front cover of the U.S. News & World Report on March 8, 1957. And he practiced what he preached, both in Government and in private life.

After leaving Washington Mr. Garner lived in the servants' quarters which was built in 1879, located behind his old home. The Garner home stands 50 feet from the street, amid giant oaks and towering pecans. This two-story brick mansion was built by Mr. Garner for his wife, the late Ettie Rheiner Garner. The building was donated to the city following Mrs. Garner's death in 1948, and is now used as a museum in her memory.

Garner's only child, Tully, lives across a driveway from where his father lived. In love and devotion, the son ministered to his father's every need during the declining years.

Mr. Garner knew the value of a dollar, and he accumulated considerable wealth during his lifetime. In recent years he gave most of that back to the community which had honored him so long. He often spoke of the debt he owed to those who had loyally stood by him during his long career. A popular State park, known as Garner Park was a product of his generosity. At one time he donated a million dollars in bank stocks to Southwest Texas Junior College, located in Uvalde, and he engaged in other philanthropies.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is much better off because John Nance Garner lived and served. The world is a little darker because his light has gone out. And the entire Nation mourns the passing of this great and good man.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MINK). The distinguished Speaker is recognized.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Madam Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of my dear and valued friend, John Garner, who was not only an outstanding legislator, but also one of the great Americans of our Nation's history. Throughout his entire lifetime, John Garner evidenced his intense love of America by the many contributions he made toward the strength and progress of our country.

John Garner's life was one that is typical of America. He took advantage of the opportunities that our form of government presents to everyone, and against great odds and difficulties, making every sacrifice necessary, he attained ambitions and goals that place him among the important figures of our Nation's history.

I had a close personal relationship with John Garner. When I was first elected to the House, he was the minority leader. He later became Speaker. I remember in my second full term, with trepidation I went in to see him. As a matter of fact, I did not know the Democratic leaders knew I was a Member of the House for the first 2 years. Apparently they did. I was one of those who

wanted to learn my rules of parliamentary law and, although not completely unheard, I conducted myself so that I was not aware the leadership knew I was actually a Member of the House during my first 2 years. I went in to see John Garner when we took over the House, and I went to see him with trepidation, to see if he would give me support for assignment to the Committee on the Judiciary.

My first committee assignments were Territories and Elections No. 3 and Civil Service. So with trepidation I went in to see him to enlist his assistance with reference to getting on the Committee on the Judiciary. I delayed coming down, because I was trying some cases in Boston, cleaning up some cases I had there. He said, "We wanted you down here. We wanted you to go on Ways and Means, but you waited until the last minute."

Of course, that was beyond my fondest dreams or ambitions, to get on the Committee on Ways and Means, with actually only one full term of service.

I said, "Well, Mr. Garner, I do not mind running and being defeated if at the outset I have a chance of winning." "But," I said, "I do not want to run just knowing I am going to be defeated, and if you will blow your nose at me I will go out and be a candidate."

He said, "You go and tell Billy Connery to send out a letter from the delegation for you."

Well, he blew his nose. So I did.

The first delegation that met and unanimously endorsed me for election to the Ways and Means Committee was the Texas delegation. I knew that was due to John Garner—to Jack Garner, as we called him—and Sam Rayburn. I have never forgotten it during all the years I have been a Member of the House. I have never forgotten the friendship that existed between us.

That is a little human interest side of what friendships mean, that I have spoken about so frequently both in Democratic caucuses and on the floor of the House. I have spoken of the friendships we make and how they transcend party politics.

So I am very, very sorry because the country has sustained in the death of John Garner the loss of one of our truly great Americans. I am also very sorry because of the personal relationship that existed between John Garner and me while he was Speaker and later Vice President and during the many years of his retirement.

I extend to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding on the occasion of this sad announcement.

If this lesser bird might seek to twitter while larks sing on high, as a representative of the current minority in just and deserved tribute to John Nance Garner, former Speaker of the House, former Vice President, a man of America who lived to be 90 and 9, I would presume to say indeed he did belong to all of America. He etched well into the history of this body and into the history of our Nation rugged individualism. He had the courage to stand for eternal principles in the face of the stares of all in high places, including his own.

As our friend from the hills of home, the Ozark Mountains in which I live, used to, with great love and appreciation, refer to Cactus Jack Garner, so do we, with all attribute, with all accolades and with all appreciation; join the distinguished gentleman who represents this district in expressing our sense of loss of a great Texan, another great American, as he is laid to rest.

Our sympathy goes to his entire family.

I should like to associate myself with the erstwhile words of the gentleman from Texas and the current distinguished Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FISHER. Madam Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(At this point the Speaker assumed the chair.)

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I came to Congress John Garner was Vice President of the United States—having just taken that office. I believe I found in him one of those practical men in politics who are necessary to make our Government function through various kinds of times.

He was far from a theorist. He was a practical man. His practicality sent him to Congress. His practicality kept him here and kept the U.S. Government on a good deal more even keel than it might have been had it not been for John Garner. As I see it, that was his great and unique contribution to American politics and to American history.

He served during a period of time when there was a tremendous change, and it was often a change for the good, but he recognized that change, even though it may be good, could come too fast. He always exercised the stabilizing influence, which is always needed in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Garner was probably better known in Washington than in his native Texas in later years because he spent so many years here that there was a second and third generation in Texas by the time he came home to spend his last years there. I think it was a source of great comfort to him that he was able to spend his last years in Texas in Uvalde. He always spoke of Uvalde as his home and he always mentioned his home and the people of that community.

We, his neighbors, probably cherished the hope that he might live to be 100. He almost reached that age. But far more than the idea of his being 100 years old, we were impressed with the fact that one of our neighbors had so considerably influenced history and influenced it for the good. Our whole country has suffered a loss in the loss of John Garner.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, nothing that I might say can possibly express the great loss that is felt by all of us with the passing of John Nance Garner. It is a loss beyond measure, deeply felt not solely by those of us who were privileged to know him personally but by all who know him. His name is inscribed indelibly on countless pages of our country's glorious history.

Nothing that anyone might say will add a fraction to his stature. The passing of John Nance Garner is like the passing of an era in our history that challenged our very existence as a free people, and we have now lost one of our national leaders who proved himself more than equal to the challenge.

A truly great American is no longer with us. The entire Nation mourns this loss. We pause here in an hour of sadness but we are inspired in the task before us from reflecting on the life and deeds of such men as this who so courageously met the challenges of his day.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, although it was not my privilege to be personally acquainted with that great Texan and former Vice President of the United States, John Nance Garner, I would like to join in this tribute to a man who I know was a truly great American.

John Nance Garner personified the spirit of independence and individualism that have made this country great. His homespun philosophy was simple and direct and could well be followed by some of those who today seem so confused as to what, if anything, they do believe.

John Nance Garner served his country well and set an example of integrity in both his public and private life from which we all benefit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to also bring to the attention of the House the death of the beloved former Vice President of the United States, John Nance Garner.

Mr. Speaker, there are many of us who have fond and affectionate memories of this great Texan, who spent so many years as a leading figure on the Washington scene. When I was elected to the Congress in 1928, John Nance Gardner was already a prominent figure in the Democratic Party and in the leadership of the House of Representatives. I had the honor of serving with Mr. Garner for 4 years before he was elected as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Vice President in 1932. This was a memorable experience.

Mr. Speaker, I feel particularly close to John Nance Garner since he was born in Red River County, near Detroit, Tex., in my home district. Mr. Garner grew to his young manhood in northeast Texas and we in the First Congressional District have always taken pride in our close relationship with one of the great statesmen of our era.

We share with all Texans and all Americans a fond memory of John Nance Garner.

Mr. Garner's career was a fabulous one by any standards. His entire life was one of public service. He was county judge in his home county of Uvalde and served in the Texas Legislature. Mr. Garner was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1902 and served there until his election as Vice President in 1932. He was the minority floor leader in the 71st Congress before

becoming Speaker of the House in the 72d Congress.

More importantly, John Nance Garner was a warm personality who brightened Washington for so many years. Those of us who had contact with him cannot forget his great sense of humor and his willingness to consult with and guide the freshman Members of Congress.

America has lost a great man, a great statesman, and a wonderful human being. Both Texas and the United States have been tremendously enriched by having a leader like John Nance Garner. We owe his memory much and I know that all of us here in the House of Representatives and our fellow Americans everywhere will miss Mr. Garner.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in taking note of the passing of John Nance Garner. Mrs. Mahon and I are grieved to learn of the death of Mr. Garner. In my book he was one of the Nation's greats.

His legislative finesse, his down to earth ideas of government, and his homespun philosophy are legendary. Texans can always treasure the memory of former House Speaker and Vice President John Garner.

When I came to Washington as a Member of the House in 1935, Mr. Garner was then Vice President and his counsel and advice through the years were invaluable to me.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today a great American, who once served as Speaker of this body, passed on. Former Vice President John Nance Garner, a Texan who served in the House of Representatives for 30 years, died this morning.

He had been a living legend in our time. He was a great man who rose from an extremely humble beginning in Red River County, Tex., and with a very meager formal education advanced to the second highest position that any American can attain.

During his years of public service, he experienced and took part in many great decisions and events. Certainly some of the highlights of his great career were attained during his service with the late President Roosevelt in bringing our country from the depths of a depression by initiating programs on which our country has grown into the greatest nation this world has ever known.

John Nance Garner rose to the highest counsels of our Nation and a position of eminence throughout the world, but he never lost contact with his native Texas and the hard-working Texans from whom he came.

"Cactus Jack" Garner was a frontiersman from the day he was born until he retired in 1941. The frontier which he faced changed, but the dedication and hard work that its challenges required remained the same. John Nance Garner has joined other great Texas heroes, but his patriotism and dedication will serve as an example for many future generations of Texans and Americans.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, our Lone Star State of Texas mourns the death of a great and distinguished native son, John Nance Garner.

His accomplishments, during a long and illustrious career, are legendary. He was, as his nickname "Cactus Jack" implies, as rough and rugged as the Uvalde land that he loved so well.

We, in Texas, are proud of our many sons who have left their mark on the course of world and national events. Ours is a strong land, and the strength of the land and the people is bred into these great men.

My colleagues know the distinguished background of this great statesman, of his battle to overcome educational shortcomings to become an outstanding lawyer, judge, Member and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Vice President of the United States. His was a career to rival the greatest of our leaders.

A few years ago, I had the great privilege to visit with John Nance Garner in his home in Uvalde. He had celebrated his 92d birthday. I found a man who had not sat idly by in retirement, letting the world and events pass him by. His mind was alert, brilliantly so. He discoursed on current events with a knowledge that only a full career at the fountainhead of action could have given him. He regaled us with tales of his years as Vice President, as Speaker, and as a Member of this great body. He set out in detail the facts of his opposition to the proposed "Supreme Court packing plan" which led to the deep split between him and President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His strength of body and mind at this great age of 92 was phenomenal. I recall one story he told of his first campaign for U.S. Representative. He stumped his district, as we all have done, soliciting votes from his constituents, for he was a relatively young attorney seasoned by a term as county judge of Uvalde County, and a term as State representative. And when he finished his speech, he pointed his finger at the crowds and added:

> And one more thing, he said. If you vote to send me to Washington to handle your affairs—don't you write me any letters telling me how to do my job. If you don't have confidence enough in me to do this job without being pestered with a lot of postcard advice—then I don't want your vote.

He said he got their votes, and less mail than any Member of Congress, which he rarely answered.

Mr. Speaker, we are privileged to sit in a Chamber where the great men of history have left their imprint. None, in my judgment, has been greater than "Cactus Jack" Garner. His passing will be mourned by all, and I extend deepest sympathy to his many close friends and relatives at this great loss.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from Texas and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of the late Speaker and Vice President, John Nance Garner—a great leader who became a legend in his own time.

John Nance Garner was a great Texan, a great American, and a rugged frontiersman popularly known as Cactus Jack. He went far in public life—and rose to great heights and yet he retained his humble spirit. John Garner saw America and its problems through the eyes of its people.

At the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1940, I had the privilege of meeting John Nance Garner and Sam Rayburn with the Texas delegation. At that time Garner was considered a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President following his service as Vice President for two terms. Judge Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, was also being considered for the nomination. Although President Roosevelt chose Henry Wallace as his Vice-Presidential running mate for an unprecedented third term, Jack Garner, of Texas, never lost his place in the hearts of his countrymen.

He lived a long and useful life and was a great American.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD concerning the late John Nance Garner.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OCTOBER MOTORCAR SALES SHOW THAT GERMAN-MADE VOLKSWAGEN PLACES THIRD IN AUTOMOBILE SALES IN AMERICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspaper reports of October automobile sales show that the German-made Volkswagen placed third in automobile sales in America with 41,661 sales.

Only Chevrolet and Pontiac managed to outdo the Volkswagen in attracting the American consumer.

The American automobile manufacturers should be concerned with the sharp increase in automobile imports. Apparently, there is a strong market in America for a sturdy, economical automobile of unchanging design for some Americans who simply want economic transportation. Evidently 750,000 car buyers each year—almost 1 out of 10—place these considerations ahead of the gasoline burners currently designed in Detroit.

Almost any day now, we can expect the automobile manufacturers to plead for import limitations to choke off the growing desire for economy imports. As a better alternative, they should contemplate meeting the needs of this market either by producing an acceptable economy car or by manufacturing the foreign favorites in the United States under license. The import quota system should never be used to force-feed the American people into accepting something they do not want.

THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER WINNER OF ALBERT LASKER MEDICAL RESEARCH AWARD

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see in the morning Post that one of our colleagues has been announced as the winner of the annual Albert Lasker Medical Research Award. The Member to whom I refer is our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, CLAUDE PEPPER.

He was born and reared in my congressional district in Alabama and I claim him as my constituent.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate him for having brought this honor to the House of Representatives, and to himself, an honor that is richly deserved by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I join with the gentleman in this word of tribute to a man whose presence casts a ray of light over this Chamber. We are all happy for this honor to our colleague. It is an honor richly deserved.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I want to join with my distinguished majority leader in praise of my colleague from Florida. He has not only served with distinction in the other body but he was then elevated to come over here where he is continuing to do fine work not only for Florida but for the Nation. I congratulate Congressman PEPPER.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. I have said many times that he is one of the greatest orators on Capitol Hill and I wish we could hear him more often.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to join in extending warm and sincere congratulations to our distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, on being chosen as a recipient of the Lasker Award. These awards, known as the Albert Lasker Medical Research Awards, are given annually and are worth $10,000 each. The Lasker Public Service Award was given to Congressman PEPPER for his support of medical legislation. Honored with him are Dr. Bernard B. Brodie, of the National Institutes of Health and Dr. Robert Allan Phillips, director of the Pakistan-SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory.

We in Florida have long known of the great humanitarian interests of Congressman PEPPER and of his contributions for the good of mankind in many fields. It is stimulating to realize that his fine efforts are so widely recognized and that he has been chosen for this distinctive and outstanding award. I congratulate Congressman PEPPER and the other distinguished recipients for this outstanding achievement.

Under unanimous consent I include in the extension of my remarks news items from the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Evening Star:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 7, 1967]

TWO SCIENTISTS WIN LASKER AWARDS—REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER ALSO NAMED TO RECEIVE HONOR

(By Robert Reinhold)

A physician who developed a highly effective treatment for cholera and a pharmacologist whose research has influenced drug therapy were named yesterday to receive the 1967 Albert Lasker Medical Research Awards.

The physician, Dr. Robert A. Phillips, director of the Pakistan-SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory in Dacca, East Pakistan, was awarded the Clinical Research Award for his treatment, which has reduced the death rate among cholera victims from 60 per cent to 7 per cent.

The pharmacologist, Dr. Bernard B. Brodie, chief of the Laboratory of Chemical Pharmacology at the National Heart Institute in Bethesda, Md., received the Basic Medical Research Award for his 30 years of research into what happens to drugs taken into the body.

Cholera is an intestinal disease spread through the contamination of food or drink by bacteria in human sewage. The bacteria cause catastrophic vomiting and diarrhea, and often death from dehydration, if not treated. The disease, almost unknown in Western countries with modern sanitation, is still widespread in Asia.

BODY FLUIDS REPLACED

Dr. Phillips, a 61-year-old retired Marine Corps physician, developed a technique for replacing the body fluids in cholera victims. The withered patient is intravenously fed sodium bicarbonate and saline solutions continuously until he begins to hold the liquids and gain strength.

The $10,000 awards, given annually for achievements in Medical research by the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, will be presented at a luncheon at the St. Regis Hotel on Thursday. The recipients were introduced to newsmen yesterday morning during conference at the foundation's offices at 866 United Nations Plaza.

Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat of Florida, was chosen to receive the Albert Lasker Public Service Award for his interest in medical legislation over 30 years in both houses of Congress. This award also carries a $10,000 honorarium.

Dr. Phillips, a soft-spoken Iowa-born physician said at the news conference that his feeding technique was so simple that it could be applied by persons without medical training. The chief drawback, however, is that treatment of the average cholera patient costs about $50—the equivalent of five-month's salary in developing countries, where cholera is most prevalent.

Dr. Brodie was cited for studies that have profoundly influenced treatment of cardiovascular diseases, mental disorders and cancer.

Asked at the news conference what he regarded as his most significant work, the 58-year-old British-born scientist told of his findings that human response to drugs differs little from animal response if the amount of drug in the blood rather than the dose taken is used as the basis of measure.

Many drugs, he said, are metabolized, or broken down, at "fantastically different" rates in different animals. Therefore, he said, drug responses must be rated to the concentration of the active ingredient at the site in the body to be acted upon rather than on the over-all dose.

These findings, Dr. Brodie said, raise important questions about the practice of testing new drugs on animals before humans. A substance effective in humans, he said, can be passed up because of its low activity in animals. As an example, he cited phenylbutazone, a drug effective against rheumatism in humans but almost inactive at comparable doses in animals.

NIH AIDE AND PEPPER WIN LASKER AWARDS

The winners of the annual Albert Lasker Medical Research Awards, worth $10,000 each, are Dr. Bernard B. Brodie, of the National Institutes of Health and Dr. Robert Allan Phillips, director of the Pakistan-SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory in Dacca, East Pakistan.

The recipient of the Lasker Public Service Award is Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), for his support of medical legislation. The awards anounced yesterday, will be presented at the Lasker luncheon in New York on Thursday.

Dr. Brodie is being honored for his "extraordinary contributions to biochemical pharmacology" and the use of drugs in treatment of heart, mental and emotional disorders and cancer. He is chief of the Laboratory of Chemical Pharmacology in the National Heart Institute.

Among a number of achievements for which Dr. Brodie, 58, is cited is "an understanding of how antipsychotic drugs can be used effectively in the treatment of mental and emotional disorders" and his stimulation of research to develop "a basic understanding of how the brain functions in health and disease."

Dr. Phillips, 61, a former Marine Corps captain, is being honored for his "research and leadership" in the reduction of the death rate from cholera. In the area in which he has worked in East Pakistan, the death rate from cholera was 60 per cent in untreated cases. In the cases he has treated, the death rate is less than 1 per cent.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 7, 1967]

LASKER AWARDS ARE GIVEN TO TWO SCIENTISTS, LEGISLATOR

A retired Navy physician and two Washington public servants—one a researcher at the National Heart Institute: the other a member of the House of Representatives—are this year's winners of the Albert Lasker awards for Medical Research and Public Service.

The Lasker awards, which carry with them an honorarium of $10,000 each, rival the Nobel prize in terms of prestige. They will be presented Thursday at a meeting in New York.

Dr. Robert Allan Phillips, the former Navy physician, is currently the director of the Pakistan-SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) Cholera Research Laboratory in East Dacca, Pakistan. The treatment he developed over the last ten years has reduced the cholera death rate to less than one percent. Before the treatment, the disease sometimes killed as many as a million people a year in India and Pakistan alone.

The key to the Phillips treatment is replacement of the electrolytes—the body fluids salts and other chemicals lost through dehydration in the course of the disease. According to the citation that accompanies his award, the "life-saving therapy of rapidly replacing, intravenously these lost body fluids and compounds is so simple that it can be successfully administered in the field, even under the most elementary conditions, and even by relatively unskilled personnel."

The other scientist to receive a Lasker Clinical Research Award is Dr. Bernard B.

Brodie, chief of the Laboratory of Chemical Pathology at the National Heart Institute in Bethesda. Brodie's research into the precise biochemical pathways of the body has improved the treatment of many disorders ranging from heart disease and cancer to emotional disorders and is now helping other scientists to develop new and better drugs.

Brodie is also a pioneer in the chemical study of the brain. By correlating data on how nerves impulses are transmitted with how people behave, he has proposed "a new line of attack on schizophrenia," his citation says.

Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Florida, is the recipient of the Award for Public Service. His citation points out that he has been active in the field of health legislation since 1937 when as a member of the Senate he was cosponsor of the legislation which led to the creation of the National Institutes of Health.

Among the other laws which Pepper has had a major hand in shaping are the Mental Retardation Act of 1963, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, and the Health Professional Educational Assistance Act of 1965. A long-time fighter for Medicare, he is now working to extend its benefits to the elderly and bring them to the disabled, as well.

According to the citation he will receive Thursday, "A measure of his vision is reflected in the fact that when the Pepper Committee held hearings in 1944, the National Institutes of Health was spending only $2,400,000 a year. . . . By 1967 the National Institutes of Health has grown to include eight additional Institutes and the former National Institute of Mental Health, now separately reorganized as the Bureau of Mental Health. Their present annual budget—is in excess of one and a half billion dollars."

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want very profoundly to thank my fellow Alabamian, my devoted friend, the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and others of my colleagues who have been kind enough to make these generous remarks about me. I thank them all very much.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 371]

Abbitt	Dent	Green, Pa.
Abernethy	Diggs	Gross
Adair	Dole	Grover
Addabbo	Dorn	Hagan
Anderson, Tenn.	Dow	Halleck
Annunzio	Downing	Halpern
Barrett	Dulski	Hanley
Boggs	Eilberg	Hays
Brasco	Erlenborn	Helstoski
Brock	Eshleman	Herlong
Broomfield	Everett	Hosmer
Buchanan	Fallon	Howard
Bush	Fino	Hutchinson
Button	Flood	Irwin
Byrne, Pa.	Ford, Gerald R.	Jacobs
Clark	Fountain	Jones, Mo.
Cowger	Friedel	King, N.Y.
Cramer	Gallagher	Kluczynski
de la Garza	Garmatz	Kupferman
	Giaimo	Madden
Mathias, Calif.	Resnick	Tenzer
Mathias, Md.	Rhodes, Pa.	Utt
Meskill	Rogers, Fla.	Watkins
Miller, Calif.	Ronan	Watson
Monagan	Rooney, Pa.	Watts
Moorhead	Rosenthal	Whalley
Morgan	Rostenkowski	Whitten
Morton	St. Onge	Williams, Miss.
Multer	Sandman	Willis
Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk	Wilson, Charles H.
Nix	Smith, Calif.	Wolff
O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, N.Y.	Wright
Ottinger	Steed	Wydler
Pelly	Stratton	Zion
Pettis	Stubblefield	
Pike	Taft	
Reid, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH LAWS RELATING TO MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6430) to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6418) to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and expand the authorizations for grants for comprehensive health planning and services, to broaden and improve the authorization for research and demonstrations relating to the delivery of health services, to improve the performance of clinical laboratories, and to authorize cooperative activities between the Public Health Service hospitals and community facilities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this is the bill that has been in conference but which passed the House on September 19 this year, entitled the "Partnership for Health Amendments," and if one of those amendments added thereto by the other body represents the changing of the status of the Under Secretary, thereby creating an additional position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for medical matters?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am not sure that that question is in disagreement. However, we have other amendments in disagreement and this could very well be in disagreement.

Mr. HALL. I would certainly hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well as the other conferees on the part of the House will seek to maintain the position of the House in this area.

Mr. STAGGERS. We shall attempt to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in what the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is saying with reference to the creation of an Under Secretary for Health, as is contained in one of the amendments added to the legislation in the other body.

Mr. HALL. Certainly. It appears on page 24, line 21, under the title of "Deputy Secretary for Secretary of Health and Welfare; Under Secretary for Health" thereby creating an additional agency under which there were no hearings held whatsoever in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there were none in the House and, I understand, there were none held in the other body, beyond the submission of the amendment, and there was a rather prompt vote on that amendment.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Ohio is exactly right. For that reason, I wanted to clarify the position of the House thereon.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There was some indication that this may be the first move in an effort to reorganize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, according to a pattern rumored for some time. It occurs to me, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations as well as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that this particular subject would fall under the jurisdiction of one or the other of those two committees, probably under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations if it were to involve an effort toward reorganization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the position of the House will be maintained in the conference.

Mr. HALL. I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, and I am sure that we must sustain the position of the House in that we will not allow the appointment of a social worker to a place that should be filled by a professional. This is my concern and area of interest.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

DR. JOHN E. YANNAKAKIS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4538) for the relief of Dr. John E. Yannakakis, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor John E. Yannakakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 2, 1960, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay".

Page 2, line 6, strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay".

Page 2, line 8, strike out "pay and allowances" and insert "retired pay".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAURITZ A. STERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3865) for the relief of Mauritz A. Sterner.

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

H.R. 3865

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise approprated, the sum of $100,000 to Mauritz A. Sterner, of 107–19 Seventieth Avenue, Forest Hills 75, Long Island, New York, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for his original idea and development of a paper blanket: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike "$100,000" and insert "$25,000".

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.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

FIRST LT. ALLAN L. SCHOOLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6325) for the relief of 2d Lt. Allan L. Schooler.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. PABLO E. TABIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 62) for the relief of Dr. Pablo E. Tabio.

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

S. 62

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Pablo E. Tabio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 15, 1960.

The 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.

DR. ANGEL REAUD, ALSO KNOWN AS ANGEL REAUD RAMOS IZQUIERDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 503) for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izquierdo.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. MENELIO SEGUNDO DIAZ PADRON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 808) for the relief of Dr. Menelio Segundo Diaz Padron.

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

S. 808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Menelio Segundo Diaz Padron shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 10, 1961.

The 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.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

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

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

There was no objection.

PANAGIOTIS PAULUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5575) for the relief of Panagiotis Basil Paulus.

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

H.R. 5575

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiotis Basil Paulus may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. George Paulus, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Panagiotis Basil Paulus" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Panagiotis Paulus".

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Paulus."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISANTHE SAVAS KARATAPANIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6326) for the relief of Chrisanthe Savas Karatapanis.

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

H.R. 6326

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chrisanthe Savas Karatapanis may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Savas M. Caras citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

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.

VALENTINA SIDOROVA PARKEVICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 811) for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich.

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

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

There was no objection.

DR. CESAR ABAD LUGONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 863) for the relief of Dr. Cesar Abad Lugones.

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

S. 863

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Cesar Abad Lugones shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 23, 1961.

The 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.

DR. G. F. VALDES-FAULI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Dr. G. F. Valdes-Fauli.

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

S. 1105

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor G. F. Valdes-Fauli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 30, 1960.

The 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.

DR. RAMON E. OYARZUN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Dr. Ramon E. Oyarzun.

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

S. 1109

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Ramon E. Oyarzun shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 29, 1961.

The 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.

DR. YOUSSEF (JOSEPH) SELIM HASBANI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 809) for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. RENE JOSE TRIAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1592) for the relief of Dr. Rene Jose Triay.

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

H.R. 1592

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rene Jose Triay shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 10, 1961.

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.

ANDRES MAURICIO CANDELA, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3516) for the relief of Andres Mauricio Candela, M.D.

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

H.R. 3516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andres Mauricio Candela shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residency as of November 5, 1960, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the date, "November 5, 1960" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

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.

ISRAEL MIZRAHY, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3525) for the relief of Israel Mizrahy, M.D.

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

H.R. 3525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Israel Mizrahy, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such a lien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 6, after the language "for permanent residence as of" strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "October 28, 1960."

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.

ISAAC CHERVONY, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3528) for the relief of Isaac Chervony, M.D.

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

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

There was no objection.

DR. ARMANDO COBELO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5186) for the relief of Dr. Armando Cobelo.

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

H.R. 5186

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Armando Cobelo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 12, 1961.

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.

DR. MANUEL A. TURBAT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4974) for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Turbat.

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

H.R. 4974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Manuel T. Turbat shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 9, 1961.

With the following committee amendment.

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "July 9, 1961" and insert in lieu thereof the date "July 10, 1961".

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.

DR. EDUARDO ENRIQUE RAMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3866) for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Enrique Ramos.

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

H.R. 3866

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That under the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Eduardo Enrique Ramos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 26, 1960.

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.

DR. HECTOR ALFREDO E. PLANAS-PINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5187) for the relief of Dr. Hector Alfredo E. Planas-Pina.

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

H.R. 5187

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hector Alfredo E. Planas-Pina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 21, 1961.

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.

DR. MANUEL JOSE COTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6088) for the relief of Dr. Manuel Jose Coto.

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

H.R. 6088

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Manuel Jose Coto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 7, 1962.

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.

DR. ORLANDO O. LOPEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6449) for the relief of Dr. Orlando O. Lopez.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1556, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if the Senate bill is the same as the House bill, with the proposed amendment?

Mr. DOWDY. It is, and I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]?

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

S. 1556

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Orlando O. Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 16, 1962.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "July 16, 1962" and substitute in lieu thereof the date "July 19, 1962".

The amendment was agreed to.

The 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. 6449) was laid on the table.

DR. ROLANDO POZO Y JIMENEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6658) for the relief of Dr. Rolando Pozo y Jimenez.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2167, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]?

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

S. 2167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rolando Pozo y Jimenez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 24, 1959.

The 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. 6658) was laid on the table.

DR. PEDRO AUGUSTO RUIZ Y CUE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6659) for the relief of Dr. Pedro Augusto Ruiz y Cue.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. VIRGILIO A. GANGANELLI VALLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6670) for the relief of Dr. Virgilio A. Ganganelli Valle.

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

H.R. 6670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Virgilio A. Ganganelli Valle shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 9, 1962.

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.

DR. RAUL GUSTAVO FORS DOCAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6766) for the relief of Dr. Raul Gustavo Fors Docal.

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

H.R. 6766

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Raul Gustavo Fors Docal shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 10, 1961.

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.

DR. JOSE DEL RIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7042) for the relief of Dr. Jose Del Rio.

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

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

There was no objection.

DR. JOSE A. RICO FERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7896) for the relief of Dr. José A. Rico Fernández.

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

H.R. 7896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor José A. Rico Fernández shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 26, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", insert the following language: "for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

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.

DR. NEMESIO VAZQUEZ FERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7898) for the relief of Dr. Nemesio Vazquez Fernandez.

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

H.R. 7898

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Nemesio Vazquez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 15, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", insert the following language: "for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

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.

DR. HERMES Q. CUERVO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8256) for the relief of Dr. Hermes Q. Cuervo.

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

H.R. 8256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hermes Q. Cuervo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 6, 1961.

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.

JOSE BERNARDO GARCIA, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8257) for the relief of Jose Bernardo Garcia, M.D.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JORGE GABRIEL LAZCANO, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8258) for the relief of Jorge Gabriel Lazcano, M.D.

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

H.R. 8258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jorge Gabriel Lazcano, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 16, 1962.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "April 16, 1962." and insert in lieu thereof the date "April 17, 1962.".

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.

DR. RAQUEL MARIA CRUZ-FLORES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8407) for the relief of Dr. Raquel Maria Cruz-Flores.

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

H.R. 8407

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Raquel Maria Cruz-Flores shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 29, 1962.

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.

GUILLERMO RAMON PALACIO SELA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8738) for the relief of Guillermo Ramon Palacio Sela.

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

H.R. 8738

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guillermo Ramon Palacio Sela shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1961.

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.

DR. JOSEFINA ESTHER KOURI-BARRETO DE PELLEYA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9081) for the relief of Dr. Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya.

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

H.R. 9081

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 14, 1961.

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.

DR. LORENZO GALATAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10985) for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. RAFAEL DE LA PORTILLA LAVASTIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11374) for the relief of Dr. Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2192, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

S. 2192

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael de la Portilla Lavastida shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 13, 1960.

The 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. 11374) was laid on the table.

DR. JOSEFINA QUINTOS MARCELO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7890) for the relief of Dr. Josefina Quintos Marcelo.

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

H.R. 7890

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Josefina Quintos Marcelo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of September 30, 1957.

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.

DR. PEDRO PINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11472) for the relief of Dr. Pedro Pina.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2168, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

S. 2168

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Pedro Pina y Gil shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 28, 1962.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "February 28, 1962" and substitute in lieu thereof the date "March 2, 1962".

The amendment was agreed to.

The 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. 11472) was laid on the table.

JACK L. GOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11254) for the relief of Jack L. Good.

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

H.R. 11254

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 151, title 35, United States Code, or any provision of existing law, the Commissioner of Patents is authorized and directed to accept the late payment of the final fee (prescribed in section 41 (a), title 35, United States Code), in the application for United States Letters Patent of Jack L. Good of Palestine, Arkansas, serial number 381,830, filed July 10, 1964, and allowed July 28, 1966, for a stump pulverizing apparatus, as though no abandonment or lapse had ever occurred: *Provided,* That such final fee is paid within three months of the date this Act is approved. Upon payment of such fee, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the said Jack L. Good the patent for which application was so made. No patent granted on said application shall be held invalid on the ground that the final fee was not paid within the period specified in title 35, United States Code.

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. AND MRS. CHRISTOS PHOTINOS-SVORONOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3031) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christos Photinos-Svoronos.

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

H.R. 3031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Christos Photinos-Svoronos may be classified as immediate relatives within the meaning of section 201(b) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by their adopted daughter, Mrs. Despina St. George, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

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.

MRS. KAREN WOOD DAVILA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3032) for the relief of Mrs. Karen Wood Davila.

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

H.R. 3032

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Karen Wood Davila, a citizen of the United States at birth, shall be considered to have resided in the United States for five years after attaining the age of fourteen years.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, at the end of the bill, change the period to be a comma and add the following: "and prior to the birth of her son.".

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.

WEN SHI YU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 287) for the relief of Wen Shi Yu.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

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

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

There was no objection.

CHESTER E. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

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

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

There was no objection.

JAMES W. ADAMS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 234) for the relief of James W. Adams and others.

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

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

There was no objection.

ELOY C. NAVARRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 294) for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF PATRICK E. EAGAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 910) for the relief of the estate of Patrick E. Eagan.

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

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

There was no objection.

JOHN W. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of John W. Rogers.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SOPHIE STATHACOPULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1705) for the relief of Sophie Stathacopulos.

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

H.R. 1705

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sophie Stathacopulos, of Brookyln, New York, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $636, representing an overpayment, through administrative error, of her wages during the period beginning October 14, 1962, and ending July 16, 1966, while employed by the Small Business Administration in New York, New York. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sophie Stathacopulos, of Brooklyn, New York, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by her, or withheld from sums otherwise due her, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike "$636" and insert "419.86".

On page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were 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.

DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

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

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES B. FRANKLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2288) for the relief of Charles B. Franklin.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF CHARLES C. BEAURY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2688) for the relief of Charles C. Beaury.

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

H.R. 2688

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles C. Beaury, of Saint Louis, Missouri, the sum of $508. Such sum represents the amount which the said Charles C. Beaury, a substitute letter carrier in the United States Post Office at Saint Louis, Missouri, was required to pay the United States for the loss of money contained in an envelope sent as registered mail which was apparently stolen on March 4, 1965, from the mail truck used by the said Charles C. Beaury. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the estate of Charles C. Beaury, deceased is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $288, representing the amount which the late Charles C. Beaury, a substitute carrier in the United States Post Office at St. Louis, Missouri, was indebted to the United States by reason of the loss of money contained in an envelop known as registered mail which was apparently stolen on or about March 4, 1965, from a mail truck operated by the decedent.".

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.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles C. Beaury.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SONDRA D. SHAW

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2760) for the relief of Sondra D. Shaw.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

O. P. BECKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4818) for the relief of of O. P. Becken.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RALPH W. HENEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4819) for the relief of Ralph W. Heneman.

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

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

There was no objection.

SYLVAN H. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4820) for the relief of Sylvan H. Miller.

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

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

There was no objection.

ARNOLD E. REMMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4821) for the relief of Arnold E. Remmen.

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

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4936) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

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

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

There was no objection.

RAYMOND E. GRAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5853) for the relief of Raymond E. Grail.

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

H.R. 5853

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the annual leave account of Raymond E. Grail, of Moline, Illinois, a civilian employee at the Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, there shall be added a separate account of one hundred and seventy-four hours of annual leave, in full settlement of claims of the said Raymond E. Grail against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him during the period beginning May 1961, and ending May 1966, inclusive, while employed at the Rock Island Arsenal, and which, through administrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

SEC. 2. Section 6304 of title 5 of the United States Code shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said Raymond E. Grail. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said Raymond E. Grail is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service.

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.

CLAUD FERGUSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6305) for the relief of Claud Ferguson.

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

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

There was no objection.

LESTER W. AND SADIE HEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6890) for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein.

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

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

There was no objection.

GILMER COUNTY, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7431) for the relief of Barney Elrod Construction Co., Inc.

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

H.R. 7431

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Barney Elrod Construction Company, Incorporated, a Georgia corporation, the sum of $34,359.36 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for the construction work which the said Barney Elrod Construction Company, Incorporated, performed on the Gilmer County Airport, Gilmer County, Georgia, during the period beginning July, 1966, and ending October, 1966, which work was part of the planned development of such airport as contemplated in Federal Aviation Agency Project Numbered 9–09–083–C701.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Gilmer County, Georgia, the sum of $24,715, in full settlement of its claims against the United States for the Federal share of allowable project cost for the development of the Gilmer County Airport in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Airport Act in the period beginning July 1966 and ending October 1966, involving work which was part of the planned development of such airport as contemplated in Federal Aviation Agency Project Numbered 9–09–083–C701.

"SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.".

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Gilmer County, Ga."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AT CERTAIN U.S. NAVAL STATIONS IN FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7882) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at certain U.S. naval stations in Florida.

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

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE AIR FORCE AT KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8096) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.

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

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

There was no objection.

RICHARD BELK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8481) for the relief of Richard Belk.

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

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

There was no objection.

LUCIEN A. MURZYN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9568) for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn.

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

H.R. 9568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lucien A. Murzyn, United States Army, retired (FINCS–E, W–903593), is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $837.71, representing overpayments resulting from an administrative error, of his retirement pay and allowances as a retired member of the Army while holding Federal civilian employment under the dual compensation laws of the United States. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucien A. Murzyn an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

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.

JOSEPH J. WOJCIK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9574) for the relief of Joseph J. Wojcik.

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

H.R. 9574

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph J. Wojcik, of Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $806.17 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for the funds which he extended during 1965 to provide necessities of life for Frank E. Mandlsky, a World War I veteran, prior to the death of said Frank E. Mandlsky at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Dayton, Ohio, in November 1965.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike "Mandlsky" and insert "Mandlski".

Page 1, line 10, strike "Mandlsky" and insert "Mandlski".

Page 2, line 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were 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.

JOHN M. STEVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10003) for the relief of John M. Stevens.

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

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

There was no objection.

LLOYD W. CORBISIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10199) for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbisier.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ESTHER D. BORDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10058) for the relief of Mrs. Esther D. Bordi.

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

H.R. 10058

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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Esther D. Bordi, of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, the sum of $700, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for not paying, by reason of lapse of time, seven $100 United States postal money orders held by her, numbered and dated as follows: 12799, November 10, 1944; 21224, March 16, 1945; 35935, March 28, 1945; 14410, June 18, 1945; 54, July 13, 1945; 55, July 13, 1945; 56, July 13, 1945. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "Bordi" and insert "Borda".

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther D. Borda."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMILLE ANITA DOBSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10449) for the relief of Camille Anita Dobson.

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

H.R. 10449

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of subchapter III (relating to civil service retirement) of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, Camille Anita Dobson, Kansas City, Missouri, shall be held and considered to be the adopted daughter of Armand Dobson, deceased former employee in the Post Office Department. No benefits shall accrue by reason of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

SEC. 2. Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply with respect to annuity benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

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.

E. L. TOWNLEY, OTIS T. HAWKINS, AND LEO T. MATOUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

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

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

There was no objection.

JOSEPH M. HEPWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12119) for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth.

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

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

There was no objection.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7210) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the private calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will be recognized for 3 hours, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 28 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on April 10, 1967, I introduced H.R. 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. This legislation was studied by members of the Committee on Education and Labor until the bill was reported October 20. S. 2388, as passed by the Senate, was before the committee when we completed the markup of H.R. 8311. In reporting the bill, the committee amendments struck out all of S. 2388 after the enacting clause and substituted the language in the House bill.

Members of this House are aware of the tremendous impact that has already been made as a result of the decision made by Congress 3½ years ago when we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It has been accepted by the people of this country as another piece of landmark legislation along our road to a better life. Thousands of men and women who 3½ years ago had been left outside the great prosperity which the American economy is capable of sustaining, have now been brought into the mainstream as fully participating members.

We have had many successes, and we have made mistakes.

Congress acted responsibly in 1965 and 1966 when it amended the original act to make improvements and to correct errors. S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, is in that tradition. We feel that the bill before you today will make some needed improvements in the basic legislation, and will eliminate some of the mistakes we have heretofore made.

I admit at the outset that we are tardy in bringing this legislation before the House, and for that I am willing to take my share of the responsibility.

We held long and exhaustive hearings

on the operation of the entire economic opportunity program—much longer than were conducted even before passage of the original legislation. We took longer with the markup of the bill than we should have. But I thought it was important that we take every step that could possibly be taken to reach agreement and accommodation among all the members of both parties.

While the measure that we produced is not what could be called an agreed bill, I must say that neither is it a one-man bill; nor a one-faction bill, nor a one-party bill. I believe there is something of every member of the committee in this bill, and I am delighted to recommend it to this House.

I would urge the House to act with speed and dispatch. The delay in funding the programs for fiscal 1968 is already producing great havoc and frustration throughout the country.

And I would certainly counsel against the temptation exhibited by some to inflict mortal cuts in the authorization for the economic opportunity programs.

For the past fiscal year, the economic opportunity programs operated on an appropriation of $1,687 million. The request for fiscal 1968 is for $2,060 million, and that is the figure S. 2388 would authorize.

At the same time we were holding hearings on the basic measure, we also were considering H.R. 10682, the minority party's opportunity crusade.

Even the minority measure envisioned $1,669 million for fiscal 1968, and that was certainly the very bottom figure that anybody on the committee felt could be seriously considered.

Let me tell you some of the things that are already happening as a result of our delay in funding for fiscal 1968.

Six local community action agencies—including one in my own congressional district, right in the heart of Appalachia, are without funds.

One other local CAP agency has had to cut half of its operations.

Unless we act by November 23—just 17 days from now—35 other local community action programs will have to close down their operations. This involves $42 million worth of CAP programs and affects the lives of some 500,000 poor people.

The local agencies are scattered throughout the country in 16 States, including New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Colorado, and California.

The community action agencies are not the only ones affected by our failure to provide funds.

The approximately 4,000 VISTA volunteers have been asked to serve without food and living allowances until we act.

In the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 67 projects are already closed down, affecting 16,463 boys and girls.

Unless we move by November 23, another 134 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects will have to close down, leaving 33,000 boys and girls without the opportunity to continue their education and training.

Unless we act, the Job Corps will be unable to pay the November allowances to its 40,000 enrollees, amounting to $1.2 million. That agency will also be unable to pay $1.5 million in allowances to the families of the Job Corpsmen.

You can well imagine the anxiety and the frustration that this lack of funding is creating in the hearts and minds of poor people throughout this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know there are those who would have us go the route of a continuing resolution—who would have the Congress simply say to the Office of Economic Opportunity. "Go ahead and operate but don't spend more than $1.2 billion, or $1.3 billion," or whatever figure they settle upon.

Those are strange figures indeed, coming from people who just a short time ago were boosting an Opportunity Crusade for $1.669 billion.

This continuing resolution, of course, would have the virtue of being fast. But then the meat ax always is. You do not have to wait around in slow agony. It gets the job done fast.

But for the House to ignore the lengthy study given to the economic opportunity programs by the Committee on Education and Labor, to scrap all of the really constructive work we have done to bring about substantial improvements, this is completely unrealistic and completely irresponsible.

Make no mistake, the impetus for a continuing resolution approach is coming from those who want to see the economic opportunity programs severely crippled. It is camouflage to shield the wishes of those who would slam shut the door of opportunity in the faces of some 30 million of our fellow citizens.

I have faith enough in the Congress and in this House to believe that we are not going to let the poor people of America down—that we are going to act promptly and decisively to get these good programs funded and back in enthusiastic operation again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to discuss briefly some of the titles in the bill before us. Because of the many programs that are involved, even brief mention will make the discussion lengthy. I shall confine myself to brief comments, and rely upon my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor to discuss in detail various phases of the bill.

TITLE IA

Title I, part A involves the Job Corps, one of the most significant programs undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We are asking for fiscal 1968 an authorization of $295 million to provide meaningful training for some 40,000 young men and women.

During its relatively young life, the Job Corps has been damned by its critics for being "controversial"—whatever that means. They said it was expensive, that the enrollees did not behave themselves, and even that the rolls were loaded with juvenile delinquents.

I can only say that this was the judgment of the uninformed, particularly with respect to the Job Corps as it exists and operates today—November 1967.

At the outset, I will admit that the Job Corps' first months were less than impressive. Its operation was marred by blunder and mistake.

The cost was high.

And its enrollees did include some pretty tough customers. For this we merely say "Thank God," for that is exactly the kind of young men and women the Jobs Corps was designed to accommodate.

Today there is a new Job Corps:

One that has built upon its experience;

One that has found its focus;

One that is carefully and ably managed;

One whose costs have steadily gone down;

And one whose record for reclaiming and rehabilitating young men and women has steadily gone upward.

This is a Job Corps that is making an important contribution to a greater and stronger America.

I want it to work itself out of a job as soon as possible. No one will be happier or more relieved than I to vote to dismantle Job Corps just as soon as it has performed the task which we have set for it.

If this is a paradox, I explain it by reminding the House that the Job Corps was designed to give another chance—to give a hand up, if you will—to the thousands of young people who have, by reason of poverty and deprivation, been left outside the mainstream of life in this country.

They are the youngsters whose education is so scant or of such poor quality as to leave them powerless in an economy that depends upon ever greater sophistication in its work force.

They are often youngsters who have gotten off on the wrong foot with the community of law and order, because of the frustrations accompanying their poverty.

These are often youngsters whose lack of elemental medical and dental care has handicapped them from birth.

They are often youngsters whose very motivation to be independent, self-reliant, self-supporting men and women has been eroded and possibly destroyed by the only experience with life they have known.

Can there be any wonder that some of these youngsters have on occasion gotten into trouble? For the first time in their lives, many of them have been taken out of a poorly structured home environment and exposed to a residential community based upon rules, discipline, hard work, and consideration for other people.

To be perfectly frank, we ought to be surprised that the Job Corps proved workable at all.

Now the critics are confounded by the knowledge that it is not only working, but working well. The Job Corps is getting results.

Current information shows that of 103,000 youths who have been through the Job Corps program, 71,500 are now holding jobs; or have upgraded their training to the point where they have returned to school; or have successfully passed induction standards to enter military service.

We now have operating some 123 Job

Corps centers—with a capacity of handling 43,000 youths at any one time.

During fiscal 1968, the Job Corps expects to operate at an average on-board enrollment of 41,000. Before the fiscal year is out, an additional 100,000 young men and women will have been involved.

During this calendar year, the Job Corps has more than doubled its capability for training young women in the 18 women's centers. Plans are well under way to increase the proportion of women until it eventually reaches 50 percent.

As I have mentioned, the cost of training a corpsman has steadily dropped during the 2½ years this program has been in operation. Last year, at a time when costs per enrollee were averaging about $9,000 per year, Congress imposed a statutory limit of $7,500.

Under the dedicated management of Mr. William Kelly, the Corps director, this cost has actually been reduced $800 below that to $6,700.

Although I firmly believe that figure can and will be reduced even further I am neither alarmed nor horrified by the $6,700 figure. This is a special situation, and it calls for extraordinary measures.

I realize that there are those who say that for $6,700 you could send all these youngsters to a good university. They are talking hogwash.

The youngsters for whom this program was created could not even get near a university campus—unless it was to sweep up the debris left by an antiwar demonstration.

For the most part, these young people could not even make it through grade or high school. They are people who have been failed by the elementary and secondary schools of this country, in many instances through no fault of their own.

Except for programs such as the Job Corps, they stand to become a drain on the productive elements of our society for the rest of their lives.

The Job Corps is simply trying to retrieve these young people and restore their capacity to be productive and self-supporting before it is utterly destroyed. We are simply holding out a ladder by which they can climb back from the brink, over which many of their parents have already disappeared.

If this ladder costs $6,700 and will give to society a useful, productive, contributing citizen—then it is the best money the Congress can spend.

The question is not whether to spend that $6,700 or to save it.

The question is: Can we afford not to spend $6,700 now, and risk many times that amount in future years as the cost of welfare handouts to this individual and his progeny, and even more if he develops a criminal or antisocial behavior pattern?

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not impeach the character of the young people who enter this program. Far from it.

The fact that they have made a decision—a hard decision—to improve themselves and to take a purchase on an independent future for themselves, indicates that they have courage of a very high order.

This is the American way. A young man or young woman sees and seizes an opportunity to make something of himself by dint of perseverance and hard work. And the rewards are his.

I urge every Member of this House to get acquainted with some of these young people, if you have not already done so. When you do, I suspect that you are going to be pretty impatient with people who call the Job Corps a "controversial" program.

I yield to no Member of this Chamber as an advocate and supporter of vocational education. It has long been one of my major interests in Congress.

I can understand those of my friends who say that we should take Job Corps out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and lodge it in some expanded vocational education program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We may come to that point someday, but the time is not yet.

In the first place, vocational education is not yet equipped to deal with the kind of youngster now served by Job Corps.

Vocational education is taking the "cream of the crop" of the school dropouts, and is doing a good job with them. I do not mean it derogatorily when I say that the vocational education schools are giving first preference to those young men and women that are most easily trainable and most easily placed in a job. That is only natural.

But the Job Corps youngster is something else. He is the most deprived, the most handicapped, the most difficult to place, and unhappily, the most unwanted.

As of now, only Job Corps is equipped to deal with this highly specialized problem. And the program is making great strides.

The private industries, educational institutions, and government agencies that are operating Job Corps centers are developing new methods, new techniques of teaching these youngsters. Much basic research is being done.

Eventually, this new material will be picked up by the vocational education schools who will make excellent use of it. In fact, some of the techniques are even now being used in such institutions.

This is a fringe benefit of Job Corps, of course. But in the long run it may turn out to be worth the investment on this score alone.

For the moment, only Job Corps is equipped to deal with the truly impoverished youth of the country. Only the Job Corps is equipped to treat the total youth —his educational, vocational, social, and cultural needs. Only the Job Corps operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. It is a unique agency, designed for a special purpose, and it is serving that purpose very well indeed.

For me, it is unthinkable to do other than continue it as presently constituted, subject of course to the improvements that we have sought to make in the bill before us today.

TITLE IB

The bill which we bring before the House today combines all work and training programs for youth and adults in a single heading—part B of title I.

The authorization for this important work would be $579 million, of which $321 million is for Neighborhood Youth Corps and $258 million is for the adult programs.

I shall give you a detailed breakdown of these proposed authorizations in just a moment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been in operation less than 3 years. During that period, it has developed 3,895 local projects in all of our 50 States.

These projects have provided almost 1½ million youth with work opportunities:

To help them stay in school;

To help them return to school;

And to improve their chances for gainful employment in the job market.

The latest available figures indicate that some 1,770 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects are currently active, serving more than 300,000 boys and girls throughout the country.

These projects are located in both urban and rural areas. Of the 1,438 projects authorized in fiscal 1967, 772 were in urban areas, 657 in rural areas, and nine in mixed urban-rural areas. Rural participation accounts for 35 percent of the enrollment opportunities.

For the $321 million requested for the Neighborhood Youth Corps for fiscal 1968, we propose:

To provide enrollment opportunities for 106,000 youngsters in in-school programs at a cost of $67.8 million;

To provide 50,000 out-of-school slots at a cost of $152.7 million; and

To provide 165,000 summer Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollment opportunities at a cost of $88 million.

The remaining $12.5 million of the requested authorization would go for research and demonstration programs and for program direction.

During the extensive hearings on the bill before us this week, I do not recall a single critical reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It is not a visionary, pie-in-the-sky program, but one that gets straight to the heart of one of the most pressing problems in America today.

The adult work-training experience programs were authorized by 1965 and 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. These programs now consist of three main groupings: Operation Mainstream, New Careers, and Special Impact.

The bill which we reported and which we discuss today makes some revision, in that all manpower activities carried out at the local level are to be consolidated into this part.

The focus is to be upon unemployed or low-income persons, both youth and adult, with emphasis upon full use of local capacity for planning, operating, and evaluating programs that will draw upon all available public and private resources.

Authority for all existing programs is continued, including the Nelson amendment—Operation Mainstream, the Scheuer amendment—new careers, along with necessary supportive services.

But we have taken a significant step in providing for substantial funding of the concentrated employment program recently initiated by the Department of Labor. This replaces the special impact

program, and is designed to reach the hard-core unemployed and disadvantaged residents of urban and rural areas through a single contract with a single sponsor and a single intake center where all participants will go to get whatever help is necessary to move toward employability.

It combines in one local program all of the Federal and local manpower resources that are available to operate a manpower program in a specific target area.

The concentrated employment program now operates in 20 cities and in two rural areas, and is aimed at those individuals in greatest need of a concentrated effort.

The committee believes that this is a significant new step to get at the hard-core unemployed, and have great hope for its effectiveness.

To carry out these adult work-training experience programs, we propose to authorize for fiscal 1968 these amounts:

For Operation Mainstream, 14,200 training slots at a cost of $48 million;

For the new careers program, 12,100 slots at a cost of $48.1 million;

And 64,400 slots in the new concentrated employment program at a cost of $155.8 million.

We further propose $3.6 million for research and demonstration projects and $2.5 million for program direction.

Adding the 90,700 slots of the adult programs to the 321,000 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we have a total of 411,700 openings in the work and training programs under title I, part B, at a total cost of $579 million.

This, I admit, is a great deal of money. But I say we are getting our money's worth from these programs. We stand to gain a great deal more than that in increased productive capacity spread over the lifetimes of the 411,700 individuals involved.

We risk having to spend a great deal more on them if we fail to provide them with an opportunity to enter the mainstream of American economic life as fully participating members.

TITLE II

Under title II of this bill, Mr. Chairman, $1,022 million would be authorized for a strengthened and expanded community action program. Community action is at the heart of our effort to improve the lot of the poor—a working concept the committee has strengthened through important changes in the bill before us.

We have made provision, Mr. Chairman, for the greater participation of local public officials in this important part of the economic opportunity program. We have strengthened the prohibitions of law against political activity by antipoverty personnel. We have restricted the size of community action boards and tightened quorum requirements to assure responsible majority control. We have tightened the audit requirements for community action agencies. And we have called for greater emphasis on programs for the elderly poor, on day care centers, and in providing emergency food and medical services where severe conditions warrant such action.

These changes should not be interpreted, however, as a retreat from the concept of community action by the committee. It is a good concept and it is working. Businessmen, religious and civic leaders, educational experts, women's organizations, labor leaders, and the poor themselves are working together in communities across the country to develop and implement programs.

Since the endorsement by the Congress of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, more than 9 million poor Americans have been served by this program—most of them through community action that is bringing together, at the community level, local resources, local intelligence, local pride, local responsibility, and local decisionmaking in a fight against the causes and consequences of poverty.

More than 1,000 community action agencies across the country have been formed to implement such national programs as Headstart, Neighborhood Health Services, Upward Bound, and Legal Services; as well as thousands of unique, locally initiated programs developed by the individual community.

Under the Headstart program, more than 1.3 million youngsters have been given the chance to start school on a more nearly equal basis with children from more affluent homelife.

Under the legal services program, 172,000 poor persons have been given the opportunity for justice that only a lawyer can provide.

More than 55,000 poor persons have obtained necessary medical help through neighborhood health centers.

And in programs initiated at the local level, more than 1½ million poor people have gained a better education and 4 million have taken advantage of the neighborhood centers in poor areas to obtain information about jobs and job training, counseling, and available manpower and social services.

But it is time to move on, Mr. Chairman, if only in the modest and responsible fashion that our overall financial situation dictates.

In authorizing $1,022 million for community action in this bill, the committee is recommending a step-up in the war against poverty that is both necessary and minimal.

We are proposing under this title that 50 new community action agencies be started in rural America and that the Office of Economic Opportunity proceed along the following lines:

For a Headstart program, $352 million, to serve 520,000 youngsters in the summer and 213,000 in full-year classes;

For a Followthrough program, $120 million, to assure that the benefits of Headstart are not lost when a youngster moves on into school;

For an Upward Bound program, $35 million, to encourage 30,000 potentially capable but previously unmotivated high school youngsters toward college;

For an expansion of the legal services program, $47 million, in both urban and rural areas—a move fully supported by the American Bar Association, which asked the committee to double the present program;

For the funding of 50 centers to provide comprehensive health services in areas of concentrated poverty, $60 million;

And $329 million for locally initiated programs, including the development of 1,000 neighborhood service centers.

These proposed allocations by OEO reflect only the most urgent needs. Of the 613 rural community action agencies in this country, many have received only program development grants and now need funding to put their program in operation. Of the $166 million increase in funds for national emphasis programs, all but $46 million is for the new Followthrough program for youngsters starting to school.

The need is urgent. We cannot tolerate a condition that condemns 30 million of our fellow Americans to remain untouched by the prosperity and the hope that is available to the other 170 million.

The Office of Economic Opportunity—the director and coordinator of our effort—the acknowledged symbol of hope and promise to the poor of America—is now out of funds and the authority to spend. It cannot even pay its own employees.

And the many community action agencies which helped keep the peace during the urban tensions of last summer are now ending their program years without money to continue the important work they are doing.

It has been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the community action program should be dismantled—that certain of its programs be transferred to other agencies. The committee rejected such an approach after hearing more than 100 witnesses—selected by both the majority and the minority—testify in favor of OEO as the agency to operate these programs.

I could cite many reasons why a transfer of these programs would be unwise at this time, but let me, at this point, make just two observations.

First, the strength of a full-scale effort to provide full economic opportunity lies in a centralized source of direction with powers of coordination and operation. You cannot curb the authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity in these areas without curtailing the overall objective.

Second, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have both said that OEO should run the programs which opponents of the present program would transfer to them.

It has also been suggested, Mr. Chairman, that the funds for the program should be cut back severely. Some of my colleagues have suggested that the program should even be cut back to a level of $1.2 billion—a billion less, in other words, than the Senate has already authorized; $800,000 less than the President requested and almost half a billion less than the program received in the last fiscal year.

I would urge my colleagues to reflect for a moment what a cut of this magnitude would mean. It would mean, for instance, that California would receive $48 million less in antipoverty funds;

New York, $44 million less; Texas, $24 million less; Illinois, $21 million less. I could go on, but for the benefit of all I will include in the RECORD at this point the State-by-State cutback a $1.2 billion program would mean:

Dollar reduction by State that would be necessitated by a $1.2 billion appropriation

State	Amount
Alabama	$8,810,075
Alaska	1,679,601
Arizona	8,299,494
Arkansas	6,769,531
California	47,812,673
Colorado	6,509,592
Connecticut	4,558,578
Delaware	777,049
District of Columbia	8,666,376
Florida	12,007,188
Georgia	10,061,385
Hawaii	1,513,550
Idaho	2,662,589
Illinois	20,959,551
Indiana	6,539,210
Iowa	4,833,487
Kansas	2,377,921
Kentucky	16,089,786
Louisiana	8,955,197
Maine	3,892,561
Maryland	5,345,923
Massachusetts	11,011,527
Michigan	17,983,533
Minnesota	8,211,178
Mississippi	17,493,546
Missouri	12,809,585
Montana	3,224,097
Nebraska	3,645,302
Nevada	1,397,080
New Hampshire	1,094,443
New Jersey	17,744,406
New Mexico	7,695,309
New York	43,830,779
North Carolina	13,125,782
North Dakota	1,875,650
Ohio	15,829,088
Oklahoma	8,102,033
Oregon	6,946,712
Pennsylvania	18,767,889
Rhode Island	1,739,242
South Carolina	6,231,878
South Dakota	3,223,729
Tennessee	10,318,996
Texas	23,579,540
Utah	3,354,711
Vermont	1,111,316
Virginia	7,416,133
Washington	8,221,931
West Virginia	9,748,247
Wisconsin	6,197,835
Wyoming	1,580,470
Guam	421,854
Puerto Rico	8,484,649
American Samoa	187,315
Virgin Islands	562,453
Multistate	5,821,365

In the area of community action alone, a $1.2 billion program would deny the benefits of Headstart to 92,000 children who would receive them under the committee bill; it would close 320 legal services offices; preclude any new follow-through projects; deny basic education, day care, and housing programs to 15,000 migrants; cut 19,000 students out of Upward Bound; prevent progress on 33 neighborhood health centers; and cut versatile funds to local communities by nearly 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is what the Congress or the country wants.

The questions before this House are quite clear.

Are we, Mr. Chairman, to let the community action agencies serve and speak for the urban poor—or are we to give ground in the ghetto to the Stokely Carmichaels and the Rap Browns?

Are we to offer the poor in rural America a way out of the poverty that grips them—or are we to abandon them to the expensive welfare existence their families have known for generations.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the House will take the route of responsibility—a route that commands the continuation of the community action program and all the American traditions it involves: local initiative, self-help, community cooperation, and innovation.

Those thousands of Americans who are working in community action programs across the country—to bring peace to our cities and opportunity to all—need our endorsement.

TITLE III

Turning to another important feature of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I turn now to the rural loan program under title III.

This program provides for loans to rural residents to assist them in such agricultural or nonagricultural enterprises as may increase their income. The authority to operate this program is delegated by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

The significant amendment proposed by the committee with respect to this program is to specifically spell out the eligibility of elderly rural people to participate. Another proposed change is merely a technical one having to do with the manner in which the $3,500 loan limit is calculated.

I felt it was particularly important that the Congress make it crystal clear that our elderly rural citizens are eligible for this program. For in many cases, particularly in my area, these are the people who suffer most with least outcry from economic privation.

Some lending agencies are reluctant to enter loan agreements with an elderly fellow, even if it can be demonstrated clearly that a loan would help him upgrade his economic prospects and make him self-supporting. We want to correct this situation, and we believe this move merits your support.

The bill contains a proposed authorization of $20,000,000 in new obligation authority for the rural loan program.

Amounts in the loan fund resulting from loan repayments and funds carried over from fiscal 1967 will be used with this new obligational authority to support $27,000,000 in individual and $5,000,000 in cooperative loans. These amounts will provide 13,000 loans to individuals and 368 cooperative loans.

Individual loans under this program may be made up to an aggregate indebtedness of $3,500. Loans generally are secured by a promissory note and a loan agreement. The maximum term is 15 years with an interest rate of 4⅛ percent on the unpaid principal.

Cooperatives financed through this program may be either incorporated or unincorporated groups providing a needed marketing, purchasing or processing service predominately to low-income families and individuals. Before a loan can be made, the FHA must determine that the service involved is not already being supplied by others in the area. Cooperative loans have a 30-year limit, and the interest rate is the same as for individuals.

Up through June 30 of this year, $13,165,000 in principal and interest had been repaid by rural borrowers under this program. And as of the same date, repayments on loans were about 3 percent greater than the amount due.

The bill before us today makes no change in the other major program under title III, the migrant and seasonal farmworker program.

We simply ask for an authorization of $27 million which is approximately $6 million below the amount authorized for fiscal 1967.

This program was designed to meet the special needs of groups with respect to education, housing, sanitation, and day care. The migratory nature of their lives simply puts them beyond the reach of the ordinary public welfare and rehabilitation programs available to other citizens.

It is anticipated that the number of enrollees in the migrant adult education program will be about the same as last year—28,000. The cost will be $17 million.

No funds are sought in this bill to continue the youth education program for the children of migrant workers. These children are now covered by title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We are asking in this bill for an authorization of $5 million for permanent housing for migrant workers, covering some 2,000 units to serve 12,000 occupants.

The $1 million authorization requested for temporary housing under this title will cover 1,600 units servicing 16,000 occupants.

A total of $4 mililon is sought for the day care program to serve an estimated 13,000 children.

This latter program permits a migrant mother to work along with her husband and older children, insuring that the younger children need not be left unattended, frequently inside locked automobiles on the roadside.

The day care program for these migrant children provides not only the normal babysitting, but medical attention where needed. Even the mothers are trained in the elements of child care and child guidance.

This is truly a "stitch-in-time" program that will certainly "save nine" and many more in the years ahead.

TITLE VIII

The Volunteers in Service to America, popularly known as VISTA, is a corps of full-time and part-time volunteers from all walks of life who are willing to devote their efforts toward helping the Nation's poor.

Since its inception, some 7,200 people have served as volunteers, and at the beginning of fiscal 1968, the enrollment stood at 4,257.

The committee has sought, I believe successfully, to improve the effectiveness of the VISTA organization by several amendments.

We have made it possible for the Director to assign volunteers to work in their own or nearby community service programs to utilize part-time volunteers for periods of less than 2 months.

It is the hope that these changes will encourage the voluntary service of many business and professional men who have a little time to contribute their talents to needed projects. We see the changes as stimulating retired people to make use of their creative energies in useful work with the poor.

The authorization sought for the program this year is $31 million, and I am sure the Congress will give consideration to it.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that in this discussion, I have been able to touch upon only some of the major aspects of the bill and of the economic opportunity programs.

I believe that subsequent discussion in this Chamber over the next few days will persuade a vast majority of the Members that the great journey upon which we set out with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is going well.

It is a journey that must be taken for when the objective is reached, this will be a stronger, richer, and more vital America.

In closing, I would compliment our great President on recommending to the Congress so strong a renewal of this Nation's commitment to the alleviation of poverty.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. First of all I would like to clarify for the RECORD that the opportunity crusade involves over $1.4 billion being expended, and we will have something over $3 billion in money that would be going to help the poor cause.

So I would like to ask the gentleman, since he has made such a strong case for the $2,060,000,000, I have also heard rumors going around, is the gentleman prepared to assure us that he is not going to come in at the outset, when we start reading this bill, and support the amendment that will cut this $2,060,000,000 substantially?

Mr. PERKINS. It is my purpose to support the committee bill as recommended by the Members of the House who serve on the Committee on Education and Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 10 additional minutes to myself.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, then I will yield, but let me complete my statement first.

Mr. GOODELL. Do I interpret the gentleman correctly that he is going to oppose the amendment to cut this $2,060,000,000?

Mr. PERKINS. As the gentleman knows, the proposed substitute of $1.2 billion, as I understand, will be offered at the outset and is nothing more than a very effective way to kill this legislation and place the responsibility on the majority party.

Personally, I feel that if the shoe were on the other foot, and the Republicans were in power and had a bill that had been thoroughly considered by the committee, I would not vote to cut the guts out of the bill.

If I were against the bill, I would vote against it—or else I would support the bill. I am certainly not supporting any substitute that would completely destroy this legislation. This substitute is a camouflage to shield the wishes of those who would like to kill the bill and to try to shift the burden somewhere else. I do not think this House is gullible enough to buy any continuing resolution of that type.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has described this as being an effective way to kill the bill. I would say a more accurate description is that it would be a very deceptive way of killing the bill—and that that is what is intended.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman's position on the $1.2 billion continuing authorization should that be offered. As the gentleman knows, I do not intend to offer such an amendment or substitute.

Mr. PERKINS. I did not think that the gentleman from New York would offer the $1.2 billion amendment. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio was going to offer the $1.2 billion amendment at the outset.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has made a very compelling case here for the expenditure of $2.06 billion but he still has not answered my question. The rumor is going around that there will be a move at the outset to revise that figure substantially and that it will be supported by the chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me state to the gentleman that as chairman of the committee, I know nothing about any such rumor.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not the chairman's intention to support such an amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not the chairman's intention to support such an amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not intend to support a move to cripple this legislation in any way.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman has referred to what may be done and has assumed that I was going to offer an amendment. I would like to discuss it briefly with the gentleman.

I know the gentleman is aware that the $100,000,000 a month—and I think you can help a lot of poor people with $100,000,000 a month—has already been approved by this House and is in conference now. So this House has already taken a position on that proposal.

Mr. PERKINS. I will agree with the gentleman that before we brought this bill to the Chamber that that resolution was approved by this House. But the resolution is now dead. We are out of spending authority, and if we cannot get a bill through this Chamber expeditiously and if we have to rely on this $1.2 billion continuing resolution, the whole program in this country would go down the drain. In fact, you would find any competent administrator resigning. I cannot think of any competent individual who has had any experience in the field of administration who would think of assuming a position of that type under such circumstances. But the worst thing that is going to happen is that there will be thousands and thousands of dedicated employees, now working in the anti-poverty program throughout the Nation, who are going to resign almost overnight if we fail to come up with a bill. In my judgment, we would cripple the program to the extent that it would be completely unworthy of support and to all intents and purposes would kill off the program in this session of the Congress.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the gentleman does not have the same feeling that many of us in the House have that the bill reported out by the committee would never pass the House. So I know that we would be very interested, if when the gentleman has the time available, he would discuss what he might intend to do in reference to this bill and improving it in some way so that the Members of the House might take a different view of the bill than they do of the bill that was reported out by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished minority whip, I think we have brought a bill out of the committee with many improvements, and many effective changes.

One of which was authored by the gentlewoman from Oregon to the community action section of the bill which she will explain to the Members of the House. Other provisions to strengthen the bill will also be discussed as this debate progresses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York, as I promised I would yield to him.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

At the time I was asking the gentleman to yield, I wanted to clarify the matter.

The gentleman from Kentucky made a strong case that if we transferred the Job Corps it would take 10 years to get residential centers started. I believe in this debate we should be very clear about what the alternatives are.

The gentleman is aware, I am sure, that there is no proposal just to close up all the Job Corps centers and to start all

over again with grants to the States and wait for the States to get residential centers. The proposal is to transfer the administration nationally of the Job Corps into the Vocational Education Office, with authority to continue the present Job Corps centers, but to begin the phasing over process so that we will set up realistic training centers on a regional or community basis.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe I understand. We went through weeks of hearings.

The proposal, as I understand it, is to transfer the operation of the whole Job Corps presently to the Office of Education, to be operated through the vocational schools. But that would require plans from the States, just like the present vocational school system operates today.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. That is not the Opportunity Crusade. The Opportunity Crusade gives full authority for the Vocational Education Office to operate the Job Corps with 100 percent Federal funds, to keep these centers open. Then, over a period of years, they would work out integrated facilities with the existing schools, and work them into State plans to the degree it is feasible.

The Vocational Education Office has full authority to keep these centers operating under the Opportunity Crusade.

Mr. PERKINS. What about funds to be provided in the Opportunity Crusade for residential centers through the Office of Education? How long would the gentleman expect that program would take to get off the ground?

Mr. GOODELL. How long to get off the ground?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. It would be off the ground immediately.

Mr. PERKINS. Where are the centers?

Mr. GOODELL. They would take over the present centers.

Mr. PERKINS. Would it close down the present Job Corps centers being operated by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GOODELL. No.

Mr. PERKINS. Where are the facilities?

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the confrontation is at hand.

I hope in the course of the debate in the ensuing days there will be a clear confrontation, that we will not muddy the waters, that we will not talk about alternatives which are fictional, which nobody is proposing.

I hope there will be an understanding of what we believe to be realistic proposals we are making, and that the House of Representatives will make a choice based upon the facts and the arguments presented here in a truthful and accurate basis.

This poverty legislation embarked at the beginning on a rather partisan course. Today, 3 years later, it is careening along a tortuous course, bordering on a precipice, apparently with many leaders clutching for the wheel and pulling in different directions.

It serves no purpose for us to talk here of passion or partisanship. All of us are concerned about doing more to help the less fortunate in our country.

I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress who would deny the means to implement a realistic program to help the poor and to eliminate poverty in this country.

The debate from the beginning, in 1964, revolved around the question of what is the best way? What is the most realistic way? What is really going to reach the poor?

Arbitrary, all-encompassing indictments of the war on poverty are also uncalled for. We have spent over $4 billion in 3 years. Obviously, when you spend $4 billion, you reach some people, you help some people. Virtually everyone in this Chamber would agree that some of the programs in the war on poverty are good and some of them are not so good. The issue before us as responsible Members of Congress representative of our people is to discuss how we can improve the war on poverty.

Let us not deal with overall indictments. On the other hand, let us not deal with paeans of praise from those who advocate this program claiming that all has been going right and clean in the war on poverty. I think the record is unmistakably clear that it has not been all right in the war on poverty and that there are many difficulties with the present operation of the program.

Recognizing that the American people want to eliminate poverty in this country and that they are willing to pay in order to eliminate poverty in a realistic way, we should end up with a bipartisan approach. Yes, there is not anything partisan about the basic approaches to eliminating poverty. We should end up with a program that is not going to duplicate a variety of other programs and that is not going to add confusion to the present confusion and compound it all into chaos but which will straighten out the problems which are so evident.

Many of us believe this establishment downtown known as the Office of Economic Opportunity is a monument to administrative asininity. It is beyond any doubt the worst administered office that we have seen in modern times in Washington. Now, I say that flatly, and I think most of you off the record and privately would concede that you would have a lot of difficulty in naming another agency of this Government that is administered in a more muddled and confused way.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I will in just a moment.

It is not enough to say these are just new approaches and innovations and therefore inevitably involve some controversy and inevitably involve conflicts. I agree with that. I agree that new programs and innovations involving the poor, with a little decisionmaking of their own and guiding of their own destinies, involve some controversies. This can be constructive for our society. That is no excuse for the unending administrative blunders and confusions that have been going on in the war on poverty.

I can look at my colleagues across the aisle here and see one after another of those who have said this to me privately and conceded this. There is no controversy, really, and there is no discussion that anybody can debate on as to the poorness of the administration of this program. So then the question is how can we improve it.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Our initial suggestion was, let us get these programs into the existing agencies where we can count on some better administration.

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

Mr. GOODELL. At this stage we have been forced to a new position recognizing that, listening to the hearings and listening to the experts who came in in an unpartisan way, they feel that the Office of Economic Opportunity has become an important symbol—an important symbol—that something, something, was going to be different and something might eventually come about that would help the poor. Recognizing also that we should move to get this program out of the partisanship in which it was born in 1964, we tried to move in the opportunity crusade that we will present here later this week, to a proposal that is a fair compromise, that will improve the program and which will permit major redirections in the program without destroying the good.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky first and then to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me first say to the gentleman that we all admit that mistakes have been made. Mistakes are made everywhere in government.

Mr. GOODELL. Can you name me an agency that has made as many mistakes, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman that we threw a lot of money at Sargent Shriver and told him to get started at an early date, and he did just that according to my way of thinking, and he handled the situation in an excellent manner, considering the time he had in which to get started and to commence the operation. Considering the circumstances it has been an efficient operation and in my opinion he has performed in an excellent manner. He has profited from mistakes that were made from time to time. Improvements have been placed into operation. The Job Corps is an example, wherein the cost of its operation has been brought down. And, you can take the programs one by one and examine them and you will find that Sargent Shriver has been effective.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's blanket charge is completely unfair to the present Director, because he is doing an excellent job. The Office

of Economic Opportunity was designed in one sense of the word to do a lot of experimenting, to do something for the poor people, and to do some coordinating in the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, it takes time for that to be accomplished.

We admit that mistakes have been made. But we have profited—the Office of Economic Opportunity has profited—from those mistakes and has done something about these mistakes when they detected them.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky did not answer my question. I certainly do not know of any other agency of this Federal Government that is working to help the poor that is so poorly administered—and we are spending somewhere between $25 billion and $40 billion a year on poverty-oriented programs, Federal money, depending upon how you define the "poverty oriented" program. Yet only $1.5 billion is contained in the war on poverty, and I know of no agency that has made as many monumental mistakes as have been made by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and which has made such mistakes with consistency, with more consistency than any other agency of the Government.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman began his original remarks with a statement of his desire to remove partisanship from consideration of the legislation providing for the war on poverty. He indicated to us on this side of the aisle in a grand and eloquent manner he intended a fair and full discussion of this program so that we thought he was prepared to come to the peace table and suspend the bombing. However, the gentleman immediately came to the question of extending this program by dropping a blockbuster upon the command post of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's question I do not know of any agency in the Government which is prepared to sustain such an attack. Also, I do not know of any other agency that was ever asked to take on something that this country had never tried before in its history; the job of coping with the war on poverty and undertaking to improve the deplorable conditions which existed. However, just about the time the agency began to fully confront this task of great proportions, they were cut back 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any other agency which was ever given a job like that and then had its weapons spiked before it got to the frontlines.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York would indicate that the Republican side of the aisle controls this Congress and, therefore, the course of this legislation. We, together, on our side shall do everything we can in the next year to make that situation come to pass. But the gentleman from New York knows full well that the House of Representatives is 3 to 2 Democrat, and when he says that the minority deprived the Office of Economic Opportunity of 40 percent of their money, he is just engaging in a fallacy.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I do not yield further to the gentleman at this moment. However, I shall in a moment.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York is well aware in the second session of the 89th Congress—and it was, perhaps, the most generous Congress in our history—that second session of the 89th Congress cut back the war on poverty, and I say that there were some good reasons why this happened. The people, suddenly, in this House of Representatives and the other body, began to take a look at what was going on and said, in effect, "We had better stop here and try to redirect this program to some extent."

We had better not just funnel money out in a big load, because it will not solve very much, because not very much of it is really going down to help the poor. So let us do that in this debate here this week.

The gentleman from Kentucky was the first one who mentioned the Director. I said that the program has been poorly administered, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity has made great mistakes.

We said this in 1964, that we felt there was an unrealistic administrative structure. Frankly, I believe Mr. Shriver has made mistakes, but I will give him my sympathy in having to take over such an agency with the administrative structure that was proposed by the President, and that Congress created for him. It was an impossible administrative structure from the outset.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that since the gentleman has been relating the history of this bill, I believe it is clear upon the record who the friends of poverty have been, and who have really been interested in this problem of our Nation.

Let me say this: that the gentleman has never voted for this program, and the gentleman has always voted for the motion to recommit. The gentleman has voted for every crippling amendment that has been offered.

I recall one of the great contributions that the minority side made to the war on poverty was that Mr. Shriver—whom I consider to have done a terrific job, and who undertook a job that no one was willing to handle. And I believe he has done a fine job for the benefit of the poor. I say to the gentleman that I believe he has done a terrific job.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand the gentleman believes he has done a terrific job.

Mr. CAREY. But when the minority first came to consider this matter, they insisted that one of the things that had to be done was in the fact that Mr. Shriver would have to remove one of his two hats, because he was handling the Peace Corps, and this meant that he was now going to handle poverty also, and they wanted him only to concentrate on the poverty program, and thus they then settled for removing one of his hats. Now they are asking for his head.

Mr. GOODELL. I refuse to yield any further to the gentleman. The gentleman can take all of his own time that he wishes to deliver his perorations. I would only say to the gentleman, as long as he has raised the issue, I would just like to quote what the gentleman stated in a public session—and this is from the transcript, and I am quoting the gentleman from New York who just sat down:

> If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies * * *. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation.

The record speaks for the gentleman. The gentleman now says he believes it is a very finely administered program.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield briefly, but I do not want the gentleman to go off on a tangent for another 5 minutes.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will say very briefly that the context in which I made those remarks was that I had specifically in my mind my hometown program in the city of New York.

I believe the gentleman realizes that under the local option formula in this case it is administered by Republican Mayor John Lindsay. And all the criticisms that I am going to make of this program will be directed as to the manner in which it has been conducted in New York City, where Mr. Shriver cannot prevail upon them to conduct the program in the manner he would suggest.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, the great irony is that most of your colleagues who have spoken or who may speak on this subject have very clearly in mind the way the programs are being handled in their own district, and they do not have the benefit that the gentleman from New York does of placing the blame for everything at the top, on the individual mayors of these cities as fall guys, as the gentleman has done here.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I believe actually it is not necessary, judging from the prior comments about all of the mistakes that have been made, to belabor this issue of chaotic administration, but at this stage I would like to quote two individuals who were active in the war on poverty who are very strong advocates of community action, and who certainly have done yeoman work in trying to straighten out the problems at the local levels.

The concentrated employment program was announced with great fanfare last spring. They were trying to get the summer programs started, as they should have been started and planned in the winter or fall of last year, not on a hit or miss basis last spring, in a panic. When these actions were taking place late last spring, James Banks, former UPO director here in Washington, D.C. had this to say:

> The government's whole method of approaching the summer is a crazy, illogical, emotional response to a problem that deserves more serious consideration.
>
> There's something rather immoral about it.
>
> The government's response is: Let's keep down riots and violence rather than to eliminate the causes of riots and violence.

Then Mitchell Sviridoff, director of the program in New York City, the Human Resources Administration, said:

> It is a hell of a way to run a public program. It's unhealthy. What it does is to inform people: The way to get some money is to have a riot or threaten one.

Two and one-half years after the war on poverty was declared, we were still last summer throwing together crash programs.

You can go through the hearings and find testimony after testimony from individuals, that in April, May, and June they were suddenly told that they were going to have $8 million or $10 million to spend in the summer. There was no time to put them together in a reasonable and realistic way.

Now, I want to talk about the Job Corps. I will not belabor the statistics there, but the only evidence we had on the Job Corps performance after 2 full years of operation had to come—and it is appalling to have to say this in a public body—it had to come from the OEO sending out Lou Harris, a pollster, to poll the Job Corps kids to find where they were and what they were doing.

These were kids for whom in the first 2 years we were spending about $11,000 a year in the Job Corps centers per enrollee. We had to have the Federal Government go out and get a pollster to take a sample to find out how many of them got jobs, where they were and what they were doing.

There is something wrong with that.

I believe very deeply in the concept of residential skilled training for those who must have a change in environment to respond. But I believe that we can do it in a more efficient way and more effectively. I think it is kind of sad that we are here 3 years later still arguing that the Job Corps should not be changed and that we should go on doing it in the same way.

The gentleman from Kentucky mentioned the National Youth Administration and the CCC. That is part of the trouble. Apparently, we have not grown up from the tragic years of the thirties. We accept the same old, tired approach and that is not good enough for the problems of the 1960's.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. It took us a long, long time to get vocational education job oriented. Now you are the one who is proposing to take us back so that it will take us many, many years to go forward again, by reason of these transfers.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point because I was about to explain exactly what we would do.

Mr. PERKINS. I would hope that the gentleman would tell the Committee about Lou Harris and the statement he made when he appeared before the committee. It is true that the placement record is 70 percent in the Job Corps and that in the first year they did not have adequate followthrough procedures to see how many of those youngsters were employed, but they did contract for surveys, but I think the gentleman in good faith with this Committee should tell the Committee about the statement that Lou Harris made when he appeared before the committee keeping in mind that the report he made concerned the Job Corps as it existed in 1966 and not as it is today with greatly strengthened directions and administration.

Mr. GOODELL. I will respond first and tell you some of the things that Lou Harris reported to us.

Mr. PERKINS. But I do not mean the way you interpret it.

Mr. GOODELL. These are figures that come from the Lou Harris survey, the only information that we have as to what has happened in the Job Corps after 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. I will have to be quick about this because I would like to explain briefly the opportunity crusade. Mr. Harris showed that 44 percent of the Job Corps graduates, that is those who graduated and stayed to completion, had jobs before they came in. Fifty-three percent had jobs after they graduated. In other words, the number with jobs rose from 44 to 53 percent.

It showed that only one out of 10 Job Corps graduates got any help at all in getting a job from the Job Corps and another 11 percent got some help from the local employment office.

The rest were just cast on the open seas to fend for themselves.

The Harris survey showed that one-third of the Job Corps enrollees dropped out in the first 3 months and another third in the second 3 months. On the average that means that two-thirds of them dropped out in the first 6 months. Mr. Harris also showed that if an enrollee did not stay in the Job Corps for at least 6 months, they were getting very little if any benefit at all out of it.

In fact this is what Mr. Harris said, and I quote——

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

Mr. GOODELL. I do not yield now. The gentleman asked me to quote from the survey, and I will be glad to discuss with him later in a colloquy, if we have the time, the specifics. But I quote now Mr. Harris with reference to nongraduate terminations:

> Overall, there is no reported change in the number currently employed compared with the pre-Job Corps studies. The number in school has dropped slightly. Unemployment has increased slightly.

These were the determinations in the first study. He indicated that if you dropped out in the first 6 months, basically, you ended up no better than before. In fact, in the Job Corps generally, with all the enrollees, 18 percent said they thought they were worse off, 29 percent said they were about the same, leaving about half, 47 percent of them, who said they were no better off than before they went in.

Mr. Harris' survey showed that only 15 percent of the total Job Corps enrollees were using the training that they received in the Job Corps in their jobs. He showed that of the graduates, those that went all the way through, only 25 percent were using the training that they received in Job Corps centers. These are some of the statistics that must be pointed out when we are talking about the Job Corps.

I do not think those statistics in the Lou Harris survey show that an across-the-board indictment of any residential skill training program is indicated here. I think it does indicate very strongly that we can do this job better, that we should make changes. This is basically what we are proposing in the opportunity crusade.

First, the opportunity crusade, instead of spending $2,060,000,000, would spend $1.4 billion of Federal money. That $1.4 billion would generate over $3 billion of money going into the pockets of the poor. How? It would use the Federal money as seed money generating the involvement of private enterprise. Almost all of the money that is in addition to the Federal money would come from private employers hiring these people.

If we talk to the poor, we discover that they do not want dead-end, make-work jobs. They want meaningful jobs for the future. They want to get on-the-job training. They want to start moving up the ladder. That is what we are trying to do with our opportunity crusade.

We would transfer the Job Corps administratively in Washington to the Office of Vocational Education. That is the only change that would be made initially. The Office of Vocational Education would be administering the Job Corps centers that we now have.

Then we would put in the law authority for the Office of Vocational Education to begin to make a transition, a phase-over, into realistic approaches where we can follow through with these youngsters to get them jobs or to give them job training, where we can take some responsibility for placement.

At the end of the transition, in 3 or 4 years, we want these Job Corps centers phased over so they are no longer centers for rejects, where they send them out into the country somewhere. Rather we would have a complex of community training facilities around the country, so that these youngsters can go into a training facility that is residential and paid for 100 percent by Federal money. It would not be set up with the States hav-

ing to match. Enrollees would go into that facility, and it would be integrated with existing technical institutes and vocational schools, so that those Job Corps enrollees who respond well could move into other types of courses. This would save a great deal of money in the program. We would abandon and reject the policy that you have to send Job Corps enrollees as far away from home as possible. The survey done by Mr. Harris indicates that 85 percent of the kids want to go back to their hometown when they get out. Let us take that into account. There will be a placement service built into this training facility. This is the kind of thing we want to move over to. We want to phase the present Job Corps into that kind of program so that we have a continuum carrying these youngsters—these boys and girls—from the beginning all the way through and placing them in a productive job at the end of the line, not dropping them off at the end of the line, as occurs in the Job Corps.

What else do we do? We now have an Education Act funding elementary and secondary education. Among other things we fund preschool programs and follow-through programs in the early years of the youngsters. So then we set up a Head-start program that is completely uncoordinated with the education program, and we go through an entirely different channel, down to the local level, and set up all the torsions and frictions at the local level, and all trying to administer this program at the local level tear their hair.

We lose the major impact of a glorious program, Headstart. It has been a success. Many of us were urging it before the war on poverty. I strongly support it. Let us get a better administrative structure for this.

We propose transferring it to the Office of Education in Washington. They would allocate funds to the State through the State commission, and the State commission in turn would allocate Headstart funds to the local community action boards—not to the local school system—and the local community action boards would contract with public and private agencies for the provision of Headstart for these youngsters.

We think it is a fair and reasonable transition over, and all of it would be run out of the Office of Education and HEW, so there is an automatic coordination of education funds with poverty funds.

This, we feel, would give a great deal more impact to the whole Headstart project.

We would transfer the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is now delegated to the Labor Department anyway, to the Labor Department and give them full authority. This is one of the programs that would cause no difficulty at all in transferring, because the Labor Department already has it.

We would set up new military career centers on a voluntary basis for youngsters who want to qualify to get into the military service and where the military feels they can upgrade the skills enough—either mental skills or physical condition—to get them into the service. We found many of these youngsters, particularly from the ghetto areas, wanted to get into military service. A good many of them got into the Job Corps, and the minute they could qualify for the service, they enlisted. Why do we not have a special program in the military where they can have a uniform and go in on a voluntary basis, upgrade their skills, and then go into the service of their choice? We think this would be a sensible approach to the problem.

Let me come finally to a major change we make in our program. There are many others. We set up an Industry Youth Corps where the community action boards will be able to pay part of the wages of the poor youngsters, for up to a year, so they can get on-the-job training, and get over that first major hump to employment, when they are 16 to 22 years of age. We know this is a major crisis problem in this country, the employment of youth.

This would help, because the community action boards could pay one-quarter of the wages with a private employer paying three-quarters, for up to a year's time, with safeguards provided in the act. Also they could pay some of the expenses of training. The employer is paying three-quarters of the wage, and it is not Uncle Sam paying 100 percent of the wage. Thus, with one-quarter of the wage paid by the Federal Government, we can reach so many more people, and the private employers come in and make a contribution and get productiveness from these individuals.

This is the kind of job the average poor youngster is looking for.

There are a variety of other programs providing counselors in our schools, to get part-time jobs for the youngsters in public or private employment, but once again it will be the approach that will get the jobs that are meaningful and productive.

Let me come to community action and how we handle that in our bill. Unfortunately in our committee we took a regressive step—resisted strenuously by most of us on this side of the aisle. In my opinion, we completely sandbagged the whole concept of involvement of the poor. We turned community action agencies over to city hall. I say bluntly, it does not do any good to guarantee the poor one-third representation on a community action board if we then say that the board is the instrument and the creature of city hall, that the board gets no money unless it comes through city hall, and that the board is created by city hall. This is what the Green amendment does. In my opinion, in most of our big cities, it will completely destroy the genius of community action. I believe it would do so in the South.

In the big cities and in the South it would destroy community action. Is this the price of the votes that may be necessary to pass this bill? If so, it is a dreadful price, because it is snuffing out the one spark that holds great hope for the future in a poverty program; that is, self-motivation, self-involvement in one's own destiny.

This is a good old American principle, going all the way back to the barn-raising days of getting people involved together as a team, working and exchanging and communicating, feeling a part of society.

This has been misconceived in some areas. In some areas community activism or community action has been confused with community militancy and destructiveness. Community building has been confused with community tearing down.

These things should be corrected. We need some standards and guidelines in the program.

We need to involve the local governments more effectively as partners in this, but we need to keep the community action board as the decisionmaking body, with at least one-third of the representatives of that board the representatives of the poor themselves who are to be served.

I believe very deeply that this move, this action by the committee, should be reversed in our deliberations in this Committee of the Whole. I shall offer an amendment to do that. It is an amendment that will bring the States in, in a coordinative way, and will bring in local government as a partner but not as the dominant master of community action.

The amendment which was adopted in our committee might well be called the bosses and boll weevil amendment because it is an amendment for the big city hall bosses and for the southerners to completely denude community action of its potential.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois briefly.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if the gentleman would give us his interpretation of the language in the bill which reads as follows: "at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures."

Mr. GOODELL. I will answer right now.

Mr. PUCINSKI (continuing). "Adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served."

Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will. What you have done there is handed it over and said that the community action agencies are the local governments and are the State governments. Then you provide that the program shall be administered through what will in effect be advisory committees. That is all. You let the poor elect at least one-third to this advisory committee that is totally impotent. You have taken away the dignity of a decision from them, as a partner in the decisionmaking process.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How does the gentleman suggest we do it?

Mr. GOODELL. I just outlined that. We would have a community action board with at least one-third of the representatives of the poor selected by the poor——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what is in here?

Mr. GOODELL. Who sets the priorities——

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what is in here?

Mr. GOODELL. No, it is not.

I do not yield further. The gentleman

knows that is not what is in the Green of Oregon amendment. Let us not muddy the waters.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I suggest that the gentleman read the Green of Oregon amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. That is not what it is. You make a community action board there that is a charade. It is a little charade for the poor to go through that is meaningless.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How does the gentleman want to do it?

Mr. GOODELL. I want that community action board to have power. I want it to be representative of the whole community and be independent of city hall but with balanced representation from all elements of the community, including city officials.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Who would pick them? Who would select them?

Mr. GOODELL. At least one-third would be representatives of the poor. They would be selected by the poor.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a high compliment. I thank the gentleman. I do not believe I will need that much time, except for yielding.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GARDNER. I hate to take issue with my colleague, but the reference to the "boll weevil" southerners certainly offends me.

I supported the Green of Oregon amendment in the committee. I plan to support it on the floor.

I want to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman apparently does not have much faith in the local forms of government. In the South we are perfectly able to take care of our own problems. If I remember correctly, the gentleman stood up and told us that under the Quie amendment the proper thing to do was to turn this funding over to the same governmental agencies, in order that they could best determine how the money should be spent.

I think we should do the same thing as far as this is concerned.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman's comments confirm my characterization of the amendment. I said it was a bosses and boll weevils amendment. I must say to the gentleman I have very little confidence that southern local government will undertake the innovation and the new approaches necessary to help the downtrodden Negro in the South. I do not have much confidence in that. I am sorry.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? You have sort of slandered us. I wonder if you will yield for a little observation on that point.

Mr. GOODELL. Did the gentleman say I slandered you?

Mr. GIBBONS. I certainly did.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly did not intend to, and I apologize if I seemed to. But I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida at this time.

Mr. GIBBONS. I get pretty excited about something like this. You dubbed us the bosses and boll weevils. That makes me laugh. I think the gentleman adequately answered it and I do not want to expand on that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODELL. I think he adequately answered it, too, if I may say so to the gentleman. I think he confirmed what I am saying.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman should know that there are many fine governmental agencies in the South. There are quite a few of them. I know some who have rendered service to this program responsibly and have involved all races and have done it on a very fine and proud basis. I do not want the impression left here at this time that there are not responsible, openminded governments in the South.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to respond briefly to that and say to the gentleman I have great respect for local government and I have great respect for the ability and integrity of many officials of local government in the South. I just feel that the concept of community action and the new approach we are seeking here cannot be implemented in the way that the gentleman's amendment and Mrs. GREEN's amendment does it in community action, because it hands over the whole idea of innovation to people who really do not want to have that kind of innovation.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I think the gentleman's designation of his proposal as a crusade is quite accurate, because in the Middle Ages the crusaders set out to convert the infidels and they ended up by butchering and slaughtering them. I am not sure whether your crusade is for the poor or against the poor, but I think it is very well named.

Mr. GOODELL. I think it is well named, too, for apparently different reasons I will say to the gentleman. I suspect maybe the gentleman from New Jersey will agree with me on community action, will you not? Does the gentleman from New Jersey support the Green amendment in this bill?

Mr. JOELSON. I am considering it very carefully and weighing the debate.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, the so-called opportunity crusade before the committee, when we considered the legislation, H.R. 10682 provided for the transfer of the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where it would not have any constituency. Now, if I understand you correctly, in your new substitute you are proposing to leave it just as it is but transfer all the functions away. Am I correct? Is that your new substitute?

Mr. GOODELL. Oh, no, no, no. We do not transfer all of the new functions away. We leave a great many functions in OEO. The community action remains in OEO. VISTA remains, and a variety of other programs. The legal services program remains. Most all of your new special emphasis programs and things of that nature remain in there. We transfer Headstart, the Job Corps, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. That is basically it. That is to be administered by existing agencies. The gentleman has correctly stated what I think should be the case and I hope will soon be the case, that we transfer community action to HEW.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 additional minute.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to conclude in 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members of this Committee will give serious, fair, and open consideration to the proposals that we are making in the opportunity crusade. They are offered in a constructive and unpartisan way. We want them to be enacted because we think they will bring realism to this program and bring more help to those who so desperately need it.

From 1950 to 1960 we reduced the number of poor families in this country from about 30 percent to 20 percent. And, in the last 5 years that pace of reduction of poor families has slowed. It is now 16.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years we have reduced the amount of poverty by a lower rate than we did from 1950 to 1960. Something is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, as the poor could so eloquently put it, "I am as poor as Job, but not so patient."

Mr. Chairman, let us move to change this program before it is too late.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, much has been written and spoken in recent days about the war on poverty. It is obvious that this legislation is in trouble, but, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the war on poverty is in trouble, not because Congress is blind to the urgent problems of our cities, and not because Congress is deaf to the pleas of those in need, because if that were the case Congress would not have passed innumerable bills for the preschool child, the aged, the unemployed, the unemployable. We have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for programs to help those in need and to give a start to those who would try to help themselves.

For disadvantaged children—this year alone we appropriated over $1 billion in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have appropriated funds for neighborhood facilities; for public housing; for model cities; for education for the handicapped; for vocational rehabilitation; for the public health service.

Over $4 billion have gone in grants to States for public assistance; for maternal

and child welfare; for the manpower development and training alone, one-half billion dollars. For school lunch program; for the food stamp program; for the school milk program; for rural housing for domestic farm labor; for aid to the blind; for aid to dependent children.

Mr. Chairman, this does not exhaust the list but it would be a disservice to this Congress and to this administration to have a message go abroad in the land that this Government is not concerned about all of its citizens and further than a disservice—it would be a misstatement of the facts. We can record by chapter and verse the great programs that have come from the various committees.

But today this program on which we start debate is in trouble because of other reasons than the indifference of Congress to the plight of the poor.

It is in trouble because money that Congress thought would go to the poor is eaten up in high administrative costs or in some cases unaccounted for. It is in trouble because some of us on the committee could not even get answers to questions which we asked. It is in trouble because efforts are made to invoke executive privilege on studies that would give Congress needed information on which valid judgments could be made. It is in trouble because there is an absence of candor when honest people try to get honest answers.

These and other matters have given me great concern about the way the war on poverty has been administered.

Many of our people are caught in the eye of a social hurricane.

The schools of the District of Columbia, the schools of New York City, Detroit, Watts, Cambridge, Cleveland, are caught in that eye of a social hurricane.

Three years ago the Nation declared itself ready to try to do something about poverty. The opponent is an old, grim warrior, strong with years of neglect. That enemy, as I see it, is not so much outside us as he is a part of our individual values. The war on poverty seeks to attack specific evils, but it also helps to transform us as individuals and as a nation. For in daily battle we gain a truer picture of ourselves, a truer concept of the idea that to call oneself an American is tantamount to calling oneself "my brother's keeper."

Poverty, in one sector or one section of America, impoverishes all Americans. To be poor is to die a little each day as the dream of dignity fades down the years. Our war, therefore, must draw no lines of race, color, creed, or sex. Our enemy is everywhere, sapping all of the substance of humanity.

The legislation the committe brings you today is a measure of our resolve to continue the fight. In some areas, on some fronts, the results have been most encouraging and successful; on other fronts our efforts have not been equal to our task. Often our tactics have proved faulty. From these we must learn.

Mr. Chairman, I would argue that past mistakes must not and cannot serve as an excuse to abandon the war on poverty. To make changes in the program, yes; to abandon it, no. Other Federal programs have had their failures and we have not cut them off. Mishap and error in space exploration did not end their efforts in that area of Federal spending. The tragic death of three gallant men in an Apollo capsule did not signal the end of that program. On the contrary, we went forward, saddened by wasteful death, determined to eliminate the cause, but nevertheless forward.

And just a few weeks ago this Congress appropriated over $2½ billion for the Apollo program and an additional $315 million for Apollo applications. If we can afford—in this year of the tight budget—to spend these billions on such projects as putting a man on the moon, we can certainly afford to spend the necessary money on a few million of our children—on this corner of our planet—if in so doing their lives will be enriched and thereby our national life enriched also. The moon is very patient and, I am certain, could not care less whether it meets one of us in 1970 or 1980, but youngsters are not patient and grow up in whatever ways are open to them; they stand still for no one.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Education and Labor Committee are determined that the waste of funds, the inefficient operations, the irresponsible actions are to be stopped—not just for the sake of economy, but so that the disadvantaged will, in fact, reap the benefits of good intentions.

Americans have left messy battlefields in all wars. Few would deny that there is not evidence that the war on poverty has not left a messy battlefield also. But the committee believes the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 will continue the battle with more precision.

But we do not, we cannot, use partial failure to justify retreat. To do so would be unworthy of our responsibility to evaluate and correct programs begun as an expression of this Nation's will to try to end poverty in America.

Let me turn now to title II and the change that the committee made in the bill. In many areas CAP worked well and they will continue to work well under committee changes. A few years ago President Johnson said:

> Legislation should not be examined in the light of benefits it will convey if properly administered—but by wrongs it would cause if improperly administered.

It is to these areas that legislative changes in title II are directed. As I understood the original legislation—and I served on that subcommittee which drafted it—the Congress did not intend to create a new governmental structure of powerful political bodies with the luxury of millions of Federal dollars to spend and none of the responsibilities of raising any of that money. I do not think that Congress aimed to create autonomous groups to displace the decision-making process of State, county, or local governments or to fund with Federal dollars any groups intent on reversing the decisions of the duly elected school boards or county or local governments. No one challenges the right of dissent but many of us question the wisdom of requiring others to pay taxes to finance it. As I see it, the Congress clearly intended to attack an economic problem through political means, but it did not intend to legislate a revolution in American politics by establishing another structure of government at the various levels of political action in the United States.

This year's committee bill that makes community action agencies "a State or a political subdivision of a State"—having duly elected or duly appointed governing officials—clarifies the intent of the original Economic Opportunity Act as I see it.

It does not intend, nor do any of its provisions provide that "poor people" will no longer be able to help shape decisions affecting their lives. The opposite is true for the bill specifically provides that community action boards shall insure participation of the poor through giving poor people at least one-third of the seats on such boards. But it also provides that those who are helping to pay the bill—and who also live in this same community—shall have a voice through their elected officials on how their money is spent and how programs can be coordinated with other existing programs.

I would also like to call attention to the provision encompassed in section 3(d) of title II—the so-called bypass language—if States or political subdivisions fail to develop program meeting criteria of this legislation. It reads:

> 3(d). The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a Community Action Agency other than a Community Action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the Community Action Agency serving the Community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a Community Action program which meets the Criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the state nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the Community Action Agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

But the bill does provide that State or local governmental officials shall participate—and for good reasons: Those who spend public money and initiate local projects affecting the entire community should and must be accountable to their fellow citizens through the democratic process, an election, and the electorate has the chance to reject those for whom private gain or personal power is of greater value than public service.

The bill does not blunt the attack on poverty through this provision. It helps to ensure that locally elected commanders will be responsible for local successes and local failures.

In this respect, I would ask what political alchemy at work in the United States has suddenly made Washington politicians and appointees above error or reproach, and State or local politicians incapable of making wise decisions for the constituents who elected them. In any area where Federal, State, or local politicians are unresponsive to constituency needs, blind to poverty, deaf to legislative pleas for change, then I would say the answer is to make it possible for the people to throw them out of office

at the next election and not permit them to enjoy the luxury of seeking refuge in a nonprofit corporation—not subject to the same regulations as other public employees. In the last several days I have heard cries of alarm in regard to committee changes to title II. The cry usually is, keep the State or local politicians out of it, that local politicians are inefficient at best or nonresponsive or corrupt at the worst. But what they are really saying is: do not have the community action program in the hands of "elected" politicians. This does not keep the politicians who have been rejected by the voters out of it. This does not keep the self-starting politician, who dreams of empire building out of it. This does not keep the self-starting politician, who dreams of empire building out of it. The only complaint I have heard: somehow keep the elected politicians away. My answer is to bring the local elected politicians into it. Then we would continue to be able to measure their competence in the light of popular judgment.

And how many so-called local politicians, who have suffered defeat in State and local elections, have found a community action agency a convenient sanctuary from which they may sally forth—armed with Federal money and sanction—to further their own ambitions?

How many agencies are providing millions of Federal dollars to build local political empires for would-be elected politicians—and those very politicians cry—"keep the politicians out."

Is it the purpose of this legislation to foment discord in our cities and in rural communities? Or are we not trying to stamp out ignorance, disease, and poverty in America? If it is the latter, it is the worth of the program that is important and not whether the poor are the architects. Are the able, are the compassionate, are the concerned the architects? For when the reckoning comes—and come it must—when the shouts produce no skills; when the marches deliver no meat; when the rallies yield no rewards; it will be the Government of the United States of America which is credited with the lie, and then there is no one left to believe.

The bill aims to insure that emergency measures to meet a genuine crisis do not become a pattern of government based on the assumption that all wisdom lies somewhere in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., or that there will be no local movement without Federal initiative.

I have heard in recent days that we may "throw out the baby with the bath." But that baby that is in danger of being thrown out is that fragile infant we call the democratic process. We are not defending the right of local majorities to oppress local minorities.

We are defending the right of local governments to make hard decisions on local problems. In fact, the bill demands engagement by local politicians so that they cannot avoid tough decisions on the battle lines of the war on poverty.

The bill does not abandon responsibility for national guidelines to insure that the purposes of the program are fulfilled and that there is representation of all the people in local decisionmaking. Nor does it take the easy path of building a neatly symmetrical pyramid of Federal power in which the foundation stones exist merely to bear the weight of those above them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we are fighting a war against the idea that "the poor shall always be with us." Our dedication to see victory increases our dedication to see that victory soon. Our dedication gives us the responsibility to make our tactics suit our strategy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, let me compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for one of the great speeches made in this body. In the past we have never involved public officials in the so-called Economic Opportunities Act to the extent that we should have. The explanation of the gentlewoman speaks for itself. We have made tremendous improvements in the legislation and we have got it in shape so that we can eliminate waste. I am hopeful now, Mr. Chairman, that all of the membership of this body could support the bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. To my mind certain clarifications are needed to interpret section 211, for which I understand the gentlewoman from Oregon is responsible. First: What is the composition or the supposed composition or the intended composition of the community action agency under section 211?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The community action agency is to be a State or a political subdivision of a State or a private corporation that the State or political subdivision would so designate and the Director would designate.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Subquestion 1: Is that agency to be composed of a tripartite group, like the war on poverty?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That agency, either under a political subdivision or the State, is the community action agency. There will be a community action board. It is a tripartite agency, it becomes a community action board. If a private agency is designated as a community action agency by the State on a political subdivision of the State—then there is to be a community action "governing board." In both instances it will be tripartite.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the community action agency may be either the State, the city, the local government, or their representatives, they in turn, as I understand, must work through a board?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I then come back to the original question: What is to be the composition of the agency which is the city, the local government, or whatever the government may be? What is the intention on that?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. One-third of the board is to be the elected public officials, one-third representatives of the community, industry, labor, education, welfare, and so forth, and one-third of the board would be representatives of the poor, elected in a democratic process by the poor.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Evidently I have not made myself clear. There is the top layer of the city or its appointed agency. Then there is the lower agency or the board. Is that correct?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There is no lower agency of the board. There is to be a three-party board for every community action agency: one-third public officials, one-third community and one-third the poor.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Let us assume there is only one layer. Under subsection (b), one-third are public officials, one-third are representatives of the poor, who are elected, but there is left in the air the composition of the center group, these officials who are members of business, industry, labor, religious and so on. How are they designated? How do they come into being?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the question is, how are representatives in the one-third group to be representative of the community at large to be designated, the answer is that the bill remains silent on this, and intentionally so. It was not any oversight by the committee. It was the desire on the part of the members of the committee to leave the maximum flexibility possible.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker explained her amendment to the bill that is before us, which is the committee bill. It greatly revamps the action of the community action program as we have seen it for the last 3 years. It also greatly weakens a provision I believe very strongly in, and that is the maximum feasible participation on the part of the poor. Last year I was successful in including an amendment to the bill which required in every community action agency at least one-third of the members of that board must be representative of the poor.

The reason I believe it greatly weakens the bill is that the first priority I can see in reading this bill is that the State can be a community action agency or, if the State chooses not to, a political subdivision of a State or combination of such political subdivisions can be community action agencies. In the event the State does not designate a public nonprofit private agency to be a community action agency but chooses to be the community action agency itself, section 211(a) reads that they shall administer their program through a community action board, but that board will not have the powers of a governing board as defined in section 211(e).

Section 211(e) provides:

> The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

I would assume that since these powers are given only to the governing board

of community action agencies, a community action agency which does not have a governing board because it is a political subdivision, retains these powers for the mayor and his council. The three-legged stool or the tripartite board would be only an advisory board in the case the State or political subdivision chooses to be the political action agency.

Some say, as the gentlewoman from Oregon just indicated, that section 210(d) will prevail in case the State and local political subdivision does not operate a program the way the Director wishes, and that he can then designate another community action agency, private nonprofit agency, in order to run the program. But I have seen enough of the political pressures that cities can make on the Federal Government, and I doubt that the director in a number of instances of big cities would say to them, "We do not like your program. We are going to turn this over to another private, nonprofit agency in your city."

So in this instance, I believe the bill effectively removes the participation of the poor that has been very difficult to achieve so far. The poor have had very little experience in self-government. In the big cities of the Nation, the poor in their neighborhoods are as far away from city hall and the mayor as the people generally are from the State government or even the Federal Government. These people need to learn how to exercise their responsibility in self-government. The community action agency has been an effort to achieve that. It has been difficult. It has been slow. But in some areas this has been achieved. They have made substantial progress. Three years have seen that progress.

I have seen it occur in my congressional district. I have seen it occur in some areas of the country and in some cities of the country.

Where elections have been held, it has been difficult to get the poor to participate in the elections. They had never had a meaningful voice before. They would not believe they had a meaningful voice now with this bill.

Do the Members suppose that we can sell them on the idea of a meaningful voice in the future if they have only an advisory capacity, when their advice has never been accepted before?

When we look to the section of the bill providing for three groups, who will select those who serve on the board?

The first group will be the one-third who are public officials.

The second group will be:

> At least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served.

If a mayor appoints a person from an area of the city where poor people reside in large numbers, is that a democratic procedure? Some Members have said to me that is a democratic procedure, and an appointment by the mayor would be sufficient.

That would greatly weaken what we have anticipated as the responsibilities and the opportunities of the poor in this program. I believe that the poor themselves ought to select the person to represent them, and no one else should appoint a person the poor do not select.

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

Mr. QUIE. Let me finish this, and then we can come back to it.

The poor themselves need to know that the individual they select, whether he is acceptable to city hall or not, is their representative. They need to know if he does not do a good job for them they can turn him out and put somebody else in.

There should be no fear of this by public officials and my colleagues, if the poor have only one-third membership of the boards. In fact, the mayor of Seattle said the poor have more than half in Seattle, and he thinks it is great. At least there is no danger, because we are only insuring that the poor have one-third.

As to the other leg of the stool, the remaining members who are not public officials or representatives of the poor, they are the members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups.

But this does not provide that they will choose their representatives on the board either. I anticipate that the public officials will appoint the representatives of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups, and therefore they will be answerable to the public officials.

I believe that if we are going to have these other people on the board, as we should have, they should be answerable to the groups who send them. The business group ought to have an individual answerable to them. Organized labor ought to have an individual answerable to them. The welfare group ought to have the same thing.

Each one of those groups ought to select its own representative for the board. In this way I believe we will have effective local government in community action.

Some people have said that always, when there is Federal assistance to the local level, it be given through the State governments and local governments. But this will not be effective for poverty programs, because the poor people to date have not been actively participating in the city governments. We should permit a State to appoint a State commission to develop a State plan. But at the local level city hall is not the best agency to go through.

Rather, this ought to operate, as I have said many times, in the way the rural programs with Federal assistance do, which we have had for years and years, and which are practically sacred. If anybody should try to touch them, woe unto him.

Those are in three areas.

One is cooperative extension. In cooperative extension the boards are representatives of the farmers, who are selected by them.

Another is the Soil Conservation Service. Through the election process the farmer participates in electing a representative, a soil conservation district supervisor, to make broad policy decisions.

In the ASCS committees, again on a township level the farmers elect the township committeeman, and the committeemen join together to elect the county committeemen. This method has proved effective in the rural areas.

I should like to see the people in poverty, be they in the rural areas or in the cities of the country, given the same effective voice in selecting their representatives to make the broad policy decisions for programs in their areas, because no one knows what a poor person is thinking of, as he is caught in the ghetto and cannot escape.

There is no way of understanding that. None of us can visit there or spend a week there and understand that. These policymaking boards need individuals to represent the poor who are caught in that helpless state. The poor should select men as their representatives to speak on these boards. There is a gross failure in the legislation we have before us.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to ask the gentleman these two questions and see if he will answer them. I would like to know, first, how he interprets the language on page 174, and I invite my colleague to that language. It appears on line 23.

Mr. QUIE. Will you give me the section? I have the committee report in front of me rather than the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The section is 211(b). It says:

> At least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served.

This is relating to the composition of the board.

My second question is, the gentleman has made many, many statements on this floor over the years on this subject, but he has never spelled out nor has his colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], spelled out precisely and specifically how you propose that these people be chosen. If you are for elections, why do you not say so? How do you propose it? What is your formula? Forget about our formula. Tell us, What do you propose to be the accepted procedure for selecting the one-third representatives of the poor in the community served?

Mr. QUIE. I will be glad to tell the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you.

Mr. QUIE. There are two methods that can be used that I believe are effective. One is election. Election in the cities of the country where the poor reside in an area such as a census tract where 80 percent of the area are poor. I would say let everybody in that area vote. Let them all vote and decide who are to be their representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. How do you decide who will be a qualified voter?

Mr. QUIE. Anybody who lives in that area can vote.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will you say I am poor and therefore I can vote?

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will listen

to me instead of talking at the same time, he would understand what I said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Go ahead. I would like to hear it.

Mr. QUIE. I said in the census tracts where more than 80 percent of the people are poor everybody in that area can vote. You do not have to prove you are poor.

Now, in the rural areas and where they are more widely distributed, the poor people who will benefit from the program and are interested in the program, can come together in neighborhood meetings. This has been done effectively so far. At the neighborhood meetings they can select the person to represent the poor in that area. If they do not choose wisely, the next time when there is such a neighborhood meeting to select a representative, the ones opposed to the representative can come to the meeting and select whoever the majority wants.

Those two methods are effective so far for the poor to select their representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman, but I must say this is a heck of a way to run a railroad. The gentleman saw the disaster we had in this country when we tried this method in Philadelphia and in a few other cities.

Mr. QUIE. Philadelphia was not a disaster. Philadelphia was not as successful as they believed should have been the case, but it was not a disaster. It was an attempt, and they made greater progress the second time they tried it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman answer the second question? How do you interpret this language in the bill which provides that they shall be chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served? How do you interpret that language?

Mr. QUIE. Nobody has given me guidelines or rules and regulations that will be followed to implement this program. I assume it would permit a mayor to appoint them from the area where the poor reside. The appointment method has been considered a democratic process before, but I do not approve of that method of selecting representatives of the poor.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York once again raises this in a context that would confuse the Members. I think it should be emphasized the requirement for a board where one-third are selected by a democratic process to represent the poor is for a community action board that is totally and completely subservient to and a creature of city hall. So that it is a facade. There is a clear involvement of the poor, or else the board itself will not be the decision-making creature. It is a creature of city hall and it does what it tells them to do.

So, if you leave all the representation to the poor and assume that they will be democratically selected, they end up on a board that does not do anything that is meaningful.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield further, and if the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] would be good enough to give me the basis for his interpretation under the law. As I read the law, one-third of them shall be elected officials and one-third of them shall be individuals who are considered to be poor.

Now, let me tell the gentleman how they are elected in New York City. I am unaware as to how they are elected elsewhere. Individuals in a particular area can be elected to this poverty board by petition. As we have it, and as I envisage this specific proposal involving this particular situation, I can see no basis that "city hall" will control it.

I wish the gentleman from New York would clarify that particular situation.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is talking about the present law. We are talking about the bill that comes out of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I would quote from page 171 of the bill, line 7, and thereafter:

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions——

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to further ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]——

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], in further answer to the gentleman's question, if you will follow on from the language which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] just read, section 210, over to section 211, it says that there are two different kinds of community action agencies. There is the one which is the State or political subdivision which shall administer its program under a community action board. But the other community type of community action agencies are ones designated either by a political subdivision or combination of political subdivisions or designated by the Director of OEO, and the governing board's powers are defined in section 211(e).

So the powers given the poor, as well as the other two classes on the board, meaningful power, are listed in section 211(e). But those powers are not given to the community action board where the State or the political subdivision is the community action agency, but, rather, are retained for the political subdivision itself.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this brings about a community action agency governing board. Now, are there two layers or is there one layer of government?

I tried to determine that from questioning the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. QUIE. It is evident that there are two layers. The top layer is the Government, the other is the board appointed by the Government, whether it be city or State appointees.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my question is, How do they come into being? Does this top agency come into being pursuant to the law which does not actually say how it is to come into being? Is it the intention that the agency be composed of a tripartite group, and is the lower level also to be composed of a tripartite group?

In other words, is the top agency just created by law; that is, the mayor or the local council, or the Governor, and the legislature? As I see it, how is this top agency to come into being?

Mr. QUIE. The top agency is not selected by a political subdivision, but the political subdivision which accepts the designation itself, and by following the law they shall be the "community action agency." The Director, of course, must designate them as the community action agency. But if they designate somebody else—another public or nonprofit agency—then there is only one top group or board which receives full governing powers.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Let me see if I understand this correctly, because I believe it is beginning to make sense. It is either the mayor or the council or the Governor or the legislature who are to act as the agency?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Representing the Office of Economic Opportunity, let us say?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Thereafter there is this lower agency which is composed of a tripartite board, although the governing agency or the first agency does not of necessity have to be composed of a tripartite group; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. So that in event that the Governor and State legislature refuse to act, and they designate individuals, then there must be a tripartite group; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. Then there must be a tripartite group that has governing power. However, in the first instance they shall have the tripartite group as an advisory group.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Just one moment. If they designate the tripartite group then there will be two groups that will be composed of people in political life or public life, civic groups, and representatives of the poor.

Mr. QUIE. Right.

In that instance there would be two groups which would be composed of public officials; the ones who have the governing power is the State or political subdivision, and their advisory group through which they say they shall administer the program is the three-legged group.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not understand it to be an advisory group. As I understand—and I would like to be enlightened if I am wrong—is that first group, or the top group, designates, a board through which they act if they so desire. If they

do not desire to designate, they act as both the advisory agency and the board.

Now, a board must be composed of, as I understand it, a tripartite group, and they in turn carry out the functions of the agency. To determine whether or not this lower group is to be influenced at all, I inquired and I asked wherein is there any statement showing authority by anyone to designate the central group or the civic agency. It would seem to me that there is nothing in the law that says the top layer shall appoint them, and there is nothing to say any other body shall appoint them, therefore it would appear to me that the central agency should be elected also just the same as the poor are elected.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 372]

Abbitt	Gallagher	Pettis
Addabbo	Garmatz	Pike
Anderson, Tenn.	Giaimo	Reid, N.Y.
	Green, Pa.	Resnick
Annunzio	Griffiths	Rhodes, Pa.
Ashley	Gross	Rogers, Fla.
Barrett	Grover	Ronan
Boggs	Hagan	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Halleck	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Brown, Mich.	Hanley	St. Onge
Bush	Hays	Smith, Calif.
Button	Helstoski	Smith, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Herlong	Stratton
Clark	Hosmer	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Howard	Teague, Calif.
Cowger	Hutchinson	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Irwin	Tenzer
Dent	Jacobs	Utt
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Vander Jagt
Dole	Kupferman	Watkins
Dow	Madden	Watson
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Watts
Dulski	Mathias, Md.	Whalley
Ellberg	Meskill	Williams, Miss.
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Williams, Pa.
Eshleman	Moorhead	Willis
Everett	Morgan	Wilson, Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	
Fallon	Multer	Wolff
Fino	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
Flood	Nix	Wydler
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neill, Mass.	Zion
Fountain	Ottinger	
Friedel	Pelly	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2388, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] had 4 minutes remaining of the last 10 minutes allocated to him.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, just a last comment upon the colloquy which we had before the quorum call was requested, and this has to do with the language which appears on pages 46 and 47, wherein we see the explanation of subsection (e) defining the powers of governing boards.

Subsection (e) of this section specifies that "community action governing boards" must have the power to select persons for senior staff positions, determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, approve overall programs, establish priorities and assure compliance with conditions of this title. Does not specify the powers to be delegated to "community action boards" when the State or political subdivision itself has been designated as the community action agency.

And, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated previously, under section 211(a), the State or the political subdivision, if it is a community action program, does not have a governing board. But it states in the phraseology of subsection (e) of subsection 211 that this section does not specify the powers to be delegated to a community action authority when the State or the political action group has been designated as the political action agency.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, head of Metropolitan Applied Research Center in New York, in his recent study of community action programs in 65 cities noted that:

Programs directed to community action were successfully implemented only when they were basically independent of political control or, occasionally, and very rarely, supported and protected by an empathetic progressive local government, and

That, generally, local governments and, when challenged the OEO, were alarmed when the poor took the anti-poverty community action program seriously, and tended to resist or to seek the defeat of such programs when their programs challenged the status quo directly.

He further noted:

Where the local community has resisted the organized program of the poor, the Federal Government has not proved able to support the program effectively over such resistance.

A recent effort in St. Louis to turn control of the board over to the Mayor by giving him power to appoint 10 of the 15 board members. In regard to this attempt, the regional OEO director Don Thomason said:

The Mayor's power to appoint two thirds of the board would create such a concentration of power as would trend to develop loyalties and antipathies which probably would deprive the community action agency of the greater wealth of talent and resources attendant from the whole community.

The AFL–CIO and others attack this proposal asking that the Human Development Corporation be "kept above politics."

Another said:

The War on Poverty is too serious a business and critically affects the lives of too many of our poorer citizens to allow the program to become bogged down in political maneuvering.

Well, I brought this question up of the involvement of the poor because I believe that this is a key feature, the real genius to the poverty program. There is not much else which is really new in the poverty program. The Job Corps and the NYC are not new. Other agencies could administer them just as now the Department of Labor actually administers the NYC, but involvement of the poor in the programs that the Federal Government administers is an ingenious feature that I strongly support which has been operated in the poverty program, and I would hope that it would continue into the future. I dislike seeing it hampered, as the amendments that came out of the committee will do.

I believe there are a number of programs that have functioned well. Some of them are the Headstart program, the new addition of followthrough, I believe is excellent, and should be supported, and there are other programs like foster grandparents, and the Green Thumb, that really have made significant contributions to the war on poverty that have been attempted in the crusade that I would like to see us get into.

The special genius of Headstart has been the recognition that the pitiful poverty cycle can best be broken at an early age. The opportunity crusade places far greater emphasis on Headstart and a more meaningful followthrough program in the first three grades. I believe also there should be a continuing and expanded foster grandparents and Green Thumb programs.

However, the major difference between the Democrat and Republican approaches is that Republicans place emphasis on creating real jobs for the poor, while Democrats continue to fund makework jobs which lead nowhere. The key to ending poverty has always been finding ways to assure men and women of good jobs. Our Industry Youth Corps and other educational and training programs are designed to prepare the underprivileged and undereducated for jobs with dignity.

The opportunity crusade will truly involve business and industry in the war to alleviate poverty. Hiring a few firms to run Job Corps camps is not true involvement of America's No. 1 generator of jobs—private enterprise.

Let us remember the needs of the poor and the deprived. The hard reality of poverty will be with us far beyond the elections of 1968. Democrats and Republicans should join forces to write a bill which will truly begin to end the tragedy of poverty in this land of affluence. Republicans are more than willing to take the best of the administration's program along with the best in the opportunity crusade and combine them into a strong program. Poverty is too critical a problem to be the victim of partisan struggles.

I believe that the opportunity crusade would make some meaningful changes in the program to enable it to function better. For instance, in Headstart, followthrough, and upward bound, we propose that those be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, then they could be coordinated with similar programs that are presently being operated by the Office of Education today.

There is title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, which is funded over $1 billion, that can be used for the purposes of preschool education. Since OE is administering that pro-

gram, certainly Headstart would function much more efficiently and have the same advantages that are enjoyed by the same Department of the Government, this would permit these two to be coordinated. However, I will point out that when we suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare administer project Headstart, that we do not mean that the community action agencies would be divested of their responsibilities that they have had heretofore.

The way that private organizations can participate in Headstart programs is to permit money to be administered through community action agencies. In the opportunity crusade, State agencies broadly representative of all the groups who are interested in this program, will set a State plan and develop State policy, and the money will go through the community action agencies if a qualified community action agency is in existence, otherwise it would go through Headstart agencies or any other means whereby the young people who definitely need the assistance of a Headstart program can benefit from it.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would be possible for a bill to be developed which would take the most important features of opportunity crusade, and blend them into a bill that would enable us to finally write a bipartisan poverty bill.

As was stated by my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the poverty program started out in politics. In 1964 the President did not want any Republican amendments to it. Evidently he wanted to make certain that the conglomeration of the Kennedy proposals that they put together in the war on poverty would carry his stamp, and his stamp alone for the 1964 elections, and there were enough Democrats in that Congress to do it without any Republican stamp to it at all.

In the fall of 1966 issue of Columbia Journalism Review, Erwin Knoll and Jules Witcover had an excellent article entitled, "Maximum Feasible Publicity." They stated that:

President Johnson, leafing through the pending-business basket of the Kennedy Administraton for something dramatic to call his own, seized on the poverty problem with characteristic zeal. Tentative Kennedy titles—"Human Conservation and Development," "Access to Opportunity"—were discarded as "bloodless" and Johnson declared "unconditional war on poverty" in his first State of the Union message.

The article is mostly about, however, the amount of publicity that emanates from OEO. Quoting from Knoll and Witcover again:

In the Johnson Administration's War on Poverty, nobody—not even the poor—gets more attention from Sargent Shriver's GHQ than does the combat correspondent. Except for the Pentagon, where more than 200 government publicists labor to explain or obscure details of the administration's other war, no federal command post puts greater emphasis and energy into psychological warfare for and against the press.

But not since New Deal days has Washington seen a coordinated hard-sell for a relatively small program to match OEO's merchandising of the effort to combat poverty.

But I think most of us remember when there was a meeting with the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty. A number of the poor saw through Shriver's avalanche of propaganda. Knoll and Witcover again state in their article:

Only one misfortune has marred Shriver's record as his own, and OEO's, best PR man—the Washington convention last spring of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty at which he was booed off the stage and out of the hall by delegates who were angry, disillusioned, and poor. There were two immediate casualties—Shriver's image and Kramer's left shoulder, which was bumped in the melee. There were also significant implications for OEO's publicity effort. Newspaper stories on the incident jarred the office of public affairs. Particularly resented was the front-page story in *The New York Times* by Nan Robertson, whose account of what had happened differed in no significant respect from other newspaper and wire service reports. In New York, Turner Catledge, the executive editor, received protests against the story. In a long telegram, one prominent citizen informed the *Times* that "I resent and object to today's news story," and went on to praise Shriver as a man who "to the best of my knowledge has never ducked out of any meeting in his life including yesterday's." Another, shorter telegram advised the *Times* that Shriver had "conducted himself with calm, dignity and decorum." Neither sender mentioned the fact that his message to the *Times* had been encouraged—in fact, solicited—by OEO, or that others had been importuned to send similar protests, but had refused. The handling of the episode had become a matter of controversy—some of it openly expressed—within the public affairs office. Shortly afterward, Kramer's deputy, Jim Kelleher, resigned.

Shriver blamed "professional demonstrators" for the incident, but there were other appraisals that laid the cause closer to the door of OEO's in-house advertising agency. Walter Reuther, the chairman of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, was quoted as pointing out that the demonstrators started booing as "Shriver was trying to overwhelm them with success statistics. They released their anger and their deepest frustrations at not seeing results." The shouts of the protesters lent weight to Reuther's assessment. "Tell us where the poor are being helped," one woman screamed. "It's just a big publicity deal." "Shriver tells us what has been done, but what about what hasn't been done?" another shouted. The Washington Post commented in an editorial that Shriver "was hearing from the people who have taken literally every word of every official pronouncement. These true believers now consider themselves betrayed, for the performance turns out to be less splendid than the promise."

I understand that $2,400,000 has been expended per year in public relations by OEO. In the hearings before our committee on page 881 my colleague, CHARLES E. GOODELL, asked Sargent Shriver about this expenditure. The colloquy is as follows:

Mr. GOODELL. If you are referring to the series of investigative reports we made last year, none of which were contradicted in their essential facts, then I think it is a very unfortunate reference. Glib terms like "throat slitting," "professional hatchet job," which don't advance the cause of good legislation at all. We were very careful with those memos to stick to the facts as we were able to establish them with our professional investigators. It seemed to us that those facts should be brought out.

Part of the problem with this is the so-called ballyhoo budget that you have at OEO. Is it true that you have $2.4 million allocated to public information and public relations at OEO?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know that specifically.

Mr. GOODELL. You have 46 employees in your public information office and a $2.4 million budget. This troubles a good many of us. According to a recent AP story, $42 million is spent by the Federal executive agencies on self-pleadings, if you will, publicity or public relations. At OEO $2.4 million for a ballyhoo budget really does bother us. Is that much money really necessary?

Mr. SHRIVER. I would be glad to compare our budget for publicity with any agency carrying on a comparable program under President Eisenhower.

Mr. GOODELL. You have all sorts of reservations.

Mr. SHRIVER. I will be happy to compare it to any program with the same amount of money.

Mr. GOODELL. You don't think $2.4 million is too much?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know about the figure. All I know is that our Department of Public Information is working night and day trying to keep up with requests for information about the program. It is a small office for an agency of this size and compares very favorably with any agency that I know of, or any business concern of comparable magnitude. There are 47 people including all the secretaries that work in that division and they have an annual pay of $975,000 for them all. Now the additional money probably is to pay for printing of reports that are required here by the Congress and by others. We have to have information on hand about the program. For example, when we launched Project Headstart we had to put out five little pamphlets, each one of which was essential for every community in the United States to have. One was about nutrition, another about the kind of teaching equipment you needed, or materials in the headstart program. We had to pay for all of that out of our money.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that information pamphlets have to go out but it seems to me that $2.4 million is an excessive amount of money for public relations for an agency that size.

Mr. SHRIVER. We would be delighted to have the amount of money that we spend for that purpose up here for a complete analysis by this committee where the men in charge of it will show you everything that is being spent, who gets paid, and then I think you can compare that with the expenditures for any agency of the U.S. Government, any private business, or the Red Cross, or any other agency.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason for our concern about this is that many of us feel exaggerated statements of results accomplish nothing constructive at all. This concern has been shared by many conscientious observers including Haynes Johnson of the Washington Star who wrote articles on the poverty program. He said:

The program has suffered from too much and too effective salesmanship. As a consequence, it is, in part, a captive of its own promises.

I could give you a number of quotes from other people who basically favor the war on poverty. In a war on poverty it seems to me it furthers no one's case to exaggerate and go through a bayhoo routine which points up and exaggerates alleged good features and leaves out the bad features. As a matter of fact, I have before me an article in which this problem is discussed and an OEO information staff member is quoted.

An OEO information staffer says that: "With Sarge when something goes wrong with the program you step up public relations." Unfortunately there are a good many times when legitimate, constructive criticism has been made and each time it does seem that the thin-skinned reaction is almost a flashback. OEO denies everything and then comes through with great exaggerated claims for what has been done. There have been a number of cases where the poor themselves have risen up and objected to this kind of high promise which far exceeds performance.

Mr. SHRIVER. I will just respond by saying that first of all we welcome the criticism whenever it is constructive. Second, we have not exaggerated our claims for success but, in fact, have minimized it. With Project Headstart we have only reached 32 percent of the kids eligible. In other programs we are very, very low in terms of reaching the people who should be reached by the program, so that I would like to say for the record that we are interested in constructive criticism. We are not exaggerating what we have done. We do try to dramatize the needs and will continue to, because the needs of the poor are always overlooked and their needs need to be dramatized. That is where we are concentrating our effort.

Mr. GOODELL. We have heard these claims about 4 million of the poor touched or 8 million touched or affected by this program, technically I guess you could say that is not an exaggeration. However, when you take an impressive figure like 4 million or 8 million people who have been touched and we don't know what the dickens "touched" means—it certainly doesn't mean meaningful impact—then your claim exaggerates the real effects of the war on poverty. It seems to us that this doesn't serve a particularly good cause.

Mr. SHRIVER. Those figures are compiled by the research and planning department. Sarge is not putting them out. They come from there.

Mr. GOODELL. It is your agency.

Mr. SHRIVER. They are the best figures it is possible for us to obtain. Everybody likes to know what the figures are, what are you doing? These are the best figures we could come up with. Suppose we had touched 6 million or 5 million or 7 million people. That still leaves five times as many people untouched and that is what we are talking about all the time. If there are 32 million people in the United States that are poor we are not touching even one out of four with 8 million.

Mr. GOODELL. Reached, affected, served, touched, all of these words are misleading. I quote another outstanding authority who has made many of these studies and he said:

"Unsupported claims of achievements and exaggerated official promises for the Federal war on poverty regrettably have serious repercussions."

Mr. LEVINE. On that 7 million or 9 million people, it should be clear that neither my Department nor Mr. Shriver has ever claimed anything for that figure aside from what you have said. There are people who have passed through that we don't know how we have affected.

Mr. GOODELL. What does touched mean?

Mr. LEVINE. It means perhaps they have been in a neighborhood center. In fact, Mr. Shriver never meant anything but that.

But as I have looked at programs in the past and seen them develop from a committee, the real strong programs that continued without a great deal of controversy are the ones that have had bipartisan support when they came out of the committee. For that reason I believe that there ought to be some major changes.

Some of the major differences of the opportunity crusade will involve private business to a far greater extent than does the committee bill.

I am convinced that the only way we are really going to solve the poverty problem in the United States is to enlist private business in the activity so that private business can give meaningful jobs—real jobs—that can carry these people on year after year.

You talk to the people in the ghettos and talk to the poor people and ask them what they want. They want jobs—good jobs—jobs with dignity. If we will give them the benefits of the educational training programs and an opportunity to find jobs in private business the antipoverty efforts will be worth the money expended.

The Industry Youth Corps, which we advocate, will enable the Federal Government, through a much smaller expenditure of money per individual, to give poor youth a better opportunity for meaningful jobs.

The National Youth Corps now requires a 90-percent Federal share in the wages of the youth. Under the Industry Youth Corps the Federal Government will only need to contribute 25 percent of the wages of the youths, enough to enable private business to utilize such young persons and teach them skills during the period of time that their skills are not commensurate with the wages that have to be paid.

This subsidy would enable us to reach many more young people with the same amount of money and give them much more meaningful jobs than they could secure either through public or private nonprofit employment.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, if we will strengthen the private enterprise portion of this bill and transfer those parts of the program that obviously ought to go to existing agencies for the operation of such as the Job Corps going to vocational education, and Headstart and Upward Bound and Followthrough to HEW and make certain of a more meaningful voice for the poor in community action, we will then have the kind of strong economic opportunity bill this year which I believe we could all support. It is toward that end, when we are considering the bill under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, that I will be working as one Member of this body.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to commend the gentleman on his statement and on the position that he has adopted and to advise him that I support it wholeheartedly. I am looking forward to success in the effort that he will be offering to us to improve this program.

Mr. Chairman, if one can accept that which is said editorially by the New York Times as being accurate and objective, then—on the basis of its lead editorial this morning—Julius Caesar would have to stand corrected for "all Gaul" would now apparently have to be divided not just into the traditional three parts but into five parts, with the two new divisions being reserved for our two colleagues on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

This is because—though one has to change the spelling of "Gaul" a bit—the Times has chosen, wrongly and unfairly, I believe, to attack these two of our colleagues for advancing their "opportunity crusade"—as they call it—as a substitute for the bill, S. 2388, now before us.

To quote the Times:

It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade" but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy enough to get emotional about subject matter such as that we are now beginning to consider—anyone can do that and many of us here probably will before this debate ends—but I believe that the Times has gone way off the deep end in this respect and I, personally, resent and object to the line its editors have thus taken. I resent it and object to it, not just in behalf of these two of my respected colleagues who have so been singled out for attack, but I resent it and object to it in my own behalf and in behalf of all those others here who, regardless of party, have voted against prior antipoverty legislation, not because of any lack of disregard for or understanding of the problems of America's poor, but because we disagreed with the approach—or some portion of it—as embodied in those earlier bills and offered as a solution to those very real and urgent problems.

The situation, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is very much the same here again today.

For the question we all have to decide is not whether the poor have problems—or whether those problems are worthy of our attention—but how best can we, how best can this Nation, get at the root causes of those problems; how best can we devise an antipoverty program that will produce more for America's poor than a rising tide of expectations that—once dashed against the hard rocks of reality—will smash back in against us all in a flood of disappointment and disillusionment that could carry with it the seeds of revolution.

Now, I am far from an expert in this field. In point of fact, I doubt that anyone really is, given the truly experimental nature of what has been attempted in this war on poverty that—Government directed and Government led—has been devised to supplement and spur on the similar war that the individual American citizen has heretofore been carrying on, mostly on his own, and with generally outstanding success, ever since this Nation was born.

But, at the same time Mr. Chairman, I have done the best I could to familiarize myself with the manner in which this new and focused war has been conducted in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. I have visited and talked with the paid professionals who have been selected in our several communities to head this war, and I have—within the limited time given me—also visited and talked with as many of the so-called poor, themselves, whom this program was intended to encourage and to assist, as I could.

From this experience, Mr. Chairman, I know that this program has accomplished much that is good and useful in my congressional district, and I believe that this is an effort that must now be carried on—and I now announce that I hope we will vote to carry it on but, at the same time, this experience has convinced me, too, that the program can and must be improved in several respects; that it needs to be tightened up and to be subjected to better overall administration, and that in this respect the suggestion made by the Goodell-Quie substitute for a transfer of certain of the OEO's programs to other, preexisting Federal agencies, makes good sense to me and, far from "gutting" OEO as this proposition has sometimes been pictured, this would permit OEO to move back toward what ought to be its primary function—that of coordinating and spurring antipoverty efforts on both the Federal and local levels.

For it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that though less visible and less dramatic, certainly, than the running of national antipoverty programs, this coordinating role—the overseeing role—that OEO ought to have, if this overall program is ever to succeed, is of vast and heretofore mostly forgotten importance. For, as we have already seen all too often, when OEO attempts to operate programs itself—outside of the community action program which it ought to retain—it inevitably acquires a vested interest in continuing those programs, regardless of their merits or lack of success.

The prime example of this is, of course, the Job Corps which—as the minority points out in the committee report—has, unfortunately, been "as tragic a failure as anything attempted under the Economic Opportunity Act."

I was especially impressed, some time ago, by the views of Richard Boone in this connection. Mr. Boone, a former director of the Program Policy and Development Division of the OEO's community action program, suggests that OEO was intended by its original planners to serve as a "catalyst for the development of leadership among those who have been traditionally excluded from local decisionmaking, its funds to be used as 'cement' in bringing about the coordination of local groups that ordinarily might never work with one another."

But, then he adds—as has so painfully been true about so much of this originally oversold war—that "we promised much more than we could produce," and he goes on to further suggest that, in large part, the failure of OEO to produce better results has been because it has only partially fulfilled its role as a catalyst, saying:

> I doubt whether the Office of Economic Opportunity can remain responsive to its policy goals and *new* operational strategies while continuing to expand its direct operational responsibilities. If Federal agency history is any guide, as OEO increases its direct operations (through administering bigger programs and adding new ones), it will find its ability to innovate, criticize, evaluate and mobilize decreasing. As it increases its operational "domain", its constituency will shift from the poor to middle men, the carriers of its programs, and to those who help to designate the carriers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the concern thus expressed by Mr. Boone to be most worthy of our consideration—and it is, as I understand them, the same sort of concern that now has motivated the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] in devising their substitute.

I am also especially gratified to note that, in that substitute, these gentlemen of the committee do not adopt that portion of the reworked committee bill which would tend to put local politicians—no matter how worthy and understanding they may be—firmly in control of the community action program, for I think this would be a very large mistake.

If there is promise anywhere in this whole effort, that promise—in my judgment—lies in the concept of community action, a concept that, to succeed, must remain flexible and innovative and, thus, fully responsive to local needs and conditions, and that, above all, must also involve to the fullest extent possible the poor themselves.

This is an issue that, I know, will be further developed as this debate moves along, but as of now I am squarely on the side of the Goodell-Quie substitute in this respect, just as I am on its side where it eliminates the proposal made by the committee requiring that at least one-half of each local community's contribution toward this program must be in cash. If one really wanted to gut the program, I do not know how it could be accomplished any more quickly than in that latter fashion because, bad though the Federal budgetary picture is, the local and State picture is, if possible, only worse.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to express these preliminary views. I do not know, nor do any of us, what the outcome here this week will be; but I do wish that the Nation's press—that ought to be more objective about such matters as this, even on its editorial pages, than it has been—would take note that not all those who seek to preserve but improve, the war on poverty are its enemies. The Goodell-Quie substitute may not be flawless—but, then, neither is the committee's product, and it is our common task here this week, as responsible legislators, to do the best we can with the best of both; and this, I trust is what we will do.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, poverty is a pitiful state sometimes caused by circumstance and sometimes, we are told, passed from generation to generation almost as though by heredity. There can be little doubt that a war on poverty will find favor in our society. The Government, as an instrument of our citizens, has a rightful role in ministering to their broad problems. And so, I would say that there is little disagreement on the basic objective before this body—to approve a proper and successful way to alleviate poverty.

Nevertheless, we are undergoing extensive debate, over a period of several days, on this very point. In a few words, we are attempting to determine the best way to help the poor permanently.

I have been one who was skeptical. My constituents have related to me charges of direct political campaigning by antipoverty workers employed with Federal funds, suspicions of labor organizing with these same funds, even importation of hippies into certain areas to create pockets of poverty and require an antipoverty program. I am one who encourages political action and supports the need for labor unions, but I do not believe that public funds should be used in a partisan way to further these institutions.

Many of these problems have eased. Further, programs such as Headstart, Follow Through, Foster Grandparents, and Green Thumb have succeeded in areas of great need. In short, I consider some of our Office of Economic Opportunity programs, especially Headstart training for preschool youngsters, to be among our finest social programs.

This week we have before us a proposal to continue the war on poverty at an increased level of $2.06 billion, an increase of $460 million over the present program. In view of our present tight fiscal situation caused by the Vietnam war and heavy domestic spending; in view of the serious problems still existing in the present program; and in view of basic philosophical fallacies in the present program, which I will detail a little later, I cannot agree to continue this program in its present form, nor to substantially increase its authorized funding.

Instead, I will support a detailed program to redirect this poverty war into more constructive channels. We must develop the strengths, not perpetuate the weaknesses of the poor. We must inspire and incite them to self help rather than soothe them in the status quo with handouts and lack of incentive. We must bring the private sector into this effort to help the poor rather than load it all on the backs of our taxpaying citizens.

The vehicle for this change of direction, hopefully toward much greater success, is the opportunity crusade. I will support this new approach because it provides the following necessary changes:

First. It would cost the Federal taxpayers $660 million less than the administration program now before us.

Second. It would continue community action programs under OEO but with greater emphasis on job training, strong representation of the poor, and would require State plans to administer the program within each State.

Third. It would prohibit political activities by all antipoverty employees.

Fourth. It would create new programs to attract wider participation from private industry for job training.

Fifth. It would shift all educational programs—Headstart, Job Corps, Upward Bound, and In-School Neighbor-

hood Youth Corps—to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sixth. It would shift manpower and vocational training programs to the Department of Labor and eventually phase the Job Corps into State vocational education programs.

Seventh. It would establish military career centers to upgrade young men to meet military service requirements.

I firmly believe that an antipoverty program of this nature must appeal to the strengths of our citizens rather than to their weaknesses. It must be our goal to provide programs which will motivate people to help themselves improve their lot rather than to encourage dependence on others or to reward idleness, sloth, or immorality. In addition, any program should include provisions which will encourage individuals to help the poor and disadvantaged through a sharing of their knowledge and talents.

If we do otherwise; that is, if we establish programs which convince the poor that they are in for a free ride or that they will be taken care of by a benevolent society without any effort on their part, we cannot possibly realize any long-term gain, and I am certain that we would only succeed in placing a damaging and, perhaps, disastrous drain on the human and financial resources of our society.

I think the experience we have had with the Office of Economic Opportunity over the past several years has substantiated this point. The one great failing of the war on poverty to date is that it has attempted to solve deep-seated and long-standing problems with a simplistic handout of easy Federal money. I say simplistic because it has stemmed from a desire, conscious or unconscious, to take the easy course and to refrain from admitting to the real problems which cause poverty and the related feelings of cynicism, bitterness, and hopelessness which the poor feel, and which cause them to believe they are unable to help themselves. They think society, rather than their own shortcomings, holds them back from improving their lot.

The unlikely combination of Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, and conservative William F. Buckley, Jr., has joined in recent years to point out that our society is unwilling to admit, and consequently ignores, many of the problems behind chronic poverty, particularly among poor, urban Negro families, which are far beyond solution by Federal grants. In many cases, political norms run counter to accepting and attempting to solve these problems.

Thus, I believe creative programs must be developed which come directly to the root of the problem. The past history of the Office of Economic Opportunity shows that it has failed to meet these problems and, in many cases, only increases bitterness and frustration among the poor. We need to provide the proper motivation.

I believe it is possible and effective to use the tax structure to help create incentive for people to advance their way in life rather than to destroy their initiative through excessive taxation or reliance on easy governmental grants. As we seek means of improving our education, employment, and other programs for social progress, we must seek positive means of making the tax structure a constructive tool in our way of life, not a destructive tool. Proper tax reform is an answer.

Rather than taking away initiative by way of free money and help, people should be encouraged to become motivated volunteers by permitting them to take measured tax deductions if they, in turn, accept certain responsibilities.

I think the tax structure can become the focal point of our efforts. Also, in keeping with the philosophy embodied in the tax reform proposal, we should make certain that other programs for social upgrading be based on providing motivation, both to those who need the assistance as well as to those who are able to provide it. The more socially disadvantaged persons we can motivate and the more successful persons we can motivate, the more far-reaching and long-lasting any program will become. Additionally, any successful effort of this nature will become self-prolonging and self-sustaining.

A successful program, to my mind, must draw from the resources of all levels of government, from the private sector and from the independent sector of religious groups and charitable organizations.

If we can muster up the courage to acknowledge and accept the true sources of the problems of the poor, if we can develop intelligent programs designed to encourage greater motivation toward self-help and, if we can involve all segments of our society in this vast effort; then, and only then, can we begin to make significant improvements in the lives of our disadvantaged people. Further, any program which does not meet these criteria will be an unfortunate waste of time and money and will cruelly raise the expectations of our poor without any hope of fulfilling them.

We have a responsibility to the poor to help upgrade their lives and I hope this Congress will live up to that responsibility. However, a poorly conceived effort could become a tragic hoax, and I hope that wisdom and judgment will be used in developing an efficient, successful effort in this field. In respect to these thoughts, I believe that the opportunity crusade is a significant improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, after 8 or 9 or 10 months of working on this legislation, the issues have now been distilled, despite all of the talk we may hear in this Chamber, to just two major issues that should attract the attention of this body during the remainder of the debate.

The first major issue is on the question of money. How much money and effort are we going to put into this program?

The second major issue revolves around the Green amendment—the amendment that my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], refers to as the boss and boll weevils amendment, and as to which he said, as I understand it, there just were not any real responsible governments in the South to carry out a constructive program.

I am going to devote my time to those two important issues.

First of all, apparently, tomorrow the first thing we are going to be faced with is a motion by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] that we commit hara-kiri with this program; that we take this program and we slit our own throats; that we take this program and allow it to continue on a month-to-month basis, with $101 million.

All that that would do to this program is to kill it, without the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], and the Members who will vote with Mr. AYRES tomorrow, accepting the political responsibility for killing the program.

That is all it would do, because the program would deteriorate in Washington, and on every street in the United States where it is working effectively. That is all that the Ayres motion would do. If Mr. AYRES wants to kill this program—and I am sure that he does because he has submitted motions to strike out the enacting clause in the past—then I would suggest to him that he take the straightforward approach that he has always taken in the past—just attack the program. Do not merely strangle it to death. Do not let it commit suicide by itself.

I would urge those who are truthfully opposing the program not to vote for the Ayres amendment but just vote to kill it when final passage comes.

On the money issue, the bill that the committee brought to this floor was in the President's budget. Many people may wonder how much of the need is actually met by this program; let us talk about the need in America for a little while and contrast it with what our actual support is. Actually, the need in this country is about 10 times as great as the effort we are carrying forth in this program. If we had the money available, if we had the trained people to carry out the program, to actually do something about the amount of poverty that we have in this country, it would take in addition to this program, and all the other programs ongoing now that we have in this country, $12 to $13 billion a year to really make a substantial impact on poverty in the United States. The need is that great. Contrast it with the figure we will probably come out of here with next week when we vote on the bill. So the need is much greater than we have ever been willing to put up.

I think America has the capacity and the skill, but, I am afraid it does not have the determination to attack and solve this problem. But the need is there and the money can be spent and spent wisely.

As to the "bosses and boll weevils," first, I take strenuous objection to calling Mrs. GREEN'S amendment by that title. It was an amendment that many of us had talked about for a long time. I do not think I need to apologize for my support of that amendment.

I support Mrs. GREEN'S amendment because I think it is a constructive step. It would bring back into the program what we had originally conceived the program to be—a responsible program, administered wherever it can be by a local government, a local government

that would put some money into the program and put some of their own effort and some of their own reputation on the line. That is what I meant it to be when I voted for the program 3 or 4 years ago and when I have supported it ever since. That is what the Green amendment does.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Is it not true that your familiarity with the guidelines that were published by the OEO to translate the intent of Congress in the present bill into implementation at the local levels, that those published guidelines actually carry the same kind of provision that we now have put in this bill, namely, on page 17 of the guidelines it states—

The minimum standards for representation, either on the governing body of the community action agency or on a policy advisory committee are:

A. Representation from private and public agencies shall include at least one representative of the chief elected official, or officials, of the community, the board of education, the public welfare agency—

And so forth.

Thereafter, in subparagraph (b) it states that there shall be—

Representation form the leadership of important elements in the community, such as labor, business, religious, and minority groups—

Just as we provide in this bill.

Finally, Congress decided to include the poor to be served, which we call the indigenous corps, and which has been characterized as the maximum feasible participation by the poor.

Is it not true that if these boards that were set up had followed the guidelines laid down by the OEO, and had followed them as published in the OEO pamphlets, they would not have to reconstruct or try to revise the boards to meet the language of the bill? Is this correct?

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman has accurately described the situation.

Let us talk about the Green amendment a little more. I think, as I said, there are only two major issues. One is money, and the other is how we are going to control these community action programs. I think Mrs. GREEN of Oregon put her finger on the issue when she said we did not intend in 1964 to create another whole level of government in the United States, a level of government that had no clearly defined constituency and a level that did not have to levy any taxes, and a level that was not responsible to any electorate.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line the objectives of title II were perverted by the establishment of numerous so-called private, nonprofit corporations to administer Federal funds.

There are many of us on both sides of the aisle who have a great deal of respect for local government, for the process of people standing for election, and that is all we are asking that we go back to.

If there is any irresponsible government in this country, there is adequate provision in the Green amendment for the bypassing of this operation.

So I would urge, as we consider how we are going to vote tomorrow, to remember there are only two really major issues: One is on money—and we are not doing enough, and we have a great deal of capacity to do more—and the other is on how the program should be managed.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity and urge its support.

In its formative period OEO did not function perfectly. However, as time progressed, many cogs were eliminated and greater efficiency achieved. The program is still not without fault. However, its continuing improvement justifies our approval of its work.

Basically, I support OEO for two reasons. First, I believe in the fundamental concept of rehabilitative services in contrast to Government handouts. The active participation of highly skilled personnel working with the individual helps him break the cycle of poverty. It provides the individual subsistence level, enabling the individual to attain the essential motivation and self-respect to become a contributing member of society.

Second, I have observed the programs in my district. OEO programs in Cleveland deserve praise. OEO funds in Cleveland have been well spent. Thousands of people have been benefited by these programs.

It is imperative that OEO continue. The war against poverty must be fought on many fronts, but there must be essential coordination between these efforts. This can be best achieved by all programs being a part of OEO. Extensive hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor show unanimous agreement by almost all sectors of society—business, labor, charitable organizations, and government—that OEO should be the central guiding mechanism for the war on poverty.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2388. I do have one point I would like to make relative to the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. I do have to agree essentially with what he said, relative to adequate representation of the poor on the community action boards.

Mr. Chairman, the need for a meaningful and effective war on poverty has at no time been more critical.

We are just beginning to realize the dimensions of the problem facing us—in terms of numbers and in terms of the kinds of needs that must be met.

We are just beginning to make good on promises too often only spoken and to realize the rights and hopes which have too long been deferred.

My belief in the need for a meaningful war on poverty is not without the qualification that in all too many instances it has suffered from serious maladministration on its several levels.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of us—especially those of us who have not supported antipoverty legislation in the past—should take a moment to reflect on the issues before us today.

Despite popular statements to the contrary, a vote on our committee's bill is not a vote for or against the war on poverty.

It is a vote for or against changes which would improve much of what has been wrong with the war on poverty.

I have been numbered—and will probably continue to be numbered—among the most severe of OEO's critics.

But it is because of such criticism that we have before us today a constructive piece of legislation—not perfect by any means, but a great deal more constructive than anything we have considered in the past.

This bill constitutes an acknowledgement by OEO's most vigorous defenders that criticism has in fact been justified.

I have joined with my minority colleagues on many occasions in attacking such faults as the inordinately high cost per Job Corps enrollee.

This legislation would reduce that cost.

I have protested the use of taxpayers money in partisan and nonpartisan political activities by antipoverty workers.

This legislation would finally restrict such activities.

I have seen and been critical of serious fiscal abuses in community action programs.

This legislation recognizes such abuses and provides strengthened auditing requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to slice up the antipoverty program.

I know that many have said the Nation is running through a period of conservatism, that the people want to slow down, not spend money, and so forth; but, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the American people believe this insofar as the urban ghettos are concerned or the poor in the ghettos, or the poor in areas such as Appalachia. I believe that to say they are opposed fighting poverty would be misreading their sentiments. The American people do recognize poverty as a problem, a disease, and despite the condition of the thinking of the American people today, which one might say is conservative, I believe the American people want to do something about this very severe problem.

If we should kill this bill, poverty areas are going to interpret it as—as an attempt to turn our backs on the urban poor. I believe that it would be a very serious mistake for either side of the aisle, to take that position.

This is the time to strengthen it.

The war on poverty has only just begun.

We have failed so far to put sufficient emphasis on the paramount need for on-the-job training in jobs of substance in the private sector.

We have failed adequately to utilize the largely untapped resources of private enterprise.

It is essential that this house lift its sights to meet the expectations of the American people.

We must take action of real significance—rather than turning our backs

on the cities and dashing the hopes of our youth.

We must do so now—not because it will cool the cities, not because it will prevent riots—but because it is right, and long overdue.

We have a commitment to the ghetto dwellers, to the rural poor, to the young people of this country.

That commitment, to be meaningful, must be enlarged, not cut back.

It must be streamlined, not shuffled into further confusion.

To do less could destroy the hopes of those who have little left to live on but faith.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. Does the gentleman know, either from memory or from checking either with the majority or minority staff, whether in the consideration of this bill in the committee there ever appeared representatives from the Salvation Army, one way or another?

Mr. BELL. I do not recollect whether they did or not. Perhaps the chairman of the committee could answer that question.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not believe they did.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] for his outstanding work in the legislation. He worked diligently and untiring in his effort to bring a decent bill to the floor of the House, and gave the Committee his most active support in writing the present legislation. Numerous amendments the gentleman proposed were adopted. He has made a great contribution.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill as amended. I believe it will go a long way toward continuing the war against poverty in America.

It is the irony of our time that while this Nation enjoys its eighth consecutive year of economic prosperity, there continues to be millions of Americans who live under poverty conditions.

I would agree with my colleagues in the minority that the first goal of this legislation must be the ultimate attainment of a job for the victims of poverty. There can be no question that a poverty program that does not ultimately prepare those in poverty for employment fails to meet its mark.

But it would be my hope that my colleagues would not view the poverty program as a program within itself. If we were to view this effort as a single-shot operation, only within itself, then I would say the poverty program is destined to fail.

I suggest that we view the Economic Opportunity Act as only one weapon in the arsenal of the war on poverty and apply it to the totality of the problems being experienced by those in poverty.

The poverty program supplements and adds to the program of the model cities, Federal aid to education program, manpower retraining, and the various efforts to improve housing for the underprivileged, together with the massive efforts now being worked out both by the Government and private industry to eliminate slum housing; the huge effort being made by local governments to improve education, all of these things—moving together—in their own way play a key role and will lead to the elimination of poverty in America.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake for us to view the legislation before us today as a total answer to poverty; this poverty program must be viewed as only one segment of the total effort to eliminate poverty. Those of us who support this legislation are part of a national effort for America ultimately to be the first nation in history to reduce and hopefully eliminate poverty. This is the great promise of a free America.

There are those who have expected miracles in the short time this program has been alive. And, indeed, in many parts of the country in many of the community action programs, miracles have literally been performed.

Unfortunately, there have been many shortcomings, and those shortcomings are the ones which have received the greatest public attention.

The committee has labored honestly and fairly and sincerely to eliminate those root causes which brought about the conditions which produced the criticisms.

But all in all, when you view this program in its entirety and understand those fundamental objectives, and that is to deal with the total problem of poverty along with all the other programs now on the books, only then can you fully appreciate this effort.

It is a hollow effort to say that you want to create a job for an unemployed person in poverty when in reality that person in his present form is totally unemployable. It is not easy to find jobs for those who have migrated to the big cities and to the small communities in rural America because they were automated out of their sharecropper role, or from the forests in the deep South where they have been automated out of a job, or from Appalachia where they have been literally dislocated and forced to move because of abject poverty, when none of these families have even the more basic experience for individual employment.

In many instances these tragic victims of poverty do not know how to distinguish between a men's and women's washroom in a factory because they cannot read the signs on the door. People who are totally unemployable because they cannot recognize simple signs like "Danger" and "Stop" and "No Smoking."

People who have had absolutely no experience in any kind of factory or service industry.

How can you expect Headstart alone to make an impact on youngsters who are offered this marvelous educational assistance when they are returned to a home or a mother coming to the big city or urban rural America with no concept of life in urban society. She walks into a supermarket and aimlessly wanders through the aisles, unable to read the labels on the cans. She knows nothing about urban life, nor does she know anything about the problems of urban communities. This women needs a great deal of assistance. Yes, she needs assistance on how to run her house. It is difficult for Americans to appreciate this and understand that in this great and beautiful America of ours there can be people like that. But the harsh reality of life is that they are with us, and until we can reach the total problem of these people and until we can help them at all levels to resolve their individual family problems as well as community problems and train them and prepare them for employment, piecemeal and fragmentized approaches to the problem of poverty must end in failure.

This is why the community action program has been so successful in so many communities.

I am aware of the opportunity crusade proposal, but I suggest to my colleagues that it does not face up to the reality of the problem before us.

It is superficial in that it presumes that all you have to do is find a person a job and somehow all of the problems will disappear.

I am amazed that my colleagues who have spent so much time in studying this whole problem of poverty and the deep roots that it presents to us would try to oversimplify the solution by proposing their opportunity crusade.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has recognized that poverty has many roots and until you deal with all of these roots individually and collectively, you are not going to make any significant contribution to eliminating poverty.

Let me cite you the most recent study made of five exceptional schools in the city of New York which have been partially financed under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All of the most modern techniques of teaching were moved into these five schools and these youngsters were exposed to the finest kind of teaching ever developed by man. Small classes; special teachers; highly trained teachers; all of the visual aids; special tutorial services; high-density counseling; psychiatric and psychological assistance, and all of the other things that modern-day educators believe are needed in order to raise youngsters to an appreciable educational standard.

After 3 years of this high intensity teaching, Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that an impartial study of this experiment shows that the youngsters attending these special schools have achieved no greater academic standards than the youngsters who did not have this kind of assistance.

What does this mean, it simply means that there are a great many other factors which must be brought into play if you want to improve the academic standards of children in poverty. It cannot deal

with this problem on any single-shot, single-method operation. Obviously, the problem was that while these youngsters received an inspiring education in school, after school hours they returned back to the same morbid poverty-stricken conditions in their homes and family environment. And so, Mr. Chairman, this poverty program is designed to close that gap of family life which contributes so much to the many social problems, including rioting which plagues the streets of America today.

Let me give you another example, Mr. Chairman.

This Nation is now spending in excess of $2.5 billion every year on support of the ADC program—the aid to dependent children program.

This figure is constantly growing, despite all sorts of effort at the local level to deal with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for us to condemn the problem and say that we ought to tighten up the rules. This problem is going to be with us for a long time to come unless we do have an effective antipoverty program which deals effectively with these young women, and helps them develop higher social values. I read an excellent article by Miss Lois Wiley of the Chicago Daily News on this entire subject and if ever anybody needed any persuasion to support the continuation of the poverty program, and within it, the very important planned parenthood provisions which make possible intelligent programs for these young women within the community action program, let them read the article by Miss Wiley.

Mr. Chairman, the minority says that it wants to reorient this program to bring in a greater degree of the private sector and private industry of our economy. I could never find any quarrel with that concept. I also read an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun Times dealing with the very problem of how private industry today is more and more taking on a key role in the elimination of poverty. We read with great pride and admiration a statement by Mr. Henry Ford that the 5,000 workers who quit to find other jobs during the recent Ford strike will be replaced by workers from poverty areas who will be trained by the Ford Co. to be eligible for these jobs. This is a magnificent and inspiring example of how private industry now is moving in with its own resources to deal with the problem.

We also read with great admiration how the private insurance companies of America are providing more than a billion dollars in financial assistance to deal effectively with slum housing.

In Chicago, the U.S. Gypsum Co. is engaged in an exciting program to renovate 1,500 slum housing units in order to make them habitable for people in poverty.

We also see a huge effort being made by the Federal Housing Administration to encourage homeownership among the people in poverty, giving them guaranteed housing and home improvement loans in order to speed along this progress.

It is because we realize that poverty has many roots that a tremendous coordinated effort is being made in this country to deal with the problem of poverty, and it is for this reason that I sincerely hope my colleagues in this Chamber will set aside harsh judgments, will set aside parochial views, will set aside personal animosities, will set aside lack of understanding and look at this program in its entirety. More important, Mr. Chairman, it is critical to view the poverty program as one aspect of a total effort being made today by local governments, by State governments, by private organizations, by not for profit agencies and organizations, by private industry, and yes, the Federal Government—all of us moving together in unison in an effort to eliminate poverty. I honestly believe that we can be the first nation in the world to eliminate poverty.

It is for this reason that I believe the Education and Labor Committee amendments to the act have made a significant and constructive change. The gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has offered two very significant amendments which I hope will be retained in the bill.

They are not amendments to give this program back to city hall.

This is a statement that will not stand up to the facts. In those communities where local governments are now very active, and actively participating in the development of these programs—and thus including more of the big cities—we find the most successful programs in America. The criticism of these programs has come primarily in those areas where public officials have for various reasons been disengaged from this program and have avoided any responsibility for its management.

An amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] would make sure that all Federal funds must flow through an agency of government as a community action agency—either a State agency or a county agency or a municipal government. But the amendment clearly and specifically and unequivocally requires that this agency must be governed by a community action board whose members equal at least one-third of those representing the poor in the community, one-third elected officials, and one-third interested parties. The amendment specifically provides that the poor cannot be handpicked by the mayor or by the Governor, or by the city manager or by the county board president based on their political beliefs or how much help they can give to the local political organization.

On the contrary, the bill requires that this one-third of the representatives of the poor must be "chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served," and I am quoting from the bill, page 174, line 23. In other words, the committee bill in no way disturbs the present method of selecting members. All we did was put the money in the hands of the community action agency.

I hope this House will reject the irresponsible statements made by those who try to create the impression that somehow Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment is designed to give this program to city hall. I invite your own careful study of the language of this particular provision. You will see from reading the language that these statements are just not consistent with the facts.

The other very important amendment is the amendment which would bar direct funding from Washington to these various "fly by night" organizations that few have ever heard about. This has been an area of great and serious criticism. Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment provides that only programs approved by the community action board—and keep in mind this board must have a minimum of one-third members of the poor on it—can be funded out of Washington. Heretofore, we have found instance after instance where somebody here in Washington, without even consulting the local community or the proper people in that community went ahead and funded programs directly out of Washington. This has created many problems; serious problems.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot argue on the one hand that you want maximum feasible participation of the poor in the planning of these programs and then on the other hand allow the bureaucracy here in Washington to make its independent decisions on the funding of these programs that do not go through the local community action board.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment would provide that hereafter all such funding must go through the local community action board, or after it is approved by the community action board, it can then be funded directly out of Washington.

All over this country, decent, legitimate, experienced, effective, private organizations and nonprofit agencies which have been dealing with the problems of poverty for a long time and whose only shortcoming over the years has been that they have been plagued with a shortage of funds, are asking how come they are being required to go with their programs to the local community action board of a given community to share in the limited funds available to the local CAP agency when certain elite can come directly to Washington and get million dollar financing without ever clearing with the local board.

Mr. Chairman, if you really want to preserve the structure of private—not for profit agencies—participating in this war on poverty, then I say you will accept the Green amendment which bars the bureaucracy here in Washington from choosing at will those private agencies that tow the line of those who have their own design on America here in Washington.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment in no way interferes with the participation of private, not-for-profit agencies in the war on poverty. All it says, is that programs or proposals devised by private agencies shall first be submitted to a local community action board and the people of the local community will have the final decision whether or not this particular program fits into the comprehensive plan they have devised for their community with the assistance of the

poor in that community to attack poverty at all levels.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's amendment makes a lot of sense to me, and I hope that this House will support her in this endeavor.

There have been many other amendments that the committee has adopted which, in my judgment, make a more effective bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the committee bill.

I hope we reject efforts by the minority which would seriously reduce the funding of this program. All over this country local communities have worked out effective programs which are starting to have impressive results.

In the city of Chicago alone we have been able to remove more than 22,000 families from the public dole with this poverty program. The savings to the taxpayer in the long run are huge.

America now is spending an estimated $44 billion on various forms of public assistance to the people of this country.

This cost is second only to the cost of our defense commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that my colleagues will dispassionately look at this poverty program. Talk to their local officials, and recognize that for any appreciable reduction in expenditures, in the war on poverty now will have a profoundly adverse effect all over the country. This is false economy. You would have to phase out programs that have cost us a substantial investment of public funds to establish. You are really wasting money when you try to reduce the expenditure at this time because sooner or later, Mr. Chairman, you are going to have to restore these programs.

This poverty program has many facets—all of them directed at eliminating the menace of poverty.

I sincerely hope the House will sustain the committee in its honest effort to make the war on poverty an effective instrument for the betterment of America.

Thank you very much.

So I say to the Members the two amendments, approved by the committee and offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], strengthen this program, and will help us move forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the gentleman from Chicago that this will legitimatize the control which Mayor Daly now has over the program in Chicago. The same thing will happen throughout the country in the other big cities as far as their programs are concerned. Such as Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, who has dominated the Los Angeles program, now he will have control completely. There will be no programs which they disagree with funded because they will control all programs through the local councils, they will dispense the money, they will have likewise a community action board that is a central place where the poor can represent themselves and make no decisions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me comment on that. I have invited the gentleman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]——

Mr. GOODELL. I have been in Chicago.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have invited the gentleman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] to come to Chicago and investigate our program and I told them they would find the best program in America and all of you gentlemen have gone through the whole Chicago program from top to bottom. You had investigators over there who cost the committee hundreds of dollars. We gladly paid these expenses so that you could see what was going on in Chicago, and there was not a thing that you found down there. So let us cut out this foolishness. We have full involvement of the poor in planning and executing our programs.

Mr. GOODELL. You have the involvement of the city government in Chicago, you do not have the involvement of the poor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to examine firsthand the operation of various antipoverty programs in my congressional district in Pennsylvania, and I am happy to report to this House that many splendid things are being accomplished by these programs. In particular, I have seen many of our youths receive training that equipped them to obtain gainful employment. This has brought dignity to the individual and benefit to our society. I have also seen programs of doubtful value.

Unfortunately, as the record shows, most of the other antipoverty programs operating throughout our country do not operate with such a high degree of efficiency. It is my understanding that, in some areas of the country, fully 75 percent of the funds in these programs are used for administration purposes, leaving only about 25 percent of such funds to filter down to the people where they are needed.

Why are these programs in my congressional district so successful? Mr. Chairman, they are making a positive contribution because they are being supervised by highly responsible people who have an interest in having these antipoverty efforts bring beneficial results. The programs are operated not to pay off political debts or to provide political favors but, instead, to accomplish a bona fide public good. This type of responsible management promotes positive results.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that most of the antipoverty programs in the country do not follow the lead of the programs in my congressional district in worthwhile achievement. If they did, there would be an altogether different and improved tone to the program, and it would win wholehearted support rather than abuse.

Mr. Chairman, nobody can argue with the intent of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, but plenty of argument can be marshaled against the general results—particularly, the object of this legislation is admirable, and, generally—with the exception previously stated—the administration of it is deplorable.

Mention has been made of the so-called Green amendment. I want the RECORD to show that those responsible for the administration of the program in my area are violently opposed to this feature of the bill. If enacted as now written, many features of a working program will be destroyed.

Under unanimous consent I insert a letter at this point, written by one of the directors of the Community Progress Council:

COMMUNITY PROGRESS COUNCIL,
York, Pa., November 4, 1967.

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: I want to thank you for meeting with Mr. Robert Erdos and me this morning and discussing the pending amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. We also appreciate your suggestion that we submit our thoughts to you in writing.

The York County Community Progress Council is a non-profit corporation organized under Pennsylvania law in April, 1965. It is the duly authorized community action agency in York County for the development, conduct and administration of authorized programs under the E.O.A.

Ever since its organization the C.P.C. has followed a policy of involving as many community resources in its activities as possible. It has tried to maintain contact and communications with local and county public officials; it has involved existing health, welfare and recreational agencies as delegates in the actual operation of program; and it has striven to involve as many representatives of the poor, both in policy-making functions and program activities, as is possible. We believe we have had reasonable success in all of these efforts and that the many varied programs which have been developed and put into operation in York County have met with public approval and have produced significant results in terms of the objectives of the E.O.A.

Unfortunately, we believe, some of the proposed amendments to the E.O.A. will seriously impede continued progress of our program in York County. We are particularly concerned about two proposed changes.

First, it is proposed that agencies involved in E.O.A. community action programs be directed by a board at least one-third of the members of which are public officials or their representatives. In York County we have had excellent cooperation from existing public officials. Both the County of York and the City of York have made cash contributions to C.P.C. to assist in its operations. Various public officials have served as members of the corporation, and one has served on the board of directors. I believe I am accurate in stating that these officials have no desire to add the responsibility for governing the county's community action programs to their existing heavy duties.

Even more important is the effect this change would have on our delegate agencies. For example, one of our major programs in the City of York is being conducted under the sponsorship of the York Y.M.C.A. It is most unlikely that the Y.M.C.A. would be willing to revamp its own organizational

structure in the way required by the proposed amendments to S. 2388. The only logical effect of such a change would be to make it impossible for C.P.C. to receive continued support and assistance from the many community agencies which have been so active in the program.

Second, the suggestion that at least one-half of the local contribution must be in cash will produce an equally great hardship on these agencies. So far, they have been able to meet the local contribution requirements by in-kind contributions and by mobilizing volunteer assistance throughout the County. We believe that this approach not only allows communities to conduct programs which, otherwise, it would be unable to support but also serves the positive goal of involving as many members of the community in the program as can be used. A requirement that local cash be supplied will undoubtedly work a hardship on the program and subvert one of its beneficial purposes.

We believe that the E.O.A. program has been a good one for York County and is working well here. We urge you to do what ever is possible to insure its continued operation and funding in a manner consistent with its original purposes. Your support in this effort will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. RUBIN,
Member, Board of Directors, C.P.C.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to enter the sticky wicket that has been created by those who support the so-called Green amendment to provide for domination by city hall of community action. I would, however, ask that some consideration be given to a study that was done by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., on behalf of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among other things in their study of some 10 communities, the Yankelovich study urged the Office of Economic Opportunity to give more attention to programs aimed at breaking the cycle of poverty, and at deemphasizing services that simply mitigated poverty. But they went on to point out that in most communities "the poor are included in even greater numbers on policy boards which govern individual programs. Thus, there is abundant evidence that the poor are in a position to contribute to the direction of the program. But there are significant differences of opinion about the effectiveness of their contribution."

It should be stressed, finally, this report goes on to say, "that the leaders of the poor—and to some extent the poor themselves—consider CAP's stress on giving the poor an opportunity to be heard as one of its most important innovations."

It is my judgment that it would be exceedingly difficult to continue this kind of innovation were the committee's amendments to title II, the community action title, to be adopted by this House.

The report goes on to ask, in question No. 13, on page 21:

Why can't CAP do a better job of keeping the political and government leaders informed of its activities?

The relevant findings were these:

This appears to be a major problem. It is a cause for adverse criticism in many of the communities studied. In some of these communities there is little or no contact, because there is no representation of the local administration on the CAP Board. This deficiency appears likely to be remedied in the future by changes in OEO law.

I concur this is a major problem, but what would be most regrettable would be to have the solution be regressive rather than progressive. Instead of moving to provide for meaningful participation the committee bill provides for complete domination of the CAP Board by city hall.

The committee bill is in contrast to what the Opportunity Crusade would provide which is the opportunity for complete participation both by the local administration and the citizenry.

There is, however, one further amendment in the committee bill which has not received a great deal of attention thus far to which I would call the committee's attention.

It is that part of the committee bill which will require that 10 percent of the local contributions for community action programs shall be in cash rather than in kind.

I have already placed in the RECORD on two separate occasions letters from people around the country who have been exceedingly critical of the 10-percent cash provision.

I got a letter dated November 3 from the League of Women Voters of Wisconsin in which they said:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: The League of Women Voters of Wisconsin wishes you to know that we are very concerned about the future of the Community Action Program. We feel the two changes proposed by the House Committee on Education and Labor in the present Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act will alter the self-help concept of community action. We hope you share our concern and will help to defeat these amendments.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. F. A. MOTE,
President.

Prof. George Hartung, University of Wisconsin, wrote to me and said:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, Wis., November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: In my position as chairman of the English Department of University Extension I have had an opportunity to work closely with administrators and parents in Head Start. University Extension, in cooperation with Head Start, has set up a program to give parents a chance to remove themselves from the public welfare list, and to develop a more responsible attitude toward their children. We feel that we have been making some headway.

Now the program is in danger because of proposed legislation that will affect O.E.O. programs. The amendment that would require communities to provide 20% of funds, 10% in cash, would severely cripple Head Start in Dane County, which has been one of the national leaders in innovation and planning. I feel very strongly that a commitment has been made to the disadvantaged and that to escalate in the area of one national commitment while we deescalate in another is a gross inconsistency, particularly when the long-run effects are going to be upon American children.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HARTUNG,
Associate Professor of English.

The First Methodist Church of Madison, Wis., pastor J. Ellsworth Kalas, wrote to me as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and said:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Madison, Wis. November 3, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: I am writing you because of your position on the Health, Education and Labor Committee. I'm concerned that an amendment now before the House would require local communities to provide 20% of the cost of the Community Action Commission, 10% in cash.

I thoroughly favor that a great part of the burden be carried at a local level by contributions in-kind; I'm afraid that a cash contribution would kill the program in the very communities that need it most.

The church of which I am minister currently houses a Head Start Project. We have chosen to do so with no remuneration for rental or janitorial service; in fact, we did not seek even enough remuneration to pay for the several hundred dollars of fencing required to make our parking lot suitable for usage. I think this kind of contribution ought to be made by local agencies, to keep the program "local." But I'd hate to see the program suffer in the communities of greatest need simply because those communities would not be able or willing to get behind the program financially.

Sincerely,

J. ELLSWORTH KALAS.

In addition, I have heard from the following, each of whom expresses the same concern about the committee amendment to require that 10 percent of the local contribution be in cash:

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.,
November 5, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: The League of Women Voters of Sheboygan is opposed to two changes the House Committee on Education and Labor has made in the Administration Economic Opportunity Amendments. Placing the Community Action agencies under control of state and local governments would effectively put Community Action Programs directly into the hands of the local political groups, some of whom are not at all sympathetic to the program with its attendant participation by the poor.

As the amendment is now written, a private, non-profit organization may establish a CAP agency only if a public agency does not establish one. However, the private agency may be much more interested in sponsoring a program. We would like to point out that Sheboygan has had a Head Start program the past two summers only because of a few strongly interested individuals. We wonder if a city program would have been as well supported by the volunteer workers.

The committee amendment which increases the local contribution from 10% to 20%, of which half must be in cash, will effectively prevent Sheboygan from having a Head Start program next year, since the application is again being made by a small group of private citizens, under the sponsorship of the Sheyboygan Human Rights Association. We were pleased to read in the *Sheboygan Press* Nov. 2, 1967, that you oppose

the 10% local cash contribution. We feel that the amendment should be changed.

Sincerely,

MRS. ALFRED GRUBE,
President.

NOVEMBER 3, 1967.

Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: Since you are a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am writing to you about House Bill S. 2388 concerning the Economic Opportunity Act.

I hope that you will work to keep the local Community Action Agencies under the control of concerned citizens, because I hear that elected officials (of state and local government) are given too much control under the proposed amendments.

Also I understand that local communities would have to contribute 10% of the funds *in cash*. The danger of this is that the communities with the greatest need are no doubt least able to raise this money. I hope this amendment will be eliminated.

My concern and interest are derived from my experience as a volunteer in the local Headstart program.

With best wishes,

TED PAGE.

NOVEMBER 6, 1967.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: I am writing as an interested member of the Dane Co. Citizens' Assn. for Children & Youth and a volunteer working with a group of Headstart mothers.

In reference to the House Bill S. 2388, please do *all* you can to fight for: citizen control of OEO programs, abolition of the requirements of 10% in cash donation from communities.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY BATT.

MADISON, WIS., *November 4, 1967.*

Re: House Bill S. 2388.
Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: We are greatly concerned about some of the proposals in House Bill S. 2388 as we feel is will weaken the Economic Opportunity Act, something our nation can ill afford.

We feel it is of utmost importance to maintain citizen control of OEO programs for most effective operation. We are opposed to the requirement of 10% in-cash donation from communities, as this would result in OEO programs being denied to poor communities.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES E. LAKE.

MADISON, WIS., *November 2, 1967.*

Congressman WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I am writing in reference to House Bill S. 2388, the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Madison presently operates a Head Start program and a neighborhood youth corps, both projects in large part funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have been directly involved in the Head Start schools as a volunteer and have found it a very rewarding experience. The importance of the Head Start program and the other possible OEO projects I believe lies to a great extent in the participation of the average citizen who through these programs can acquaint himself firsthand with the problems of poverty. I think it would be tragic for the program if strings were attached making cash donations from the local community mandatory in place of the previously allowable contributions in kind for the local share. Secondly, I think the participation of the community itself in the planning and organizing is vital. Oftentimes, the political figures, those elected officials, are not willing to take the necessary steps toward elimination of poverty. I could here cite the reluctance of the Dane County Board in taking advantage of the federal program to train ADC mothers for work on the grounds that in the short run it might cost the County a small amount of taxpayers funds.

Yours truly,

REBECCA YOUNG.

I happen to share their concern about the 10-percent cash amendment and I hope the House will not continue with that provision.

As to the opportunity crusade which my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, discussed in some detail, there is a very important and I think meaningful provision which deserves further discussion.

It provides for the transfer of the Headstart program from OEO to the Office of Education.

One of the most severely criticized aspects of the Headstart operation has been the program's administration.

Unfortunately, there has been a severe time lag between application approval and funding in many instances.

I would like to call to the committee's attention that in a sampling questionnaire to Headstart sponsors by Congressman QUIE, the following facts were revealed.

Of those answering, over half—84—favored the transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education. Some of their comments were as follows:

Application was made in December 1965 and it wasn't until June 10, 1966, that funds became available. This was two weeks after the start of project. This program could be administered more efficiently if we were responsible to the State Department of Education.

By the public school system since there is a greater understanding of the purposes of pre-school education and most of the administrative machinery would already be in operation.

This program is definitely in the realm of education and should be handled by the public schools. . . . Headstart, in my opinion is a sound program and does a great deal of good for the less fortunate youngsters. It should be operated through the U.S. Dept. of Ed. and be handled locally by the public schools. As it is now operated no one seems to know what the other fellow is doing. We are asked to fill out numerous forms that are probably worthless.

Should be public school administered with strong safeguards to insure the objectives of Headstart are carried out.

Since this is an educational program for children, it should be administered locally by qualified, licensed early childhood specialists. Much red tape could be eliminated and funds received on time if all funds were administered by the same source.

A program such as Headstart is an educational endeavor more than an economic one, therefore I believe it should be administered by the Office of Education. . . . Under present arrangements, we have been answerable to three agencies (1) local school board, (2) OEO and (3) ESEA, Title I. Can we cut down on duplication of paper work?

The Headstart program is good and should have a secure place in our educational system, with the assurance that funds are available from year to year.

Other agencies (not public school) are not close enough to the opportunities and problems.

Concerning existing funding procedures, the following comments were made:

We have not been notified of funding yet—This is ridiculous . . . trying to guess a program out while waiting to be funded. The tardiness of organization whoever is at fault is comical and tragic. But we still function effectively.

Discontinue such procedures as a firm in Oklahoma assigning preschool training programs for teachers in New York State.

Funding should be assured earlier in the program—We were funded on Friday and had to open 400 classes for 6210 children on the following Monday. This made innumerable problems concerning personnel, recruiting and equipment. We could not officially hire aides, doctors, etc., until we were sure that the funds were available. We could not order materials for the same reason.

(Changes). That OEO hire competent people to handle the administering of Head Start project. Many times people in the capacity of Head Start Area Evaluators had no knowledge of school, classroom procedure, and children in general. It is well to be an expert in stipulation set down by the OEO but most important that evaluators and technical assistance people be aware of the overall program and the objective.

One reason for the delay in funding has been a confusion over the source of funds to be used for pre-school-age programs. Headstart type programs can be financed under funds from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as the Economic Opportunity Act. On August 10, 1965, Francis Keppel, then Commissioner of Education, and R. Sargent Shriver wrote to summer Headstart grantees and school supervisors urging them to follow up summer programs. Their joint letter said:

Both the Economic Opportunity Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act can be used to finance both programs. (followup and summer programs)

Either Act can be used to finance full-year programs for pre-school children of the poor, except that the Education Act is limited to programs under the administration and control of public educational agencies.

Herein lies the source of much confusion. There are numerous instances of applications being shunted from agency to agency while each claimed the other should finance it. In some instances, both agencies have jointly financed a program. However, OEO does not consider the role of the Office of Education when making projections of future Headstart program needs. They do not even maintain information on how many projects they are funding jointly with the Office of Education. As one OEO official put it:

You can't legitimately say there has been a close relationship between the Office of Education and OEO. There has been a spirit of competitiveness.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, approximately 4.9 percent of the total of $778 million provided in fiscal year 1966, or about $38,179,000, of that title has been used for preschool and kindergarten programs; 5.8 percent of title I participants are utilizing the program under funding provided by ESEA which is similar to that funded by OEO.

I believe that it would make a great deal more sense to take the approach

of combining these programs in the Office of Education to fight duplication and to fight overlapping and waste so that everyone will know exactly where to go to get this program.

I want to make clear, however, that the local community action agency would have the responsibility for determining how and by whom the program would be run. If there is no local CAP agency, of course, a nonprofit Headstart agency would continue to be eligible as the sponsor at the local level.

Thus, the opportunity crusade would basically be aimed at a shift only at the Federal level.

This is what is provided in the amendment that will be offered for the consideration of the committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], to insure that there will be coordination—something which is now lacking.

I want to pause here, Mr. Chairman, to pay tribute to the Fond du Lac County Office of Economic Opportunity, the Fond du Lac Area Economic Opportunity Committee, Inc. Under the able and dedicated leadership of the director, Mrs. Rosalie Tryon, and her staff and board of directors this community action agency has proved to be an effective agency in mobilizing the resources of the Fond du Lac area in working to meet the needs of the people of Fond du Lac County. Donald Flanders, a member of the board of directors of this agency, appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor and did an excellent job in providing insight into the operation of a local CAA.

I have had the privilege of viewing firsthand the programs being carried out in Fond du Lac County. Their operations are well run and well managed and it would be most unfortunate if this program were to be jeopardized by the failure of this House to provide the kinds of changes necessary to insure that the program can be strengthened, not weakened, in the time ahead. My fear, Mr. Chairman, is that the constructive amendments which will be offered in the days ahead will be turned down, that there will continue to be an unwillingness by the majority and OEO to move to correct the errors and mistakes which are so readily apparent. But, Mr. Chairman, if this program is not substantially redirected then the good programs, like the one being carried on in Fond du Lac County, will suffer.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. What I do not understand, to engage in some forensics with my colleague, is why they will not accept success. When we established the poverty program, was it not to effect just exactly the competition that you describe as existing between the OEO and the Office of Education—the goad, the stimulus, the challenge, the competitive pin prick to the existing agencies in the executive branch to do the job with the poor that they have not been doing, and if the Office of Education now feels that they have felt the pin prick of competition and are now themselves engaged in the job that they had not done before; namely, to reach the kids in their preschool years and to adopt from OEO the concept of Headstart in an effort to get the local public school agencies of our country to reach down to preschool years, to reach into the homes and get to parents; is that not the hallmark of success of the poverty program?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. In my judgment, competition in many cases can serve, as the gentleman from New York has said, as a pin prick for the purposes of upgrading and improving the policies that may operate in another agency.

Mr. SCHEUER. So the program then has been successful?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I do not think that is the case, and what bothers me is that it has not achieved success. It has achieved duplication. In my judgment, that is not to be desired as a goal either in OEO or in the Office of Education.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I have but 10 minutes and I cannot yield further.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I merely wish to make one brief observation. It is always the same line that comes up here. They were not doing it before. They have success now because we have given them all this money. The basic point here is that the Federal Government, never before 1964, set up a program for preschool education. Many of us were urging such a program prior to 1964. That question is entirely irrelevant as to the proper agency that could administer this program effectively. Had we set the program up initially in the Office of Education with a good structure down through it to coordinate with existing programs and existing education efforts at the Federal level, with this money we would have a far more successful program today, and we are urging the Congress to take that action belatedly, 3 years later.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. There are two other points upon which I wish to make comment. One relates to the amendment that the committee adopted, and which is contained in S. 2388 for title IV. It is an amendment that I offered during consideration of the bill by the Committee on Education and Labor, and which has come under some criticism from those who think that this provision would be an invasion of the responsibilities and independence of the Small Business Administration.

May I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that this is not the intent, the substance, or the purpose of the title IV amendment. In my view, title IV contains a significant breakthrough in the necessary struggle to help our major metropolitan areas, and in particular those who reside in ghetto areas. Title IV contains a program to develop businesses in those areas and to provide the kind of managerial training that is lacking today for so many ghetto area citizens. It would extend the title of this act, Economic Opportunity, into a more meaningful phase than it ever has been before. It would create a program of economic development where now there is none. It in no way jeopardizes the Small Business Administration, but what it does provide is a totally new program which would be assigned to the Department of Commerce for the purpose of giving meaningful management and technical assistance and advice to those in urban areas who can, with that kind of training and advice, undertake to become a part of the economic life, the indigenous economic life, of the ghetto area.

All too often the frustrations and the riots that we have seen break out in the past two summers have been vented against the very small businessman we were supposed to be helping.

The reason that has happened is because the small businessman has not been indigenous to the urban area served by his place of business. Title IV then would begin to reverse that trend.

What we are talking about in title IV is a program aimed at one of the root causes of this Nation's ghetto existence. Without this kind of program to initiate and provide the kind of entrepreneurial skill necessary to improve economic life, our ghettos will remain this Nation's wasteland filled with hopelessness and despair.

In title IV we have a program to ban that hopelessness, to change despair into hope for the future. That hope, quite simply, lies in creating an economic community in our inner cities by providing those who live there with a pride necessary for existence and growth.

Last, I think it would be well for this committee to take note of what a very wise Englishman, Richard Titmus, has said after a lifelong study of the problems of social welfare:

> We cannot achieve a better balance between the needs of today and the resources of today by living out the destinies of tradition. Without knowledge of wind and current, without some sense of purpose, men and societies do not keep afloat for long either morally or economically by merely bailing out the water.

S. 2388 in its present form does nothing more than bail out the water. It does not really aim at breaking the cycle of poverty. It does not give true meaning to economic opportunity.

I hope that the program will be redirected to provide less duplication, a greater involvement of State and local government, less redtape, and more meaningful help for the poor.

America today desperately needs an effective program to help the poor in a meaningful way. The Republican proposal—the opportunity crusade—would provide for proper administration of major segments of the existing antipoverty programs while redirecting the remainder strongly toward overcoming unemployment and dependency. It would use Federal funds in large part as seed money to help enlist the enormous resources of our free enterprise economy and to increase the scope of State participation.

Our opportunity crusade proposal, for example, would authorize a 1968 Federal expenditure of less than $1.7 billion—the administration called for an expenditure in excess of $2 billion—but would generate a total investment of public and private funds of nearly $3.5 billion. The revitalization of the program is impossible to calculate in dollars.

The war on poverty is in very deep trouble. It is in trouble in large measure because of its failure to meet the real needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor and because:

First, in far too many places in this country it has been mired in partisan politics and factionalism.

Second, a large part of the funds appropriated to help the poor have been spent for administrative expenses and high salaries.

Third, its management at the Federal level particularly has been inept.

Fourth, programs such as the Job Corps have produced few results at enormous costs when administered by a Federal agency having no competence in education.

Fifth, it has failed to involve the resources of either private industry or the States in any meaningful way.

I think if we can—as I trust this Committee will—move to redirect it, to involve State and local government and to a greater extent involve private industry. If this is done we can truly say that this House has created an opportunity for some advancement for the disadvantaged. If it does not, it will have failed in its responsibility.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and in support of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. I would say I rise in support of the bill as reported to the House, but there are areas in which I think it could be improved. I am not an enthusiastic fan of what the present amendments have done to community action. I am not wildly happy about the sudden doubling of the cash contribution by local agencies, and I am quite dubious about those amendments which seem to be designed to prevent the poor from being advised that they, too, are voting members of the community in which they live.

But I am also aware of the temper of this House, and I do not expect that a perfect bill could pass the House this year. Considering the mood of the House, considering the vital needs of the Nation with respect to the poverty problem, I am willing to measure the desirable in terms of the possible, and give my sincere support to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of thousands of words and speeches to the contrary, the war on poverty is not primarily a program "for the poor." It is a program for all America. Poverty is a problem with which the poor must cope daily and intimately. But those among us who think our affluence is eternal have to cope with it as well, whether we know it or not. Poverty at the level it is known in contemporary America is a national problem—it is a handicap all of us suffer from—it is a disgrace to the entire Nation.

There is so much that needs doing in this country, there are so many jobs for for which we lack the trained hands and heads, there are so many competing and equally legitimate demands on our human resources are left virtually untapped.

The growing burden of welfare costs, and the growing impact of the welfare mentality on recipients and dispensers alike, is reaching very serious proportions in this Nation. A program which will help break the cycle of poverty, help find permanent remunerative jobs for those who have always been thought of as being in a kind of surplus labor pool, such a program, Mr. Chairman, would be one of the most valuable things we could perfect, not only for those who would benefit from it at the outset, but for those, as well, who must pay for the consequences of our failure to do so.

America, Mr. Chairman, stands at a moral crossroads. The poverty program is designed to reunite a nation that the evil of poverty has come perilously close to splitting into fragments. The poverty program is intended to bring people into a community from which they have been excluded by walls too high to climb and too thick to push over.

And today, this very day and this very week, Mr. Chairman, this Nation on the floor of this House, will decide whether or not we want to continue with the progress we have been making, or whether we want to continue forward along the other road—the road of fragmentation, of growing alienation and class division. Some Americans may think the choice before it is whether we go forward or go backward—backward to a happier time when:

> The poor were poor, and the rich were rich. And you felt so damn secure, just knowing which was which.

These people reminisce about times when the poor were taken care of by private charity, and public affairs were securely in the hands of those whom affluence allowed the time to get involved.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going back there, even if that nostalgic vision were of a land that ever existed—and it did not. We do not have that choice. Our choices are which road ahead are we to take. Are we to try to build bridges and open doors between the two or three or four nations that exist within our boundaries, or are we to deepen the chasms that separate us, and close the doors we have begun to open?

The choice is essentially a moral one. I have heard and heard and heard talk about our "not being able to afford" the poverty program, Mr. Chairman. But on Thursday of this week, we are going to hurl into space, at a cost of $350 million, a rocketship which several tries later may take three people from the prosperity of Cape Kennedy to the empty wastes of the moon. I do not oppose the space program in essence, but if we can afford to practice moon shots at a cost per practice equal to one-sixth of the entire annual cost of the poverty program, then we can afford the poverty program.

If we can criss-cross America with a network of highways like the world has never seen before, just to accommodate our growing number of automobiles, then we can do something to meet the food and shelter and job needs of people.

If we can spend $1.2 billion of public funds to develop a supersonic transport, so the jet set can get to Paris in 2 hours instead of 6, then we can afford a program half again as large to slow down the very rapid pace at which a poor American moves from the cradle to the grave.

If we can afford a war in Vietnam which is estimated to cost $100,000,000 per day, then we can afford to spend the cost of 20 days of that war to fight against poverty—which is as implacable and deadly an enemy to America as communism or Nazism ever were.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply not convinced that this debate, and the votes that come at the end of it will center around cost considerations. Those who shout so loudly about the cost of the war on poverty are in some cases those who shout equally loudly about "false economy" when cuts are made in some project in their district or some project affecting an industry in which the Member may feel particularly friendly.

In my 14 years in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, I have voted for a great many expenditures of public funds for purposes which seemed to have an immediate impact in one section or among one part of the population. I have voted for great dams in the West, for flood control along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, for agriculture support and research, for highways, for space, and for defense. I have supported these expenditures, even though only a part of the population might profit from them, because I have felt in my heart that what strengthened America strengthened us all. I have always felt that Grand Coulee Dam and the Interstate Highway System and price stability for farmers and insurance and loans for small businessmen and contracts for the aerospace industry were of benefit to us all—that they were investments in a nation which had learned, better than any other nation in the world how to share its wealth among its people, and how to use money imaginatively and profitably, to make us all strong and free.

Never in those 14 years, Mr. Chairman, have I seen a better prospect for an investment in America than I see in the poverty program. Because this program, to a greater extent than any other program I have supported, is an investment in the one natural resource that always pays off—human hands and hearts and brains. I hope those in this House whose districts have benefited directly from the other programs I have mentioned, and who have spoken at such great length about how such programs are good for the entire country—I hope these distinguished and able gentlemen will see that an investment in the war on poverty, too, is an investment in the future of the whole Nation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill. I take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on his tenacious and persistent effort to bring a bill to the floor of this House that will enable the war on poverty to move ahead effectively and successfully.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I also want to pay tribute to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a man of great integrity, ability, and dedication, who has given outstanding leadership to the effort to carry out our national commitment to combat poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I think it appropriate here to raise the following question:

Why, in spite of the very strong support which the antipoverty program has won in communities across the Nation, do we find such determined opposition to continuation of the program on the part of so many of our Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives?

In this respect, I was struck by an editorial, to which reference was made earlier in the debate by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CAREY], an editorial in the New York Times of this morning entitled "Whose Opportunity Crusade?"

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that under the rules of the House it is not proper—and I shall not do so—to make specific reference to any Member of this body who was mentioned in that particular editorial, but I do want to call attention to the fact that the New York Times editorial made a comment relative to the point I am raising; namely, why is there such a determined effort here on the part of some of our Republican colleagues in this body to try to kill or cripple this program?

As the New York Times pointed out in referring to some of the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty program:

> The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is grave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

Mr. Chairman, I think this editorial which appeared in the New York Times today is right on target because one of the points that have struck me in this debate is this: From some of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have come suggestions of a so-called opportunity crusade to help the poor. Yet we all know that the strongest support for drastic slashes in funds for carrying out the war on poverty have come from the same side of the aisle. I think, therefore, that, it might be much more apt if we were to talk about an "opportunistic crusade" rather than an opportunity crusade, for it seems to me quite opportunistic to make a lot of speeches about wanting to help the poor in 1 week when not many days before many of those same speechmakers were voting for drastic reductions in the money for this important program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make just one other point and that is to call attention to the widespread support which our national moral commitment to resolve the scandal of poverty in a land of great wealth has won from the churches and religious organizations of America.

I here cite but one example. Only this afternoon a distinguished group of religious leaders from here in the Nation's Capital issued a statement in support of continuation of an effective war on poverty.

Chairman of this group, the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations, is the bishop of the Methodist Church for the District of Columbia area, Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Bishop Lord's letter to Members of Congress, dated November 7, 1967, and to insert following the letter the list of distinguished clergymen who constitute this committee:

INTERRELIGIOUS CONCERN FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967

(Statement by Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D., chairman, on behalf of the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations)

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Interreligious Committee on Race Relations is composed of 60 clergy and lay religious leaders in the greater Washington area. Their names appear on this letterhead. The Interreligious Committee was organized in April, 1963, with His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington as its Chairman for the first two years. He was followed by the Right Rev. William F. Creighton, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington, as the Committee's Chairman for the next two years. As present Chairman of this Interreligious Committee which represents all the major institutions of faith in the Washington Metropolitan area, I am writing to you to seek your support for a continued strong and vigorous War on Poverty.

Three years ago, our nation embarked on the War on Poverty, a bold new effort to give fresh opportunity and a rebirth of hope to the poor. The major religious communities in America strongly supported the legislation which launched the Poverty War as a visible expression of our nation's moral commitment to the liberation of those citizens imprisoned by poverty. This week will decide whether our nation's commitment to that venture will be continued and renewed, or whether the door it opened will now be closed and the hopes it raised cruelly smashed. On the field of this domestic battle the reliability of our national commitments is surely tested at least as severely as on any foreign one.

The decision rests with you, the members of the House of Representatives who are now debating the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. The bill reported out by the committee and now under consideration on the floor already compromises some important parts of the program, and further crippling amendments would spell death to its effectiveness. We call upon the House to pass a strong anti-poverty bill which:

(a) retains the Office of Economic Opportunity as the Coordinating agency for the whole of the War on Poverty;

(b) authorizes funding of the program at a minimum of $2.06 billion annually;

(c) provides maximum feasible participation of the poor themselves in community decision making without political domination of their programs;

(d) eliminates the 10% cash local matching fund requirement for community action programs.

In the midst of unprecedented national prosperity, none of us can afford the shame of continued crippling poverty. This is no time for "business as usual" nor for maneuvering for partisan or personal political advantage. We hope and trust that you in Congress will renew and strengthen the nation's efforts to relieve the misery of its poor. We are acutely aware that many poverty programs here in the Nation's Capital will be severely curtailed or eliminated without positive action in the House of Representatives. If Congress provides the nation with a renewed War on Poverty, our democratic institutions will be given a new chance to prove their worth. If Congress fails to provide effective legislation for the struggle against poverty, we will all pay the price, in bitterness, despair, disillusion and strife, and worst of all in the betrayal of our own aspirations and moral commitments.

We of the Interreligious Community can do no less than to pledge to you our continuing support in common cause to fulfill the promises of America for all Americans.

INTERRELIGIOUS COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Chairman: Bishop John Wesley Lord, D.D.

Past-Chairmen: Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle; the Right Rev. William F. Creighton, D.D.

Co-Chairmen: Bishop Henry C. Bunton, D.D.; the Rev. David G. Colwell; Rabbi Martin S. Halpern; the Most Rev. John S. Spence, D.D.; Bishop Smallwood E. Williams, D.D.

Secretary: Dr. Isaac Franck.

Treasurer: Philip J. Olin.

Members: Floyd H. Agostinelli, Hon. Harry T. Alexander, the Rev. Arthur A. Azlein, Dr. William A. Banner, the Rev. Geno Baroni, the Rev. Theodore Bowen, George O. Butler, William Calomiris, the Very Rev. Msgr. Leo J. Coady, the Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Insp. Vernon E. Culpepper, the Rev. Burke E. Dorworth, Julian Dugas, the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, the Rev. Samuel Frazier.

Also the Rt. Rev. Msgr. George L. Gingras, Louis C. Grossberg, the Rev. Earl L. Harrison, D.D., George Hartford, the Rev. Everett A. Hewlett, Dr. Duncan Howlett, Maj. Reginald K. Ingram, the Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, D.D., Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, the Rev. John W. Laney the Rev. Theodore E. Ledbetter, Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, Edward B. Lyman, Richard K. Lyon, the very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons.

Also the Rev. Graydon E. McClellan, R. Grayson McGuire, Hon. John P. Moore, the Rev. Philip Newell, H. Carl Moultrie, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, the Rev. Daniel Pierotti, Mrs. John Posey, Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, Hon. Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., the Rev. Jefferson P. Rogers, Harry N. Rosenfield, the Rev. John H. Satterwhite, Th. D., David H. Scull, Rabbi Samuel Scolnic.

Also Rabbi Theodore Steinberg, the Rev. Russell C. Stroup, D.D., Dr. Donald F. Sullivan, the Rev. Henri Stines, Sterling Tucker, Rabbi Lewis A. Weintraub, the Rev. Richard Williams, S. D. Wolf.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, since I became a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have had the opportunity to study the Office of Economic Opportunity and the programs administered by that agency in the so-called war on poverty.

I wish that I could support S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amend-

ments of 1967, and do so with the conviction that I would be helping to improve the lot of the many Americans that do need help to break through the barrier of poverty. Unfortunately, this is not possible.

I realize, as presumably does each Member who will cast a similar ballot, that a vote against this bill will in some quarters be interpreted as a vote for poverty. That is precisely the conclusion many supporters of the measure hope Americans will draw. Nothing would please them more than to have us branded with the stigma that we are unsympathetic with the plight of the economically disadvantaged, or that we are indifferent to the Nation's needs. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have supported and will continue to support every realistic antipoverty measure, whether in the field of education, health, or welfare. This bill is primarily unrealistic because it is based on a false assumption; namely, that our problems are wholly economic. Dollars alone will not eliminate poverty. The principal tool to upgrade those who are now underemployed or unemployed is education. When I speak of education I do not mean merely formal education but also rehabilitation and vocational retraining.

Even if the Government had the money to fight costly wars on two fronts, even if public spending were superior to private investments in solving these problems, and even if you assume all these things—what reason is there for believing that "we can buy our way out of poverty." Certainly the present OEO program does not warrant such confidence. At best, it has achieved only mediocre success and even that has been expensively purchased.

The founding father of OEO, Sargent Shriver, predicted that his agency would eliminate poverty by 1976. Of course, such a statement is wholly inaccurate and adds fuel to the flames of disillusionment which swept across America in the urban riots this summer. Time after time, I have been told by both friend and foe of the OEO that the agency promises more than it can deliver. A key element, which OEO has not considered, is time. Attempts to substitute time with expenditures of money result in wasteful and extravagant spending as well as ill-advised and poorly planned programs. Specifically, what I object to in the poverty program are its high administrative costs. At least 75 percent of the community action expenditures are administrative in nature; nearly one-half of those employed by the OEO in semi-responsible positions are paid $10,000 a year.

What we object to in the OEO program is not its aims, which we also share, but its excesses, its failures, its unfulfilled dreams and the frustrations which they, in turn, produced. At this point, I wish to cite some of the many blunders for which this program is accountable. They symbolize what the war on poverty is to many Americans.

The war on poverty has benefited some, to be sure. But in all too many cases, we become aware of situations like these:

Take for example, the case of Mr. and Mrs. William S. Clark. Both were on two poverty war payrolls at the same time. The Clarks drew a total of $5,178 in pay and expenses during 12 weeks in June, July, and August of 1965. Clark was director of the Headstart program and supervisor of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project at the same time. Mrs. Clark was overall supervisor of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and on the Headstart program as an instructor.

In the Bronx, a minister serving three churches with a fourth post as a city civil defense inspector was charged with still another activity—stealing more than $9,000 from a Federal antipoverty project he handled.

This gent really knew how to aid the poor. On his antipoverty payroll he had his father at $150 a week, his mother at $100 a week, his sister at $175 a week, and himself at $200 a week—and they all lived at the same address.

However, this income was apparently inadequate. The 145-count indictment returned against this man, charged that he took kickbacks from the employees of the program

A CAP director found moonlighting so profitable that he recently gave up the war on poverty to pursue it full time. This gentleman was collecting fees from schools for compiling their applications for Federal aid to education.

The San Jose News indicates that under-the-table payments are being made to expedite antipoverty job training grants—fees are being paid to cover rewriting of applications for grants in a manner that would facilitate their approval.

My colleagues, I cannot ask the taxpaying Americans in my congressional district to continue paying for this type of conduct.

The war on poverty was conceived of politics and under the circumstances it appears that unless the entire house is cleaned, politics will continue to be the name of the game.

In city after city, all across the country, we find antipoverty officials and employees engaging in political activity.

VISTA volunteers registered voters on the Near North Side of Omaha, Nebr., during the 1966 congressional campaign. My protest to OEO brought new guidelines, which in effect said—you can register voters but you must be nonpartisan about it. This is precisely the point. As long as an area contains known partisan groupings, the act of deliberately selecting an area of this type to conduct registration activities is a political or partisan act. While the Hatch Act covers these employees, it is being interpreted so as to permit this activity.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been subsidizing a voter registration drive in Reading and Berks County, Pa., and in Gary, Ind. One has only to read the newspaper accounts of what is going on in Gary these days to see how improper Federal intervention exists.

In Atlanta, Ga., the OEO has 60 employees working on a voter registration drive that is organizing the recipients of poverty program aid on a block-by-block, precinct-by-precinct basis.

Our colleague, JIM GARDNER, has brought to our attention, through minority views filed in connection with the bill we are considering today, that antipoverty funds have been used to establish a massive political machine in Durham, N.C. Antipoverty money in Durham was even used to print sample ballots and to provide transportation to the polls.

In Des Moines, Iowa, antipoverty officials, with approval of Federal officials, are backing candidates in the local elections. The Polk County Community Action Council personally interviewed candidates for mayor and city council, intending to compile the answers for distribution in low-income areas "to give residents information—and to help them make a decision."

In a desperate effort to thwart responsible efforts to reshape the war on poverty into a workable and worthwhile program, the Office of Economic Opportunity has encouraged Republican mayors to send telegrams to members of the House and Senate. The message is clear—leave the program alone. I can imagine the message was very clear to these mayors, too. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has pointed out that this activity may violate the Federal antilobbying law.

Bulletin boards in Job Corps centers have been used to develop a partisan political bias in enrollees. I have seen it myself.

I repeat: I cannot ask my people to continue contributing their hard earned money to finance such activities. To aid the poor—yes, but to establish a federally financed political machine—no.

After the OEO sets money aside to pay salaries and other administrative expenses, there is some left to finance programs for the poor. But the American people have just cause to seriously question many of these expenditures. I will mention only a few:

In Nashville, Tenn., funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity went to help finance a liberation school, which was used to teach Negro children to hate whites. This situation was revealed before the Senate Judiciary Committee by Nashville Police Capt. John Sorace, and attempts to discredit him failed when the head of the Nashville Metropolitan Action Commission had to "reverse his field" and admit that the funds had been so used.

An OEO audit has revealed that a Mississippi antipoverty outfit called Child Development Group, "has more than a half million dollars in expenditures which cannot be accounted for."

This same group was also listed as one of the groups with credentials to the recent meeting of the National Conference for New Politics in Chicago.

An investigation by the General Accounting Office has revealed that a Job Corps center in Pleasanton, Calif., operated by Litton Systems, Inc., purchased $347,000 worth of so-called instructional materials from Litton Instructional Materials upon the recommendation of another Litton division, the learning resources department.

I have nothing against "keeping the money in the family," but this money went to purchase materials on the atomic

theory, the laws of relativity, trigonometry, and "facts about sex." These are dropouts they are teaching.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has financed a $376,000 program through the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to establish a domestic student exchange program. The main problem—instead of the expected 150 participants, only 15 were placed. That works out to about $25,066 per enrollee for a one-semester project.

The United Community Corp. of Newark held a weekend retreat at the Goldman Hotel in West Orange that will cost the taxpayers about $2,500. Included in the package was a floor show.

It was reported in the September 15, 1966, issue of the Detroit News that that city's antipoverty program had been paying $500 a month since March for a youth center which has not even been opened.

In New York City, a local antipoverty group is providing the funds to defend 10 peaceniks who interrupted church services and staged a protest in St. Patrick's Cathedral against the war in Vietnam.

The Rangers and the Disciples, two of Chicago's big teenage gangs, have been given nearly $1 million in Federal antipoverty money, supposedly to set up a job training program.

My colleagues, is this the kind of misguided monster the Government of the United States intended to create with the establishment of the war on poverty? I think not, but I am not impressed with claims that the bill we have before us will yield a significantly improved product.

The files in my office, and I am sure yours, too, are filled with letters from people around the country who wonder if OEO has lost direction. OEO seems to have a great deal of difficulty keeping its mind on the task it was established to tackle. For example:

In Omaha, Nebr., 560 children from poor families have had no Headstart program for the past 2 months. Why? Because the Kansas City regional OEO officials have refused to release funds, claiming that residence patterns in Omaha result in de facto segregation.

Has OEO forgotten that the purpose of this program is to aid the poor, not compulsory integration?

The Pledge of Allegiance has been removed from the curriculum of Project Headstart because, in the opinion of the Office of Economic Opportunity, it is "meaningless" to preschool children.

When the OEO was having trouble finding a place for its Headstart program in Kirksville, Mo., the Christian church offered the use of its rooms, rent free. After using the church for 2 years at no cost to the program, the Kansas City office of the OEO ordered the church to remove religious paintings and other symbols from the rooms being used. The church refused.

Community Opportunities, Inc., an antipoverty program in my own district asked newspapers and radio stations to sign pledges to use publicity releases from the agency in return for local in-kind credits of $1.50 a column inch or $4 a minute for air time.

As was pointed out by Congressmen KYL, MAYNE, and myself, and by the Des Moines Register, this is nothing short of bribery.

We have often heard that without retention of the Office of Economic Opportunity as the coordinating head of the Government's antipoverty efforts, the program will lose its direction, and the poor will lose their spokesman. My colleagues, I submit that the direction has been lost and the spokesman is ineffective. The American people do not trust the Office of Economic Opportunity, and cannot be expected to continue feeding it the money it needs to keep it alive.

We can all appreciate the difficulty of accurately measuring the success of any program such as we are considering here today. But there is one program which should be capable of evaluation on this type of basis. I refer to the Job Corps.

The concept of the Job Corps is, or should be, to give an unemployed young person, in a relatively short period of time, a needed job skill, a healthy work attitude, and an opportunity to begin working with that newly acquired job skill.

But the Job Corps has failed in each respect.

According to a study made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, only 28 percent of the Job Corps graduates who obtain jobs are working in a job for which they were trained. In this same study, the chamber indicated that in its view, most of the employed graduates found work because of current economic conditions rather than their Job Corps training.

The program continues to cost a phenomenal amount of money. Job Corps officials have recently revealed that the per enrollee cost for fiscal 1967 exceeded a whopping $8,500.

As was pointed out recently by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], according to the Internal Revenue Service, over 51 million wage earners—two out of three wage earners—make less money than it costs to put one boy or girl through 1 year of Job Corps training. Census figures show that over 70 percent of American workers earn less than this sum.

With the money is takes for a single Job Corps enrollee, most parents could put a child through college. They cannot understand such an expenditure by the Government, and neither can I.

On September 4, 1967, the Omaha World-Herald reported that of the 1,506 trainees who have entered and left the Lincoln, Nebr., Job Corps center this year, the whereabouts of more than one-half are unknown. What's more, only 338 were reported to be employed.

The Lincoln statistics also show that of each 10 entering corpsmen, only two will graduate. The other eight will transfer, drop out or be dismissed. As they say—nothing succeeds like success.

No one seems to be able to explain the reason for the outrageous cost of the Job Corps program, but a couple of examples from a Job Corps center across the river from my congressional district should provide a good clue:

The Omaha girls Job Corps center has less than 800 enrollees. Yet it costs nearly $93,000 a year to keep unauthorized visitors from entering the centers, and to keep the girls from leaving without permission.

The center also spends $132,000 a year to provide recreation for the enrollees on Saturday and Sunday. There must be a more efficient way to provide these needed opportunities.

Not only has the Job Corps product been poor, and the cost excessive, but certain administrative practices have brought the program into further disrepute. The Washington office of the OEO, in what appears to have been a plan to inflate Job Corps enrollment statistics, and reduce the per capita cost figures, asked Job Corps officials to withhold information on June dropouts until after the close of fiscal 1967. The initial charges, having reference to the Guthrie, Oklahoma center, were denied by OEO loud and long. But the director of the Omaha Job Corps center subsequently acknowledged that a similar request was made of him.

I believe the American people are fed up with the Job Corps as they know it. If the backers of the war on poverty want to institute an industry-oriented program that will achieve the desired results—fine. But if we are just going to continue on pouring money into this program as it now operates, I think the time has come to eliminate it.

My colleagues, I object to a program which encourages one group of Americans to hate other Americans. I object to its reliance on measures that are "throw backs" to a depression era. I object to the practices of ignoring and bypassing State and local officials, and the almost total exclusion of the resources that private industry could bring to bear on this problem.

There is no logical reason why many of the poverty programs cannot be funded through and administered by existing Federal agencies. The Federal Government administers more than 79 separate training and education programs under the auspices of 15 different bureaus and agencies. Job recruitment funds can be obtained from nine manpower sources; funds for adult basic education from 10; funds for prevocational training and skill training from 10; and funds for work experience from five. On-the-job training can be subsidized by five programs and support service can be funded from nine programs.

Already, a proliferation of Government agencies are involved in the major segments of the war on poverty. For example, the Department of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense, and the U.S. Employment Service are already involved in the operation of the Job Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is farmed out to the Departments of Labor, and Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Civil Service Commission. In both of these cases, the principal function of the Office of Economic Opportunity appears to be that of a "gadfly."

The list goes on. The Department of Agriculture works with the rural loans program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Labor Department have been delegated respon-

sibility for the work experience program; the Small Business Administration makes economic opportunity loans; the adult basic education program has been transferred from OEO to the Office of Education. These illustrations, it seems to me, serve to emphasize that the Office of Economic Opportunity, as such, is just so much excess baggage. The expertise in dealing with the poor is concentrated in the established agencies of Government.

Why must we forever establish new bureaus, new sections, to deal with problems and programs that clearly are within the province of a functioning agency? That practice produces enormous duplication and waste.

Another concern, maybe even a primary one, is whether the American taxpayer can afford such an expensive program with our country at war fighting international communism in Vietnam. Also State and local taxes have been increased throughout the Nation; social security taxes soon will be raised, the Johnson administration which, this year alone will produce a $29 billion deficit seems certain to soon push through at least a 10 percent surtax. Inflation now runs rampant throughout the country—where will it end? How much of a burden must the average taxpayer be asked to shoulder? The only thing we can accomplish by continuing to support legislation like this is not to raise the poor out of the depths of poverty, but rather to tax countless more Americans, those who work and pay the cost of this Government, into a position of near poverty. We must find the moral courage to admit that we cannot afford to do everything at once, no matter how much some might think it needs doing. Instant affluence cannot be purchased on a credit card. It must evolve from the maintenance of this country's fiscal health.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, let me commend the distinguished chairman of our committee, who with great diligence and devotion to this program has labored with it and given it his utmost efforts in an attempt to bring forth a bill which would truly serve the needs of the poor of this great country.

In passing, let me state as to the remarks delivered by my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] so recently in the well, I can appreciate his not yielding during the course of the entreaties that we directed to him to yield, because I have never heard more unyielding arguments. They did not yield very much new. They were old criticisms. They were heaped on the back of the OEO from newspaper accounts, many of which have been explained and contradicted.

I do not think that that is a constructive way in which to approach this program. I think the first thing we should do when we come into the well to talk about the poverty program is to produce our own credentials and ask what each one of us has done on his own to try to make this a better program. I know we can look around the table on both sides of the aisle and see those who have gone out into the country and have seen these programs firsthand. They have met the kids in the Job Corps and the young people in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and have seen the infants in the beginning Headstart programs. They know firsthand what is good and bad about these programs.

Perhaps after the gentleman from Iowa has been here a little more than 9 months, he will have time to do that and see these programs firsthand. When he does that, possibly he will know a little bit more of his own knowledge, and he will not have to depend on newspaper articles, which make good reading for those who want to read horrible things about the program that deals with the most abject cases in society.

So when he finds a benighted man, a minister of God, who strays from the path of righteousness and then is indicted by the U.S. attorney and, with his family, attempts to make restitution, finally receives a sentence in a court of this land for taking money from this program, that does not mean the program is bad. It means human nature is still there to deal with.

Unfortunately, this program has to deal with human nature in its most tragic aspects. I think what the committee is trying to do is to look at the errors and the objections that have been raised validly to the program, and has come forth with a bill that will move this program forth with more efficiency and better direction. There is nothing that was ever legislated in this House that could not be improved.

I say we should speak with our credentials known. I come into the well of this House, as have those others from our side, able to say that in every case I and the others to whom I have referred have voted for this program. We have opposed motions to recommit. We have opposed crippling amendments. We have sat in the committee hour after hour and day after day to hear the recommendations of those from both sides of the aisle who want to help us build a better program.

We come to the well today I think with good conscience, and in all good conscience I promise the people of my district and the people of my country that when I find something wrong in this program, I will not hesitate to speak out and try to correct it. That is why I have supported very strongly, and with great conviction, the remedial amendments that have been placed in the bill this year.

Of course, that which has received the greatest attention has been the restructuring of title II, according to the amendment introduced by the gentlewoman from Oregon, which will have, I hope, a remedial and reforming effect upon community action.

Has it need of this? It most definitely has need of this, for the reason that at the lower level, because this is a local option program, there is no means, no instrumentation, no apparatus, no mechanization at the hands of the Director of OEO, Sargent Shriver, to control the setup of these programs. He can lay down guidelines but he cannot tell local mayors or country officials whom to hire and how to expend funds.

This program was designed that way. As a result of this, we have decided we now need to lay down some very direct statutory authority on what will be done and how it will be done at the local and State levels, because there has crept into this program not politics, not some misuse that is laid to the current structure of our Government in this country, but what has crept in really has been an inordinate use of moneys expended by the Federal Government, devoted by the Federal Government for the benefit of the poor, an inordinate use of these funds to build up administrative structures at the local level that are not needed to help the poor. That is what we are trying to get at here.

I would be the last to say we have a political boss in New York City, the greatest city in the country, which annually has received $75 million in poverty funds. We do not have a political boss. I have not heard him called that. He operates this program in New York City. I am not satisfied with this New York City program where, in each eligible community, 75 to 80 percent of the funds are used for high-priced administration, for professional staff, for clerk hire, for rentals, phones, travel, and fixtures, and only 30 percent or less is available for antidependency and action-type activities for the benefit of the poor.

What do I mean by that? I mean we need to write the kind of bill here today that will state if they want maximum feasible participation of the poor in the benefits of the program, there is only one way to get that, and that is to confine and restrict the money that can be used to build up little "pentagons of power" to run the poor and make more programs available to the poor.

In this last minute I will say, Mr. Chairman, I will place in the RECORD, when I have the opportunity to do so, when we go back into the House, chapter and verse, item by item, of the way the poverty program has been structured in New York City by the mayor now incumbent. This is where we need reform, and I hope the Republicans will support this in the interest of the poverty program reform, even if it hurts one of their own.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support for the new Job Corps.

This Nation now has an effective and successful Job Corps which in the past year served 100,000 youngsters, 24,000 of whom were impoverished young women. This is a Job Corps that has significantly reduced its operating costs from over $9,000 per man-year in 1966 to $6,950 in fiscal year 1967.

This is a Job Corps that has documented a 70-percent placement record with youths who were the 100-percent failures of the existing educational system. This is a Job Corps that now has an arrest rate that is less than half of the national arrest rate published by the FBI for youths between the ages of 16 and 21; a Job Corps that has reduced the distance that a youth must travel from his home to a center by an average of 400 miles and reduced transportation costs by 50

percent; a Job Corps that has stirred the corporate social conscience of private enterprise and involved business in the work of educating youths as it has never done before; a Job Corps that has revised earlier negative attitudes in innumerable communities throughout this Nation; a Job Corps that represents the first and only organization that seeks out and rehabilitates the poorest of poor young men and women in this country.

And the Job Corps of today estimates that it will further decrease the operating cost of its centers in the coming year; that it will lengthen the average stay of corpsmen to 9 months in the coming year—since success is so closely related to the time spent in a center—that by next year it will be placing 80 percent of the corpsmen leaving its centers in jobs, school or the military; that it will further increase the number of poor female youths served; that it will seek more effective participation of States in the Job Corps program.

In the spring of 1965, this Nation had neither the capability nor the facilities to reach and help hard-core impoverished youth. But in the short span of just 2½ years the Job Corps has opened and is successfully operating 123 Job Corps centers. Eighty-three are conservation centers operated by the Forest Service and the National Park Service. Seven are conservation centers run by States. Ten are men's urban centers: 18 women's urban centers.

These centers have been erected with a capability of handling over 43,000 youths at any one time, and during fiscal year 1967 the Job Corps reached 100,000 youths. At present, various statutory limitations restricting the female enrollment to a specific percent of total enrollment prevents the Job Corps from utilizing its full capacity.

Nonetheless, during fiscal year 1968, the Job Corps plans to operate with an average on-board enrollment of 41,000 and expects to reach another 100,000 poor young men and women.

In the beginning of Job Corps, emphasis was primarily placed on reaching young men between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of school and out of work. By congressional direction, the female capacity was significantly enlarged.

Within the past 9 months the Job Corps has more than doubled its capability to train young women. As late as this past January there were only a few thousand women in the Job Corps. By May of 1967, 17 percent of the total enrollment in Job Corps were women. By June of 1967, 23 percent of the total enrollment of Job Corps, or over 9,500 enrollees were women.

In 1968, the Job Corps has proposed to further increase the size of its women's program. The present plans are that at least 25 percent of all enrollees will be women. This means that over 10,250 women at any one time will be receiving the services of Job Corps.

From the time Job Corps opened its first center, critics have claimed that the operating costs of Job Corps were too high. These critics persisted, despite their knowledge that all new organizations must initially encounter high start-up costs, which can be allocated to only a very small number of enrollees.

Over the past 2½ years, the cost of operating the Job Corps has continually dropped. Last year at a time when the costs per enrollee in the Job Corps were averaging about $9,000, the Congress imposed a statutory limitation that the average cost per enrollee in the Job Corps could not exceed $7,500.

But the Job Corps brought the cost down below $7,000 and there is every indication that it will continue to reduce its unit cost further to $6,500 per enrollee in this fiscal year, as required in the bill before us.

The high cost of capital investment has also been a point of criticism about the Job Corps. The total investment for 123 centers now stands at $144 million or about a little over $1 million per center. The capital investment was minimized by making maximum use of idle military facilities.

The $144 million of investments resulted in spaces for 43,000 corpsmen at a cost of about $3,000 per space. However, the Job Corps has served over 140,000 youths, including those now on board.

The allocation of these capital costs over just the number of youths served to date reduces the capital investment per youth to $1,000. And this is not the end: these capital costs per youth will continue to decrease as each graduating corpsman is replaced by another youngster.

The record also contains many observations detailing the success of the Job Corps in touching the social conscience of private industry. From Job Corps earliest days, over one-half of all corpsmen were trained in centers operated by private enterprise. A listing of its contractors and corporations desiring to operate additional Job Corps centers reads like a who's who listing of the business world.

It is significant to note that this country has never before been able to attain this level of involvement with private enterprise as an integral part of its educational process. It is also significant to note that no industrial organization has ever quit on the Job Corps. The management of these organizations are fully behind the Job Corps and fully support the objectives that Job Corps has striven to attain.

From time to time comments are heard about companies who make a profit out of poverty: These comments are not fair. The size of the profit realized on any Job Corps training center contract is well below the return being realized by these corporations on other endeavors. The maximum fixed-fee, or profit, has been set at 4.7 percent, significantly below the fixed fee of 6 percent and higher which these contractors receive on Space and Defense contracts and far below the rate of return realized on commercial sales.

Over the past several months we have also heard testimony from several individuals describing training organizations that are "the same as Job Corps." These educational organizations were vocational programs dealing with youths that had dropped out of school.

An objective inquiry and analysis into the programs of these vocational schools and the characteristics of their student body will show that not one of these programs is "the same as Job Corps." These vocational programs:

Do not deal with the truly impoverished youths that the Job Corps seeks to help;

Do not treat the total youth—his educational need, his vocational need, his social need, his cultural need;

Do not operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year; and

Do not operate the same program cheaper than the Job Corps since these institutions receive substantial local support and provide a more limited program, neither of which is considered when cost per student is cited.

Many vocational schools do an excellent vocational training job. But, the Job Corps remains unique in its approach of treating the total human being. The youths served by the vocational schools whose programs were explained to the Education and Labor Committee are not dealing with the truly impoverished youth.

Job Corps has a success rate as good or better than the public schools and many vocational schools even though the Jobs Corps youth are much poorer and much harder to deal with.

There is no organization in this country that has the capability of the Job Corps to deal with the hard core and impoverished men and women who represent the failings of the existing educational system.

The Job Corps is unique. From its inception, it embarked on a program of total human renewal. The Job Corps did not see a young man's or woman's lack of educational or vocational training, or lack of social skills, as separate problems to be dealt with by separate organizations.

The Job Corps has never attempted to take the "cream" of the youth. It has taken 103,000 youths who can be truly classified as 100 percent dropouts or failures and has placed 70 percent of them in jobs, school, or the Armed Forces. These are youths who, had it not been for Job Corps, in all probability, would be a dredge to society for the rest of their lives.

To spin off the Job Corps into another agency at this stage of development will do nothing but impede, if not destroy, all that Congress has sought to achieve. Neither the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor have both indicated that OEO should operate the Job Corps.

The public image of the Job Corps has changed for the better in almost every community in the vicinity of a center.

The testimony of House hearings contains letters from the mayors, law enforcement officials, leading editors, and heads of chambers of commerce of 100 towns and cities in the vicinity of Job Corps centers. In all of the letters there are only five that can be considered generally negative.

It is evident from this overwhelming testimony by local community leaders, some of whom were violently opposed to

Job Corps just 2 years ago, that Job Corps is a good neighbor. Practically every community is now a strong supporter of the program for many reasons—

Appreciation is expressed by these towns and cities because of the way corpsmen have so willingly assisted with voluntary projects;

City officials compliment the Job Corps on the attitude of corpsmen and staff members on centers and in communities; and

These cities and towns are aware and grateful for the favorable impact on the economy of the community in which the center is located.

This is the record of the new Job Corps—a changed Job Corps that must be permitted to continue. I repeat that I personally believe one of the greatest tragedies of this session would be the authorization of legislation that would require Job Corps to deviate from the plan that it has outlined to this Congress.

The present Job Corps is an improved Job Corps and one that gives every indication of further improvement in the months ahead. I believe that Job Corps must be maintained as an organizational entity to preserve its imaginative, innovative, and successful program. It must be preserved because, today, this Nation does not have a feasible alternative to the Job Corps.

For the first time in this Nation's history, we have an organization that has demonstrated the capability of dealing with the very poor. We must not destroy this organization.

I strongly support the request of the Job Corps managers that Congress permit them to operate during the remainder of this year at its present capacity. A year in which no drastic changes are required will provide the opportunity to prove what Job Corps can really do. I am convinced that such a year would stabilize the program and result in an even more improved Job Corps than the successful one we have today.

THE PATRIOTISM OF JOB CORPS BOYS

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Members of this House of the sacrifices that are being made by young people who have been lifted from poverty by the program whose future we are debating today.

Two weeks ago, 44 young men from Parks Job Corps Center, in California, enlisted simultaneously in the Army airborne forces. Their induction test scores were higher than the national average, by the way.

As we sit here in this comfortable Chamber discussing whether or not to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity, some 350 young men trained by the Job Corps are fighting for their country in Vietnam. This may be a controversial war, but there is no controversy at all about the extent of the danger that stalks the young men we send into battle.

Eight former Job Corps men have been killed in action.

One of these fine young Americans who have given their lives in Vietnam was George W. Jones. A private first class in the 1st Cavalry, he was drafted in June 1966 from Kilmer Job Corps Center and killed in action 6 months later.

This is what George's friends at Kilmer Job Corps Center said about him:

He was here for the same reason we are—to get a trade. Even though George never finished his training, we can finish ours as a memorial to George.

My fellow Members, are we going to make it possible for George's friends to carry out their pledge?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard over and over again the statement that "Job Corps does not provide any placement or follow-up services for its trainees." It is surprising that this myth continues to be related despite vast amount of testimony during the extensive hearings on Job Corps.

Job Corps placement and follow-up system is effective and is working. Although the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended does not specifically call on Job Corps for placement, Job Corps has been moving ahead in this area.

Job Corps now receives verified placement records for 86.4 percent of terminees within 90 days of termination. 78 percent of the youths who complete training enter jobs, school and the military at an average wage of $1.70 per hour within an average time of 36 days.

Now it is true that a year ago they did not have all of this information. This is a part of tightening-up and improvement in administration that we have seen during the past year.

In addition to this, Job Corps is interested in long-term results as well. Job Corps has established two methods of obtaining these results:

First. Surveys through Louis Harris and Associate, and

Second. Concentrated support service programs.

Follow-up statistics based on surveys show that 6 months after Job Corps:

First. Seventy percent of all youths are in either jobs, school, or military.

Second. Eighty percent of completers are placed with: First, 89 percent working full time; and second, 75 percent having had no more than two jobs.

These figures also show that youths under 18 have less success than those over 18, although completers under 18 do just about as well as noncompleters over 18.

Working hand in hand with placement are Job Corps two networks of support service volunteers—JACS and WICS.

For the men, JACS now has 370 volunteer coordinators and 1,644 community volunteers who have helped 3,000 corpsmen on their return to the community since June.

For women, WICS with its 12,000 volunteers in 300 local units has helped 25,000 women since 1965.

Still not satisfied, Job Corps is testing a model placement and support project operated by the City of Baltimore Health and Welfare Council.

During the last 6 months, they have worked with 347 terminees, placing 80 percent of them. The record for completers is:

First. Eighty-six percent placed;

Second. Ninety-four percent placed in training-related jobs; and

Third. Eighty percent employed in the same job after 6 months at $1.91 average hourly wage.

This has been done at a cost per youth served of $51—less than the cost of 3 weeks of welfare benefits or 2 weeks of unemployment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this is the new Job Corps—as Lou Harris said in his 2 hours of testimony explaining the results of his surveys before the House Education and Labor Committee:

In fact, what happened to these young people as human beings may in the long run go much further toward determining the real long-term effectiveness of the Job Corps than whether immediately their hourly wages are going up 20, 40, or 80 cents an hour, or whether they are among the upper third or second third as engine mechanics today.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, 3 years have passed since Congress enacted landmark legislation creating the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We gave a mandate to the OEO to undertake a comprehensive assault on the poverty.

As a result, resources were mobilized. Ideas were generated. Programs were developed and put into operation. Today we can see in human and organization terms the first results of this effort: 1,000,000 Americans volunteering their services in a variety of antipoverty efforts; 1,050 communities with new organizations seeking to meet the needs of the poor; 2,000,000 children helped by the excellent Headstart program for preschoolers; 321,000 young people receiving basic education, job training, work experience, and needed income through the Neighborhood Youth Corps; 102,000 men and women given work training, counseling, and education providing them with a second chance, through the Job Corps; and 41 neighborhood health centers funded and beginning to make a dent in the long-neglected health problems of the poor.

These programs, during their brief existence, have begun to make significant inroads on conditions which have prevented millions of Americans from full participation in the prosperity and economic program of this Nation.

Gov. Warren P. Knowles, of Wisconsin, recently wrote to Director Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity, urging authorization and appropriation of $2 billion for community action programs.

In his letter of October 5, Governor Knowles spelled out the reasons for supporting increased funds for community action programs. The text of his letter follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, Wis., October 5, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: In response to our recent correspondence, I would like to thank you and Mr. Beals of the Chicago Regional Office for restoring most of the cut in allocations to the Milwaukee Social Development Commission. I have been assured that the Social Development Commission now will be

able to operate its present programs satisfactorily.

In responding to the P.S. in your letter of September 19, I am most willing to communicate my convictions concerning the Economic Opportunity Act amendments to the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation.

I feel the three major pieces of legislation to be inadequate to the needs of the poor especially as defined by the community action sections in all three. I am therefore enclosing a copy of this letter to the Delegation indicating my request for a larger community action authorization and appropriation over and above 1.062 billion dollars.

Quite frankly, I find various features of program content attractive in each of the three major bills. For the Quie Bill, I believe the strong emphasis on state planning and financial participation to be important. In this direction, I have recommended the State Board of Governmental Operations be authorized $1 million by the Wisconsin Legislature to be used in assisting inner-city, urban poor.

I have also called for the appropriation of $100,000 in state monies for the Milwaukee OIC program.

I find the Administration Bill, as proposed, a continuation of programs which are excellent, but which are not coordinated by the federal agencies as well as they should be. Certainly the allocations for community action are heavily mortgaged for Fiscal 1968.

Likewise, I do not consider the community action allocation under the Senate Labor and Welfare Bill adequate to meet the needs of the nation either. The Senate measure appeals to me in its approach and funding level although community action again is given light treatment.

I feel that a $2 billion investment for community action alone is none too much. Best wishes.

Very truly yours,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

I certainly regret that some of my colleagues from Wisconsin on the other side of the aisle do not support the Governor in his request for OEO funds. Instead of seconding his call for increased funds, they launched a series of attacks on him.

Governors, mayors, educators, civic groups, and businessmen generally recognize the need for the OEO and the programs it furnishes because they come face to face with the poor and their problems.

Yet, in spite of this, some Members have suggested that the attacks on poverty could be better waged if OEO were eliminated and the responsibility for administering its programs scattered around Washington.

The other body and the Committee on Education and Labor gave careful consideration to this issue. They held more than 6 weeks of public hearings, listened to more than 100 witnesses—mostly from outside Government—and recorded more than 4,000 pages of testimony. An attempt was made to let every knowledgeable and important voice on this subject in the country be heard.

Of the 64 public witnesses who addressed themselves to the issue of retaining OEO, only one called for the elimination of that agency. Outstanding spokesmen representing diverse segments of American life, such as business, labor, church groups, education, and all levels of government firmly and clearly supported the retention of OEO as the central guiding mechanism for the war on poverty.

Public administrators, asked to comment on the question, were unanimous in recommending that OEO be continued. One of these officials succinctly stated the general position of those responding when he said:

To break up the Office of Economic Opportunity and place its functions in the established departments would be a disaster.

There are four good and decisive reasons for continuing the OEO:

First. The poor need an independent advocate. To break this agency up and parcel out its programs to other agencies would destroy the war on poverty as a concentrated effort. It would mean that programs conceived by OEO would be given over to administrators whose primary responsibilities have not been and still would not be concerned with programs specifically fashioned to help the poor.

Second. The problems of poverty require new and imaginative solutions. OEO has shown a willingness to experiment, to innovate, and to tackle the tough problems of poverty with freshness and vigor.

Third. The war on poverty requires central direction and guidance. Someone must have primary responsibility for leading the fight, exercising control over the channeling of resources, and standing accountable to the public through success and failure. If this country's antipoverty effort is not to go off in all directions without overall responsibility, the command post must remain intact.

Fourth. The OEO has gotten results, despite the enormousness and intractability of the problem and the modest resources so far engaged.

OEO is not perfect. Of course it has faults and makes mistakes as it plows new ground.

The answer must not be to destroy the OEO. Instead, let us support and strengthen it.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, as some Members of this body careen along on budget-slashing sprees and others play nakedly partisan politics with programs that are crucial in attacking the social and economic ills of the Nation, I wonder if we all have a full realization of what these capricious actions mean locally, in thousands of communities across the country.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that not all of us do know the local consequences. And I further submit that we had better find out before it is too late.

There are wise economies, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress must make. But there are also actions, taken piously in the name of saving money, that in reality will result in a prodigal waste of the Nation's resources and will end by costing us all dearly.

It is emphatically not an economical move, Mr. Chairman, to cripple community attacks on poverty, to stifle the local initiative which the self-styled economizers among us pay such lipservice to, and to turn our backs on the national commitment affirmed 3 years ago when Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act.

Yet this is just what the self-styled economizers are doing when they talk of cutting the already minimal war on poverty budget to pieces and in the meantime of putting the economic opportunity programs on a continuing resolution that would force community cutbacks of up to 50 percent.

No elected officials are better qualified to predict the consequences of this false economizing than the mayors of our cities, who must deal day by day with the almost overwhelming problems of poverty and social unrest. My good friend, the perceptive, able, and dedicated Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, has made a telling comment on what the current "economizing" wave may mean for his city. These consequences will not be unique, Mr. Chairman, and accordingly I insert in the RECORD at this point for the very careful consideration of my colleagues an article from last Friday's Providence Journal summarizing the views expressed by Mayor Doorley at a press conference:

DOORLEY FEARS DEVASTATING POVERTY CUTS

(By Hamilton E. Davis)

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence said yesterday that the federal antipoverty director had warned him local programs across the country will be cut by nearly half if the House gets its way on temporary financing for the agency.

The mayor said in an afternoon press conference that the effect of such a cut in community action funds would be "devastating," and that the effect on Providence would be especially serious because the city gets more antipoverty money than many communities its size.

Mr. Doorley said he had been warned of the danger to the program by Sargent Shriver, director of the federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), in a meeting Tuesday in Washington.

If the House gets its way on the temporary spending level and if the appropriation bill is put over to the next session of Congress, the effect on Providence would be to cut its roughly three-million-dollar budget by as much as two-thirds.

To head this off, the mayor said he was calling chief executives from other cities to urge them to bring pressure on the House to moderate its hostility to locally designed and run "community action" programs.

Mr. Doorley said he was not yet sure what form this pressure might take, but that he was hopeful there might be a meeting of big-city mayors in Washington to demonstrate the degree of support for the program among the men who have to live with the problems of poverty.

The threat to the antipoverty effort lies in the House decision to force OEO to operate its community action programs at a level 40 percent below that of last year until the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year is passed.

The Senate wants to operate the program temporarily at last year's level, and the conflict will have to be resolved by a Senate-House conference committee. This decision is expected daily, because OEO's authority to spend anything technically expired at midnight Monday.

Under normal circumstances, the appropriation bill for the agency would be passed about now—the Senate has passed it and House debate is scheduled Nov. 7—but there has been so much controversy over it there is speculation that Congress may put off action until the January session.

In a telephone interview from Washington after the Doorley press conference, an OEO spokesman said that if Congress does put off action on the bill, the agency will have to operate at the temporary level fixed by Congress.

The spokesman said the consequences de-

scribed by Mr. Doorley amounted to the worst that could happen; that is, the House could make its 40 per cent reduction under last year stick. Actually, however, the House-Senate compromise is likely to be a smaller reduction.

In his statement yesterday afternoon, Mayor Doorley said that he had been told that the roughly three-million-dollar community action budget for the Providence antipoverty agency could be cut to as little as one million dollars.

He said that he had not discussed the problem yet with officials of Progress for Providence, Inc., but that a major cut could wipe out not only operating programs but those that are in the planning stage.

Cleo E. Lachapelle, director of Progress for Providence, said, when asked for comment last night, that a cut to one million dollars here would emasculate the program.

"It would be a terrific blow, not only here, but throughout the country," he said. "I don't think we could recover from it."

The local programs that are paid for with community action funds include the preschool Head Start effort, the community schools, the neighborhood resource units, drop-in centers and legal services.

In answer to a question, whether he would consider using city money to help make up any cuts in the program by Congress, Mr. Doorley said that no city, by itself, could hope to attack the poverty problem.

Providence contributes no cash to the program: its share is made up in "in kind" services such as the use of city school buildings.

Mr. Doorley said that he hopes pressure by the chief executive can counterbalance the effects of a coalition of House members who oppose the bill. This coalition does not include Rhode Island's representatives—Fernand J. St Germain and Robert O. Tiernan—he emphasized.

The Doorley move to draw attention to the implications of the House effort and his action in trying to mobilize the nation's mayors appears to be the first major step in an OEO campaign to bypass the hostile House coalition.

The mayor said that the information about the effects of the cuts asked by the House and the specific reductions this would cause in 50 cities around the country were contained in a memorandum given him by Mr. Shriver.

He said he had asked Mr. Shriver what he should do with the memorandum and that the director told him: "Do what you want with it."

In Washington, the OEO spokesman said that Mr. Shriver couldn't very well announce the consequences of the House move because it would look as if he was trying to scare people into support for OEO.

But it was perfectly proper for the staff of OEO to chart the worst possible consequences of the cuts, the spokesman said. It was those consequences that were contained in the memorandum given to Mr. Doorley. The mayor did not release the memorandum. Until recently, OEO was operating at the same level as last year, in which it received an appropriation of 1.6 billion dollars. This figure was agreed on by both the House and Senate.

According to the OEO spokesman, the House voted on Oct. 19 to cut this to 1.2 billion, and on Oct. 23 the previous joint agreement expired. The 1.6 billion figure contains $1,022,000,000 for community action programs; the remainder is for other programs that are federally designed, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The 1.2 billion sum contains only $600,000,000 for community action. These levels are set in what are known as "continuing resolutions." The compromise between House and Senate between the 1.2 and 1.6 billion dollar figures is expected momentarily.

The actual appropriation bill requested by the administration calls for a total annual spending of 2.06 billion dollars. The Senate has passed a bill authorizing expenditure of 2.258 billion dollars.

On Nov. 7, the House is scheduled to debate a bill calling for 2.06 billion dollars, but with a series of amendments attached that are aimed at satisfying critics of the community action effort.

This bill was reported out by the House education and labor committee, but only after the most heated debate in the life of the anti-poverty program. It is this factor, and the hostile mood in the House that has led to the speculation that Congress might just let OEO run for an indefinite period on the continuing resolution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished Member from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] in his personal judgment of R. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Few men have had more difficult assignments in the Federal Government than Mr. Shriver and few men have so risen to the challenge and responded so magnificently. The genesis and progress of the Peace Corps has had no greater personal stamp than that of R. Sargent Shriver. The success of this great program is, in my opinion, directly attributable to his leadership, his dedication, and the inspiration he gave to the staff and the members of the Peace Corps.

In this complex, highly controversial, and difficult task as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Shriver has again demonstrated his ability to bring life to a new and untried program. No one knows better than he, that all has not been a bed of roses, and everything about the program has not been perfect. He would be the first to agree to this. But his vision and his deep concern for the problems of the poor gave him the drive to get the program off the ground. He deserves the applause of all who are concerned with giving hope and help to the disadvantaged and poor of this Nation. I congratulate him for what he has done in this important area.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, today we must face the question of continuing or abandoning our national decision a few years ago to attack poverty and to seek to better the lives of millions of Americans whose lives are carred by urban and rural ghettos and the culture of poverty. New techniques and ideas were put to the root of the problem, emphasizing most particularly jobs and education.

A smaller part of the war on poverty was to be directed at assisting low-income persons expand their business opportunities and gain a stake in the economic life of the community—title IV authorized loans to be approved finally by the Small Business Administration and envisioned the establishment of small business development centers to locate and screen applicants and to organize training and management counseling necessary for borrowers, most of whom had little formal education and lacked basic business skills. Without much priority, though, and with administrative conflict of the guiding principles of the program, the entire operation was shifted in 1966 to the SBA and soon the SBCD's were being informed that they would not longer be funded.

I feel very strongly that this program must be revitalized according to its original concept and so I rise to urge the support of the House for the amendment of our colleague, Congressman STEIGER, to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—to focus the loan program upon small business concerns either located in poverty areas or owned by low-income persons and, second, to require management development programs for the participants. The responsibility for this crucial technical assistance is to be with the Secretary of Commerce, and thereby, the Economic Development Administration.

By reactivating the SBCD's, we shall not be undermining the role of the SBA, but merely halting the further slipping away of the economic opportunity loan program with its unique and difficult goal of testing whether or not low-income, unemployed, little-educated persons, given the proper training and assistance, can establish a self-supporting small business enterprise.

I include a letter I received recently from Mr. John K. Lopez, treasurer of the American Association for Business and Economic Development, urging the support of the Congress for title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act. Mr. Lopez cogently and forcefully states the case for this program, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
San Jose, Calif., October 24, 1967.

Hon. W. DONLON EDWARDS,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: It has become apparent in the past few months of the Congress sessions that the concept of *local participation in the development of the nation's business economy is being discouraged.*

Federal bureaucrats in a display of self-serving interest have co-ordinated their activities with private pressure groups in an attempt to destroy the funding provisions of *Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act—Employment and Investment Incentives.*

As you well know, Title IV—EOA is the enabling legislation for the Small Business Development programs of many local community and business organizations. These programs assist the minority and disadvantaged *to develop entrepreneurial skills.*

These *beneficiaries are the hard-working small businessmen of the disadvantaged community, the real victims of the civil destruction and disorder that has plagued our nation.*

It is incredible that any of our Congress would allow a single bureaucracy to control all available assistance to the entire small business community (95% of all U. S. businesses).

However, it is evident that numerous informed members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, *from both political parties,* have maintained Title IV of the EOA and have additionally called for more resources to develop this program of *free enterprise and job opportunities.*

Our nation is truly indebted to those of the Congress that support Title IV—EOA.

Locally sponsored and administered small business assistance programs, co-ordinated by the Department of Commerce, are a splendid opportunity for our nation's resources to encourage participation and con-

tribution by responsible minority and disadvantaged individuals in our free enterprise democracy.

Your support is needed.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. LOPEZ,
Treasurer.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, I reported to my distinguished colleagues of the very great degree of support for the war on poverty which exists in my congressional district and in the State of Minnesota, and to express my alarm over the threatened demise of tremendously worthwhile and essential antipoverty projects in Minneapolis.

Today, I would like to further substantiate what I have said on previous occasions about the crucial importance of the war on poverty in Minneapolis by calling the attention of my colleagues to an editorial, entitled "Penny Pinching on Poverty," which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on November 3, and a very fine article by Bernie Shellum, entitled "Mayor Urges Fight To Get Pilot City Fund," which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on November 2.

Mr. Chairman, the Minneapolis pilot city project, which was to be supported with OEO funds, is of great importance to my city, just as thousands of other locally developed antipoverty projects are essential to the health and stability of cities from coast to coast. As Governor LeVander of Minnesota said in a recent statement:

> With the tremendous amount of citizen interest and neighborhood involvement in the pilot city project, the sudden halt of funds would be a breach of faith.

Mr. Chairman, the time for partisan politics and petty bickering is past. We are dealing with America's future. Let us pass a strong antipoverty bill without further delay.

With permission, I insert the Star editorial and the Tribune article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Nov. 3, 1967]

PENNY PINCHING ON POVERTY

Northsiders, and others in Minneapolis who worked long and hard to organize the successful election of directors for the Pilot City demonstration project, can hardly be blamed for their outrage as they see the program about to collapse.

The fault lies with Congress. Looking about for spending programs they could cut, members of the House have passed up such obvious targets as pork barrel public works projects and the supersonic transport, and instead have zeroed in on the war on poverty. By slashing the spending authorizations for the Office of Economic Opportunity, the congressmen have brought the Pilot City project and other antipoverty programs here to the edge of bankruptcy.

The lessons of last summer's riots and disturbances have apparently been forgotten. One of those lessons was that the dwellers of the nation's ghettos cannot for much longer be taken up the mountain of expectations and then, before realizing the hope of a better life, be dropped again into the abyss of despair.

The North Side Pilot City project offered such a hope. Scheduled to start operations this week, with the elected board of area residents planning a wide variety of social services, the program may never get off the ground. A letter-writing campaign by Northsiders, and a city-wide protest meeting Monday night, will convey to congressmen the disappointment at this turn of events. We hope they will be listening.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Nov. 2, 1967]

MAYOR URGES FIGHT TO GET PILOT CITY FUND

(By Bernie Shellum)

The Pilot City project in North Minneapolis was nearly bankrupt Wednesday, two days after 1,317 residents elected new directors.

The estimate that the demonstration project would run out of money in about 1 day provoked a protest against congressional cuts in the antipoverty program.

"We must have lost our sanity," said Mayor Arthur Naftalin at a news conference in which he chastised Congress for a "punitive" attitude toward the poor.

The news conference is to be followed by a letter-writing campaign urging restoration of antipoverty funds and by a citywide protest meeting Monday night.

The letter-writing campaign and the Monday meeting at Lincoln Junior High School will be sponsored by the North Side Federation, the 60-plus organizations which have formed the base for Pilot City board elections.

"We are not rats. They won't exterminate us," said Mrs. Charlotte Carmouche, one of the 12 resident members of the Pilot City planning committee. She was reelected Monday and, with two other North Side women attended the news conference in Naftalin's office.

The Pilot City staff of 12 full- and part-time workers is operating on what remains of a four-month, $50,000 planning grant.

As a new project it is not eligible for federal funds being doled out to other Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) agencies under a continuing resolution which has served in place of a 1968 appropriation.

President Johnson has requested $2.1 billion in antipoverty funds for fiscal 1968, which began in July. The Senate is willing to provide it, but the House is not.

The House, until recently, did allow OEO to continue spending at the 1967 rate of $1.68 billion. But on Oct. 23, the House amended the continuing resolution and cut OEO spending to a level of $1.2 billion, 40 per cent less.

Nationally, some 35 local agencies serving 500,000 poor people will have to shut down in three weeks unless they are financed. Some 38,600 Job Corps boys and girls will start living off the shelf and 2,800 workers at OEO headquarters in Washington face a payless payday Nov. 14.

Yesterday Naftalin said Congress understands neither the importance of the antipoverty effort nor "the nature of the trouble this nation faces."

One reason for the plight of OEO, Naftalin said, is that Southern congressmen object to the large number of Negroes employed in the program.

He said he has written to all Minnesota congressmen urging their support for OEO and invited Rep. Albert Quie, R-Minn., to "come into Hennepin County" and "go project to project." Quie has led Republican critics who want to transfer many OEO functions to other governmental agencies.

Naftalin called antipoverty money "the price of decent relationships next summer."

Pilot City was promised $100,000 for 1968 to administer a complex of social services that would be available under a single roof to 52,000 North Siders.

The planning committee compiled an application for programs costing up to $4 million before giving way yesterday to the Technical Advisory Committee to Implement Community Services (TACTICS), elected Monday. The fate of that application, the first of 14 such projects in the country, is still not known.

The appropriation for the Hennepin County antipoverty board, Mobilization of Economic Resources (MOER), expires Nov. 30, meaning a 40 percent cut in those projects unless the mood in Congress changes.

Edgar Pillow, MOER director, said Head Start, which involves 1,000 children—and 109 parents as paid workers—will be among the programs to be reduced. The youth employment program, which gave jobs to 1,000 last summer, also would be cut.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, never, since I entered the House of Representatives a little less than 3 years ago, have I been as deeply concerned as I am today.

The lead editorial in today's New York Times and a column by Tom Wicker eloquently state the reasons for my concern.

I will include in the RECORD excerpts from both items at the conclusion of my remarks.

I would like to add a personal plea to all of the Members of this House—Republican and Democrat, liberal and conservative.

When this House first passed the Economic Opportunity Act, we were, for the first time, facing up boldly and courageously to a grave national problem we had ignored for generations.

We dared then to give the poor and downtrodden a voice, a chance to live a decent life, to educate their children, to participate in the design of their own futures. We dared to conceive the idea that we in the United States of America could, for the first time on this planet, banish abject, inherited, endemic poverty.

We have now created a tidal wave of rising expectations, hopes, aspirations, commitment. We must not, we cannot, turn back the clock.

During the past month, this House has demonstrated its hostility to this program in mean, petty, and vindictive ways, utterly beneath its dignity, let alone its generosity. Government employees, including secretaries, office boys, and so forth, face payless pay days because the House has refused interim funding. And Federal poverty employees at all levels were gratuitously and spitefully executed from the general executive branches pay raise.

Across the country, antipoverty programs are in chaos, some without funding, others uncertain as to their future.

Now we have an opportunity to erase the bankruptcy of the immediate past. Let us unite to produce legislation that will not dash, but rather will fortify and validate the hopes of millions of the poor who wish meaningful work, not welfare; independence, pride, and self-respect, rather than charity, dependency, and despair.

This program is important to many of our towns and rural areas; it is desperately crucial to our cities.

Our cities are paying for half a century of neglect by Federal and State governments. Polluted air and water, filthy traffic-jammed streets, crumbling rat-infested slums, and grossly antiquated educational plants and systems are too often the tragic hallmark of our central cities.

In these explosive surroundings live a substantial number of the beneficiaries of

this antipoverty legislation. The failure of this legislation may well be the proverbial straw for many of our urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, let us not play Russian roulette with the fate of our cities.

The excerpts referred to follow:

WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employes are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the $30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of $50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for pre-school youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now underway in the House.

POVERTY IN THE HOUSE—THE POLITICAL GRAB BAG

(By Tom Wicker)

In most of this, of course, there is little concern for the poor; and although opponents of the program love to charge that it has been nothing but a political grab bag, the political grabbing in the House of Representatives obviously is a lot worse than anything yet proved to have happened in the poverty program.

But whatever happens to the program itself, the poverty question is not going to disappear. That is the real achievement of O.E.O.; it has aroused some of the poor themselves, and called the attention of a nation to their plight. Poverty is going to haunt American politicians for years to come, and if the men who vote in the House this week don't know that yet, they will find it out the hard way.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, as the House begins debate today on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I hope that my colleagues will focus their attention on the great accomplishments of the antipoverty program during the last 3 years rather than constantly eyeing and criticizing the few faults of the program.

There have been problems with the antipoverty program, as there are with any new program in Government during the shakedown period. But this does not mean that we should emasculate and dilute the program, as title II would, because there have been problems. We are living in a most critical period and the need for a more meaningful and effective antipoverty program is urgent, both now and for the future.

The New York Times respected and perceptive columnist, Tom Wicker, writing on the antipoverty bill today, said, and I quote:

President Johnson declared "war on poverty" three years ago. The resulting program may be reduced to a helpless invalid, without money or power, when this week's shouting, table-thumping, posing and meat-axing have been completed in the House of Representatives.

Already the Office of Economic Opportunity's funds are exhausted and many of its projects around the nation are shutting down; already its employees are having to work as volunteers—despite the insulting fact that this House has specifically excluded them from a Federal pay raise.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wicker justifiably says in concluding his column:

But whatever happens to the program itself, the poverty question is not going to disappear. This is the real achievement of O.E.O.: it has aroused some of the poor themselves, and called the attention of a nation to their plight. Poverty is going to haunt American politicians for years to come, and if the men who vote in the House this week don't know that yet, they will find it out the hard way.

Mr. Chairman, there are still some 30 million Americans living in poverty today. The productive future of some 2½ million of them, if we exclude youths still in school, is in large part dependent on intensive training and job placement programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity will have reached no more than 1 million of these at the end of this fiscal year. The Nation is just beginning to realize the dimensions of the problem facing it, in terms of the numbers of poor and of the kinds of needs that must be met.

Promises have been made to these people and they should not be broken. This is not the time to cut back or to change the antipoverty program. There have been successes, innovation and creativity in these programs. Let me list some of them:

Headstart has changed the future for more than 2 million youngsters.

The legal services program has assured the poor the right to equal justice which more fortunate Americans have so long enjoyed.

Neighborhood health centers have helped to break the vicious cycle of poor health and poverty for residents of 35 low-income areas.

Upward Bound has opened the doors of a higher education to some 27,000 young men and women whose potential might not otherwise have been recognized and encouraged.

The 700 neighborhood centers established by community action agencies as a multiservice unit have brought a large reservoir of heretofore untapped manpower and services to bear on the total needs of individuals and families.

The followthrough program, which seeks to provide services of the type offered in Headstart programs to youngsters who have moved on to kindergarten and first grade, is now underway on an experimental basis for some 190,000 children, and holds promise as a meaningful addition to the regular curriculum of educationally deprived children in public schools.

Mr. Chairman, these programs, and other OEO components such as the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, are concerned not only with learning to read but also with learning what books are and what they have to offer, not only with learning a skill but also with learning what it means to hold a responsible job.

Participants in these programs differ from middle-income Americans not simply in terms of their paychecks but in the more tragic, the more human terms of functioning as thoughtful, responsible, and self-sufficient citizens. To learn these things—to learn to learn—is one of the most basic goals of the antipoverty program, and is a prerequisite to increasing a youngster's reading level by three grades or learning to be a television repairman.

In this endeavor, the Office of Economic Opportunity has the potential to provide the impetus and coordination that make such programs meaningful. The overall direction and coordination must be left with OEO. It would be a mistake to sacrifice the innovation and spirit that OEO has brought to this challenge to the more traditional approaches of many other governmental units.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to turning over control of community action programs to city hall. This would dilute the independence of existing local boards and still the voices of the poor and the disadvantaged who now have the opportunity to serve on these boards. These provisions in title II should be taken out of the bill.

I have received many telegrams from my district and from throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in opposition to this proposal. I also received a petition with hundreds of signatures of people benefiting from the antipoverty programs in Springfield—my home city of Springfield—expressing opposition to this provision in title II. The petition preamble reads:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: The bill, if passed as drafted, will take the Poverty Program away from the poor people.

It will place the Poverty Program in the hands of state and local governments. If approved by the House and voted into law, it would give governors, mayors and local officials a good deal of authority in running the Poverty Program. Please vote to kill this provision

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to further cuts in the antipoverty program. America has made a commitment to the poor and the disadvantaged. We should live up to that commitment by expanding these programs, rather than slashing and weakening them. Not because we want to show our magnanimity in order

to prevent riots in the city, but because it is right and long overdue. In conclusion, let me quote from the lead editorial in today's New York Times concerning the bill before us now:

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employees are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, OEO has had to cut off the $30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of $50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for preschool youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388), to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 2388 and to include therein extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

FIRMNESS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at long last there are indications that a new firmness is taking hold within U.S. college administration in dealing with unlawful college demonstrations. The distinction between the constitutional right to demonstrate and illegal civil disobedience is being drawn in terms of suspension or expulsion from school or college, which is, of course, something that should have been done long ago. In fact, it is almost safe to say that had it been done in the beginning, much trouble would have been avoided.

This same firmness is urgently needed on the part of our law-enforcement agencies in dealing with non-school illegal civil disobedience. Those who deliberately violate or conspire to violate the laws of the land in the process of demonstrating should be warned that if they break the law, there will be prompt arrest and prosecution without exception, no matter who they are as individuals. If a professor at a particular university deliberately breaks the law, no matter what his motivation, he should be prosecuted. If he wishes to have a record of conviction of lawbreaking, his wish should be granted. The same should apply to individual students.

There is now new talk about more illegal civil disobedience either this winter or in the spring, some relating to the war in Vietnam and some to civil rights causes. Insofar as these planned demonstrations project a deliberate violation of Federal law, their organizers should be dealt with as conspirators and prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney General in accordance with the law.

Title 18 of the United States Code makes it a Federal offense punishable by 5 years in the penitentiary to conspire with another person to commit an offense against the United States or any agency thereof and to do an act to effect such an objective. Organized demonstrators should be warned that if they plan an unlawful demonstration against a Federal agency such as the Pentagon and then commit an act carrying out the demonstration, they violate this Federal statute.

In the same sense, title 18 of the United States Code, section 2387, with reference to the armed services provides a penalty of 5 years in the Federal penitentiary for anyone who, intending to interfere with loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military advises insubordination or mutiny or refusal of duty by any member of the Armed Forces. It is well known that numbers of adults throughout the country have intentionally urged refusal to serve by draftees as well as distributing materials encouraging demoralization of morale amongst members of the armed services serving in Vietnam. The persons distributing this material should be arrested and promptly prosecuted under this statute, no matter who they are, including the ministry.

Why does the Attorney General fail to act here?

Recently the president of the United States Anti-Communist Congress, Mr. Wilson C. Lucom, inquired of the Attorney General with regard to these specific statutes in relation to the proposed demonstration on October 21, 1967, in Washington, D.C. A copy of his letter has come to me from the staff of one of the standing committees to which it was sent, and I include it following these remarks. So far as I know, the Attorney General has not even acknowledged receipt of this letter. I am sure that Members of Congress will be most interested in the answers to these questions.

The other day I wrote the Attorney General asking him to act to keep a certain article in Playboy magazine out of the U.S. mails on the ground that it was obscene within the meaning of Federal law. The Department replied to me in substance that they were unable to say it was obscene under decisions of the Supreme Court relating to pornography. This correspondence and my reply is also appended.

In protecting our people from what the chief law enforcement officer of the country believes to be pornographic principles announced in a Supreme Court decision dealing with different material is not a complete bar. Each case stands on its own in this field, and if the Attorney General would only act to protect the people from the floods of this type of filth we would be better off. He can do so under existing statutes awaiting court ruling on the new material. This sometimes takes years, but in the meantime, the offending material will not be on the shelves.

It is little short of scandalous that the Supreme Court of the United States declares itself unable to define or describe obscene material in such a way as to enable those who are responsible for protecting the young people of the Nation against outright pornography to even know what is illegal material. The Court's opinions have been so unnecessarily libertarian as to open the floodgates of the mails and invite the printing presses of the unscrupulous to sell the most aggravated types of pornography and obscenity. The article to which I have referred at page 154 in the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine is one example. Beyond nationally known publications everyone knows that smut and filth available in relatively unknown magazines and tabloids can be found in quantity at virtually any corner store across the land.

The dismal thing about all this, of course, is that there has been no need for such loose decisions. They could have been worded in such a way as to give the country some measure of protection.

Even more dismal is the compelled conclusion that those who wrote these decisions knew exactly what effect they would have upon this country and are now fairly chargeable with having intended the foreseeable consequences of their chosen language. The national injury does not derive from a single case. The decisions have been repeated, again and again.

Mr. Speaker, this is a damning indictment, but it is nevertheless demonstrably true. In the meantime, let the U.S. Attorney General and the Department of Justice pick up the pieces and do the best they can with the help of this Congress in moving against the conspirators, the peddlers of pornography, the distributors of narcotics and the inciters of riots. Let us have some firm action to protect and preserve the America we love. The hour is late.

The material referred to follows:

UNITED STATES ANTI-COMMUNIST CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Congress is being criticized for not passing new laws to protect

our government departments and the armed forces from obstruction of their lawful functions by demonstrators. A specific reference is made to the "Peace" Demonstration of October 21, 1967.

In addition to obstructing the lawful functions of the Defense Department, you can be assured that the TV and news coverage will be used throughout the world to mold world opinion to the effect that President Johnson's Vietnam Policy is wrong and that the American people do not approve of the President's policy—once again damaging his world image.

The Washington Daily News, October 14, 1967, carried an article by Ted Knap, Scripps Howard Staff Writer, stating "Mobilization chairman David Dellinger said more than 100 organizations will be represented. These include the Communist Party, W.E.B. DuBois clubs and several communist splinter groups".

Realizing how busy you are with other important matters, I call your attention to the following two sections of the United States Code which are present, enforceable laws:

"TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

"Section 371, conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor."

The legislative history shows the Supreme Court interpreted this statute and said:

"The statute is broad enough in its terms to include *any* conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, *obstructing* or defeating the lawful functions of *any* department of government." (Italic supplied.)

"Any department" specifically includes the Department of Defense as defined in 18 USC Section 6 and 5 USC Section I. Interestingly enough, this law does not include either the White House or the Capitol in its provisions:

"TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

"Section 2387, Activities affecting Armed Forces generally

"(a) Whoever, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States:

"(1) advises, counsels, urges, or in any manner causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(2) distributes or attempts to distribute any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States—

"Shall be filed not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and

shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'military or naval forces of the United States' includes the Army of the United States, the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve of the United States; and, when any merchant vessel is commissioned in the Navy or is in the service of the Army or the Navy, includes the master, officers, and crew of such vessel. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 811; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, Section 46, 63 Stat. 96.)"

Enclosed for your convenience are xerox copies.

Charging the lawbreakers with a misdemeanor has not been successful in preventing further planned demonstrations which will obstruct the lawful functions of the Defense Department. These two laws make such obstruction a felony rather than a misdemeanor.

No longer can the enforcement of Section 371, "Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States" or Section 2387, "Activities affecting armed forces generally" be suspended.

Nowhere do I find that the *Department of Justice* or you as Attorney General are empowered to suspend the United States Criminal Code of the United States. Have I over looked such suspension power granted to you under the Constitution? If so, please inform me. I feel that neither you nor any other government official has the right to suspend laws of the United States except provided for by the Constitution of the United States; otherwise, there should be a debate in Congress on this point.

If you agree that these are valid enforceable laws and must be enforced rather than suspended, then you are petitioned to put these people on notice by:

1. formally and publicly announcing that any obstruction of the lawful functions of the Pentagon or interference with the armed forces anywhere will be dealt with as felonies punishable by up to 5 and 10 years in prison and $10,000 fines under these two sections of the United States Criminal Code.

2. That as Attorney General, you have a sworn duty to uphold the United States laws which include these two laws; therefore, these laws must be enforced because you and the Department have no authority or power to act as judge and jury. The law must be applied and the dispositions thereof, left to a Federal judge and jury. Forms of protest and petition exist within the framework of the law. If they choose to violate the law, you do not have a choice, but a duty to enforce the law and charge felonies.

The passing of new laws by Congress will be an exercise in futility unless the existing laws are enforced.

It takes great intestinal fortitude to stand up to a large number of demonstrators and enforce the law. The Department of Justice did this in Alabama and Mississippi. Now it has to do this at the Pentagon.

May God give you the moral strength and courage.

Sincerely,

WILSON C. LUCOM,
President.

[From the United States Code]

§ 2387. ACTIVITIES AFFECTING ARMED FORCES GENERALLY

(a) Whoever, with intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States:

(1) advises, counsels, urges, or in any manner causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(2) distributes or attempts to distribute any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States—

shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the five years next following his conviction.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "military or naval forces of the United States" includes the Army of the United States, the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve of the United States; and, when any merchant vessel is commissioned in the Navy or is in the service of the Army or the Navy, includes the master, officers, and crew of such vessel. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 811; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, § 46, 63 Stat. 96.)

[From the United States Code]

CHAPTER 19.—CONSPIRACY

Sec.
371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States.
372. Conspiracy to impede or injure officer.

§ 371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States.

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 701.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I call your attention to the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine and the article contained therein commencing at page 154. I ask that you act to bar the distribution of this article through the United States mails in whatever form.

In my Opinion, this article is violative of Federal law and palpably obscene.

I hope and trust that you will act immediately in this matter so that any further distribution can be stopped, including the use of such injunctive procedures as may be necessary.

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1967.

Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter to the Attorney General dated October 26, 1967, regarding the November, 1967 issue of "Playboy" magazine. The Post Office Department has supplied us with a copy of this issue and we have reviewed the material which you referred to in your letter.

We note from Post Office intelligence reports that sale of this issue has been stopped at Dover, Exeter, Manchester and Portsmouth, New Hampshire. There is no comparable Federal statute under which we may ban or enjoin the sale or distribution of this issue. We must primarily rely on the Federal criminal statutes (18 U.S.C. 1461, Use of Mails, and 18 U.S.C. 1462, Use of Carrier for Interstate Shipment) to control the traffic in alleged obscene materials.

In order for material to be actionable under these statutes it must be established that (a) the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to a prurient interest in sex; (b) the material is patently offensive because it affronts contemporary community standards relating to the description or representation of sexual matters; and (c) the material is utterly without redeeming social importance. The latter test presents the most formidable obstacle to successful prosecution. In *Memoirs* v. *Massachusetts*, 383 U.S. 432 (1966) at footnote 7 the Supreme Court cited with approval the following language from *Zeitlin* v. *Arnebergh*, 383 P. 2d 152 (1963):

"Material dealing with sex in a manner that advocates ideas . . . or has literary or scientific or artistic value or any other forms of social importance, may not be branded as obscenity and denied the constitutional protection. Nor may the constitutional status of the material be made to turn on a 'weighing' of its social importance against its prurient appeal, for a work cannot be proscribed unless it is 'utterly' without social importance."

We are unable to make the judgment, in a practical sense, that this issue of "Playboy" magazine or the article in question is without the modicum of social value which entitles it to constitutional protection. Further evidence of the stringency of this test is represented by the Supreme Court's per curiam decisions of May 8, 1967 and June 12, 1967, which together reversed two Federal criminal convictions and fourteen state cases both civil and criminal. See, e.g., *Redrup* v. *New York*, 386 U.S. —, 87 S. Ct. 1414, 18 L. Ed. 2d 515 (May 8, 1967).

We hope that this brief discussion of the inherent constitutional difficulties in the area of pornography will aid you in understanding our conclusion in this matter.

You will be pleased to know that the Congress has enacted Public Law 90–100 creating a Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography which was signed by the President on October 3, 1967. The Commission's duties call for a broad gauged study of the obscenity problem which will include an evaluation by leading constitutional authorities of the present definition of obscenity. We are hopeful that constructive legislative recommendations will be made by this study group.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1967.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Thank you for your letter with reference to my request that the Department act to take the Playboy article out of the U.S. mails. I appreciate your taking the time to reply as carefully as you have.

I do not agree with the opinions of the Supreme Court dealing with obscenity, either in regard to their substantive content or with the interpretation that has been placed upon them by prosecuting agencies. I believe that it is possible to limit the circulation of particular material, not yet ruled upon, on the grounds of obscenity. I cannot believe that even as loose as some of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions have been in this regard, that they require you to permit everything filthy to flood our mails without restraint.

I did not contend that the November issue of Playboy Magazine in which appeared the article to which I had reference was obscene. It was the article at page 154, not the issue, and the article could have been removed, and still could be removed, from the magazine to make it mailable. The Justice Department should enforce the law and protect the people against this sort of filth.

If the Court wants to put up the roadblocks, let it do so. This will only further arouse the American people to the staggering dimensions of the dilemma law enforcement faces from a Court that is unable to even selectively define obscenity and deliberately continues to hand down decisions that keep this country in a condition approaching civil chaos.

I am aware of the existence of the Presidential Commission, which of course undoubtedly will sometime present recommendations for legislation which may even extend to a constitutional amendment or two, but this is a long way off.

In the meantime, are we to stand helpless against the floods of pornography that are overtly available at virtually every local corner store throughout the land? I cannot believe this is made necessary for the Department of Justice merely because of the present confusion resulting from decisions of the High Court. They have not enjoined you in the Justice Department from protecting the people. Why don't you at least try to take the smut off the shelves and let them holler—including the Court?

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the bill S. 2388 earlier today I stated I would place in the RECORD statistics and figures on the status of community action programs as conducted in New York City.

I do this in response to the call of the minority as expressed on page 208 of the report where I am quoted as follows:

Mr. Carey had this observation:

"If I wanted to sack this program I could load the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies * * *. I could be a vandal in this regard and damage beyond all repair the image of community action agencies which have expended millions of dollars not for the benefit of the poor but to set up hierarchies of staff and clerical personnel, travel, and all sorts of designs and features which were never, never contemplated in the passage of this legislation."

Since the minority believes it is my "public duty" to cite these matters in detail I will oblige.

First, however, let me place my criticism which is meant to be constructive in a proper context.

As I said earlier my observations referred to the organizational operation of community action programs in New York City and not elsewhere in the country.

The configurations and structures of these community action program agencies are in no way due to any action or policy directive of the OEO in Washington.

In fact, just the reverse is true. I have observed a succession of three regional OEO directors and officials of OEO in Washington who have diligently but vainly attempted to secure the cooperation of New York City officials in following OEO guidelines in CAP structure.

I have met not once but several times with Federal representatives and city officials in the past 2 years to indicate that the city was not following the intent of Congress nor the guidelines in setting up either its city-wide umbrella agency or its neighborhood community corporations.

These guidelines as I have indicated earlier today clearly provide (see "OEO Community Action Guide," October 1965, page 17, referring to participation in policymaking agencies) that there should be representatives of the chief elected official or officials of the community, and representatives of the leadership of elements of the community such as labor, business, religious, and minority groups. Combined with these two categories would be representatives from residents of the area and members of the groups to be served.

Briefly stated this is the one-third, one-third, one-third representation which we clearly intended in community action.

There has been, and is, valid and substantial reason for this arrangement in the judgment of our committee.

The need for elected and appointed public officials in the program is demonstrable. Those officials represent the entire community including the poor and they are needed to articulate the needs of the poor to the entirety of society. They can bring to community action programs the understanding and cooperation they need from other agencies of government, State and local, and legislation in such fields as housing, health, education, and so forth.

Most importantly when joining with the leadership of important elements of society they bring two indispensable strengths to community action.

First. They are in a position to build confidence and understanding of community action among the families in society who are in better income groups.

Second. They can through local action institute responsible and efficient management practices to see that excessive overhead and waste will not diminish the already limited flow of funds for programs aimed at ending dependency and building dignity and motivation among the poor.

Had these concepts been followed by the administration in New York City I am sure we would not have the situation existing today which I shall illustrate below.

To make certain that we will reform the programs in New York City and elsewhere for better benefits and greater impact I have joined with the gentlelady from Oregon in supporting the amendments to title II which would have this result.

All this amendment does is make statutory what the Congress intended in our

legislation as indicated in the guidelines which have unfortunately been either demurred or defied by local officials.

Now what did happen in New York City? Did the poor organize and develop these programs and neighborhood structures? Hardly.

The mayor of New York appointed a human resources commissioner. In a dramatic demonstration of how to escalate income to escape poverty, he took a $17,000 official of the New Haven poverty program and paid him $45,000 to set up the New York City programs. This is no reflection on the individual, Mitchell Svirdoff who must be worth the money because he now is going to Ford Foundation where he will be paid $55,000 after grappling for a year and a half with the problems of New York City.

But the commissioner was not expected to labor without adequate staff.

To head up the three major divisions in the poverty corps there was appointed one commissioner of community development at $32,500—recruited from OEO-level $15,000. One manpower commissioner at $32,500—formerly with the Department of Labor at $22,000. And one community relations director at $32,500—formerly staff director for a New Jersey community action program at $17,000.

Then with Federal funds there was organized at 100 Church Street, New York City, in the highest rent district in the world several hundred strategic thinkers spread over several floors to man the command post.

So far the poor have not had much to say about running this program but good news is on the way.

If the poor had a hand in these programs, if public officials other than the plush-lined commissioners I have referred to above, and if leaders in other sectors of the community had a voice I doubt if they would condone the cost of the strategic direction center at 100 Church Street just one-half mile west of city hall.

This center, for salaries, for personnel service, for professional planning and research has its own withholding system. To make certain the poor will be well planned for it deducts over $4.5 million from the city's direct poverty entitlement of $34 million or 12½ percent.

This would not seem overly disproportionate if the poor received the remainder of 87½ percent.

Unfortunately such is not the case. An examination of typical budgets at the neighborhood level community corporations which will expend the 87½ percent will show that the amount available for actual conduct of programs probably does not exceed 20 percent of the entire $34 million at best.

How can this be? Are not these programs controlled by the poor?

They are not. These community corporations are more structured for control of the poor than by the poor.

I wish to make it clear and definite that this system is in no way the fault or responsibility of the poor or their representatives in the areas to be served.

Had they devised their own budget and organized their own neighborhood corporations I doubt that the present condition would obtain.

Rather it becomes apparent that these budgets were handed down from above and the poor and their representatives were instructed to submit these budgets and they would be funded accordingly.

In order therefore not to cast any aspersion or criticism on the residents of the areas in question I shall designate them as area A, B, C. I am citing only these three although my study indicates that the remaining target areas in the city have almost identical balance sheets.

At the heading of each budget I have inserted the population of the target area and the number of welfare cases located within such area.

AREA A

Population	56,436
Welfare cases	10,788

Personnel:	Salary 12 months
1 Executive director	$15,000
1 Deputy director	12,200
1 Executive secretary	6,450
1 Secretary	5,050
Total	38,700

Urban development:	
1 Assistant director (for community programs)	10,650
1 Information officer	8,300
1 Social service officer	8,750
4 Community organizers (at $8,300 each)	33,200
1 Consumer specialist	8,300
3 Program specialists (at $7,900 each)	23,700
2 Social service assistants (at $5,550 each)	11,100
4 Neighborhood counselors assistants (at $5,550 each)	22,200
4 Senior community workers (at $6,450 each)	25,800
45 Block workers (at $4,150 each)	186,750
20 Neighborhood aides (at $4,150 each)	83,000
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
6 Clerical aides (at $4,150 each)	24,900
Total	452,500

Training:	
1 Senior training officer	9,650
1 Training officer	6,800
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Clerical aide	4,150
	26,450

Manpower:	
1 Assistant director	10,650
1 Psychometric technician	8,300
2 Senior job placement officers (at $8,300 each)	16,600
2 Job preparation counselors (at $6,800 each)	13,600
1 Job counsellor	6,450
1 Senior Job developer	8,750
3 Job developers (at $6,450 each)	19,350
5 Neighborhood aides (at $4,150)	20,750
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Secretary	5,050
3 Clerical aides (at $4,150 each)	12,450
	127,800

AREA A—Continued	Salary 12 months
Administration:	
1 Senior fiscal officer	9,650
1 Senior fiscal officer	$9,650
2 Bookkeepers (at $6,450 each)	12,900
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
8 Clerical aides ($4,150 each)	33,200
2 Messengers ($4,150 each)	8,300
1 Stock clerk	4,150
1 Machine room operator	4,150
	85,000
Program evaluation and design:	
1 Assistant Director	10,650
2 Program analysts ($8,300 each)	16,600
2 Research assistants ($5,850 each	11,900
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Clerical aide	4,150
20 Neighborhood aides ($4,150 each)	83,000
	132,150
Personnel w/o fringe	862,600
15 percent fringe benefits	129,600
	991,990
Consultant services and contract:	
Training consultants (15 days at $50 per day)	750
Business consultants (10 days at $75 per day)	750
Program specialists (12 days at $50 per day)	600
Manpower development (10 days at $50 per day)	500
Housing consultants (20 days at $50 per day)	1,000
Medical consultants (30 days at $75 per day)	1,500
Auditing services	800
Legal services (12 days at $50 per day)	900
	6,800
Travel:	
Local (25 staff at 1.50 per week)	1,950
60 fieldworkers at 50 cents per day	7,200
Personnel:	
Out of town (4 trips—20 days at $16 a day, plus $75 per trip, also travel expense)	620
Rental of station wagon ($250 per month. Including gas, oil, maintenance, insurance)	3,000
	12,770
Space costs:	
Central headquarters 8,000 sq. ft. (current lease)	18,000
4 satellites approximately 100 sq. ft. (2.50 per sq. ft. each)	10,000
	28,000
Consumable supplies:	
Office supplies ($150 per person for 68 persons)	10,200
Postage (300 mailings per week at 5 cents each)	780
	10,980
Equipment (purchase):	
8 staff desks ($90 each)	720
4 secretarial desks ($105 each)	420
12 chairs swivel with arms ($32 each)	380
1 electric typewriter	400
1 Electric typewriter, long carriage	480

AREA A—Continued

	Amount
Equipment (purchase)—Continued	
4 Typewriters, manual	$440
2 Calculators ($460 each)	920
2 Adding machines ($130 each)	260
12 File cabinets ($55 each)	660
1 Tape recorder	150
50 Chairs w/arms ($7 each)	350
	5,180
Equipment (rentals):	
1 Xerox machine ($135 per month)	1,620
1 Postage meter ($13.33 per month)	160
4 Water coolers ($60 per year each)	240
	2,020
Total equipment	7,200
Other costs:	
Telephone installations	560
Costs 48 lines ($20 per month)	11,520
	12,080
Maintenance costs (contract)	
Headquarters ($400 per month)	
Satellites ($100 month each)	9,600
Equipment maintenance and repair	500
Printing ($250 per month)	3,000
Publications	400
Insurance costs	700
Security costs (installation and servicing of alarm system)	2,400
Conference and meetings	200
Total other costs	28,880
Grand total	1,091,860

AREA B

Population	133,913
Welfare cases	16,950
[Budget 1967 (12 months)]	
Personnel and category	
Executive:	
1 Director	$15,000
1 Deputy director	12,200
1 Program analyst	8,300
1 Information officer	8,300
1 Program specialist	7,900
1 Executive secretary	6,450
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850
1 Research assistant	5,850
1 Secretary	4,800
	74,650
Administration:	
1 Senior fiscal officer	9,650
2 Bookkeepers ($6,450)	12,900
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850
1 Maintenance man	4,400
1 Payroll clerk	4,400
2 Clerical aides ($4,150)	8,300
1 Stock clerk	4,150
1 Machine operator	4,150
1 Messenger	4,150
	57,950
Training:	
1 Senior training officer	9,650
1 Training officer (step 1)	7,150
3 Job preparation counselors (step 1 $6,800)	20,400
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850

AREA B—Continued

Training—Continued	Amount
1 Clerical aide	$4,150
	47,200
Manpower:	
1 Assistant director	10,650
1 Supervising counselor (step 1)	9,200
2 Senior job developers (1 at $8,750, 1 at $8,300)	17,050
1 Senior job placement officer	8,300
5 Senior job counselors ($7,500)	37,500
4 Job placement officers ($6,150)	24,600
4 Senior neighborhood aides ($5,050)	20,200
1 Psychometric technician	8,300
1 Supervising secretary (step 1)	5,850
2 Clerical aides ($4,400)	8,800
	150,450
Community development:	
1 Assistant director	10,650
1 Senior community organizer	8,750
3 Community organizers ($8,300)	24,900
4 Community workers ($5,550)	22,200
60 Blockworkers ($4,150)	249,000
1 Supervising secretary	5,850
1 Secretary	4,800
3 Clerical aides ($4,400)	13,200
	339,350
Total	669,600
Fringe benefits 15 percent	100,440
	770,040
Neighborhood aide trainees 50 at $1.70/hr at 40 hrs/wk	176,800
Fringe benefits at 8 percent	14,140
Total personnel costs	960,980
Consultants and contract services:	
Consumer frauds consultant ($50/day for 25 days)	1,250
Program development consultants ($50/day for 25 days)	1,250
Health consultant ($50/day for 36 days)	1,800
Legal services ($50/day for 18 days) per year	900
Accounting services ($50/day for 18 days) per year	900
	6,100
Travel:	
Local—100 employees (staff and nonprofessionals) at 40¢ per day for 240 days	9,600
Out of town: 3 trips—10 days at $16/day plus $75/trip travel expense	390
Rental of station wagon (including operating costs) $250/month	3,000
	12,990
Space costs and rental:	
Central office (current lease cost)	24,500
Three satellites at $175/month each	6,300
	30,800

AREA B—Continued

CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES

Office Supplies:	Amount
60 staff at $150/person	$9,000
60 nonprofessional at $25/person	1,500
Postage: Center and 3 satellites. average 200 mailings/day at 5 cents/mailing for 240 days	2,400
Program supplies: Psychometric testing equipment at $120 plus necessary tests at $2,500	2,620
	15,520
Equipment (see attached schedule)	12,890

OTHER COSTS

Telephone installation	1,900
40 lines at $25/line/month	12,000
	13,900
Utilities: Central office at $150/month, 3 satellites at $20/month each	2,520
Printing costs at $175/month	2,100
Insurance	500
Library at $40/month	480
Meeting expenses at $100/per month	1,200
Security: Including installation and servicing of alarm system	2,400
Total other costs	23,100
Grand total	1,062,380

PURCHASE

Desks:	
9 Staff at $90	810
2 Secretarial at $105	210
Chairs:	
12 Swivel at $33	400
4 Secretarial at $33	130
120 Folding at $3.60	430
20 Reception at $18.30	370
11 Reception with arms at $25.10	280
Cabinets:	
24 File at $55	1,320
10 Storage at $50	500
11 Conference tables at $80	880
1 Electric typewriter	400
1 Electric typewriter, long carriage	480
6 Manual typewriters at $110	660
1 Calculator	460
2 Adding machines at $130	260
1 Sound projector and screen	270
2 Tape recorders at $145	290
12 Clothing racks at $40	480
20 Typing tables at $20	400
8 Blackboards at $50	400
2 Bookcases at $40	80
	9,510

RENTAL

Postage meter at $13 per month	160
150 Folding chairs, 4 times per year at $50 per hundred chairs	300
8 Water coolers at $600 per year	480
1 Xerox machine: 1,500 copies per month at 4½ cents per copy plus supplies 7 rental at $10 per month	1,000
Amplifier and other sound equipment at $15 a day plus $25 a day for truck rental for 12 days	480
Sanitez for 13 restrooms at $50 a month	600
Waxing service at $30 a month	360
	3,380

AREA C

[Population, 169,491; welfare cases, 25,300]

BUDGET 1967 (12 MONTHS)		
I. Office of the Director:		
1 Executive Director	$18,000.00	
1 Executive Secretary	7,000.00	
1 Typist-Clerical	4,770.00	
1 Switchboard Operator	4,770.00	
1 Assistant to the Director	11,500.00	
1 Senior Secretary	5,550.00	
		$51,090.00
II. Community Development Department:		
1 Comm. Develop. Prog. Coord	10,500.00	
1 Program Secretary	6,450.00	
1 Typist-Clerical	4,770.00	
7 Sr. Comm. Organ's, at 8,870	62,890.00	
7 Jr. Comm. Organ's, at 7,770	54,390.00	
14 Blockworker's II, at 4,770	66,780.00	
14 Blockworker's I, at 4,576	64,064.00	
7 Intake Clericals, at 4,770	33,390.00	
1 Liaison Coordinator	5,200.00	
		307,634.00
III. Manpower and Career Development Program (Manp. Neigh. Serv. Center):		
(1) Administration:		
a. 1 Director for Manpower	13,100.00	
b. 1 Program Coordinator	10,500.00	
		23,600.00
(2) Intake:		
a. 1 Intake Counselor	7,500.00	
b. 1 Intake Assistant	5,400.00	
		12,900.00
(3) Job Corps:		
a. Screener	6,150.00	
b. Assistant Screener (CI Aide)	4,800.00	
		10,950.00
(4) Job Development:		
a. 1 Junior Job	8,000.00	
b. Assistant Job	7,150.00	
		15,150.00
(5) Remediation and Job Preparation:		
a. 1 Supervisor	9,000.00	
b. 3 Teachers II, at 7,750	23,250.00	
c. 2 Teachers I, at 6,600	13,200.00	
		45,450.00
(6) Job Placement:		
a. Job Placement Officer	8,200.00	
b. Job Placement Coordinator	8,900.00	
c. Job Placement Follow-Up	6,200.00	
		23,300.00
(7) Testing:		
a. 1 Psychometric Teach. II	8,000.00	
b. 1 Psychometric Teach. I	7,500.00	
		15,500.00
(8) Counseling:		
a. 1 Supervisor	9,000.00	
b. 3 Sr. Counselors (Center Staff) 8,200	24,600.00	
c. 3 Jr. Counselors at 7,150	21,450.00	
d. 4 Assistant Counselors at 6,200	24,800.00	
e. 7 Manpower Aides at 4,576	32,032.00	
		111,882.00
(9) Clerical:		
a. 1 Sr. Secret. (Ass't Director)	6,189.00	
b. 1 Secretary (Program Coord.)	5,050.00	
c. 4 Clerical Aides at 4,770	19,080.00	
		30,319.00
		289,051.00
IV. Personnel-Budget and Fiscal Dept.:		
1 Chief Fiscal Officer	10,500.00	
1 Ass't Fiscal Officer (Off-Mgr.)	8,500.00	
1 Bookkeeper	6,500.00	
1 Typist-Clerical	4,770.00	
1 Clerical Aide (Stock-Cl.-Mach-Op.)	4,770.00	
1 Driver-Messenger	5,200.00	
	40,240.00	
Maintenance Dept.:		
1 Supt.-Watchman	5,200.00	
3 Porters at 4,420	13,260.00	
	18,460.00	
V. Public Information and Community Relations Dept.:		
1 Public Information and Community Relations Director	10,500.00	
1 Resources Developer	6,150.00	
1 Program Secretary	5,050.00	
1 Translator-Typist	4,770.00	
		26,470.00
VI. Research and Evaluation Program:		
1 Evaluator-Researcher	9,000.00	
1 Research Statistical Aide	5,200.00	
1 Typist-Clerical	4,770.00	
		18,970.00

BUDGET 1967 (12 MONTHS)—Continued			
VII. Training & Education Program:			
1 Sr. Training Officer	$10,500.00		
1 Training & Educ. Ass't	5,580.00		
1 Typist-Clerical	4,770.00		
		$20,850.00	
			$772,765.00
15% Fringe Benefits			115,914.75
Total			888,679.75
Consultants and contract service:			
(1) Training Consultants, 15 days at 50 Per	750.00		
(2) Training Sessions, 30 Sessions—25 Per	750.00		
(3) Auditing & Budget Analysis, 4 Qtly Audits at 500 Per	2,000.00		
(4) Legal 10 days at 50 Per	500.00		
(5) Personnel & Administration Consultant 10 days at 50 Per	500.00		
(6) Statistical & Research Consultants 10 days at 50 Per	500.00		
			5,000.00
Travel:			
(1) Out of Town trips:			
4 trips at 5 days×16 per day	320.00		
4 Round trip air fares at 75	300.00		
		620.00	
(2) Local:			
35 Non-Professionals at .80; 2 round trips average per wk	1,456.00		
(3) 35 Professionals at 1.00: Average per week	1,820.00		
		3,276.00	
(4) Car Rental, Station Wagon 12 months:			
At $136.50 per	1,638.00		
Gas and Maint. $8 wk-aver	416.00		
		2,054.00	5,950.00
Space Costs and Rentals:			
Rentals:			
Will-Act Headquarters	30,000		
7 Comm. Action Centers, at $150 aver	12,600.00		
		42,600.00	
Maintenance:			
Janitorial Supplies:			
Central offices	360.00		
7 CAC's, at 5 per mo	420.00		
		780.00	
Consumable Supplies:			
Postage 250 mailings, at 5 cents, total 240 days	3,000.00		
Office supplies	4,500.00		
55 Proff—75 per yr., 50 Non prof, at 25 per yr	1,250.00		
		8,750.00	
Other Costs:			
Rentals:			
(1) Telephone-Switchboard 50 lines, at 20/mi/line	12,000.00		
Manpower Center 300-over/mo	3,600.00		
		15,600.00	
(2) 9 water coolers, at 4.20 each per mo		453.60	
(3) Rental of 1 Xerox Mach., at 120 per mo		1,440.00	
(4) Rental 1 postage meter, at 8.50 per mo		100.00	
(5) Rental of 50 folding chairs for 12 wks, at 7.50 doz		390.00	
			17,983.60
Utilities:			
Electricity (7)	1,200.00		
Central offices	3,000.00		
7 C.A.C.'s, at 20 mo	1,680.00		
		5,880.00	
Heating, No. 6 oil (13.50)		1,500.00	
			50,760.00
Miscellaneous:			
(1) Repairs and maintenance of equipment	500.00		
(2) Printing costs	2,400.00		
(3) Library	300.00		
(4) Meeting expenses 17 staff members, at 4 weeks	3,536.00		
(5) Security:			
Manpower center alarm, system install	250.00		
Monthly maintenance charge, at 10	240.00		
7 CAC's alarm systems maintenance	504.00		
			7,730.00
(6) Allowance for Community Committee meetings, at 12 full Comm. Comm. meetings, 50 members, at 5 per	3,000.00		
b. 6 Sub-comm. meetings, 7 Sub-comm., at 7 members each, at 5 per	1,050.00		
		4,050.00	
(7) Emergency contingency fund		2,000.00	6,050.00
Total			990,903.35

Even the most cursory study of this financial picture for three typical areas will suggest several salient observations.

First is that there is a seeming lack of relationship between the number of residents to be served and the size of the outlay.

Although the target population varies from approximately 56,000 to 169,000 the budgets are each about $1 million.

Second, they evidently reflect what some high-level mastermind believes each neighborhood community corporation should have in its professional and personnel echelon.

Each budget provides for program analysts—public information officers, psychometric specialists, budget and fiscal officers, et cetera.

The tragedy is that when all this money is expended in the poverty superstructure there will be no action program funds for anyone to analyze, let alone a full-time program analyst.

The grief for the poor is that money designed for their benefit should not be used to place onboard psychometric specialists when such scarce professional types are now available in the State employment service offices in every neigh-

borhood. Unfortunately in New York City there is a détente between the manpower agency of the city and the State employment service so that a contractual arrangement to provide these services has been pending for several months but has not been executed.

The bad news for the poor is that the only function "public information officers" can fulfill is that a million dollars is coming into the neighborhoods but only professionals need apply.

Of course, there is provision for some neighborhood blockworkers and community organizers. These may be used to secure the maximum feasible participation of the indigenous poor as they gather on folding chairs around the water cooler only to be told by the staff director of the great things that are going to happen if they can get another million dollars to add to the million dollars for the official family of the local poverty "Pentagon."

I am no nitpicker in poverty spending but I doubt if the poor who drink tap water from leaky pipes ever wanted their funds allotted for water coolers as a status symbol.

Our job is to get the water cooler waste out of these neighborhood programs.

I am certain that dedicated public officials and community leaders joined with the poor can do a better job of getting benefits down to the poor than these budgets represent.

The criticism has been directed to title II that we are trying to set up patronage for politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the patronage is in the program now and the poor are being patronized to pay for it.

The job of the public officials must be to get the patronage out and get the poor in.

Mr. Speaker, I have deliberately not chosen the biggest budget for community action agencies in New York City—just the median-type agencies.

I cannot help but note however in studying one of the major funded programs that one of them is receiving over $216,000 for guard service to protect their premises by a contractual arrangement with a uniformed force.

Mr. Speaker. I have said that we did not intend to carry on the war on poverty by having a poverty "Pentagon" with the general and top brass in every eligible neighborhood.

I am sure those poverty war "Pentagons" are not what the poor want or need and they do not represent their aspirations.

If they do, why do we need over $200,000 to protect the indigenous agencies for the poor from those who are inimical to it?

I believe the committee bill will help to correct these abuses and I urge its adoption.

PRESIDENT NYERERE STATES POSITION OF TANZANIA ON EXECUTIVES AND PROFESSIONALS FROM FOREIGN LANDS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Julius Nyerere, the President of Tanzania, whom I have known for many years as a friend and who is one of the strong statesmen of Africa, in a speech at the Tanu Biannual Conference in Mwanza in Tanzania on October 17, 1967, outlined his policy of nonalinement with either East or West, to which policy by the way he has strictly and impartially adhered, and his determination that the development of Tanzania should come from the planning, the direction, and the toil and sacrifices of Tanzanians. He made it clear, however, that where the need existed for foreigners, loyal to the Government of Tanzania, in the professions, the skills, and elsewhere they would be welcomed.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the first installment of President Nyerere's memorable address, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT NYERERE

Many things have happened since our last meeting, and it is the job of this Conference to examine the most important of them in the light of the objectives we set ourselves when we adopted the Arusha Declaration. For that Declaration was a commitment to the principles of self-reliance and socialism. It did not by itself bring either of these things: only hard thinking, and hard work in the right direction will do that. It is important that we should be very clear about this fact.

The Arusha Declaration did not cause miracles. It did not make the crops more fruitful, nor the rains more regular. It did not make everyone wealthy, nor change the level of our education. It did not change the habits of mind we have grown up with, nor create any other miraculous changes in our condition.

Our acceptance of the Arusha Declaration was like a young Christian's confirmation: it is a declaration of intent to live a certain kind of life and to act in a certain kind of manner for desired ends. We have no more become a socialist country because of the Arusha Declaration than a young boy becomes a good Christian or a good Muslim by the act of dedication.

The sincere act of dedication is important; but much more important are the actions which follow during his life. The question before us, therefore, is whether we have started to make the right decisions, and the right plans, and whether we have begun to act in a manner which will in time build socialism and self-reliance in Tanzania.

First, let us look at this question of self-reliance, for I believe that this has been widely misunderstood—by ourselves more than by others. Some of our people have spoken and acted as though it meant self-sufficiency in manpower and financial resources. It means nothing of the kind.

We would be extremely silly if we imagined that the Arusha Declaration has caused us to have more qualified doctors, engineers, teachers, administrators, and so on, so that the Development Plan target of self sufficiency in skilled man-power by 1980 had suddenly become irrelevant. Self-reliance does not mean that for self-reliance is not a silly thing. Let us therefore be very clear what we do expect now, and what the policy of self-reliance means in the immediate future, and what it does not mean.

First, it means that we must make maximum use of the resources which we have. We want citizens to be given priority in every field as soon as they are capable of doing the job efficiently. And certainly we must have Tanzanians making policy; Tanzanians must control our country. But this is not an issue now; we have already achieved that.

The question at issue is whether we must at all costs have Tanzanian citizens in every executive position. And the answer we give must be a realistic one if we wish to fulfil our ambitions. For the truth is that we do not yet have enough qualified and experienced Tanzanian citizens to do all the jobs which have to be done if the policies we Tanzanians have decided upon are to be implemented.

The question, therefore, is whether we are prepared to make our plans wait until we have educated and trained a Tanzanian for every job which has to be done. And we long ago decided that this would not only be absurd, it would also be unnecessary. An accountant is an accountant, whether he is a citizen or not; a doctor is a doctor; a manager is either efficient or not efficient. What really matters in relation to such people—whether they be citizens or not citizens—is that they loyally and efficiently carry out the decisions made by our Government and our people.

To employ an inefficient person just because he is a Tanzanian, when the job he has to do is crucial for our development, is not self-reliance; it is stupidity. When we or members of our family fall ill, what we want is a competent doctor, not necessarily a citizen. When we have decided to build a bridge, what we want is a competent engineer who will be able to ensure that the bridge will be safe and effective for its purpose.

The questions we need to ask ourselves are these: Firstly, is this job essential to our plans? Secondly, do we have a citizen who is qualified and has the necessary experience for this particular job? And if there is no qualified citizens available, thirdly, can we obtain a qualified non-citizen who will be accountable to us for his loyal and efficient carrying out of the job? And fourthly, what plans do we have for the training of citizens to do this kind of work in due course? Then, if we decide that the job is essential, and if there is no qualified citizen available to do it, and if a non-citizen can be obtained, let us pay a non-citizen to do the job for us.

By doing this we might, for example, make it possible for a village in an outlying area to become self-reliant because it can sell its increased production and thus support improved conditions for its members. If we do not allow this bridge to be built simply because we have no citizen available to do it, then the village will remain on a low level and without any real possibility of becoming a self-reliant, prosperous community.

But in this country we also have a second thing which we really desire of the people working for us. Ideally we also need socialists in every job—which is not necessarily the same thing as wanting a citizen for every job, because not all Tanzanians are socialists. But if a competent doctor also has socialist attitudes, then he is surely an especially great asset to us. And the truth is that the international reputation of Tanzania is such that many socialists from other countries very much want to come and work with us.

One day in the future Tanzanian socialists may be able to assist other socialists to achieve their objectives. Today we should be ready and happy to welcome socialists from other countries who are ready to help us achieve our objections. And we should remember that many socialists come from capitalist countries; it is sometimes the very fact that they cannot contribute to socialist objectives in their own country which makes them enthusiastic about working with us.

What all this means is that if we are to make progress towards the implementation of our policies of socialism and self-reliance, we should be ready to use all the people who are able to contribute towards these objectives. There are certain jobs which have to be done by citizens. Those we have now filled. There are other jobs which have to be done and done now or in the next few years, whether or not we have enough citizens or enough socialists. Let us get these jobs done instead of indulging our prejudices or our generalised assessments of people by skin colour or country of origin.

There is another aspect of our self-reliance policy which has also been misunderstood by some people. For the Arusha Declaration does not say that Tanzania refuses outside aid, or that there is something wrong in receiving it.

The Declaration says, and I quote: "We are not saying that we will not accept, or even that we shall not look for, money from other countries for our development. This is not what we are saying."

What the Arusha Declaration says is that the only group of people we will rely upon is ourselves; we will not organize our country and our life in such a way that there will be no development unless we get foreign money. And most of all, we have said very firmly that we shall not bend our political, economic or social policies in the hope of getting overseas aid as a result.

But if we get outside assistance to carry out purposes decided by us, then we shall welcome that assistance. Thus we welcome the Chinese decision to help with the Tanzam Railway. Thus we shall welcome an American decision to help build our road from Dar es Salaam to Tunduma.

In fact, self-reliance is not really against anything or anyone, unless there are people who want to recolonize us. Self-reliance is a positive affirmation that we shall depend upon ourselves for the development of Tanzania, and that we shall use the resources we have for that purpose, not just sit back and complain because there are other things we do not have.

We are saying to ourselves that we are going to build a self-reliant socialist society. We are saying: "Here is land, here we are: this is the amount of knowledge, skill and experience we have; and this is the amount of money we have to spend on supplementing our skill and knowledge or on buying more advanced machines. Now let us get on with it". And we are saying to other people: "This is what we are doing: if you want to help us, do this and this and this, for that is what we need most at this stage".

The really important thing for us to be clear about is that we are not saying to other people (and now, after the Arusha Declaration, we cannot say): "Please come and develop our country for us, and if you insist we will stop being socialist, or believing in equality, or being anti-colonial". These things we will never say.

We do not believe that anyone else can develop our country for us and, even if they could, we would not be willing to give up the determination of our own policy. It is we ourselves who will develop our country. We may decide to spend some of the resources we have, or the products of those resources, on buying imports of skills or machines from abroad. But our real emphasis will be on using the skills that we already have, and on developing the natural resources that we now possess.

In our situation this means that the emphasis of our development will be in the rural sector, and particularly in agriculture. Further, it means that we shall modernise within our resources. But we must modernise. In many parts of the country we are beginning to follow the advice of our agricultural experts. But our major tool, the jembe, is too primitive for our present day needs. We must now abandon it and replace it with the oxen-plough. We cannot make progress by waiting until every peasant is able to possess his own tractor which he can drive and maintain.

Indeed, if we wait for that we shall never leave the hoe behind us, for our present methods are too inefficient ever to produce the wealth which would enable us to buy tractors for all parts of the country, or to train the people to drive and maintain them. We are not ready for the tractor, either financially or technically; but we are ready for the oxen-plough.

We have the animals, and the ploughs can be bought cheaply or even made here. They are simple tools which our peasants can quickly learn to use, and they are appropriate for the kind of small unit farming which is involved in the ujamaa villages to which we aspire, or even to the amount of land an energetic individual peasant family can cultivate.

We have to modernise our farming if we are to improve our standard of living. But we cannot modernise by buying tractors for everyone, because we do not have either the necessary money or the necessary technical skill, or the social organization which would make such implements economic. We have to modernise by utilizing to the full the tools which are within our capacity to buy and to make: which are sufficiently simple for us to use without trouble and breakdown.

LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT PROVIDING VITALLY NEEDED ASSISTANCE TO UNDERPRIVILEGED PEOPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the legal services program carried out under the Economic Opportunity Act is providing vitally needed assistance to underprivileged people. Through these locally administered programs, controversies are resolved through the courts rather than through civil disobedience.

On November 5, Florida Accent, a magazine supplement to the Tampa Tribune, featured an interesting and informative report on the operation of the legal services program in my congressional district. The Hillsborough County program is administered by Law, Inc., in cooperation with the Hillsborough County Bar Association. Although their staff is small, they are doing a fine job in helping a large number of people help themselves.

I include the full text of the article, entitled "And Justice for All," at this point in the RECORD:

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(By Jack McClintock)

In four offices in four of the county's poorest neighborhoods, there are four lawyers waiting for clients.

Which, when you know the rest, is pretty unusual.

It is unusual because for a long time most lawyers didn't pay much attention to poor neighborhoods—let alone have offices in them—for the very good reason that lawyers have a living to make. And it is hard to make a living from the troubles of people who are having trouble making a living for themselves.

Which, in turn, is one reason the poor have historically found it difficult to get legal help when they need it, and why Law, Inc. was formed.

The four lawyers are paid by Law, Inc., out of the national treasury.

They work, however, for the poor.

Law, Inc. is an Office of Economic Opportunity program which cranked up in Tampa in August, the fifth such program in Florida. The others are in Miami, Ft. Pierce, Daytona Beach and Jacksonville.

Its purpose is to help that one-sixth of Americans who, in the words of Mr. Justice Fortas, "live on society's fringes."

"Our basic objective," says Don Castor, Hillsborough's executive director, "is to provide orderly and lawful methods of solving problems and handling grievances. In many ways, ours is a conservative approach—we resolve controversy through the courts rather than through civil disobedience."

The four lawyers are there to represent the poor. When a poor family has a problem, its members will come to the nearest Law, Inc. office. These are purposely situated in neighborhoods where the need is likely to be greatest: West Tampa (staffed by Douglas W. Kielkopf), Sulphur Springs (Malory B. Frier), Ybor City (John G. Tomlinson), and Plant City (James B. Moore).

The lawyer then studies the case and the financial situation of the applicant. Roughly, a single head of household must have income of $28 a week or less to qualify, with an additional $12 a week permitted for each dependent. If the applicant qualifies, there is no charge and the attorney will pursue the case through appropriate legal channels.

Law, Inc. has helped people with their legal tribulations in such fields as veteran's benefits, unemployment insurance claims, social security, welfare appeals, (on the state level), evictions, foreclosures, some misdemeanors (but not many), and Castor's area of special interest: consumer problems. The latter include sales and service complaints, warranty difficulties, etc.

Criminal cases are left to the Public Defender's office, and most misdemeanors to the Legal Aid Bureau and other appropriate agencies. It is not only good politics but practical to avoid an overlapping of services.

Law, Inc. interests itself in other matters as well.

"We also want to see that the poor obtain a legitimate share of public services," Castor says. A city councilman, for example, pestered for better street lighting, usually finds it easier to say "So what?" to a poor man than to a rich and influential one.

"Tampa rates pretty well here," Castor says, "but more needs to be done. There are slum areas with potholes in the streets, inadequate bus service . . . Nobody seems to care."

For years, the poor have been victimized in this and similar ways. They had no recourse. Castor can, and will if his visitor has time enough, reel off dozens of cases of old couples being conned into signing exorbitant loan contracts, of juveniles being hauled off to jail without their parents being notified, of illegal evictions, retaliatory rent hikes, and many cases of people simply not knowing what was coming to them and therefore not getting it.

"There are self-righteous people who consider themselves law-abiding in the country club," Castor says, "but seem to think they are above the law when they go to evict a tenant, for example. There is a legal procedure for this—you don't just move a family's belongings out into the street."

Even in such cases as have gone to court, there has often been a tendency to subject poor people to what Frier calls "cafeteria-style justice." "These people go through the mill," he says. "Their cases get handled routinely and, without counsel, sometimes handled unfairly."

It was Frier who was recently able to have a 17-year-old girl's shoplifting sentence (she admitted taking a $16 pair of false eyelashes) reduced from $300 or 100 days, to six months probation and a $100 fine payable in installments. She had been sentenced twice without even her parents being notified that the case was going to trial.

Now that they have a place to go, poor people have flocked to legal service offices all over the country. Word gets around via referrals by social workers, private lawyers, and word-of-mouth.

The OEO Legal Services program, according to "The Reporter" magazine, has been one of the most successful of poverty programs. There are about 190 local programs, including the five in Florida, and some 600 offices in the nation's poorest neighborhoods, including the four in Hillsborough County. They are staffed by 11,000 full-time lawyers who earn an average salary of $9,500 annually. Two in Hillsborough earn $11,000; the other two earn $8,000. (In 1959, lawyers and judges in the U.S. averaged $10,587 annually.) These men are working for people who could never have afforded their services before and, in some cases, did not ever know they were available.

In Hillsborough County, Law, Inc., is administered by a hired executive director (Castor), and policy is made by a 12-man board—eight lawyers designated by the bar, and four laymen to represent the poor (although none of the four is himself poor).

One of Castor's early problems was finding qualified Negroes to serve in staff positions. Since many of the nation's poor are black, it was thought not only fair but practical to have Negro lawyers to work with them—or with whomever happened to need help; there was no thought of segregation in reverse. But Castor says it was not possible to find qualified men who were willing to take on the job. There are Negro legal secretaries, and the chief legal investigator, Warren H. Dawson, is a Negro, but to date the four lawyers are white. The situation does not satisfy Castor completely.

Ideally, the poor obtain from all this not only the legal due process which in many cases eluded them for years, but a new feeling of dignity, of participation and actual membership in society. They need no longer regard themselves as left out, ignored, merely underfoot.

The success of the Legal Services program has not always set well with all the people. When the program was suggested, the American Bar was cool toward it, although it later appointed a committee to help out in designing the program. This, Castor says, was not only an admirable shift in viewpoint, but an exercise of the historically sanctioned principle: "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em and do a little lobbying from inside." The bar was able to influence the shape and direction of the program.

Some of the original opposition related to legal ethics, and this remains a point of contention with many lawyers. Many objected, Castor says, on grounds that such a program could permit—even encourage—lawyers to "stir up litigation."

The potential was indeed there, but many now think that the prohibition is irrelevant, since the lawyer who "solicits business" is not doing so to benefit himself but some other person. The lawyer's salary, after all, remains the same. The other question—of overstepping the boundaries of dignity—has to be resolved by each lawyer in terms of his own definition of "dignity."

There were other objections, some still heard. A judge said recently that Legal Services lawyers (not necessarily those in Hillsborough) seemed bent on dragging every nickel-dime case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In any event, once inaugurated the program faced another obstacle: the poor themselves.

"It really takes some time for the poor to identify with the neighborhood lawyers and to believe that some professional person is interested in what happens to them," Castor says.

This suspicion is one of the legacies of that long-time neglect of the poor by the legal establishment and by the law itself.

"To the poor, the law has often meant only welfare cutoffs, wage attachments, arrogant policemen and marshals with eviction notices," wrote Wade Green in "The Reporter."

Most of the Law, Inc. lawyers want not only to deal piecemeal with individual problems as they arise, but to press for reform of the statutes themselves.

"We are anxious to get into the field concerned with developing some idea of what laws should be passed—or repealed," says Castor. Take the case, for example, of an employer of day-labor who sometimes refuses to pay his men, claiming the work was unsatisfactory.

Perhaps only one in ten of these men, Castor says, will do more than go home mad. That one man may take his case to small claims court, where the employer can cheerfully ante up, then take his profits from the other nine men, and run.

"So how do you get around something like that?" Castor asks rhetorically.

"Simple. All you do is pass a law allowing punitive damages to the employee if it is proved he was wronged. This is the kind of thing we'd like to urge."

To do so, a lawyer might submit proposed laws to the legislature or local governmental bodies, and argue for their passage.

Until now, everybody had a lobby but the people.

Law, Inc., would also like to perform a kind of preventive maintenance: Castor says the lawyers would go over such items as sales and loan contracts for clients—before the purchase—and explain the client's obligations. Such obligations are often nuclear even to the sophisticated reader.

"Most of our cases, from my observation," says Frier, "stem from ignorance—which applies to a lot of middle-class people as well as poor ones."

Law, Inc.'s primary job, in a sense, is to keep the channels of communication open between various strata of society. By facilitating dialogue among the aggrieved, the judges, and the other side, for example, it is often possible to settle matters without going into court.

Those conservatives who like to label the poverty program a wholesale boondoggle might be encouraged by a closer look at the Legal Services program, here and elsewhere. For among its most important functions is this, in the words of Earl Johnson, the director of the program in Washington:

"We have a duty to do everything we can to substitute justice in the courts for violence in the streets."

MEDICARE IS FOR PEOPLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this House to an action of the Social Security Administration which I consider the epitome of rampart bureaucracy. It concerns a medicare claim.

A constituent of mine, in Tacoma, Wash., had been hospitalized under the medicare program. After his discharge, early this year, his family naturally preferred to take care of him at home if at all possible and attempted to do so. When it became obvious they could not properly attend him, and his doctor ordered nursing home care, they sought his admission to a home. The attempt took place near the end of the 14-day statutory period for eligibility for posthospital, nursing-home care, but it was still within that period. However, the period ran out over a weekend, and although virtually every facility in the Tacoma area was contacted, each one indicated they adhered to the policy of making no admissions on a weekend. The patient finally gained admission to a nursing home at the beginning of the following week.

Only then did he learn that, contrary to all usual business procedure in which contractual agreements do not begin or end on a weekend, and regardless of the fact that all nursing homes adhered to the policy of no weekend admissions, his claim for medicare coverage was rejected because the 14 days had expired while the patient, acting in the best of faith, was attempting unsuccessfully to gain admission to a home.

I object most strongly to this callous disregard of the true purpose of the medicare program. It has already caused my correspondent and his family great inconvenience and difficulty, and while I sincerely hope others will not be trapped by this rigid ruling, I have no doubt similar cases will occur. If the Social Security authorities cannot see their way clear to making their rulings fit the purpose of the legislation, then I think it will be up to the Congress to correct it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF LAST WEEK BEFORE CONSUMER ASSEMBLY, 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a speech last week before Consumer Assembly, 1967, sponsored by consumer organizations, cooperative groups, and labor unions.

He took the occasion to call for public pressure upon the Members of this House as well as the Senate to enact his proposed tax increase.

Two major newspapers in my congressional district carried front-page stories which were headlined in the Orlando Sentinel as follows: "L. B. J. Urges You Fight for Tax Hike," and in the Brevard County Today newspaper, "L. B. J. Asks Public To Back Tax."

As a result of these headlines and accompanying news stories, I started to get mail in my office.

As L. B. J. had hoped, the taxpayers are taking his advice and are writing Congress. However, the reaction is a little bit different than L. B. J. had hoped for.

So far, the letters in my congressional office have been 100 percent against the tax increase.

Some of the letters contained some

rather pithy language like "Spending cut—Si; surcharge—No"—with exclamation points.

Another correspondent said:

I think he (LBJ) is in for a real shock when he finds out how the American people feel about this. I suggest that we get a copy of the recording, "The Party's Over," and give it to him as a reply to his request for more money to spend.

Another:

As long as the President thinks he can raise taxes, he will continue to spend; no more taxes—less and less spending.

Let's cut down on wasteful government squandering of our hard earned money.

President Johnson has asked us to write urging you to increase our taxes. Instead of doing that now, I hope you will cut some of the excessive and unnecessary spending that I have read about.

And still another:

How he can make this request in view of the present depressed supply of money in general, I can't understand. The prices of food are steadily increasing. I guess Mrs. Gurney has told you about this; my wife has certainly let me know about it.

Here is another:

I can't understand how any Congressman would have the nerve to vote for a tax increase. It is deplorable what the Great Society has foisted on the American people. Money taken from my salary for so-called poverty programs . . . people working in these programs as typists actually are paid more than I am as an experienced, college-trained medical secretary.

My family for generations were Democrats and voted Democrat, but believe me, everyone has re-registered as Republican in the last few years, and I will never again help put another Democrat Great Society in the White House.

If my mail is any sample of what the rest of the House Members are receiving, L. B. J. has come up with another "clinker in public relations, and has struck out again."

The next Gallup poll will probably show a new low for President Johnson in the next polling.

FOREIGN AID CONFERENCE REPORT REFLECTS VICTORY FOR CONGRESS OVER THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ON ISSUE OF ARMS SALES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the issue of arms credit sales to underdeveloped countries, I think the House-Senate conferees on the foreign aid authorization bill have reached a satisfactory compromise. Because I supported final passage of the foreign aid bill on August 25, I shall support adoption of the conference report tomorrow.

At this late date, to threaten a vote against the conference report simply because I personally object to the proposed sale of jet fighter aircraft to certain Latin American nations would be irresponsible. We have been assured that any such sale will take place between the foreign government and the U.S. manufacturer, with financial credit arrangements totally without Eximbank participation or Pentagon credit guarantees. The sad fact that diversion of scarce economic resources from peaceful to military goods will take place should be taken into consideration by both our State Department and the international lending institutions to which we subscribe capital. To threaten a total cutoff of all foreign aid and military assistance to all parts of the world over what now will be a straight commercial credit transaction would be akin to saying, "Stop the world, I want to get off."

Mr. Speaker, it was on the basis of my letter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency earlier this year that the extent of secret arms credit loans by the Eximbank was first exposed to the Congress and the Nation. I shall continue my fight against any arms credits by the Eximbank to underdeveloped nations after June 30, 1968, when the Eximbank bill reaches the floor of the House for final consideration.

Those who favor elimination of any foreign aid whatsoever will, of course, be expected to vote accordingly tomorrow. Those of us who have been alarmed over arms credit sales, however, should recognize the foreign aid conference report for what it is: the first in a three-step process representing a victory for Congress over the executive branch on the issue of arms sales. The next two steps will be the foreign aid appropriations and Eximbank bills.

For the information of the House I am including with my remarks a copy of letter dated October 19, 1967, from Eugene V. Rostow, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. This letter was in answer to my own letter of October 12, 1967.

The letter follows:

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE
FOR POLITICAL AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I was glad to receive your letter of October 12 concerning our military sales policies and procedures. I appreciate the inherent difficulty of the issues raised by this problem, and welcome the opportunity to discuss these matters further with you. Each of your questions bears on one or more of the many crucial aspects of our military credit sales programs; I shall be happy to come up and discuss these problems with you further if you conclude that this would be helpful.

The following are point by point answers to the eight specific questions posed in your letter.

1. Is it not a fact that under existing law the Eximbank can extend credit for arms purchases to less developed countries and that amendments to neither the pending foreign aid bill nor the Eximbank bill would prohibit such credits? In this connection, is there any fundamental reason why the Eximbank can extend credits to underdeveloped countries for peaceful goods at market interest rates while refusing to do so for military equipment without Pentagon guarantee of repayment? I have in mind the fact that there is no prohibition against such arms credit sales to underdeveloped countries in the charter of the Bank.

As it now exists, Eximbank's charter contains no prohibition against the financing of military exports to developed or developing countries. Such financing is considered entirely consistent with the agency's purpose of facilitating the trade of the United States. Foreign military sales of U.S. defense articles and services are increasingly being substituted for grant aid whenever possible, and the return from these sales, made primarily to further political and military objectives, also represents a favorable contribution to the U.S. balance of payments position.

Pending amendments to the Bank's charter and the Foreign Assistance Act, taken together, still would leave the Bank free to extend credit to a developing country without the Defense Department's guarantee.

However, the Bank, as you know, until now has insisted on the Defense Department's guarantee for such credit sales. The Bank has taken the position that credits for military sales to developing countries under the military assistance program inherently carry more risk than credit for sales of commercial items. Unlike credit for peaceful goods, many of the credit sales of military items to the developing countries are authorized by the U.S. Government because of overriding foreign policy considerations. Since banking considerations are not always controlling in this type of case, the Bank, as a general principle, has taken and continues to take the position that it will finance such military credit sales only when supported by a Department of Defense guarantee, as contemplated by the Foreign Assistance Act.

2. In those extreme cases where the best interests of U.S. foreign policy can only be served by facilitating credit for arms sales to less developed countries, is there any reason why the Defense Department, on its own account, cannot provide financing arrangements? Aside from security and budgetary considerations, are there any legitimate reasons why the Eximbank has been used as an underwriting middle man?

There is no legal reason that would prevent the Defense Department from providing financial arrangements on its own account for credit sales to less developed countries. To do so, however, would duplicate a function that Eximbank is well able to perform more economically and efficiently.

Under a system explicitly authorized by the Congress, a procedure was devised whereby the Eximbank could be used as the best instrument within the Government to provide financing for sales to less developed countries. This system works well. The Departments of State and Defense take full responsibility for determining the political and military requirements for the sales. The Eximbank's function is to act as the banker in the sale. In this way the Bank does not involve itself in the making of the foreign and military policy of the U.S. and the Departments of State and Defense do not enter into the banking business. Each of the Governmental institutions involved operates within its own realm of special competence without duplicating functions which can best be performed by another.

If the Defense Department were to assume the Eximbank function in this process, it could no longer as a practical matter rely on financing under the 25% guaranty reserve system. Relying on the continuation of this system, the President's Budget for FY 1968 did not ask for funds to make military credit sales on a dollar for dollar basis. It is now too late in the legislative cycle to revise upward the amount of MAP appropriations which would be required adequately to fund the program. Accordingly, elimination of Eximbank at this time as a source of credit would force deep cuts in the grant and sales programs, which could adversely affect the NATO alliance and the ability of the "perimeter countries" (whose borders adjoin the USSR and Communist

China) to defend themselves, if important sales to developing countries were not to be rejected for lack of funds.

Finally, the involvement of the Eximbank in this system has introduced sound banking techniques into the credit sales negotiating process. For example, under present procedures the purchasing country knows that promissory notes which it signs will be sold to a bank rather than held in the Defense Department's "grant-aid account." This assists the Defense Department in negotiating terms satisfactory to financing institutions and also has the effect of involving the foreign finance and central banking authorities whose approval is required for such credit documents, with the helpful result that foreign borrowers consider such debts within the framework of their overall financial and economic condition.

3. *With regard to credits to developed countries by the Export-Import Bank, is it not a fact that terms and conditions of credit have been dictated, if not influenced, by the Department of Defense? I have in mind a recent Eximbank loan to the United Kingdom for $500 million at an interest rate of 4¾% per annum repayable in fourteen approximately equal semi-annual installments beginning December 31, 1968 for the purchase of F–4's, F–111's and C–130's. I have in my files a letter from Eximbank to a Member of Congress which states that "the decision (by U.K.) to buy (U.S. aircraft) was facilitated by the terms of financing offered by the Bank."*

The terms and conditions of Eximbank credits to developed countries for military exports have not been dictated by the Defense Department. On the contrary, the Bank and other Departments of the Government bear in mind the Bank's legislative mandate (Section 3 of the Bank's Act) which declares it an independent agency of the U.S. The Bank consistently has taken the position that repayment terms for military credits to developed countries should not exceed seven years, and preferably should be held to five years, and that interest should be at a rate at least that of the cost of money to the lender. As you appreciate, the credit terms which a U.S. seller is able to offer often tip the balance in favor of procurement from the United States—obviously a factor in the U.K.'s decision to buy U.S. military aircraft. The Bank actively participated in the negotiations with the British in 1965 and made a very careful calculation of the terms of the credit which it was prepared to suupport, knowing that its decision probably would facilitate an unusually large sale of U.S. equipment. And, as you know, the interest rate for this sale was above the Bank's average cost of borrowing at that time.

4. *Again, with regard to Export-Import Bank loans to developed countries for the purchase of U.S. military equipment, is there any reason why the terms and conditions as well as the equipment purchased have been until recently withheld from the appropriate committees of Congress? Conversely, could any possible violence occur to national security were the terms and conditions of such loans to developed countries revealed at the conclusion of financing negotiations and prior to delivery of such military equipment? For instance, the details of the recent $500 million Eximbank-U.K. loan were released to the press in London and later confirmed in Washington by Eximbank officials.*

Information on loans to developed or less developed countries, the terms and conditions of the credit agreements, as well as the equipment purchased, can of course, be given to the appropriate committees of the Congress. Classified information may be passed to appropriate Committees and we recognize that the confidential nature of the information will be respected. Until recently, however, with respect to the military credit sales program, we assumed it sufficient to give such information to the Foreign Relations, Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees and for the President of the Eximbank to inform the Chairmen of the Banking and Currency Committees in a general way on military credits extended by the Bank. Now that we have been made aware of the interest of the Banking and Currency Committees in receiving more complete information on this program, the Executive Branch has made clear its intention promptly to provide information in the detail required by the Committees, not only on concluded sales but on the impending sales programs as well.

5. *The enclosed administration memorandum entitled, "Latin American Military Expenditures and U.S. Arms Sales," indicates that defense budgets of Latin American countries have declined during the last 20 years. What the memorandum fails to point out, however, is the type of military equipment purchased by Latin American countries during this period. While Latin America under the Alliance for Progress is striving for regional economic integration, can it not be contended that there has recently been a tendency toward the purchase of sophisticated weapons of aggression as compared to the former emphasis on weapons and equipment more truly compatible with internal security?*

With regard to the type of military equipment acquired by Latin American countries, the tendency in recent years has been toward weapons and equipment compatible with internal security rather than more sophisticated weapons. Latin American navies have acquired no ships larger than destroyers in the 1960's. (The purchase of aircraft carriers and cruisers was a development of the 1950's.) Army acquisition programs have been modest, with emphasis on transportation and communications. Regarding aircraft purchases, these have represented the replacement of obsolete and virtually unusable equipment. Until recently, and in contrast to other areas of the world, the planes purchased have all been subsonic and roughly comparable in performance and numbers to aircraft already in service in the area. It must be noted, however, that the passage of time, attrition of their equipment, and technological advance leave Latin American countries increasingly with no technically feasible alternative to supersonic planes as replacements for the aging tactical aircraft now in their inventories. As you know, the United States is continuing to make every effort to limit the quantity of aircraft, level of sophistication, delivery rates and cost of aircraft purchases.

6. *Some have suggested that the recent Peruvian purchase of French supersonic fighter bombers was the most recent chain reaction to a series of sales that commenced in 1965 with the $10.9 million Eximbank financed sale to Argentina of A–4B skyhawks. Others point to a possible connection between the 1966 Eximbank loan to Brazil for the purchase of 50 M–41 tanks and the recent decision by Argentina to purchase 50 highly sophisticated AMX–30 tanks from France. With the substantial contribution of U.S. loans and grants to the Alliance for Progress has there been any attempt by the United States in diplomatic negotiations aimed at establishing a quantitative limitation on arms purchases by members of the Alliance, as suggested by President Frei of Chile in a recent article in Foreign Affairs Magazine?*

The purchase of secondhand subsonic A–4B aircraft by Argentina in 1965 and the recently reported purchase of supersonic aircraft by Peru are not casually related. Instead, these developments, as well as the purchase by Chile of Hawker Hunter aircraft and the purchase of F–86 aircraft by Venezuela in 1966, reflect the common intent of a number of Latin American countries to replace aircraft that are overage, dangerous to operate, and rapidly becoming impractical to maintain. Thus, the secondhand A–4B's sold to Argentina represented a relatively low-cost, serviceable replacement aircraft which would meet their current needs without undue financial strain and without stimulating equipment rivalries in neighboring countries. Chile and Venezuela also chose to fill their replacement needs, for the time being, with relatively low-cost subsonic aircraft.

Paralleling the problem of replacement aircraft is the problem of replacing World War II tanks that several Latin American countries now have in inventory. Argentina has intended to obtain replacement tanks for some time; the reported decision to purchase them from France which follows by many months a U.S. refusal to sell tanks to Argentina would accordingly appear to reflect Argentina's inability to obtain serviceable replacement tanks at relatively low cost elsewhere. There is no reason to believe that this reported purchase is a reaction to Brazil's purchase of tanks from the U.S.

As I indicate below, the Executive Branch has given high priority, in the conduct of our foreign relations in Latin America, to restraining the acquisition of arms and to encouraging the conservation of resources for the priority needs of economic and social development. While exceptions to the general trend of restrained arms procurement are, unfortunately, still occurring and are of a nature to draw attention to themselves, the general trend is, in our view, in the direction of conservative military expenditures.

7. *Your Latin American memorandum suggests that U.S. arms sales policies are considered in the context of hemispheric foreign policy and are coordinated between the Departments of Defense and State. Yet, in testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, testimony revealed that the A–4B sale to Argentina was not brought before the State/Defense Coordinating Committee for discussion. Would you care to elaborate on this testimony?*

While the State/Defense Coordinating Committee was not the mechanism used for coordination, the sale of A–4B aircraft to Argentina was not only thoroughly coordinated between the Departments of State and Defense, but prior to the departure of the negotiating team which concluded the agreements, it was coordinated with the White House.

8. *Referring again to the enclosed Latin American memorandum where it is suggested that arms purchases by Latin American nations have been on a decline, would you comment on the obvious inconsistency between the memorandum and the following statement by President Frei of Chile in his Foreign Affairs Magazine article:*

"The armaments race also conspires against the strengthening of the Alliance. The annual expenditure of the Latin American countries on armaments has reached $1.5 billion. Yet the average yearly sum made available by the United States to Latin America in the period 1961–65 was $1.1 billion. The two figures clearly show that present arms purchases seriously undermine the objectives of the Alliance. A Latin American country in 1965 had, in proportion to population approximately the same number of men under arms as the United States. India, with twice the population of Latin America and having had two armed conflicts in recent years, has fewer soldiers than Latin America.

"Nobody can possibly suppose that these weapons and armies are going to deter an aggressor from outside Latin America. Equally, the assertion that to stop subversion these countries must purchase fifty-ton tanks, supersonic aircraft and battleships defies belief. The armaments race encourages distrust and nationalism and these in turn are among the chief enemies of integration. It also diverts important resources which should be utilized to satisfy the urgent need

for economic and social development. It is therefore essential that a decision be taken at the highest levels of the Alliance to establish a quantitative limitation on arms purchases."

President Frei's article in *Foreign Affairs* magazine refers to the "annual expenditure of Latin American countries on *armaments*" (emphasis supplied) as reaching $1.5 billion. It appears that he has used the word "armaments" to represent Latin American defense expenditures as a whole, not arms and equipment purchases alone. Only about one-tenth of Latin American defense budgets is spent on military hardware, the rest going for salaries, allowances, maintenance and other recurrent expenditures.

In any case, continuing efforts are being made to limit armaments. On the multilateral level, the need to eliminate unnecessary military expenditures in order to apply maximum resources to economic development and social progress was recognized by the Latin American Chiefs of State at Punta del Este last April when they declared their intention to limit military expenditures to the actual demands of national security. President Frei's appeal for arms limitation was welcomed by the United States and the subsequent Punta del Este declaration reflected wide support for this concept even though no specific arms limitations were agreed. We are continuing our efforts through the OAS and bilaterally to exert a beneficial influence against arms competitions and for more productive use of resources.

With regard to the number of men under arms, during the period 1955–1965, one Latin American country had an average of .675% of its population in its armed forces. This was the highest percentage. Four other countries in the area had an average percentage above .5%, while the regional average was only .345%. The comparable figure for the U.S. is 1.695%.

Although we differ with some of President Frei's statistics, the United States Government is in full accord with his objective: limitation of arms expenditures and conservation of resources for more productive applications. The aim of our arms policy is to help friendly countries meet their legitimate security needs, while at the same time using our influence and managing our arms policy in ways which encourage the development of regional arms controls and prevent excessive investment in military forces.

But, as you point out, U.S. policy in this regard cannot realistically operate in a vacuum, taking little or no account of the aggressive military sales policies of other countries. Developing countries will buy their arms elsewhere if U.S. sources of supply are denied to them. Consequently, until some general understandings can be reached limiting the international sale of military equipment, we fail to see how our influence in controlling arms levels can be increased by denying ourselves the capability even to make carefully controlled and selective arms sales.

Quite the contrary, we believe that our influence for restraint is maximized by the careful management of our arms supply programs with these countries, through the ties established by training and logistical resupply.

This policy with respect to developing countries is a fundamentally negative sales policy. We do not seek out sales; we make them only when to do so is demonstrably in the overall national interest of the United States.

Credit sales to such countries is an indispensable aspect of this policy. It reduces the U. S. cost of contributing to the maintenance of world peace, encourages prudence on the part of the requesting country in assessing requirements, and makes it possible for the developing countries to take more responsibility for their own self-protection.

I believe we will continue to need this capability for the future as in the past. And in this respect the role of the Eximbank—the principal U. S. export financing agency—as the administrative mechanism for financing is both appropriate and essential.

I hope that the foregoing explanation has been helpful. I should like to thank you for the opportunity to convey this information to you and to ask your support of the military sales program as presently constituted. It is a most important element in the military, political and economic aspects of United States foreign policy.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE V. ROSTOW.

IMPORTANCE OF TELEVISION IN WINNING WAR IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may remember that after my first visit to Vietnam better than 2 years ago, I urged that plans for the installation of a television network in Vietnam be pushed off the drawing board and implemented without delay in order to help win the minds of men in this war-torn country. Just recently a progress report on the program—of unusual significance—came to my attention.

The Department of Defense has just released a report telling how a television appeal for information about the Vietcong activities in Saigon resulted in destruction of the Vietcong's 69th Special Action Unit which has long been one of the most important and most effective terrorist cells operating in Saigon. When the police broke up the sabotage ring they found among captured documents plans to place explosives around the U.S. Public Affairs Office and the adjacent Rex hotel where U.S. troops are billeted. The blast was to be touched off 5 days later. Among those arrested was the unit commander, a veteran saboteur responsible for masterminding many attacks against U.S. installations and U.S. personnel. This unit was credited with 80 percent of all sabotage and terrorist attacks in the Saigon area. Police also found the unit's weapons and explosives caches.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident the Members of the House will be gratified and encouraged to learn that our modest investment to strengthen the Government of Vietnam by helping to provide better communication with the Vietnamese people has been sound, and I urge my colleagues to join me in making certain that this program is continued and, in fact, expanded in order that the truth may be fully disseminated throughout this country. I am satisfied that the duration of this war can be shortened if we fully utilize our great television technology—a weapon in our arsenal of vast potential.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a copy of the report at this point in the RECORD:

EFFECTIVENESS OF SAIGON TELEVISION

A recent TV campaign to help Saigon police find Viet Cong terrorists resulted in the smashing of a major sabotage ring which was planning an attack against JUSPAO headquarters.

After seeing a TV spot announcement about a reward program for tips about the Viet Cong, an informer contacted police. He gave information which eventually resulted in the near-complete destruction of the VC's 69th Special Action Unit. The unit was one of the most important and most effective terrorist cells operating in Vietnam's capital city.

When police broke up the sabotage ring they found among captured documents plans to place explosives around JUSPAO headquarters and the adjacent Rex Hotel military billet. The blast was to be touched off five days later.

USIA PsyOps Advisor, Warren Simpson, assigned to CORDS, had worked with Ministry of Information officials to develop a complete media campaign which would publicize the Government of Vietnam's information awards system.

Simpson was instrumental in getting maximum exploitation of the campaign on THVN, the Saigon television station.

A reward of 400,000 piastres ($3,390) was paid to the informer. His story, in turn, will become another TV spot to encourage others to come forward.

The 69th Special Action Unit was credited by police with 80 percent of all sabotage and terrorist acts in the Saigon area. Information on the number of personnel and weapons neutralized was not available; however, among those arrested was the unit's company commander, a veteran saboteur responsible for masterminding many attacks against U.S. installations and personnel.

Police also found the unit's weapons and explosives caches.

COMMUNISM'S 50 YEARS OF TERROR AND FAILURE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, November 7 is the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution in the Soviet Union. Lenin and his cohorts seized power from a democratically chosen government, set up after the overthrow of the czars, some 8 months earlier. Their highly organized minority seized power from 160 million subjects; today communism has spread until it rules more than one-third of the earth's population.

International communism, on conservative estimates, has been responsible for some 83 million deaths since the coup of 1917. At least 45 million of these in the Soviet Union itself. Stalin boasted that the manmade famines of 1932–33 killed 10 million peasants who were refusing to give up their land.

Those who listen to Communist propagandists today forget that before the revolution 71 percent of the cultivated lands were in small holdings of 135 acres or less. Before the revolution, peasants owned 82 percent of the cattle, 86 percent of the horses, and produced a grain surplus for export. For the period 1907–

13, the industrial growth rate exceeded the rates in the same period for the United States, Great Britain, and Germany. In less than a decade, before the revolution, production had doubled. Russia was second only to the United States in railroad mileage. Russia had more universities than England, France, and Germany, with one-third of the students attending on scholarship. Although czarist terror seemed formidable at the time, only 32,000 convicts were at hard labor at the peak and the death penalty was outlawed except for the crime of political assassination.

After 50 years of communism in the Soviet Union, the Soviet gross national product—GNP—is only 45 percent of that of the United States, $333 billion compared to $739 billion. Of the major industrial nations, the U.S.S.R. is fifth in GNP. In per capita income, the U.S.S.R. is 13th; and in overall social and economic services, 20th. The average weekly earnings for a worker in 1965–66 was $26, with millions subsisting on the so-called legal minimum of $10 per week. Food takes 60 percent of a worker's earnings in the U.S.S.R., as against 19 percent in the United States. The most telling statistic of all is that 50 percent of wage earners in the Soviet Union are women—proof that a man cannot support a family with his paycheck alone.

The human costs have been staggering. Hardly any family has not been touched by arrests for slave labor—a fact from which we can estimate that over 50 million people have served in the slave labor camps. Even today, refugee information indicates that 1 million are still held. One camp, only 250 miles from Moscow, holds 70,000 in this 50th anniversary year.

The Soviet regime is celebrating 50 years of personal terror, with neighbor spying upon neighbor, husband upon wife, and son upon father. The neighborhood organized spy corps today numbers 6 million. There are 6,000 local schools to train disseminators of domestic propaganda aimed entirely at Soviet citizens. On a higher level, 177 regional institutes give advanced propaganda training. The Stalin constitution is still in effect. The Supreme Soviet—that is, the supposed national legislature—meets for a few days each year to rubber-stamp decisions handed down by the Communist Party. The accused in the Soviet Union has no right to habeas corpus; and his survivors even have no right to a certificate of his death.

Although indications are that the open terror has abated somewhat, it is clear that the totalitarian nature of the regime makes any significant liberalization improbable. The KGB—the secret police—carries on as before, and has been known to take over when local police allow disturbances to get out of hand. Recent reorganizations in the Soviet leadership have brought the KGB directly into the policymaking control of the central committee of the Communist Party. As Svetlana Stalin pointed out, many of her father's henchmen, from Brezhnev on down, participated in directing the blood purges and still sit on the central committee. Miss Stalin maintains that conditions today are deteriorating.

Today's Communist leaders are better educated, and more sophisticated than the revolutionaries of old. They are more effective in pursuing their goal of world domination through indirect means—diplomacy, espionage, and agitation. The Communists have not abandoned their goal of conquering the world.

A brilliant assessment of the operations of the Soviet Union has been made by Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. Few analysts in the world are more qualified to speak authoritatively on this subject than Dr. Possony. His views, contained in a paper recently circulated amongst his friends and which he has authorized for publication here, are the following:

PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION WITHOUT PROLETARIAT

(By Stefan T. Possony)

The exuberant celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the bolshevik revolution suggest a tantalizing question: How would Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have looked at this Russian revolution of which they are the alleged patron saints?

There have been interminable, and on the whole futile, arguments about the theories, judgments, and predictions of these two men. There would hardly be any discussion about their literary legacy if Lenin and Stalin had not proclaimed a position which in effect says: "If you can prove your point through a citation from Marx and Engels, you may be right. If there is no quote to support you, your point is not worth listening to."

Thanks to the deification of Marx and Engels, their reputation was inflated to the point of ridiculousness, even within the Free World. Thereafter their reputation was unduly deflated, even in communist countries. Whatever their public image, they are quoted and misquoted, but not read. This is a pity, for Marx and Engels have their merits.

For example, they insisted on the necessity of using scientific methods. They did not usually live up to their own standards, and the claim that they founded "scientific socialism" was not justified—"isms" and science do not mix. But they tried to base politics on scientific analysis, they rejected utopian thinking, and they were fact-oriented—they would have had no patience with the statistics emanating from the USSR.

Both men were humanists and wholeheartedly stood up for political progress, at least most of the time. There can be considerable argument as to whether the movements they supported were progressive or not. Their "causes" included the fight of the Union under President Lincoln during the American Civil War, the unification of Germany under Bismarck, the struggle of the Poles and the Irish for political independence, and the Paris Commune in 1871. In many crises they supported Great Britain and, increasingly, as they were growing older, the United States.

Their main opposition was directed at the primary "reactionary" forces of their time, the short-lived regime of Napoleon III and the Russian autocracy, which they opposed throughout their lives and wanted to eliminate through a major war or a series of conflicts. Their objections to these regimes were based on conventional "liberal" criteria: Marx and Engels fought for political freedom and democracy, and against exploitation, dictatorship, arbitrary justice, terror, and militaristic aggression.

During their youth they were violent revolutionaries, with an occasional inclination for democracy. As mature men, they promoted democratic socialism, although they often reverted to the rhetoric of, and addiction to revolution.

Marx and Engels criticized "capitalism" because it had not fully extirpated poverty. At the same time, they regarded capitalism as a progressive force which was creating far more resources and wealth, and higher living standards, than the earlier systems it had replaced. They expected that as capitalism was developing, it would ultimately reach a point where, due to its "inner contradictions," it no longer would be able to sustain the momentum of economic progress but would retrogress and create "increasing misery." At that moment, in order to regain the lost momentum and to re-accelerate economic progress, private property would be abolished and be replaced by social property and a supposedly more efficient economic system, namely socialism, would supersede moribund capitalism.

It followed that the socialist revolution probably would occur after capitalism no longer would be capable of feeding the population and after it had run its course. If the revolution were to occur earlier, it would be premature because the "tasks of capitalism" would not yet be fulfilled, because capitalism still would have an enormous potential of progress, and because the economy would not yet have developed to a level where a socialist organization is supposedly necessary.

A premature revolution would be made by a minority, in contrast to a revolution at the right time which would be desired and carried out by the overwhelming majority. The premature revolution would be "political". But a purely political change, even if executed by the proletariat (the only progressive class, according to Marx and Engels), would not result in the creation of those additional and growing "productive forces" (technology), on which sustained progress is dependent.

In a book on the peasant war in Germany which took place during the 16th century, Friedrich Engels wrote a poignant comment which my friend and colleague Bertram D. Wolfe, author of *Three Who Made a Revolution*, used as a motto for a recent analysis of the fate of Marxism after the bolshevik revolution: "The worst thing that can befall a leader of an extreme party is to be compelled to take over a government in an epoch when the movement is not yet ripe for the domination for the class which he represents and for the realization of the measures which that domination would imply." What this leader *can* do, does not depend "upon his will but . . . upon the degree of development of the material means of existence". What this leader *ought* to do "again depends not upon him" and "what he ought to do cannot be achieved." "What he can do is in contrast to all his actions as hitherto practiced, to all his principles and to the present interests of his party." "He is compelled to represent not his party or his class, but the class for whom conditions are ripe for domination." He must "defend the interests of an alien class, and . . . feed his own class with phrases and promises, with the assertion that the interests of that alien class are their own interests. Whoever puts himself in this awkward position is irrevocably lost." Those who insist on making a premature revolution, find themselves in an "insoluble dilemma", merely pay "lip service to the extreme revolutionary party", and are "foolish beyond measure". This applies particularly to leaders of the working class when there has been "only a very low level of proletarian development." In 1890, Engels commented in a private letter that the enormous social and political troubles from which Germany had been suffering for centuries were due to revolutions which had failed.

By 1917, capitalism in Russia was making

tremendous progress, but only the initial phases of capitalist development had been completed. Lenin knew that according to the theories he had adopted from Marx and Engels, the proletarian revolution was premature, simply because there was barely any proletariat. He justified his political acts through various rationalizations, but by 1921 he knew that he had reasoned wrongly. A supreme pragmatist, he introduced a system which he himself described as "state capitalism" and to which he gave the innocuous but quite incorrect name of "new economic policy" (NEP). This new—but actually very old system—was abolished after Lenin's death and henceforth socialism was being professed loudly. But the soviet economy has remained state capitalism because the "surplus" is not equitably distributed to the workers and peasants who, according to recent calculations, receive only about one-fifth of the value they create through their labor. The "surplus value" is appropriated by the state and the military machine, and the high ranking officials and managers are the beneficiaries of "planning".

The soviet system is a mirror-image of Russian serfdom, as Marx and Engels criticized it, except that it is infinitely more tyrannical, exploitative, and aggressive; and except also that the Tsar abolished serfdom in 1861, while Stalin reintroduced it in 1929.

The soviet system, to describe it in Marxian terminology, is a system of class rule. The soviet state represents the bureaucracy as a class and is run in its interest. This state is in the hands of intellectuals who have assumed the role historically discharged by the aristocracy.

What Engels said about the German peasant leader Thomas Muenzer applies to Lenin: "The social transformation that he pictured in his phantasy was so little grounded in the then existing economic conditions that the latter were a preparation for a social system diametrically opposed to that of which he dreamed."

Being premature (and also unnecessary), the bolshevik revolution became a counter-revolution. It restored autocracy and in the process invented totalitarianism. The totalitarian counter-revolution of Russia was promptly imitated by Italian fascism and German nazism. Ultimately, the bolshevik party was exterminated by bolsheviks turned "fascist". The red flag was kept flying and the Marxian words were kept flowing. But underneath the communist facade, Stalin built a Russian replica of nazism. The dream became a nightmare. It may yet end as mankind's final armaggedon.

FIFTY YEARS OF COMMUNISM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a necessary countereffort to the Soviet propaganda of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, I today introduced a resolution condemning the persecution by the Government of the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion, race, or nationality. The resolution also asks that the President call upon the Government of the Soviet Union on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of that Government to cease its suppression of the free exercise of religion. I insert the resolution to be reprinted at this point in the RECORD, as a continuation of my remarks:

H. RES. 968

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States deeply believes in universal freedom of religion and the rights of all men to their ethnic, cultural, and national heritage and is opposed to infringement of such freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is presently celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution which purported to respect the human dignity and individuality of every citizen; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union notoriously denies basic rights guaranteed even under her own constitution to all citizens; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting citizens of Christian, Jewish, Moslem, and other faiths and denominations by exercising total state control, by interfering in the sacred relationship between man and God; by confiscating sacred places of worship, by destroying cemeteries, by curtailing religious observances, by subverting the ministry; by exploiting religious differences, as in the Middle East, to attain aggressive foreign policy objectives; by discrimination against persons of faith in cultural activities and access to higher learning, by denying employment to individuals because of religion and race; by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of families, by forcibly dislocating persons of various religious, cultural, ethnic, and nationality groups; and by other acts that oppress individuals in the free exercise of their faith, heritage, and culture; and

Whereas it is the objective of the United States to contribute effectively toward the strengthening of international law, including the adherence to universal human rights and norms of conduct: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that persecution by the Government of the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion, race, or nationality, be condemned and that the President should call upon the Government of the Soviet Union on this special occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of that government to cease its suppression of the free exercise of religious and cultural activities.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial from this morning's Chicago Tribune entitled "Fifty Years of Communism," and a letter to the editor in this morning's Washington Post written by Mr. Paul De Hevesy, former Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 7, 1967]

FIFTY YEARS OF COMMUNISM

A couple of our readers chide us in the Voice of the People today for printing an extended series of articles gathered by New York Times writers in a survey of Russia after 50 years of communism. The assumption of power by a handful of bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky is being celebrated today as a peoples' revolution, which, in the light of historical truth, is an utter falsification.

Nevertheless, we have reported whatever progress the Times writers were able to discover in the despotism which has been fastened on the numerous peoples composing the Soviet Union, 45 percent of whom are not Russians. It is the duty of a newspaper to inform. Perhaps the insights of THE TRIBUNE have not always been prophetic, but it is better to try to know what lies ahead before you are swept over the falls in a barrel.

It is not possible to shut one's eyes to the fact that, after 50 years of the Marxian superstition, Russia has risen to a rank of world power which is counter-balanced only by that of the United States. There are, in fact, only two giants in this age. If Americans did not try to understand the nature of the adversary, this country would be a stupid giant indeed.

No observer has ever viewed communism with a more clear and unsentimental eye than this newspaper. We abhor the system and its masters, as we abhor tyranny of any sort. We have never subscribed to the notion, now in fashion, that soviet life is somehow ameliorating and that freedom of the intellect and of expression will eventually flower under totalitarian oppression.

Let us look at a few myths and realities. The "revolution" celebrated in Moscow today actually occurred eight months before the bolshevik seizure of power. A provisional government ruled from March to November of 1917, after the abdication of Czar Nicholas II on March 15. It was this revolution which was purloined by the Communists, who seized power thru an armed coup.

It is a myth that the masses supported the bolsheviks, just as it is a myth that the Russian people love communism. In World War II many of the victims of the new serfdom were prepared to welcome even the German armies as liberators, but Hitler's nazi apparatus, with a rigidity comparable to the mentality of the Kremlin, alienated all potential support with a fierce policy of repression.

If the peoples of Russia love communism, why has it been necessary to fence them in with terror, barbed wire, and a smothering control of all thought? Why has it been necessary to deny them any political choice save for the party of the oligarchy? If communism casts a spell over men's minds, why are its victims in the various lands over which it holds sway numbered in authoritative estimates as high as 85 million dead?

It is true that there has been progress under communism, especially in the building of military might and in accomplishments in space, but it is often forgotten that Russia in the period before World War I had an economic growth rate greater than that of western Europe. Progress would have been achieved whether or not communism had come, with all the sterilities and failures of central planning in a system of socialist command economics.

The more Russia has changed, the more it has remained the same. As long ago as 1839 a discerning French traveler, the Marquis de Custine, wrote a book which reads as if it were an account of contemporary Russia. The only changes in 130 years have been surface changes. Examining the history of Russia, Custine found that the conditions of 1839 were merely a repetition of those obtaining during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, 300 years earlier.

In these 400 years and more, despotism has been changeless. The 19th century Russian historian, Alexander Herzen, predicted in 1855, after the enunciation of the Communist Manifesto, that communism would simply be "Russian autocracy turned upside down." So it proved.

Custine judged Russians to be a "people as wildly enthusiastic for submission as others are frantic for freedom." He found them "a population of menials, able to escape one yoke only to pass under another." Over them, whether czar or commissar, was destined to preside the tyrant: "This divinity, born of a political superstition, has only two choices: to prove that he is a man by allowing himself to be crushed or to force his disciples to conquer the world in order to prove that he is God."

When he came out of Russia, Custine exclaimed, "A bird escaping from its cage or coming out from under a vacuum bell, would be less joyous [than I]. I can speak, I can

write what I think, I am free! . . . Whoever has really seen Russia will find himself content to live anywhere else. It is always good to know that a society exists where no happiness is possible because, by a law of his nature, man cannot be happy unless he is free."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1967]

FIFTY GLORIOUS YEARS?

The Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics—in short, the Soviet Union—is territorially the largest country in the world: three times as large as the United States of America. In point of population it is, after China and India, the third largest country in the world. It is a conglomerate of some 170 nationalities.

A week and a day after its foundation, on the 15th November, 1917, the Soviet Union promulgated, by decree of the Council of Peoples Commissars, a Declaration of Rights, which provided that all its component nations were to enjoy self-determination, including the right to secede and to form independent states.

Encouraged by this Declaration, the following nations proclaimed their secession from the Soviet Union and established independent republics:

Finland Dec. 6, 1917
Ukraine Jan. 22, 1918
Lithuania Feb. 16, 1918
Estonia Feb. 24, 1918
Bielorussia March 25, 1918
Azerbaijan April 27, 1918
Armenia April 27, 1918
Georgia April 27, 1918
Poland Nov. 11, 1918
Latvia Nov. 18, 1918
Kuban Dec. 5, 1918

But soon after, in flagrant defiance of its pledged word, the Soviet Union recaptured all these sovereign states, with the exception of Finland and Poland, and forcibly incorporated them into its rigidly tyrannical empire. Ruthenia, Southern Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, the northern part of East Prussia, including Konigsberg, the eastern provinces of Poland, and the Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovina: all these territories suffered the same fate.

As for the three Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—they were subjected to the most treacherous duplicity. Though the Soviet Union, by the terms of peace treaties signed with these countries in 1920, "unreservedly recognized their independence and sovereignty" and, in pacts of nonaggression concluded with them in 1932, "renounced voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty possessed by Russia over their population and territories," it did not hesitate to break its pledged word by seizing them in 1940. Indeed, a short eternity.

As if all these annexations were not enough, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and to a certain extent Rumania were—and still are—all held in virtual subjection to the despotic rule of the Kremlin.

In considering Russian territorial aggrandizement, it is, however, necessary to distinguish between different kinds of Russian annexation. In many regions of the Soviet Union, national minorities are so closely intermingled with Russian and other ethnic groups that it would be hard even to imagine their separate political existence. Nor would it be practicable to suggest that the many primitive tribes inhabiting the territories of the Soviet Union should be exalted into independent sovereign states.

Though the establishment of the Soviet Union as the second most powerful state in the world has cost untold suffering to many millions of people, it has undeniably achieved great things, including the transformation of a primitive agricultural country into a rapidly advancing industrial power.

To mark the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the Soviet Union, the rulers of the Kremlin might now—22 years after the end of the Second World War—adopt a policy of belated liberation by fulfilling their solemn contractual promise to respect the independence of the Baltic states, and by withdrawing their military forces of occupation from Poland (90,000 men) and from Hungary (45,000 men). Thus put into effect, a policy of liberation would notably enhance the moral standing of the Soviet Union and would earn it the respect and gratitude not only of the liberated peoples but also of the whole free world.

Those who wish to live in peace must understand that, in modern times, victory in war does not constitute a right to acquire territory from a vanquished adversary, unless a qualified majority of countries assembled in the United Nations agrees. The days of violent conquest and dominion are long past. It is incumbent on every state to exercise moderation and restraint in its ambitions and its demands. True greatness is born of moral excellence, and is fundamentally alien from the predatory excesses to which the Soviet Union has too often had recourse. The Soviet Union must therefore understand that it can become greater only by consenting to become smaller.

PAUL DE HEVESY,
Former Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary.

HOVE, ENGLAND.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with many other Members of the House a plan will be developed to focus attention on the forthcoming anniversaries of the national revolutions against Soviet control. These are the revolutions launched by the captive people of the Soviet Union and those nations who are now Eastern European satellites of communism.

PREPARED SPEECH OF HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my friend and our colleague, HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin, recently prepared a speech on our Nation's difficulties in Vietnam. The conclusions he reaches, and the logic he exhibits, are worthy of the attention of this body and I include his remarks in the RECORD for that purpose, as follows:

Few if any of us in Congress have the privilege to share with the White House and the Defense Department any information of a Secret, or non-Secret category for that matter, sufficient to enable us to determine in full the goals and purposes of the Vietnam War. Those of you who have attended briefings held by the State Department or the Defense Department know the pattern. You are instructed by the briefer to be sure to keep the information to yourself because you are going to be allowed into the inner holy-of-holies of the information establishment. The presentation is labelled "Top Secret," so you listen intently to what is being said and always waiting to hear that bit of news that is so hush-hush, but it doesn't come; and when you ask questions, the answers are classics of evasion and marvels of end runs.

You leave the meeting wondering how the briefers could think you could be so stupid to think you have been thrilled with the information you have received from them, trying to figure out what's new, what has been said you don't already know, and then you stop at a newsstand to read the paper and you get a more complete and detailed account than you heard in the secret briefing. Actually, insofar as Vietnam is concerned, we in Congress have no information that is not available to you. What we do have—if we want to take the time to assimilate it—is a body of information coming to the desk daily, a staff to digest it, and thus a capacity to put the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle together until a clearer picture emerges.

We only know for certain that American forces are fighting in Vietnam and that there are over 500,000 of our young men there. We do not know whether or not they are winning, losing, or just holding their own. Nor do we know the intention of those charged with the conduct of the war—the basic, hard rock, tactical, and strategic plans of that war; nor do we know the ultimate goal we are seeking there if one has been set.

Yet, many spokesmen of both political persuasions have come forth with their plans and suggestions on how to conclude the Vietnamese war to the satisfaction of everyone involved—the United States, China, North Vietnam, Russia, and the conglomerate self-interests that make up the United Nations.

As a result, we are busy dividing our people into classifications. Some enterprising newsman coined the words Doves and Hawks—and getting no-where in the process, except on occasions to single out a chicken or two who instantly become justified targets for both factions.

What is our objective in Vietnam? In asking, I plead guilty to overwhelming personal confusion, but in doing so, I believe I stand with the majority of the Members of the Congress and the majority of Americans who care deeply as I do about the lives and security of our young fighting men.

As a Chaplain in combat in World War II, I was in a unique position to participate in the life and death struggles of our young men. I witnessed first-hand the death of many of them—youngsters who died in the defense of freedom—young men who shared with their last breath the conviction of their comrades who lived believing that dying in the cause of freedom was worthwhile.

Since that time, freedom has been challenged in every part of the world. As it has been throughout history and will continue to be as long as the nature of man is what it is—as long as a few are seeking the personal prestige and power to control the many. The community of nations that was supposed to keep the peace has, instead of doing so, lost it by default and inadequate leadership. Now we are inching closer and closer to a global struggle. Do not take my word alone, but listen to those who prescribe limitations and strange rigidity on our fighting men in Vietnam in order to delay what in their hearts and minds they must know is inevitable if history has any measure of authority.

As clearly as I can discern, our people are being asked by this Administration to support—and be content with—the waging of a limited war, for a limited objective for whatever unlimited period of time it will take and for whatever price we must pay to gain an undecisive stalemate.

We are told that peace is our objective. But peace in itself is not within OUR capacity to achieve by waging war anymore than a half-peace is attainable by waging a half-war.

Neither World War I, World War II, nor the Korean War was waged for peace. If it were peace we desired, all we would have had to do was to accept the tyranny of a Kaiser, a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Hirohito. The first war was to make the world safe for Democracy.

World War II was waged—at least we were told—to make secure the four freedoms. Yet, when victory was ours, and we possessed not

only the prestige but the power to enforce the rights of people of all countries to pursue their own destiny and to live in peace, our diplomats were content to settle for less than the full freedom for which we fought and died. And as a result of lack of leadership or vision or both, the tyranny we fought was replaced by another tyranny of leadership equally oppressive and equally disinterested in peace.

Freedom is not divisible nor is human dignity negotiable. Either a people have it or they do not. A half-slave is a figure as pathetic as one totally in chains. Whenever freedom is compromised, denied by pact or treaty, limited by edict or military muscle, the memory of those who fought and died for freedom is defamed.

In Korea, a struggle comparable to the one underway in Vietnam today, we settled for less than freedom—we settled for a half-peace, continuing sacrifice, seemingly perpetual turmoil, and death. A Republican leadership in 1952 had its hands tied in seeking a settlement by the deterioration caused by the lack of leadership and determination to win in Korea.

We won the great struggle in the Pacific in World War II, but we did not win the freedom for those who fought beside us in China and other areas of Asia.

We won the war in Europe, but we did not win the freedom for those who fought and died with us there. Instead, our diplomats created a divided Germany and denied to many nations the freedom for which our men fought by placing them under Communist tyranny without their consent and without their right to self-determination. I speak of the Balkan States.

Peace is a hollow and abused word when it is stripped of the meaning of freedom, for there is no peace without freedom, as we all can see in looking at the world today.

If we fight for freedom, Peace will be its by-product. It always has been. If we fight for peace, freedom may or may not become the cherished prize.

Lincoln led this country in war—for freedom, not peace.

General Douglas MacArthur fought in the Pacific, not for peace, but for freedom; and his genius achieved it for Japan—the only truly free nation besides the United States to emerge from that conflict. While our aim in Japan under the leadership of General MacArthur was to re-habilitate the Japanese people to the position of acceptance into the community of nations, the aim in Europe was, it seems, pure revenge so that we permitted a divided Germany with its capital city an island in the midst of a sea of oppression. Later, we were willing to permit a million people in Berlin to be placed in a concentration camp behind an ugly wall.

A more devious plot destroyed freedom in China.

Now a wall is to be built across half of Vietnam—not for freedom, but for peace—with tyranny on one side and with fear and distrust on the other; and with the hope of peace not dimmed but destroyed.

I suspect that many of us in the Congress and many of our diplomatic and military leaders are deluding themselves in a quest for a peace that can be achieved without freedom. There is no such thing. Is it right that we should start a conflict under the banner of freedom and then lower that banner to half-staff for the sake of a hollow peace?

Certainly our people are not afraid to fight for freedom. Those young men, many who died in my arms in World War II, knew that peace without freedom was nothing and would in time fester into threats and another conflict. Those who survived the holocaust of World War II were well aware of the threat to peace posed by a Communist tyranny that isolated itself behind a wall of secrecy. Those dying in Vietnam today know this only too well. Is it right that we should send our young men to fight those who seek to deny freedom to others as well as to their own people and then settle for half a victory and a hollow peace or a negotiated stalemate?

To put it bluntly, in my opinion, the North Vietnamese capacity to deny freedom to any people, anywhere in the world, must be destroyed. And I did not say people must be destroyed, I said the capacity of Hanoi's leaders to extend tyranny must be destroyed if the sacrifices in Vietnam are to be worthy of our heritage as free men. If freedom for the Vietnamese was not our goal when we sent troops into Vietnam, then it was not only impractical and unwise, but it was immoral to send them. Surely, we could not expect to send fighting men and to have peace as a result. No one wins either peace or freedom by waging a war. If the war that is being waged is successful, it can buy time to pursue freedom—but the war has to be won.

We cannot destroy the philosophy, the idea, the mad dream of Communism. What we would do by winning Vietnam would be to destroy the conviction that Communism and all other forms of tyranny have a right to exist by denying freedom to others.

Weapons cannot kill ideas. Weapons cannot destroy a philosophy. If used with determination and victory as a goal, they can preserve the right of people to pursue peace and freedom. They can prevent the destruction of freedom, however, and they must be used to do so if we are to have peace worthy of the meaning of the word.

I do not propose to tell our civilians or military leaders how to fight the war in Viet Nam. I, along with most members of Congress, know too little about what we are doing there to serve as a critic.

I only speak out at this moment with every ounce of feeling I can muster to warn you not to be deluded by the cries for peace when it does not move in tandem with freedom.

We had peace before we entered the conflict in Vietnam. We had peace before we entered the war in Korea. We had peace before we entered the war in Europe and Asia in the 1940's.

We did not answer the call of peace, but the call of freedom when we committed our nation to the conflicts.

If the goal of an enemy is oppression—to extend its tyranny over the globe—surely neither freedom nor peace can result from entering the conflict unless the goal is to make it impossible for the enemy to continue his violence and to deny his capacity by threat or brutality to force people to accept his tyranny.

1) What is highly confusing to the American people is a policy that commits 500,000 men to battle, for a goal that is said to be peace yet is not clear on the more important matter of what kind of peace will be purchased—a peace in which men can secure the right to pursue freedom or the peace of the enslaved who are forced to passively accept tyranny?

2) What is confusing is the policy that commits 500,000 men to battle and insists that they do enough to die if needs be but are not permitted to do enough to win.

3) What is confusing is the policy that commits a half million men to battle against an enemy with whom the fathers and mothers and wives and sons and daughters are encouraged to trade—the result of which trade serves only to strengthen the enemy's capacity to wage war against us.

4) What is confusing is a policy of "business as usual" that taxes and taxes, not only to wage a war the men are not permitted to win but to place those who cannot go and many who will not go, on an economic level above that permitted those who do the fighting and dying.

5) What is confusing is a policy of business as usual—as if war has become a way of life to be accepted, and we hear voices from Washington and elsewhere—some authentic and some not—that we should be prepared for a war that will last ten to fifteen years.

Let us not be deluded over the reiterations that peace is our goal in Vietnam. If that is all it is, we as a people were committed to a war under false pretenses.

If that is all, we are fighting a war that is futile and useless.

I do believe the American people do not want to sacrifice their sons and their treasure for peace in Asia. They are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to permit them to pursue freedom, without which there is no peace. I hope and pray that our leadership holds the same convictions. The failure of this Administration to make clear the whole truth involving our participation in the war in Vietnam—(a) why we committed troops to battle; (b) why we have privileged sanctuaries beyond the reach of our bombers; (c) why we are pursuing a war of gradualism; that is not only alienating us from effective leadership in the world but has claimed the lives of over 14,000 of our men; (d) how long we expect to be involved; and, finally, (e) what we expect to gain—has lead this nation and our people into massive confrontations of confusion and despair and is dividing this nation as it has never been divided before.

Only on the battlefields, in the front lines of Vietnam, is there singleness of purpose coupled with the courage and determination to win.

FARMERS STRUGGLE IN FALSE PROSPERITY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, while the conflict in Vietnam may be the primary present concern of the people of the United States, the editorials I read in the rural press of the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District indicate that the matter of next concern is the decline of the countryside.

I recently read a very interesting editorial in the Little Falls Daily Transcript about the struggle of the farmer in a false prosperity which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

FARMERS STRUGGLE IN FALSE PROSPERITY

Figures compiled in Washington indicate there are 40 employes in the Department of Agriculture for every farmer in Morrison County. The farmer population in this county is approximately 2600. The number of department employes in the county is limited to just a few offices and all indications are that they are doing a good job.

The excess, however, is something else again. It can be traced to the massive complex in the national capital presided over by Secretary Orville L. Freeman, who was appointed to the cabinet after his defeat for governor of Minnesota in 1960.

Farmers read how Freeman is busy up to his ears in urban renewal, which is not in his province, while more and more bureaucrats climb on their backs. Under the Great Society the farmer's income is up, but he is held down by the high cost of everything he buys. His compensation is down, which is a discouraging proposition for those who produce the food not only for this nation, but supply food for many others. The farmer has increased his production through good

land and livestock practices and is deserving of a better deal than he is getting.

Farmers meeting with members of the House Agriculture Committee at Willmar last month had the opportunity to voice their complaints and did so with facts and figures. It probably is the first time in history that this committee has come into Minnesota seeking information, Rep. John Zwach writes. The farmers charged that they were victims of the cost price squeeze, and are victims of a false economy.

In the face of this privation comes the news that five farmers made more than $1 million each in taxpayers' money for not planting crops. Thus the rich farmers get richer and the poor get poorer. Eleven more were handed $500,000 to $1 million. A rich British-owned plantation in Mississippi got $187,000.

Nationally, farm prices, including livestock, are seven per cent below mid-September 1966.—G. W. J.

A HALT TO INSURRECTION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, people in my Minnesota Sixth Congressional District are becoming increasingly concerned over the permissiveness shown in regard to acts of violence, especially demonstrations in which the laws of the land are broken.

These people believe that the law-breaking demonstrations are not typical of our society and they believe it is time for the majority of decent, loyal, patriots and sincere Americans to take the rostrum and call a halt to insurrection.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Jack Cook of the Lyon County Independent, Marshall, Minn., which states very succintly the position on these demonstrators held by many people in my district:

WE BELIEVE IT'S TIME TO CALL A HALT TO INSURRECTION

There are some things we believe about the recent anti-war demonstrations in this country—and there are some we don't believe.

We'd like to mention some of those things we believe, as well as some we don't. For example:

We believe the constitutional position on dissent has been made clear. Americans have the right of free speech and petition. It is guaranteed in the constitution. It has been upheld and strengthened in numerous Supreme Court decisions.

We do not believe the right of dissent guarantees freedom to create public violence and chaos, or to further hatred and civil disobedience, or to destroy public order.

We believe this nation's future is in the hands of its young people. We believe this because it has to be so if there is to be any future.

We believe the future of the nation is secure with the millions of emotionally stable, intelligent, far-thinking young people who may be honestly convinced of the wickedness of war, but who also realize that an evil that has persisted since the dawn of man will not be corrected in a day; who knows that the way to eliminate one evil is not to perpetrate another evil; who knows that the impact of sane, sound and patient reason will finally prove more effective than the thrown rock or the clubbed fist.

We believe that the overwhelming majority of young people to whom the future belongs repudiates assembly that breeds violence and dissent that advocates lawlessness. We believe these young people know there are more effective and permanent methods of protest and dissent. They know that in the future it will be they and not the lefties or the hippies or the paranoids who will find and apply those means.

We do not believe the sincere peace movement of this nation is represented by screeching hordes of demonstrators who mouth four-letter epithets for the benefit of news cameras and microphones, who paint sickeningly obscene slogans on sidewalks and walls, and who urinate on the steps of public buildings.

We believe that within this nation's freedoms, dissenters must be heard and must be guaranteed a forum from which to voice their dissent. We believe they must be allowed "their say" because that right is assured them under law.

We do not believe any American has to listen to any dissenter who preaches mob action against constituted authority, no matter which way he wears his collar.

We do not believe the cause against war or any other evil is served by such public figures as baby doctors and unwashed female ballad singers who exhort to violence.

We do not believe the future of this nation lies with the likes of Dr. Benjamin Spock or Joan Baez.

We believe the right of protest and dissent was earned long ago by Americans and has been cherished and protected by Americans at considerable cost in pain and blood and sacrifice. We believe those rights and guarantees must be re-earned by Americans, and when they are not they can be forfeited.

We believe those rights are forfeited by "peace" demonstrators who throw bottles and filth at law officers and then whine about "police brutality." We believe those rights are forfeited by the runny-nose punks who bring encouragement and aid to an enemy engaged in killing as many Americans as possible.

We do not believe that most "peace" demonstrators have lived long enough or acquired enough experience and knowledge to dictate, by force, how the nation should be run. And we are sure none of them has a solution to the problems they protest.

Furthermore, we do not believe most of the violent demonstrators moved by convictions of honest dissent, but rather by such considerations as "how can I personally get out of the draft?"

We believe the Dr. Spocks and the Joan Baezes, and—yes, the Father James Groppis—and all the rest of the "peace" marchers with their commandos and their filth and their preachments of insurrection, have used up all the rights and freedoms they have earned.

We believe it is now time for the majority of decent, loyal, patriotic and sincere Americans to take the rostrum.

WEAKNESS OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY INDICATES LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF REAL ENEMY OF PEACE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, as the Soviet Union celebrates today the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, the world should take note of the heavy emphasis of the display of military weapons. While posing as a peace-loving nation Red Russia rattles its military might in attempted blackmail against any who thwart her designs of conquest. Her leaders proudly boast of the weapons they are sending to Communist North Vietnam to be used against the United States. In the face of the continued animosity toward us as expressed by Communist Russia spokesmen for the administration go on attempting to "build bridges" which in truth only strengthen the enemy and weaken us.

The latest, almost unbelievable statement which underscores a lack of understanding of Communist motives on the part of those responsible for American security is that of Secretary of Defense McNamara who blandly announces the Russians have perfected a means of shooting a nuclear warhead from outer space and at the same time tries to tell us it is not serious or that the Russians really have not broken the treaty they signed agreeing not to develop such a weapon.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the administration recognize the true enemy we face before our defenses have been completely destroyed. The following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal points out clearly the real enemy and I include it here for the information of my colleagues:

THE REAL ENEMY

"For better or worse, the United States cannot escape the dilemma of power," says William R. Kintner. "If the United States is to have the option of introducing constructive changes into the existing world order—changes that could render the military technology race unnecessary—it must ensure its own and the world's security during the process of change.

". . . As the Soviet Union nears the United States strategic position and gains leverage, the balance of power will become more unstable and the probability of general international instability will be greater.

"The risks to the American people of a nuclear war and the political consequences to the United States of a loss of strategic superiority are so great that, to lessen these dangers we must be prepared to maintain, over a period of time, a relatively high level national defense."

Mr. Kintner is a graduate of West Point and veteran of 21 years in the Army from which he retired as a colonel. He earned a Ph. D. at Georgetown University and went on to become deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

The quotations are from his new book, "Peace and the Strategy Conflict" (Praeger).

This man is a student of cold war strategy, not an alarmist. But he states that the Soviet Union "could in the near future achieve a significant first-strike advantage over the United States."

Colonel Kintner has been described by Hanson W. Baldwin as one of the most thorough chroniclers of the erosion of United States strategic superiority—"a process that has been going on for the past three years, largely obscured to the general public by Pentagon soothing syrup."

His thesis is that while the United States is heavily engaged in fighting an apparently

endless war in the Far East, this nation has permitted itself unwittingly to be suckered into letting its own defenses down steadily to the point where in due time it will be a second-rate military power.

In short, we are putting all our "eggs" in the "basket" of offensive weaponry in hopes that we will be able to strike back if attacked, and failing miserably to provide the defenses that will be needed—by 1970, he estimates—against Russian superiority. This policy, he maintains, is one which will leave us at the mercy of the Soviet Union which he believes is the power that, unlike China, is really capable of and desirous of outstripping the United States in military strategy.

The competence and experience of Colonel Kintner should give pause to all those in the nation who see the Vietnam War as the main bastion of defense against communism. If his arguments need reinforcement, that can be found in recent achievements of the Soviet Union.

Consider that while the United States is cutting back its space program—which is in fact a military training and proving exercise as well as a scientific expedition—the Soviet Union has made two notable advances in this field in the last few weeks. Consider, too, the advanced development of an anti-ballistic defense system in the Soviet Union, while the United States belatedly is beginning only a limited form of such defense against the possibility of some future Chinese attack. Even in the more conventional arms field, there has been the recent disclosure in the Mideast that Russia has beaten us in the development of a sea-to-sea missile which is highly accurate and effective.

Colonel Kintner, being primarily a strategist, only spells out the problems and the serious consequences they pose.

It is for the politicians, both in Congress and in the Pentagon, to assess the facts. It is for them to decide how long and how far this nation can go in pursuing an Asian war that might take us into the vastness of China. It is for them to decide whether such a war, costing almost 30 billion dollars a year now and undoubtedly more in the near future, is really the war we should be trying to win.

Ho Chi Minh is now, for the first time, expressing concern about the effect that the bombing of his country is having. It may be that at long last we are getting through to him the message that negotiations for peace in South Vietnam can end the war. Maybe intensified bombing is the cue.

Communism has operated on the premise that the United States is vulnerable to a war of attrition. We have suffered from a confrontation of this anti-American policy. Unquestionably the enemy is drawing American blood, physically, economically, and politically. But we are proving that attrition will not work.

We have a larger and more potent enemy than North Vietnam, and we should be concentrating our defense toward his future moves. The quicker we conclude the Vietnam War and close off the impending threat of a spreading Asian war, the better our defense position in this changing world will be.

WARTIME PROSPERITY NO CAUSE FOR CHEER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, now that the economic expansion has exceeded 80 months, the administration's propagandists are once again trumpeting their achievements in producing record-shattering prosperity. To say that the administration is misleading the public would be overly charitable.

The fact is that the administration knows full well that the current expansion is being fueled by a costly and bloody war. Its failure today to distinguish between an economy based on war and one based on peace reminds me of attacks on the Eisenhower administration made by leading Democrats during the recession of 1954. At that time, there also was an absence of candor about the fact that the economy was in the process of shifting over from the Korean war to peacetime conditions. Just as the blame for recession was misplaced in 1954, the Democratic Party's self-serving economic statements today are inaccurate and, in light of the human costs of our current prosperity, even indecent.

What is remarkable today is not that the expansion is continuing but that it slowed down sharply in spite of a war which has resulted in a million new civilian jobs, as well as opening up 700,000 positions in the Armed Forces. The failure of the administration's economic policy is best measured by the resumption of serious inflation, the highest interest rates in 40 years, the complete break in wage stability, the drop in corporate profits, and the chaos of Federal finances. Only one thing is certain: restoring stable growth will be a long and painful process that ultimately will affect employment itself. If there is any cause for cheer or self-congratulation in this picture, I fail to see it.

The distinction between an economy based on war and one based on peace was recently highlighted by Prof. Raymond P. Saulnier, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in the November 2 edition of the Washington Post, and in an editorial in the Wall Street Journal on the same day. I place these articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1967]

HOW TO MAKE PROSPERITY LAST—III: PUT FINANCIAL AFFAIRS IN ORDER, SAYS SAULNIER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The current expansion—the longest in the nation's history, is due "in large part" to the war in Vietnam. That's the gloomy opinion of the man, who served as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers from 1956 to 1961. Raymond J. Saulnier is now Professor of Economics at Barnard College, Columbia University, in New York. The following is the third of five articles written for United Press International by past and present council chairmen.)

(By Raymond J. Saulnier)

It is the longest expansion on record, to be sure, but the occasion is hardly one for rejoicing.

The longest previous expansion ended in February 1945. It was extended to 80 months by World War II.

The present expansion has reached 81 months in large part due to the war in Vietnam. There is nothing here that warrants being celebrated as a happy anniversary.

Nor is there any basis for rejoicing in the state of the economy. Cost and price inflation are back again. Since January 1967, the cost-of-living has been rising at a rate that will cut the value of the dollar by 37 per cent in a decade.

INFLATION MAY GET WORSE

More hours are being lost in strikes than at any time in eight years. Interest rates are higher than they have been in over 30 years.

And the prospect is that inflation will get worse before it gets better.

Unemployment is low, but no lower than might be expected in a war period. Even so, industrial production was no higher in August 1967 than 12 months ago, and less than 85 per cent of industrial capacity is being utilized.

Actually, recession was avoided this year only by a narrow margin, which is something of a miracle considering we are in a war and considering that the money supply is being inflated by 9 per cent a year, and budgetary deficits—in total defiance of the "new economics"—get bigger as unemployment rates get lower.

Obviously, the problem is how to correct these conditions and how to avoid the financial crisis that thoughtful people know is a real danger.

BUDGET DEEP IN RED

Two things are essential. First, the budget must be moved back toward balance. But it is so deep in the red now that even with a tax increase, which is clearly needed, spending would have to be held at the fiscal 1968 level for two years to give revenues a chance to close the gap.

Obviously, we must do a better job of setting expenditure priorities or we will have what the Secretary of the Treasury, with uncommon candor, recently described as a "financial shambles."

Second, annual increases in the money supply must be reduced from the current 9 per cent to 4 or 5 per cent. Like balancing the budget, this too will take time—at least it should.

In the meantime, we shall have to put up with inflation, with high interest rates and with a growth rate below what we might have had if costs and prices were stable.

Beyond these essentials there is a long agenda of unfinished business. We must learn better how to train unemployed people for jobs and how to motivate them toward continuing employment and self-support.

We must renew our cities, clean our air and water, improve our transportation, upgrade our education and health services, etc., etc.

But what is essential for progress in all of this is that we first put our financial affairs in order.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 2, 1967]

THERMOMETER FOR A FEVER

This great 80-month-long boom, currently being celebrated by the Administration and the more uncritical commentators and private economists, needs a down-to-earth appraisal.

Much is made of the fact that the long period of prosperity has been historically equalled only under the abnormal wartime conditions of 1939–45. But of course the present expansion, especially in the past three years, has been partly fueled by another war and by the fantastic military expenditures of some $75 billion a year. Even so, there have been a couple of dips in the course of America's economic "miracle."

Most of all, it has been an inflationary boom, right from the start in early 1961. The Federal Reserve has been inflating the money supply as though it had never heard of history's classic inflations. The Administration and Congress have been ballooning spending to a grotesque degree, causing huge and uninterrupted deficits and a steep rise in the public debt.

For the first few years the inflation was reflected in only moderate price increases, but the past couple of years have seen an annual

upsurge of more than 3%. Any housewife can readily, and bitterly, translate that into her own budget terms. For the economy as a whole it signals, if continued, an inflation of grave proportions.

The predictable distortions have all come about. Investment in marginal or uneconomic enterprises. Rising interest rates, which easy money is supposed to check but somehow hasn't. Last year's crisis in the money markets. Speculative fever in the stock markets, the root case being too much money; it must find its channels somewhere.

As Presidential economist Gardner Ackley rightly says, the Government has learned well enough how to stimulate the economy when it is threatened by slack (far too well, we would add). Now we must show "that we have the self-discipline to apply necessary restraint when the economy is threatened by overheating." By which he means to plug the Administration's proposed 10% tax "surcharge."

Nonsense. The Government could have curbed or averted the inflation if it had exerted any restraint on its own gross political spending appetities during the past six years. A tax increase now would most probably only whet those appetities, like pressing fresh drinks on a drunkard.

A case can be made that the uncontrolled spending, a lot of it useless, plus the easy money policy can put the economy in a fix comparable to that following the 1929 crash. Most of the blame for those events is placed on an overextension of private credit, and the Administration's sycophants customarily and complacently pooh-pooh any resemblance today. Conditions are very different, they contend, and we now have all those built-in safeguards such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., Social Security and unemployment compensation.

Yet we also have an inflationary, credit economy; can anyone honestly deny that it may be overextended? Or concede for the sake of argument that private credit is not unduly stretched. Unquestionably the Government's fiscal and monetary policies are. And if you have wildly overextended public spending, credit, deficit and debt, why can it not cause the same kind of havoc that private recklessness was doing some 40 years ago?

Well, we are not predicting. In fact, a quite different possibility can be envisaged. The Government could keep stumbling on, year after year, inflating without stint, but the enormous inherent strengths of the private economy might stave off the debacle, giving the nation a Brazil-type or Uruguay-type economy—tough on the people but yet not a depression like the 1930s. Still, the question nags: How long can such inflation go on?

These, we think, are some of the realistic comments to be made about the long superboom. The Administration and its friends are busily praising the wonders of the New Economics, but whether they know it or not they are in actuality charting the course of a virulent fever.

ISSUES CONCERNING THE 1970 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of important issues which have been under discussion recently concerning the forthcoming decennial census of population and housing. For purposes of moving the dialog forward, I would like to discuss briefly what I believe are four of the major issues: First, voluntary versus compulsory response; second, the possible invasion of personal privacy versus the Government's need to know; third, the benefits versus the costs of obtaining the particular information; and fourth, who should make the final decisions about the content of the census.

VOLUNTARY VERSUS COMPULSORY RESPONSE

Title 13 of the United States Code provides a fine of not more than $100 or more than 60 days imprisonment or both for any person over 18 years of age who refuses or willfully neglects to answer, to the best of his knowledge, any of the questions on the census of population and housing. This requirement goes back to the first census of the United States, in 1790, and has been incorporated in every census act since that time.

Mr. Ross Eckler, Director of the Bureau of the Census, stated before the House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics that only two persons were prosecuted for willful failure to comply with the 1960 census. Both were fined and both cases were upheld on appeal. To his knowledge, no person has ever been imprisoned for failure to cooperate in the census.

Legislation introduced in June of this year by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] would limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses to the following: first, name and address; second, relationship to head of household; third, sex; fourth, date of birth; fifth, race or color; sixth, marital status; and seventh, visitors in home at the time of census.

The hearings on this bill before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, under its able chairman, Mr. WILLIAM J. GREEN, of Pennsylvania, have been especially helpful in presenting and clarifying some of the major issues.

Although H.R. 10952 would remove the penalty provision for additional questions, it would not prohibit their inclusion. Congressman BETTS believes that a voluntary sample would be workable and that adequate voluntary responses would be forthcoming. On the other hand, Mr. Eckler believes that H.R. 10952 "would devalue the significance and importance of the national census at a time when its results are more critically needed than ever before. It would seriously interfere with the conduct of the census and it would jeopardize the information to be obtained."

Mr. Eckler argues that the voluntary nature would render much of the data virtually meaningless, especially for local purposes, since many persons would not complete the forms for one reason or another unless the Government required them to do so.

THE ISSUE OF PERSONAL PRIVACY

Title 13 of the United States Code also provides for the strict confidentiality of any information furnished under its provisions. Nonstatistical uses of the data are prohibited, as is the publication of data about an identifiable establishment or individual. Any employee of the Census Bureau who publishes or communicates unauthorized census data is subject to a fine of up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 2 years.

Congressman BETTS believes that many of the questions asked in the decennial census, as planned, are of a very personal nature and violate personal privacy. He believes that many of the questions having to do with the quality of housing, mobility, former marriages, birthplace of parents, and work histories are of this type.

Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics concerning the Betts bill, expressed the following viewpoint:

> The real question we need to answer is what and how much information does the Government need to function effectively without an undue intrusion into the personal lives of its citizens. Besides being a population count, the Census has come to be a method for collecting and collating information necessary to make the economic and social predictions on which the future planning and policy of our nation will be based. . . .
>
> The real issue with which we should now be concerned is *not* whether response to a question is forced by law, but rather whether the question violates or threatens to violate privacy in the first place and what happens to the information after it is collected. . . .

I have been informed by the Census Bureau that there have been no known violation nor has any Census employee been charged with divulging confidential information. While the record of the Census Bureau to date is commendable, the points raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] are worthy of close study. I believe the issue of privacy merits more discussion in the Congress, and I hope the Betts bill will give us that opportunity.

BENEFITS AND COSTS OF CENSUS DATA

The Census of Population and Housing should be viewed in its total context. It is central to our entire statistical system—public and private. The Federal statistical system is engaged in transforming inputs of labor and capital into information which has value. Thus, from an efficiency standpoint, a particular type of information should be collected and processed in a manner that it least expensive, most accurate, and most useful for statistical purposes.

Presumably, the information which is most valuable to the country will be produced and the value of the uses of the information will equal or exceed the alternative costs of the resources used. In thinking about the resources used, we should also include the time spent by respondents in completing the questionnaires.

Congressman BETTS has stated that the 1970 census questionnaire, as contemplated, would be excessively long and contain many nonessential questions. He also feels that the response will be incomplete and inaccurate because of the length of the questionnaire, and the fact

that the typical respondent will be asked to complete the form himself and mail it. He has suggested that many of the questions should be dropped and lists four such categories:

First, questions essentially of local interest: place of work, means of transportation to work, number of units at this address; sewage disposal, and source of water.

Second, questions for other Federal agencies to provide statistics: self-employment and income last year, farm income, other income, citizenship, and year of immigration, hours worked last year, and last year in which worked.

Third, questions not significant [enough] to merit inclusion on a decennial census: State or country of birth, activity 5 years ago, number of children ever born, mother tongue, year moved to this house, place of residence 5 years ago, married more than once, and date of first marriage.

Fourth, questions of a commercial nature [which could be] referred to private research organizations for collection of data: heating equipment, telephone, tenure, vacancy status, months vacant, value, contract rent, trailer, bedrooms, automobile, air conditioning, television, radio, clothes dryer, washing machine, bathroom, dishwasher, and second home.

On the other hand, Mr. Eckler has defended the general content of the questionnaire—pointing out that the public and private needs are weighed very carefully. He states:

A question is included only if it is of substantial value for fulfilling significant purposes. The needs of Government are given primary consideration.

Mr. Eckler has at numerous occasions discussed the uses that are made of census data on population and housing. At the hearing, he stated:

They are used extensively in developing, planning, administering, and evaluating programs by Federal, State, and municipal and other government agencies. Census data are used not only in apportionment and districting for national and State legislative bodies, but also for distribution of Federal and State funds, and for a large number of administrative actions. Census data are vital in planning, administering, and evaluating public programs relating to employment, education, health, poverty, urban renewal, and many others. Many government agencies have a need for statistics for specific small areas, such as those in the central cities, rural problem areas, river basins, school districts, State legislative districts, and others. Their need for information is not limited to head counts but covers the range of census data. . . .

The Government Operations Committee of the Senate, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and many other agencies concerned with the urban violence problem have eagerly sought and used such data. Uses by nongovernmental interests and agencies are also considered, but no question is included in the census solely because some private profit or nonprofit group asked for it. . . .

All of the questions included in the census are important. If a question is not important, it should be excluded rather than included but downgraded by being placed on a voluntary basis.

The Federal Statistics Users Conference has stated:

Census inquiries have been dictated by the emerging needs of our society; and those needs have been carefully screened through a comprehensive structure of advisory groups.

WHO SHOULD DECIDE THE CENSUS CONTENT?

Under the present law, the Secretary of Commerce is charged with the responsibility for determining the content of the census. He, in turn, has delegated this function to the Director of the Bureau of the Census. However, census questionnaires are covered by the Federal Reports Act which provides for the review of all Federal Government survey questionnaires by the Bureau of the Budget.

Congress, for its part, has a general oversight function, which in many cases operates informally. For example, the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has held extensive hearings on the 1970 census. I understand that, at least partly because of these discussions, two questions were eliminated from the 1970 census; namely, those concerning the social security number and religious affiliation. The view was expressed that these questions represent a threat to personal privacy.

The job of deciding what items are to be included and how the information can be obtained is very lengthy and technical. The Census Bureau works years in preparing for the decennial census. They consult with mayors, State officials, local planners, and many nongovernment groups, including statistical associations and marketing groups. In addition, there are interagency committees within the Federal Government which have now been meeting over a period of more than 2 years in preparation for the 1970 census.

Some legislators believe that Congress should take a more active and formal role in examining and passing approval on census questionnaires. For example, Congressman GALLAGHER has stated that he is preparing legislation which would provide that, after the Census Bureau has designed a census questionnaire, the final version would be reviewed by an appropriate committee of Congress. The committee would have the power to submit legislation that would delete particular questions from the census. Congressman BETTS also believes that Congress should take a more active role in determining what types of information should be sought from the public.

I believe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] and the others who have taken an interest in this matter deserve the appreciation and encouragement of the Congress. They have raised some basic questions in a constructive manner. Personally, I hope that their initiative will receive an equally constructive and thoughtful response. As a ranking minority member of the Economic Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, these brief remarks today were intended to make some positive contribution to that discussion.

FATHER'S FAREWELL TO HIS SON

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is James J. Kilpatrick's column as it appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, on November 5, 1967. He has eloquently written about a moment in time shared by all parents, and any further comment would be superfluous. I know all of us in the House wish Chris' safe return.

FATHER'S FAREWELL TO HIS SON

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

We drove out to Dulles Airport a little while ago, son Christopher and I, on a morning so beautiful that it might have been specially minted at sunrise. The Potomac was a mirror of burnished bronze and gold, the mist still rising, the Gothic towers of Georgetown shimmering above the quiet river.

On the way to the airport, we made the masking conversation that such occasions demand. Had he forgotten anything? Did he have enough money to hold him for a while? Would he let me have his address, and would he try to write from Subic Bay? It was no, sir, and yes, sir, and aye, aye, sir, and he sat very straight so as not to rumple his dress blues, with that ridiculous and useless white cap firmly centered on his head. It happened to be his twentieth birthday, but we had been over all that, and after a while the conversation dwindled into silence.

It is a long drive out to Dulles. The years went rolling back like road signs, briefly glimpsed and left astern. Probably it is true of every household that the sons are always different. Chris was the quiet one, driven toward the naval service with an intensity of purpose that had its exasperating aspects. When he should have been studying chemistry, he was reading Morison instead; he could not conjugate a French verb, but he could name every ship at Midway. He used to leave his room littered with great fleets of cardboard vessels, toothpick gunned, meant to sail on plywood seas.

The road signs rippled by: The November he was 12, and broke his leg in an auto accident, a compound fracture and not a tear shed; the time he got badly gashed in a football game, and had to be carted to the hospital still in shoulder pads and full regalia; the spring he learned to drive. But mostly the memories were of Chris and the Navy—a cadet cruise on the Geiger, ten days on the Sussex County, the time he was sworn into the Naval Reserve, the summer he survived boot camp at Great Lakes.

Now, active duty; and training school behind him, the minutes to flight time ticking past. It had been a good leave—long walks in the mountains, with the collie puppy frolicking at his heels; some old books reread, some favorite girls revisited; and one night there had been a bull session that went on for hours, from God to sex and back to God again.

We had talked about the hippies that evening, about the meanings of amorality, the conflict of liberty and order. Chris had watched the recent Pentagon demonstrations on TV, his young face frozen in contempt. "Give it to 'em," he kept exhorting the stoic troops. "Throw 'em out!"

On the way to Dulles, we had circled the Lincoln Memorial, where the Pentagon march began. How had it happened, we wondered aloud, that a self-respecting government could have permitted this pusillanimous rabble to carry out its obscene seige? Was this the "freedom" that servicemen are committed to defend? Freedom to defile? Freedom to profane?

As a general proposition, a political columnist ought to stick to impersonal comment on political affairs. Forgive me if I drive

out to Dulles today with Chris, thinking of slack-jawed demonstrators who burn their draft cards and wave the flag of the Viet Cong; and glancing sidewise at a son who yearns to fight in Tonkin Gulf. A million other fathers know the moment. I mark it for us all.

Saarinen's stunning airport loomed ahead, graceful as a bird in flight. Chris swung the bulky seabag to his shoulder. The flight to San Francisco was ready for boarding. In our household, long-distance comings and goings have ceased to be a novelty. There seemed nothing special to say, even on his birthday, even on the occasion of his first active duty at sea.

"Be a good sailor," I said, and hit him on the arm.

"Aye, aye, sir." He grinned and made a mock salute, the seabag bouncing, and at the steps he turned and waved. It will be a year before he comes again on leave.

ANNIVERSARY OF BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sad commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution as a tragic day for the free people of the world. There is really no cause to celebrate the day when the light of freedom was extinguished for millions, but the world's democracies should observe this occasion as a stark reminder of the threat of communism.

This is an excellent day to caution those who support trading with Communist countries in the vain hope that two such remarkably opposite ideologies can build meaningful bridges uniting them. I regard it as sheer hypocrisy for the United States to feed the mouth that has made no secret of its intention to bite us—and ultimately bury us.

By trading with the Communists, we are, in effect, freeing large sections of their labor force to develop the weapons they are providing the Vietcong to use against American boys. Today provides us with an opportunity to renew our dedication to freedom and our unfaltering opposition to the ruthless oppression of communism.

ARTHUR WASKOW, APPARENTLY A FRIEND OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the name of Arthur I. Waskow has come up on several occasions during the past few years and I am unhappy to note that Waskow is again in the center of controversy.

Mr. John R. Immer, president of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, has written to President Johnson concerning Waskow and administration approval and support of him. To date the letter has not been answered but I would like to include it here regardless of the date of the President's response, along with several other illuminating facts about this radical leftist.

Unfortunately, administration and Government dealings with persons such as Waskow who oppose the policies of the Government concerning Vietnam are not unique. Possibly, the degree to which members of the Johnson administration have supported this man recently is a new high.

At this point I include the letter from Mr. Immer to President Johnson. It gives the details of the controversy and the persons who are directly or indirectly supporting Waskow:

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
November 3, 1967.

In re support of extremist leader by the President's official Cabinet, while the President criticizes such critics of our Vietnam policy publicly.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have criticized critics of your Vietnam Policy, as has Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, House Speaker John W. McCormack and many others. Personally I have been a strong supporter, and continue to be a strong supporter of our Vietnam policy.

However, I cannot understand the support your Cabinet officers, and members of the Supreme Court are giving here in Washington, D.C., to one of the bitterest critics of your foreign policy. I refer to Arthur I. Waskow, secretary of the Adams-Morgan Community Council. Mr. Waskow was elected secretary of the Adams-Morgan Community Council October 9, and your Cabinet officers and their wives are working with Mr. Waskow in the presentation of "Camelot" at the Warner Theater on November 8.

Did they give any thought to Mr. Waskow's background as—according to the *New York Times*, a leader in organizing the militant new National Conference for the New Politics? It has also been widely reported that Mr. Waskow was a leader in the recent march on the Pentagon which was resisted by the Armed Forces at a cost of $1,000,000. He is also a leader in the Institute for Policy Studies at 1520 New Hampshire Avenue—right next door to the Woman's National Democratic Club. Apparently, the Democrats get along very well with the radical, militant New Left which is out to destroy you and your great Democratic Party, which is out to destroy our foreign policy, and which openly gives—as you and your Party leaders have well said—aid and comfort to the North Vietnam Communists.

Among the patrons listed by Mr. Waskow for the Camelot presentation on November 8 are: Mr. Justice Fortas and Mrs. Fortas; Secretary McNamara, Navy Secretary Ignatius; Attorney General Clark; Postmaster General O'Brien; Interior Secretary Udall; Secretary Weaver; Under Secretary of State Rostow (who had clearance difficulties); Under Secretary of the Army McGiffert; Under Secretary of the Navy Baird; Under Secretary of the Air Force Hoopes; Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge; and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. In view of this array of top Federal officials working with and sponsoring Mr. Waskow and his New Left activities—and the tax write-off for the Institute for Policy Studies which brings Government officials and the Stokely Carmichaels together, according to their own statements—no wonder our troops in Vietnam must be confused and must wonder about the sincerity of the support given by your Cabinet officials and Supreme Court appointees. There ought to be a searching inquiry and a house cleaning, and an immediate explanation of your Administration's support of Waskow and his ilk, to the American people and the troops fighting and dying in Vietnam.

There are a couple of other facts which show how your Administration deals with these matters—which have given aid and comfort to our enemies in Vietnam and left your supporters here at home completely mystified.

For instance, When Vice President Humphrey recently toured the Adams-Morgan area he didn't meet with the businessmen and the middle-class Negro and white citizens in the area. He took particular pains to meet with several citizens from the area a number of whom are known as black power militants. Is the Vice President, as your assistant, as leader of the Senate and its President, the Vice President of all of the people or only those who are your bitterest critics.

Furthermore, the Adams-Morgan Community Council has been given charge of the summer program and has charge of hundreds of thousands of dollars of appropriated funds made available by such Congressionally-funded agencies as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the D.C. Recreation Department. In fact, the Federal Government has demanded and required that the UPO (United Planning Organization and its agencies) stay out of the Adams-Morgan area and that the District government work with the Adams-Morgan Community Council and, as a result, all Federal and District funds are channelled through the Adams-Morgan Community Council, which has proved disastrous.

The situation in the entire area is chaotic as a result. The *Washington Post* reported on the terrible situation at the Morgan School which the Federal policy insisted the District Board of Education turn over to the Adams-Morgan Community Council. The children of the Adams-Morgan area are being cheated out of a quality education. The teachers maintain no discipline, are Hippies, use vile language, do not maintain discipline, have had little or no teaching experience and have and are using untried teaching methods. The *Post* article was published October 26 and was titled "Staff, Control Issues Beset Morgan School". This has not been an isolated incident. White children of Foreign Diplomats have been beaten at the new $2,000,000 Abraham Lincoln School which serves the Adams-Morgan area, and the situation has gotten so alarmingly out of hand that the *Washington Post* sharply called for immediate remedial action in an editorial fittingly titled "Anarchy at Lincoln" on October 27, 1967.

It is clear that the Federal support from the Cabinet officers and Supreme Court Justices down to the District Government and Congressionally-funded OEO, D.C. Recreation Department, Housing Division, and other agencies has proved to be a disaster. This is inevitable under the Waskow-type thinking which dominates the Adams-Morgan Community Council, which is bent on creating chaos.

Isn't it high time you instituted an Administration policy to request your Cabinet officers, and other Administration officials—including Vice President Humphrey—to make certain that they not work hand-in-glove with our American enemies here at home? Before any Federal employee is assigned to a sensitive position he is given an FBI scrutiny. No disloyal American can be employed by the Federal Government. Why then, should you permit top Cabinet officers to work with a Communist-supporter like Ar-

thur I. Waskow? There are scores and hundreds of loyal Negro and white supporters of your Administration in the Adams-Morgan area—why don't you demand that your Administration officers work with them instead of, as now, ignoring them and work instead with Waskow? Especially in view of his entire record—which is well-known and documented. Why not support jobs, housing, and the subway, all in the NCPC's 1985 for Adams-Morgan, instead of flag burners?

Respectfully,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

The stripe of Waskow is indicated by the groups with which he affiliates. As an example, the SDS radical education project. This is a call to radicals for total involvement in all phases of left-wing discontent, Waskow, as an adviser to REP, presumably subscribes to the following stated beliefs of the group:

That the great promise of American abundance is perverted and thwarted by the functioning of contemporary capitalism.

That anti-communism is a central element in this ideological manipulation of belief, of what is true, what is good, what is possible, what is necessary. It provides the cover to "rationalize" the most brutal applications of military and economic power.

That in America where formal democracy is highly developed, the important decisions governing the course of social developments and the quality of individual life and opportunity are not democratically made or accountable.

That violent revolution is to be recognized and deplored for its high human cost; but that where the oppressed lack political power overthrow may be the necessary though not the sufficient precondition to economic and political freedom.

This is but one of the radical positions taken by Waskow. Add to this several articles in the underground, Washington Free Press, one of which, in September of this year, gave advice on how to avoid paying telephone excise taxes, which Waskow said were extended by the President "solely in order to pay for the war." He ended his tirade with these choice words:

If all this seems a little troublesome, remember, the napalm goes on every day, month in and month out; the children keep dying; and we are paying to kill them.

The author of several books on disarmament, Waskow is also credited with proposing—according to the National Guardian—"nonlethal wars." No weapons, but spying, infiltration, bribery, and so forth, would be allowed. One wonders whether the South Vietnamese would approve of 100 million "infiltrators" from Red China.

This must be the advice Waskow gives to cohorts in marches on Washington, National Conference for New Politics, Faculty Committee To Stop the War in Vietnam, National SANE, and the fringe groups which he condones, including DuBois Clubs, May Second Movement, and Women Strike for Peace.

With this as background, Mr. Immer's letter to the President calls for a response, and soon. Without a public disassociation by administration leaders from Waskow it amounts to approval and another instance of the administration cooing out of both sides of its collective mouth.

Let me conclude by inserting an article concerning Waskow by columnist Edith Kermit Roosevelt:

WASHINGTON "THINK FACTORY" TRAINS EXTREMISTS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

A Washington based "think factory" helped train Stokely Carmichael and other extremists who incite violence in American cities. It's the Institute for Policy Studies, a tax-exempt organization of supposed "scholars." Educational research serves as a cover for intrigue and political agitation.

Through its conferences and seminars, the Institute for Policy Studies, located at 1502 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. exerts a continuing influence on the ideology and tactics of "the New Left." It serves as a model for a network of so-called "research" institutes and think factories that operate thoughout our nation.

In its report titled "The First Three Years of the Institute for Policy Studies, 1963–1966," the Institute revealed that Carmichael, then of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and a Howard University student, participated in its civil rights seminars held in January-May 1964. The term "civil rights" which most Americans favor, is used nowadays as an umbrella for every sort of anti-democratic and anti-American activity.

In June of 1965, according to its report, the Institute hatched a Conference on Youth in Politics, under the chairmanship of Arthur Waskow and Robb Burlage, two of its Resident Fellows. The participants were Robert Parris (Moses), Donna Richards and Courtland Cox of SNCC, and Thomas Hayden, Phil Hutchings, Terry Jefferson, Mrs. Bessie Smith and Connie Brown of the Newark Community Union Project, and other activists in the so-called "freedom movement."

Waskow, a senior staff member of the Institute for Policy Studies, is an advocate of what he calls "creative disorder." Creative disorder means the use of illegal or nearly illegal techniques to force revolutionary changes in society. Examples given by Waskow range from the popularized lunch counter sit-ins of the early 1960's to the 1967 drive in the Quaker movement to send medical aid to North Vietnam. For example, before the Newark riot, the Institute invited activists to view virtual training films in community organization in Newark and to attend a seminar on "Poverty, Politics and Power."

This sort of indoctrination for young people, followed by agitation and anarchy, has been largely financed by grants to the Institute for Policy Studies from tax-exempt foundations. The contributing foundations as listed by the Institute in its 1964 report and 1963–1966 reports are the Ford Foundation, the National Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, Institute for International Order, the Milbank Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, Edgar Stern Family Fund, Fontenay Corporation, Joseph Ziskind Trust, Palisades Foundation, Community Research and Development, Inc., and the Samuel Rubin Foundation.

Foundation money has also helped the work of the Institute in shaping much of the strategy for the forthcoming "Peace" Party. The groundwork for this so-called Peace Party was laid out by advocates of civil rights, peace, and Communism at a five-day meeting in Chicago. The Convention was called by the National Conference for the New Politics, the latest in newly formed organizations with deceptive titles. They constitute the new united front, with penetration in depth by the Communists.

In a position paper prepared for the Chicago Convention entitled "Toward a Radical Tammany," Waskow, senior staff member of the Institute for Policy Studies urges that priority be given to what is in effect the established guerrilla warfare technique of creating "parallel institution." In this instance Waskow suggests training nurses, teacher aides and others who when refused jobs would "sit-in" at the premises of their prospective employers, thus forcing their employment or arrest.

Another suggestion of Waskow is the creation of community institutions such as citizens groups to police the police, schools supposedly controlled by the students, and law firms that will cater to those in trouble over such an approach. In effect, what is outlined is an entire framework of a shadow government with shadow institutions.

The Institute for Policy Studies serves as a meeting place for Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) activists according to the underground "Washington Free Press," circulated here. The Institute also trains SDS members wishing to pursue the "activator vocation," a euphemism for revolutionary action.

Lee Webb, a past student of the Institute for Policy Studies, is a former national secretary of SDS. Todd Gitlin, past president of SDS and present Coordinator of its Peach Research and Education Project, was a fellow of Waskow's Peace Research Institute before it changed its name to the Institute for Policy Studies.

The influence of the Institute for Policy Studies extends beyond the radical elements outside Government. Congressional assistants and Federal Government officials participate in the Institutes comprehensive seminars on civil rights, new political structures, foreign aid, foreign policy, defense and disarmament, poverty, housing and urban planning and education and welfare. This gives Institute activists access to Government secrets as well as the opportunity to influence opinions and political developments.

We saw evidence of this summer when a faction among the temporary employees of the Congressional offices met and passed an anti-Vietnam war resolution. Obviously, the Institute is in a position to infiltrate persons into Government agencies who are indoctrinated in revolutionary ideology.

These agitation-propaganda networks function outside the institutions of a democracy. Their constituency is the rootless, urbanized mass whom they professionally mobilize around such simple slogans as "peace, jobs and freedom" and "everything for the kids."

AN HONEST REPORTER AT LAST

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the absolute deception of most of the Washington press corps in calling Walter Washington the "mayor" of the Nation's Capital. They know full well that this is a misrepresentation. Some of the news media have said that it is hard to get the word "commissioner" in a headline, but this is a phony argument. It is not difficult or impossible to mention that correct title on radio or TV programs or carry the proper name in the body of a story.

Many of us have been looking for the honest reporter who would properly refer to Mr. Washington. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I mean no discredit to Mr. Washington. He knows what he is and, as far as I know, has not called

himself something he is not. From what I have gathered and have heard in his TV interviews, he is a quite impressive person.

Viewing the Washington press corps, one is inclined to opine that Diogenes might come to Washington looking for an honest reporter and 30 minutes later would be looking for his lamp.

Last night, I did finally witness an honest reporter. There may be others, but the first I have run into is Tony Sylvester who, on his 11 p.m. report on channel 9, gave a very good news report on Commissioner Washington and, guess what, referred to him by his right title. It did not impair his news reporting and, in fact, Mr. Washington's proper title sounded good.

Thanks, Mr. Sylvester, for proving that there is at least one honest man on the Washington press corps.

CHET HUNTLEY'S PLAIN TALK ON BRITISH SOCIALISM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Chet Huntley gave a very succinct appraisal of British socialism in his NBC feature, Plain Talk, which was carried on July 27, 1967. I heard the program and was so struck by its candor and truth that I wrote and asked for the script of his message. He promptly sent it, and although I have delayed bringing it to the attention of the House, its timeliness is just as obvious today as when delivered more than 3 months ago.

On October 31, I included with my remarks an article from Barron's which pulled no punches in outlining the decline of the British industrial state. What two world wars were unable to do, the Labor Socialists have done in a few short years.

Mr. Huntley's remarks are particularly germane. He points out that in the modern welfare state, something has gone awry in communications. The benefits are preached from the rooftops, it would seem, but the obligations and costs are little known. To use his words:

> There was too much publicity about the gains for the individual out of the welfare state and too little concerning the obligations. The result has been that the British have been living beyond their means and the nationalization of steel is going to make no difference.

Mr. Speaker, it is no pleasure to say "I told you so," particularly when it comes to the welfare and fate of your own nation. For some years now, many of us have been pointing out the crash course on which this Nation is headed under the bankrupt liberal policies of this administration. I do note recently that the scoffers are amazingly silent, however, and even the diehard planners and liberal economists sense the impending havoc they have wrought on our great Nation.

The Chet Huntley feature follows:

EMPHASIS, PLAIN TALK

Chet Huntley, Emphasis, Plan Talk.

Tomorrow a long and excruciating agony will come to an end in Britain: our friends on the other side will nationalize their steel industry for the second time in 18 years. That says something: the Labor Government, in spite of the fact that it came into office with a promise that it would nationalize the steel industry according to the scripture of Karl Marx, has taken several years to bring itself to the awful decision. Now it nationalizes the industry with a minimum of promises and with a wry countenance.

The steel industry is a barometer of the decline of the British economy. One central fact tells a major portion of the story: three times as many employes are required in Britain to pour a ton of steel as are needed in the United States. British steel production fell substantially last year. The industry went into a recession, with little prospect of recovery; and no wonder, since the ominous threat of nationalization was hanging over the heads of the steel management.

The British steel industry reflects the extent to which a nation can get caught up in the habit of living beyond its means. The British have installed the so-called "cradle to the grave" social security system. All of that adds to the price of steel. Furthermore, British labor, in order to make work, has inflicted upon management a wilderness of featherbedding contracts. To make more jobs, British labor has fought virtually every technological improvement which might reduce the cost of labor.

But not all of it can be laid at the doorstep of labor. British industrial management has been complacent. At this late stage of the game, there is a wide gap between British ownership and British industrial management. But here again we get back to attitudes of government. The present-day British industrial manager, representing the owners in all their corporate numbers, is inclined to bow to the tune out of Whitehall, and there the climate is not conducive to competitive British industrialism.

Something has gone awry with communications in the modern welfare state. The moment the various welfare programs are put into practice, there is no agony, whatsoever, about making their services known. On the other side of the coin, however, it becomes almost impossible for the state to communicate the notion, or the fact, that those programs have to be paid for. There is no sure way that the welfare government can get its people to work a little harder, to produce more, to trim wage demands, or to trim their new standard of living. There was too much publicity about the gains for the individual out of the welfare state and too little concerning the obligations. The result has been that the British have been living beyond their means and the nationalization of steel is going to make no difference . . . it will mean that a once-vital industry is now more in the doldrums than ever as it substitutes bureaucracy for disinterested management.

FURTHER TESTIMONY ON THE NEED FOR TITLE IV OF THE EOA AMENDMENTS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are many problems that confront any small businessman in America. The problems for businessmen from minority groups and those in our ghetto areas are compounded far beyond the normal difficulties. Some of this was discussed by Julius Hernandez, executive director of Lower Manhattan Small Business Development and Opportunities Corp., in a prepared statement delivered before the social and economic development Mexican-American cabinet hearings in El Paso, Tex., on October 28, 1967.

Mr. Hernandez said:

The Mexican American in his native land has been exposed and involved in the full range of business and industrial activity common in the United States. He has complete freedom and opportunity of maximum participation in the business development of his country. However, although he has brought with him this tradition of entrepreneurship, this has not been his experience in the United States, especially the Southwest. As with other ethnic and minority groups, his limitation of expression in the English language, education, attainment and lack of work capital has made the Mexican American enter into small family types of retail and service business operations, almost to the exclusion of manufacturing operations. Consequently, the Mexican-American businessman has yet to make an impact upon the industrial sector. In addition the lack of opportunity and apathy has aggravated the situation. Further, no effort has really been made to bring him into the mainstream of economic life.

It has been proven, under specialized business programs, that with the proper orientation, know-how and accessibility to adequate financing, the economic development of the Mexican-American community can be strengthened and expanded. This development provides an opportunity for the furtherance of manpower resources for the unskilled and the frequently unemployed; for the orientation in and training of business skills; and for the advancement to managerial and executive positions which will generate leadership and new opportunities for the entire community.

Mr. Hernandez went on to say:

Thus, it is clear that until a substantial group of financially sound businessmen grows within the community, considerable help in these practices must come from an organized effort both from within the community itself and also from outside sources. However, the only program that has been meaningful to the small businessman is scheduled to be phased out. This is the small business development program. A substitute program passed by the Senate and being considered by the House under Senate Bill S. 2388 adequately fills the void.

Mr. Hernandez called for support of title IV when he urged that—

This conference support and recommend the passage of the Senate version of the Small Business amendment to the Economic Opportunity Bill, S. 2388, wherein there is a provision to improve the Small Business Program and provide substantial and meaningful funds to effectively carry out a program to assist small businessmen financially and technically, especially those in poor ghetto communities.

In closing, I would like to say that the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities have problems which are basically the same, with very few exceptions. Our problems can be more effectively and dynamically resolved by amalgamating our forces for the benefit of our communities. The recently proposed bilingual educationa. legislation by Congressman Scheuer of New York and Sen. Yarborough of Texas is an example of our bilateral and concerted efforts

to support and foster legislation of mutual interest.

I have always been a proponent of programs initiated, administered and staffed by the people affected. It is only through the efficient operation of these self-help programs we can really tackle the problems and find resolutions to same. My office, the Lower Manhattan Small Business Development and Opportunities Corporation, has, and I say this very candidly, tried to relate itself intimately with the Puerto Rican community.

An insight into these problems was also supplied in a proposal submitted by the City of Philadelphia Fellowship Commission of the Drexel Institute of Technology. In that proposal, appendix A, an expanded discussion on developing opportunities for small business, states:

Small business occupies an important place in American life. The versatility of products and services offered contributes greatly to the economic strength of the United States. The mortality rate of small business, however, is high. The losses to both owners and creditors is appalling, resulting in human distress and frustration.

It is therefore important to study the various factors that make for business success and for business failure. Although much statistical data is available about both these topics, there is comparatively little that relates to that lowest segment of small business, those firms which are owner-operated, "with not more than three paid employees." For our purpose, Small Business is defined in a much more modest fashion than it is by the Small Business Administration. We are concerned with businesses whose total assets do not exceed $50,000 and especially with those whose net worth may be from practically nothing to no more than $10,000 or $15,000—sometimes entitled "Little Business."

Philadelphia has traditionally been noted for the number, diversity and achievements of small business firms. Unemployment in Philadelphia could be reduced materially if a large number of small businesses could be launched in those fields of activity in which the chances of success are large. Our study will be focused on small business in the specific area of Metropolitan Philadelphia. Nevertheless, we find that the variety of businesses here is essentially similar to those throughout urban America.

The problems are: first, how can an individual or small group having limited capital, say not over $15,000, get into a business; and second, once the business is started, how can it be managed so that it will become profitable? To succeed in both of these respects requires much planning, which means that our would-be businessman must act with almost special talents, and he may need more money than he had originally assumed.

The problem of the viability of firms of such modest dimensions is much graver than of firms with somewhat larger financial resources, which are still classified as "small business." The businessman must be aware—or made aware—of the pitfalls that force two out of three businesses to die within two years after the business starts. A small new enterprise, with limited capital, must struggle to survive the harsh competition of business firms that are financially stronger, with resources and experience far beyond the reach of this small concern.

Small Business means many types of activities, ranging from a carpenter or painter to a bustling neighborhood store or to a thriving automobile mechanic's shop. The businessman we are considering is not limited in his activities to any type of business. He, even with marginal capital, can enter into a wide variety of enterprises. For instance, many manufacturing processes can be handled by a small businessmen; or he may assemble manufactured components, and market the finished product; or he may become a manufacturer's representative.

We shall also be interested in retail business, for so many individuals are attracted into the various lines of stores. The profusion here seems endless. Special problems, however, arise in this area that interest us. For example, what happens to the neighborhood store as it competes with chain stores and supermarkets? How does a small enterprise fare in a shopping center? How successful are concessions in a department store or in a "farmer's market" when run by an individual?

In the numerous enterprises that may be classified as wholesale business are found many small firms. Again, certain activities in the business of transportation, whether for industry or for the consumer, lend themselves to profitable sources of livelihood for individuals with modest capital.

In the construction industry, an abundance of small concerns with exceedingly limited capital engage in a variety of activities. Home repairs and alterations have been profitable sources of livelihood for many enterprising individuals.

We shall find it useful to examine commercial services, ranging from brokers to bookkeeping to printing, and consumer services, such as electrician, TV service, or shoemaker or a cleaning and dyeing establishment.

To understand the problems of the variety of independent business, it will be necessary to examine not only the type of activity and its functional classification, but very often the geographic location.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE—POLL

Mr. AREND S. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the views of the people I am privileged to represent are most valuable to me. It is, therefore, my custom to ask all of my constituents to express their views—and make them count—by participating in an annual questionnaire poll.

Questions in my 1967 questionnaire, being mailed this week, were formulated by the graduate students in the department of political science at the University of North Dakota. They have included a number of questions regarding the political views, age, income, occupation, and education of the respondents because they feel it will help them to more fairly evaluate the final tabulations.

The students did an outstanding job in drafting the questions and I insert them in the RECORD at this time. I will, of course, publish the results of the poll as soon as it is tabulated.

INTERNATIONAL MATTERS

1. Would you favor increasing trade in non-strategic goods to improve relations with:

____The Soviet Union?
____Other East European Communist nations?
____Both?
____Neither?

2. Which of the following policies would you favor regarding U.S. involvement in Viet Nam?

____Maintain the present policy.
____Increase bombing and extend ground operations.
____Halt the bombing and seek negotiations.
____Total withdrawal.
____Appeal to the United Nations for settlement.

3. In your opinion, what country is most friendly toward the United States?_____

4. Which of the following nations would you back in the Middle East situation?

____Israel.
____Egypt.
____Neither.

5. If you chose Egypt or Israel in the above question, to what extent do you feel the U.S. should officially support that nation?

____Moral support only.
____Economic support only.
____Military support only.
____Economic *and* military support.

NATIONAL MATTERS

1. Several legislative proposals to restrict the sale of firearms have been made. Which would you prefer?

____ Prohibit the mail-order sale of all firearms.
____ Prohibit the mail-order sale of hand guns only.
____ Permit the sale of firearms to persons who hold a valid local permit only.
____ Place no further restrictions on the sale of firearms.

2. Also under consideration is the question of the registration of firearms. Do you feel:

____ That all firearms should be registered?
____ That only hand guns should be registered?
____ That there should be no registration of firearms?

3. There has been considerable discussion recently concerning highway safety. Which of the following measures would you like to see become law? (Check any or all of the following:)

____ Compulsory periodic mechanical inspection of all cars.
____ Compulsory periodic physical examination of all drivers.
____ Compulsory retirement of drivers over a certain age.
____ Stricter laws dealing with intoxicated drivers. (Making blood tests compulsory for suspected drivers, for example.)
____ Stricter requirements for obtaining a driver's license.
____ Lowering the speed limit to a maximum of 50 m.p.h.
____ None of the above, or other (specify) _____

4. The Selective Service System is a point of much discussion. Which do you feel would be most desirable?

____ Abolish the draft, increase pay and rely on volunteers for the military forces.
____ Select men for the service by means of a lottery.
____ Establish compulsory military training for men at age 19.
____ Leave the system the way it is now.

5. In view of present conditions, both domestic and international, would you be in favor of or opposed to the proposed tax increase?

____In favor of.
____In favor of, if accompanied by significant spending cuts.
____Opposed to.

6. In order to combat increasing crime, would you:

____Expand the FBI to form a national police force?
____Approve the formation of a new national police force?
____Improve local police effectiveness through local action?
____Improve local police effectiveness through Federal grants and assistance?
____Make no change?

7. In view of the recent Supreme Court decisions with respect to individual rights, do you feel the Court:
____Has over stressed the right of the individual to the detriment of society as a whole?
____Is attempting to bring the rights of the individual into balance with the rights of society?
____Has not done enough for the rights of the individual?
____Other: _____

8. Recently there have been riots in many American cities. What do you feel is their major underlying cause?
____Unemployment and substandard living conditions.
____Outside agitators.
____A basic disrespect for law and order.
____Biased law enforcement.
____Other: _____

9. Other than Viet Nam, which problem facing the government and the country are you most concerned about at the present time?
____Cost of living, inflation.
____Civil rights, racial issues.
____Taxes, government spending.
____Social welfare programs, Medicare, Social Security.
____Farm problems, farm prices.
____Foreign affairs, foreign aid.
____Labor problems, unemployment.
____Crime, juvenile delinquency.
____Trends in government.
____Schools, education.

10. What methods would you suggest the government use to solve the above problem which concerns you most? _____

11. Which of the following possible Republican Presidential candidates do you feel is the strongest?
____ Nixon?
____ Percy.
____ Lindsay.
____ Reagan.
____ Rockefeller.
____ Romney.
____ Other _____

12. Which of the following possible Democratic Presidential candidates do you feel is the strongest?
____ Lyndon Johnson.
____ Robert Kennedy.

13. Who would you support for President at this time? _____

14. Do you believe Congress should pass legislation giving farmers power to establish their prices, along with more responsibility for regulating their production and storing any excess?
____ Yes.
____ No.

RESPONDENT'S BACKGROUND

____ Male; ____ Female.

Education: ____ Grade School; ____ High School; ____ Some College; ____ College Degree; ____ Graduate or Professional Degree.

Religious Affiliation: ____ Protestant; ____ Catholic; ____ Jewish; ____ Other; ____ None.

Residence: ____ Always lived in North Dakota; ____ More than 10 years in North Dakota; ____ One to 10 years in North Dakota; ____ Less than 1 year in North Dakota; County _____.

Main Employment of Head of Household: ____ Agriculture; ____ Industry; ____ Professional; ____ Service; ____ Retail or Wholesale Trade; ____ Government, incl. Military; ____ Banking or Real Estate; ____ Retired; ____ Unemployed.

Approximate Annual Household Income: ____ Less than $5,000; ____ $5,000 to $10,000; ____ $10,000 to $20,000; ____ More than $20,000.

Do you normally consider yourself a: ____ Democrat; ____ Republican; ____ Independent.

BIG CITIES' PROBLEMS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read the October 20 editorial in the Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., entitled "Problems of Big Cities, Problems of All America." The editorial noted that our cities are taking the initiative in solving their own problems and are not just waiting for the Federal Government to move in.

This editorial did not deny the need for Federal financial and planning aids to our cities, but they stressed the importance of the participation of the community itself, the municipal governments, the business enterprises, and the ordinary citizen.

It is a most encouraging sign that our cities are not becoming dependent on Federal aid programs. During the next year the Federal Government will channel several billion dollars into urban areas. With our cities willing to take the initiative and to make sure that the Federal expenditures are matched with local efforts, we can all look forward to a better urban America.

So that my colleagues might read this most informative article from the Forum, I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROBLEMS OF BIG CITIES PROBLEMS OF ALL AMERICA

Big things are happening in the cities of America, and they are not waiting for the federal government to move in and do the necessary jobs for them.

They will take all the help they can get in financial and planning aid, but the impetus to get things done has to come from the community itself, from the municipal governments, the business enterprises and the ordinary citizen.

One of the cities where things are happening on a major scale is Chicago, as Mayor Richard J. Daley told the Associated Press Managing Editors convention there Tuesday.

The city of today is concerned with far more than police and fire protection, he pointed out. In the last 20 years municipal government has been transformed from being a housekeeping agency to the point where the mayor is concerned "with poverty and jobs, the kind and quality of education, manpower training and merit employment, civil rights and human relations, welfare of youth and senior citizens, and conservation, rehabilitation and renewal of neighborhoods."

He emphasized that only local government is equipped to solve some of the problems that population growth and scientific breakthroughs have created. "Repetition of goals does not bring accomplishment of programs—only action under well planned programs can do that," he declared.

Even a brief visit to Chicago impresses one with the changes that have been accomplished there. Even the streets are cleaner, for one important thing. And the loop is jammed with people. The downtown is not going out of style, despite the hectic task of driving a car in Chicago traffic.

In Fargo and Moorhead, of course, municipal government has not become as deeply involved in all aspects of the community activity as it has in Chicago. There is a sharp separation of city government and school administration, for instance, but the time may soon come when a closer link between the city boards and the school boards may have to be forged. After all, they both look to the same property taxpayer for the bulk of their tax revenues.

Our problems are not comparable with those in Chicago at the moment, but Mayor Daley's speech made it apparent that the problems of big city America are the problems of all America. It is going to take strong, responsible local government to tackle the jobs outlined by Mayor Daley. A spirit of cooperation under which all urban communities work together for future improvement and progress would be most helpful.

WHY PAY MORE FOR LESS?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, have we finally heard the last of Lincoln-Dickey? I certainly hope so, but I have my doubts. Last October 25, for the third time in the past 2 years, the House voted to eliminate from Public Works appropriations the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric dam project in the State of Maine. Last time, the measure was forced back upon us in conference by the other body with the threat of "no Lincoln-Dickey, no public works bill." Such a threat was enough to get a number of extra votes and so this ill-conceived project was kept alive.

Now there is some danger of this occurring again. It is my hope that the Senate will recognize the House as a coequal partner in Congress, and will not try to again blackjack the House into approving this project. In this time of urban crisis, budget deficit and war, Congress can certainly find a more sensible use for the approximate $380 million which this dam would cost the taxpayer by 1975.

There has been a great deal of talk about how high electric rates in New England are stifling the growth of new industry. This is nonsense. The percentage cost of the electricity used in manufacturing a product is extremely small in comparison to the final value of that product. In the textile industry, the average percentage cost is less than 1 percent. This fact holds true for most industries. Only in a small number of industries in the chemical, rubber, paper, and electrometallurgical fields does the percentage cost of the electricity climb much higher than 1 or 2 percent of the finished product's value. It is not the high cost of electricity that is slowing industrial development in New England. Factors such as the shortage in skilled labor and transportation needs are the principal retardants.

One more point. It is very clear that Lincoln-Dickey is not the answer to cheaper electric rates in New England.

This hydroelectric dam, which would produce a total of 723,500 kilowatts annually, would cost approximately $227 million. This does not include the necessary transmission lines and other costs boasting the estimated total cost to some $380 million. A pump storage power project is presently being constructed at Northfield Mountain in Massachusetts at a cost of only $74.35 million and will produce 1 million kilowatts annually. Why pay more for less?

Last month, when debate over Lincoln-Dickey was still raging, an editorial appeared in the Washington Post favoring the project. The editorial stated one by one a number of reasons why the Post thought the proposal was a good one.

I sent the editorial to the director of the information services for the Public Service Co., of New Hampshire, Mr. Sinville. In his reply, each of the statements made in the Post were refuted, one by one. Although this letter is only a small addition to the large volume of evidence concerning the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric dam proposal, I believe it underscores with particular clarity many of the reasons why the project has little merit. It is true, of course, that Mr. Sinville has a bias, but his points are well made and worthy of consideration. I therefore submit the Post editorial and Mr. Sinville's rebuttal into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 17, 1967]

DICKEY-LINCOLN

Further planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam on the St. John River in Maine now depend on the House-Senate conferees on the public works appropriation bill and it is to be hoped they will act favorably.

The Senate approved the Administration's request for $1,676,000; the House did not approve it. The conferees should follow the Senate's lead. If they do not do so, previous appropriations of $1.9 million for planning this hydro-electric project will be rendered sterile. The project has had trouble in Congress at each appearance, notwithstanding the thorough House study it got in 1965 when it was authorized.

Demand for the plant arose out of the power plight of New England where rates are the highest in the country. Since it was authorized there have been some downward revisions on the mere prospect of the plant. It will surely perform such a "yardstick" service when built. The rate structure has handicapped New England in the competition for new industry. The lower rates of the TVA have enticed into the South some old industries it might have held. Congress, in simple justice, owes New England one such plant.

It has been argued that conventional hydroelectric plants are outdated; but they continue to be essential power suppliers, with a national prospect that capacity of such plants will double in the next 25 years. Plants like Dickey-Lincoln are being built right now. Their usefulness as peak-load suppliers makes them efficient complements to steam or thermonuclear plants. Private interests now are planning a large thermonuclear plant at Wiscasset, Maine, but no one believes that it will be adequate to all future needs in the region. Some voices have been raised against its effect on recreational and wildlife values; but the foremost defenders of such resources support the project as vastly superior to an alternative site that would affect the wild-river program on the Allagash.

The project has been thoroughly studied. It contemplates the addition to the Nation's power resources of an efficient supply that will be available to private distributors, municipalities and cooperatives in a region where there is a deficit and where rates are high.

Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter of October 19 requesting comments on the Washington Post article about Dickey-Lincoln. Each statement in the article is restated below followed by our comments.

Statement: "Demand for the plant arose out of the power plight of New England where rates are the highest in the Country."

Comment: This is not a true or factual statement. Enclosed is a comparison of industrial rates of the whole northeast. It shows that New England is in a favorable position when compared to other highly industrialized sections.

Statement: "It will surely perform such a 'yardstick' service when built."

Comment: To perform a "yardstick" service, Dickey would have to be competitive in the cost of construction and in total cost of producing power in 1975 and it definitely will not be. For example, construction cost of Dickey with associated transmission would be $375.00 per Kw. Public Service Merrimack II will cost $100 per Kw. MK II will operate 24 hours a day. Jet engines of Northfield Mountain pump storage will cost less than $80 per Kw. This type plant will operate during the few hours of peak demand. Enclosed is a copy of the Federal Power Commission press release relating to the Northfield Mountain project. Attention is called to the first and second paragraphs on page 3 which show that the 1,000,000 kilowatt station will cost $74,350,000, or less than $80 per kilowatt.

Statement: "The rate structure has handicapped New England in the competition for new industry."

Comment: Enclosed is a report by the Edison Electric Institute showing the percent that electricity contributes to the total cost of various products. This report clearly shows that the cost of electricity as a percent of the total cost of manufactured products is minor. Industry looking for locations in an area are more interested in:

1. Availability of labor force.
2. Availability of plants and plant sites.
3. Real Estate tax rates.
4. Access to superhighways.
5. Availability of railroad travelling sidings.
6. Access to airports.
7. Type of community.

Statement: "The lower rates of the TVA have enticed into the South, some old industry it might have held."

Comment: Some textile industries did move to the South but not because of the cost of electricity. If they moved to the South only because of the difference in the cost of electricity the most that they could have saved in the total cost of their finished products was less than 1% which is the total cost of electricity to total cost of the finished product. They moved to obtain real estate tax savings, savings in the cost of labor, and construction savings because of tax-free bonds for financing new plants. Enclosed are two statements by General Vogel, Chairman of TVA.

Statement: "It has been argued that conventional hydroelectric plants are outdated, but they continue to be essential power suppliers, with a national prospect that capacity of such plants will double in the next 25 years.

Comment: This statement is the result either of a misunderstanding of the position of the utilities or of a deliberate attempt to mislead by lifting words out of context. The position of the private utilities with respect to hydroelectric power is simple, direct, and understandable. Where new hydro-electric developments can be economically justified when compared with other sources of power, they should be built. However, in the more mature (electrically) New England region, practically all economically justifiable hydro-electric plant sites have been developed so far as conventional hydro plants are concerned. This means that most future growth will come from other sources. There is nothing surprising about this. Already TVA, which started as a 100% hydro-electric system, is now generating more than 82% of its electricity in steam plants. Also, in the Pacific Northwest, where huge government hydro-electric plants like Grand Coulee, Bonneville and others have been constructed, the use of steam power is being planned to take care of growth.

The hydro included in the Big–11 Power-loop is pumped storage which is a type of development that offers much promise for New England. There are many good sites in the area, and it seems clear that additional installations of this type will be coming along in the future.

Statement: "Private interests now are planning a large thermo-nuclear plant at Wiscasset, Maine, but no one believes that it will be adequate to all future needs in the region."

Comment: Enclosed is a progress report on Electric Development in New England that shows that the Maine Yankee Atomic Plant in Wiscasset is only one of eleven plants under construction in New England to be completed by 1972.

There is also a plan for generation and transmission lines for New England through 1990.

Statement: "Some voices have been raised against its effect on recreational and wildlife values; but the foremost defenders of such resources support the project as vastly superior to an alternative site that would affect the wild river program on the Allagash."

Comment: Two years after Dickey is completed, if it is constructed, and the economic boom is over and the neighboring communities have reverted to their present economic status, as they surely will, a decision can very easily be reached as to whether or not it was worth giving up one of the most beautiful of all wilderness areas for a four or five year economic boom.

Statement: "The project has been thoroughly studied."

Comment: If it has been thoroughly studied, what is the need for the $1,600,000 appropriation in this session? None of this money is for construction. If it had been thoroughly studied by competent power people, it would not be considered for construction.

Statement: "It contemplates the addition to the Nation's power resources of an efficient supply that will be available to private distributors, municipalities and cooperatives in a region where there is a deficit and where rates are high."

Comment: If by "efficient supply" the writer means an economical supply, Dickey would not qualify because it would definitely not be economical. Or, if by "efficient supply" the writer means a reliable supply, Dickey would not be nearly as reliable as plants planned near the load center of New England because of the 400 miles power would have to be transmitted and mostly through inaccessible timber lands in Maine.

Comments in previous paragraphs on the construction program of the private companies clearly show that there will not be a deficit of power and power from private companies will be available at reasonable prices to the electric customers of New England.

If you wish any additional comments, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

DONALD E. SINVILLE,
Director, Information Services.

FINDLEY AND RIEGLE WIN PRAISE FOR CONGRESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting article, written by David S. Broder, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. Broder observed that recently "some politicians in Washington are at last beginning to raise into public view the fundamental policy questions involved in the war."

Mr. Broder cites Congressman PAUL FINDLEY for his resolution calling on Congress to formally debate and consider alternative policies to our present course in Vietnam. Broder also makes well-deserved mention of Representative MORRIS UDALL and Representative BRADFORD MORSE for their help with FINDLEY's bipartisan work.

As a cosponsor of the Findley resolution, I, too, approve this trend away from sloganeering and toward meaningful discussion of the Vietnam issue. My colleagues might well remember the recent debate engendered by this resolution which occured on the floor of the House on Monday, October 30. The full record of the debate can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day between pages 30465 and 30479.

In my last biweekly Washington Report to my constituents in New Hampshire, I made the following comments on this interesting and informative discussion over the Findley resolution:

VIETNAM—A HOUSE DEBATE

On September 25, I joined 56 of my colleagues in co-sponsoring on a bipartisan basis a resolution authored by Paul Findley (R. Illinois). The purpose of this resolution was to determine whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to our policies in Southeast Asia. Last week on the Floor of the House, this led to a constructive debate in which many Congressional leaders of stature, including the Speaker himself, participated. Congressman Findley listed 26 alternative policies to our present course, which have been sponsored by leading citizens of this country. There are, of course, no easy solutions to the Vietnam problem, but it is a hopeful sign to have the matter thoughtfully discussed on the Floor of the House. Good debate and deliberation discourages rigidity of thinking and over-simplification of complex issues. The Vietnam issue can and should be debated without sending false signals to Hanoi. I have long felt that Hanoi's misunderstanding of this nation's purpose and resolve began with the unfortunate interjection of the peace issue into the 1964 political campaign. Miscalculation by Hanoi has surely been strengthened since by over-zealous and sometimes disgraceful demonstrations. These may have been caused in part by the lack of candor and clarity of purpose which have accompanied our commitment in defense of South Vietnam. Hopefully, debate on the Findley Resolution will help clear the air, and help make more clear our purpose and resolve: to defend South Vietnam against aggression.

Mr. Broder also praised Congressman DONALD RIEGLE in his article, and I too wish to commend our able colleague from Michigan for his fine work in the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. During the testimony of Rutherford M. Poats, deputy foreign aid administrator and once director of the so-called "other war" in Vietnam, Mr. RIEGLE asked some extremely penetrating questions, and Mr. Poats' subsequent answers shed some new light on the course of our economic programs in Vietnam. Mr. RIEGLE placed extracts of this dialog in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, September 18, and they appear on pages 25753 to 25761. I highly recommend to anybody who has not already done so to take the time to read them.

Mr. Broder's article in the Post this morning appeared as follows:

YOUNG HOUSE MEMBERS SEEK OVERALL VIET STRATEGY REVIEW

Something is happening that could alter the view, often expressed by this reporter, that the louder and longer the debate on Vietnam, the less useful it becomes.

Instead of sloganeering, some politicians in Washington are at last beginning to raise into public view the fundamental policy questions involved in the war.

The effort is not being led by the senior spokesmen for the two parties. Most of them are so committed to specific viewpoints that they are unable to take a fresh look at the issue. Rather, it is the younger House Democrats and Republicans who are bringing fresh thinking and fresh information into the stale Vietnam discussions.

Some 66 of them have joined Rep. Paul Findley (R–Ill.) in a resolution calling for formal congressional debate on the Vietnam alternatives. The discussion of the resolution on the House floor the other day, involving such able younger members as Findley, Rep. Morris Udall (D–Ariz.) and Rep. F. Bradford Morse (R–Mass.), established the fact that despite the Capital's weariness with the topic, there is still fresh food for thought on Vietnam.

The young House members' approach is characterized by an insistence that the whole U.S. strategy in Vietnam, its costs and its consequences, be examined and debated—and not just a single aspect of the war.

An interesting example of this developing drive for a systematic look at Vietnam policy is the work of Rep. Donald W. Riegle, Jr., a 29-year-old freshman Republican from Flint, Mich. Despite his lack of seniority, status and renown, Riegle is making a significant contribution to the process that must precede any intelligent reappraisal of American policy in Vietnam.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Riegle conducted an examination of Rutherford M. Poats, deputy foreign aid administrator, that shed important light on the "other war" in Vietnam, the effort to construct a stable, self-sufficient society.

It is impossible to summarize in a few sentences the testimony Riegle extracted from Poats in their four-hour colloquy. But one can fairly say that it raises serious questions as to whether our "nation-building" program in South Vietnam can succeed without a massive semi-permanent investment both of American money and of American civilian manpower.

The testimony has received too little public attention, but Riegle has circulated it among his colleagues in the House. There, it has become a major text in the debate between those who accept and those who reject the Administration's argument that the United States is simply providing a temporary military shield behind which the Vietnamese are reorganizing and rebuilding their own country.

Now, Riegle has moved on to an examination of the military side of the war and of the Administration argument that the United States has a vital national security stake in Vietnam.

He has unusual credentials for this task. He is, like Secretary of Defense McNamara, a produce of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and, after working in systems analysis for IBM, he discourses easily in the "cost-effectiveness" language McNamara uses to buttress the strategic decisions in Vietnam.

Last week Riegle sent the Secretary a letter that must have been unique in McNamara's huge correspondence from Capitol Hill. Asking for weekly tabulations of 85 specific statistical measures of the Vietnam fighting, Riegle explained, "I have designed an information matrix to collect data that I believe is germaine to the problem."

In reply to his request for a precise statement of the strategic importance of South Vietnam to the defense of Southeast Asia, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard C. Steadman last week wrote Riegle a letter stating:

"From a strictly military viewpoint, the United States does not require control of the land mass of South Vietnam to meet possible further Communist aggression against countries with which we have treaty obligations (although our problems in this regard could be greatly compounded were South Vietnam to be controlled by a government hostile to the United States and its allies.)"

Raising questions is only a first step, of course, but it is immeasurably more useful than most of the shouting that has passed for debate on Vietnam.

THE MAFIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the edition of the Saturday Evening Post that appeared on the newsstands yesterday contains an article entitled "The Mafia, How It Bleeds New England." It tells an indeed sordid story. The Post now joins Life magazine in performing the public service of informing the American people concerning the menace of organized crime. They are to be commended for this.

It is disturbing, however, that magazines have to perform a service—informing the public—that in this area is principally the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Justice. All we hear from Attorney General Ramsey Clark is how minor the organized crime problem really is. Yet with each succeeding magazine story that I read, I come more and more to the conclusion that organized crime is far from a minor problem and that for some reason or another, Attorney General Clark is not telling us all the facts.

Another point to be made about the Post article is that the stated source for most of the material contained in it is FBI eavesdropping devices. This raises the question in my mind as to how magazine writers can get access to this type of information when we in Congress cannot.

Some time ago, the House Republican Task Force on Crime called for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee

on Organized Crime and suggested that the first task of such a committee be the examination of the FBI's logs, tape recordings, and communications concerning its electronic surveillance of organized crime. Our statement did not really invite a reply from the Department of Justice since no such committee had then been created nor has one been created since. Nevertheless, an anonymous spokesman for the Department lashed back at the task force for daring to make even the suggestion that this be done. Now I find that while Members of Congress are not to be trusted with access to these materials, magazine writers are. I applaud their tenacity in this regard but wonder what Congress has to do to be afforded the same opportunity. We, too, have a legitimate purpose to serve.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I quote herewith the text of the Post article:

THE MAFIA: HOW IT BLEEDS NEW ENGLAND—IT IS TAKING IN HALF A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR FROM GAMBLING, HIJACKING, AND LOAN-SHARKING, MURDER IS A SIDELINE

(By Bill Davidson)

Early in 1965 a big, tough, 41-year-old gambler named William Marfeo opened his own dice game in a second-floor apartment in Providence, R.I. He was doing this in defiance of the Mafia, and he knew it. He disregarded several Mafia warnings to close the game. At 11:45 a.m. on July 13, 1966, Marfeo was eating pizza with friends in the Korner Kitchen Restaurant across the street from his gambling operation, when a stocky man wearing a straw hat walked in with a gun. The gunman ordered everyone else in the restaurant to lie on the floor and prodded Marfeo into a phone booth. He closed the door of the booth, fired four bullets into Marfeo's head and chest through the glass walls, walked out of the restaurant and disappeared in the noon crowd.

Just a month before—on June 13—a handsome 26-year-old former boxer named Rocco DiSeglio had dispatched a group of henchmen to one of the Mafia's floating dice games in Boston. His men, holding the gaping crapshooters at gunpoint, scooped $3,500 off the table and made an orderly departure. Three days later DiSeglio was found beaten and shot to death in his new burgundy-colored Thunderbird in a residential section of Topsfield, Mass.

In the ordinary run of criminal affairs freelance thugs do not compete with the Mafia, and they certainly don't barge into the Mafia's sacrosanct dice games and rob the Mafia's guests. The thing that is surprising is that both Marfeo and DiSeglio thought they could get away with it.

Actually, their main mistake may have been that they were slightly premature. The fact is that the New England Mafia, once the very model of a modern major Cosa Nostra family, is coming apart at the seams. Discipline has broken down. Crude shootings are common. So many FBI plants have infiltrated the organization that you can hardly tell the Mafiosi from the informers. The FBI has thousands of reels of tape recordings from a "bug" in the No. 1 leader's office. A hired gunman who has good reason to believe that the Mafia no longer loves him is talking freely to the FBI. And the No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 leaders of the organization are awaiting trial on charges involving murder; they could be imprisoned for many years.

This is not to say that the New England Mafia has gone out of business. It is still raking in half a billion dollars a year from its operations, the Justice Department estimates. But there's trouble at hand and more ahead for New England's Mafia.

"It's like Chicago in the Al Capone days," says John Irwin, first assistant district attorney of Middlesex County, Mass. In the last six years there have been 45 gangland murders in the Boston area alone. The victims have been shot, strangled, beaten to death, beheaded or butchered.

Charles Rogovin, chief of the Organized Crime Section of the Massachusetts attorney general's office, told a visitor recently, "Since I came here from President Johnson's Crime Commission, I feel as if I've been watching old gangster movies. The other families of the Mafia have become much more subtle in their killing. Their victims mostly just disappear—and there's no heat, no hue and cry. But here they brazenly shoot them down at high noon on a busy street."

Where other Mafia families are moving into quasi-legitimate big business and international finance, the main underworld occupations in New England are the old standbys: gambling, loan-sharking and hijacking—all controlled by the bullet in the head or the broken leg for troublemakers. In fact, so feared are the New England Mafia specialists in violence that Mafia families in other cities frequently send for the Boston or Providence boys to do their dirtiest work. The FBI knows, for example, that the "contract" to kill New York Mafia underboss Albert Anastasia, a founder of Murder, Incorporated, was given to Jackie Nazarian of Providence, who shot down Anastasia in a barber chair in a Manhattan hotel in 1957. (Nazarian himself was later killed by gunfire in broad daylight as he left a Providence dice game.) Similarly, out-of-state bombing contracts often go to Joe Puzzangara, a specialist in plastic explosives. Puzzangara is regarded as a gifted innovator—it was his idea to blow up a house by pumping gasoline into its oil-burner tank.

The New England family is small—only about 100 members (the Brooklyn family has more than 500)—but it has controlled crime in its five major centers of operation: metropolitan Boston and Providence, and the cities of Revere, Worcester and Springfield in Massachusetts. According to an undercover agent who penetrated the operation the family accomplished this by making a series of alliances with non-Sicilian mobsters, gamblers and politicians to compensate for its limited number of genuine Mafiosi who have taken the ritual blood-and-ashes oath.

Among the allies of the New England Mafia family are Jews, Greeks, Syrians, Irish, Italians, Lebanese, Portuguese, Germans and even old-line Yankees. They range from low-level paid killers and hijackers to full-time partners in the executive class. Abraham Sarkis, a Syrian, supervises the vast numbers racket in Boston in partnership with Gennaro Angiulo, identified by McClellan committee testimony as the Mafia underboss in charge of all Boston operations. A Jew, Jasper Sagansky, who did time on a federal bookmaking conviction, is Angiulo's partner in running the illegal wire for horse-race results. Other non-Mafia allies hold Mafia "licenses" to operate bookie joints, loan-sharking businesses or establishments for the fencing of stolen merchandise. In return they pay 25 to 40 percent of their receipts to the Mafia. Other allies have territories under "license" from the Mafia. Somerville, Mass., for example, is the preserve of Howie Winter, sole surviving leader of the Irish gangs that once dominated the Boston underworld. Winter pays tribute regularly to Angiulo's men; he meets them in a Boston nightclub called the Nautical Café.

On an even higher level, the New England Mafia has contacts among a group of millionaire pillars of the community, some of them former bootleggers for whom several current Mafia bigwigs worked as bodyguards during Prohibition. There is no evidence that these millionaire businessmen engage in illegal enterprises with the Mafia. But a court-introduced transcript summary of an FBI eavesdropping "bug," planted for three years in the Providence office of New England Mafia boss Raymond Patriarca, revealed that friendly business contacts, at least, continued. One prominent citizen mentioned in transcripts of the bugged talk is Joseph Linsey, financier and a trustee of Brandeis University who has a vast complex of industrial and commercial holdings and is considered one of the most generous philanthropists in the area. He was convicted of bootlegging in 1927 and served a one-year prison term. He still has on his payroll Michael (Mickey the Wise Guy) Rocco, the *consigliere* (elder-statesman counselor) of the New England Mafia. Among Rocco's criminal activities, as described to the McClellan committee, are extortion, mayhem, murder, bribery, burglary, robbery and larceny. Just last wear Rocco, at the age of 71, was convicted of assaulting a federal officer, an Internal Revenue Service undercover agent who had been posing as an Italian waiter in mob-frequented restaurants.

Equally important to the New England Mafia family is its impressive list of allies among the area's politicians. "In the bag," according to informants within the organization, are a highranking state official, a police chief, two licensing officials, a high-ranking court administrator and a handful of powerful state senators and representatives, among others. These contacts enable the Mafia to obtain licenses for taverns and other enterprises through front men—the real owners are not eligible because they have criminal records. The friendly officials pretend not to notice illegal activities; allow late closings of mob-operated joints; switch court cases involving Mafia figures to more lenient judges; and arrange pardons and paroles for Mafia men who are convicted.

In 1963 FBI agents watched the high-ranking state official meet with boss Patriarca in Patriarca's car in the parking lot of a Boston hospital. The meeting is referred to in the transcript of the "bugged" conversations in Patriarca's office. Patriarca was heard complaining to his bodyguard that a stool pigeon obviously had tipped off the FBI—as the FBI paraphrased it, "because they surveilled the hospital and observed Patriarca meeting with various individuals, including [name blanked out]. Patriarca said that he was contacting [name blanked out] in an effort to obtain the parole of Leo Santaniello and Lawrence Baioni" (two Patriarca lieutenants who had been convicted of loan-shark extortion).

The "bug" transcript also includes insights into the lack of police interference with mob activity in many areas of New England. In discussing a new Mafia gambling operation in Biddeford, Maine, a top Patriarca aide told the boss that a Mafia ally "has arranged to pay off the state police," and that he would furnish the identities and amounts paid to individual members of the state police. The aide went on to point out that these contributions had already borne fruit. Members of the Maine state police had obligingly warned the mob of an impending raid and "in view of this, the opening of the operation has been temporarily discontinued."

The "bug" transcript reveals that payoffs to politicians are much more subtle and usually take the form of campaign contributions. In the transcript Patriarca complained bitterly that he had been rebuffed in several attempts to induce Massachusetts ex-Lieutenant Governor Francis X. Bellotti to accept $100,000 in Cosa Nostra money for his compaigns for governor in 1964 and for attorney general last year. Bellotti's honesty went unrewarded. Piqued by his refusal, the mob spread the word that he had taken mob money, and these rumors were a major factor in Democrat Bellotti's defeat in both campaigns. The "bug" transcript (or The Patriarca Papers, as they are called) estab-

lished that the going rate for politicians in New England is $100,000.

With purchased forbearance from politicians and police, it is no wonder that the New England Mafia operated so efficiently for so many years. One of its main sources of income, for example, is a remarkable series of permanent floating crap games and card games in the Boston and Providence areas. These games couldn't last one night if local authorities wanted to stop them. One of them, in Boston, is the same game mentioned by Joe Valachi in his Senate testimony. He said he visited it in 1938, when he first met Raymond Patriarca, then just a lowly "soldier" in the New England family. The dice and card games operate in hotels, office buildings and warehouses. They earn a consistent quarter of a million dollars a week for the mob, according to an informant within the organization; $100,000 of this is Patriarca's personal cut. For years Patriarca's trusted executive officer, Henry Tameleo, journeyed every Tuesday and Thursday from Providence to Revere where, at a nightclub called the Ebb-Tide, he picked up a suitcase of money for "the office," as the mob calls Patriarca's headquarters. The floating games are inviolate, Patriarca's personal prides, and on the three occasions when outsiders dared to interfere with them, they were murdered.

Just as any bartender or bellhop in metropolitan Boston and Providence can direct you to the nearest Cosa Nostra crap game, so he can send you to a Mafia-controlled bookie within a block or so. There is an extensive network of bookmakers in New England, all supervised by the Mafia's Joe Lombardi. Their license fees to "the office"—25 percent of their take—total $6,500,000 a year. The 25 percent includes protection from police harassment, paid for by the mob. The mob also supplies horse-race results from all over the country to its bookie clients (for fees ranging from $5 to $25 per result) from its illegal race wire. Like the crap games, the terminus of the race wire floats, and it pops up in some ingenious locations. Last March, for example, an investigator staked out the Kenmore Hospital, a fully accredited, 58-bed private institution in a good section of Boston, and identified eight known bookies who entered the building in the course of a single afternoon. He also observed many unmarked panel trucks that were parked outside the hospital and were driven away sometime later without making pickups or deliveries. The investigator traced the ownership of the hospital to the Huntington Realty Trust, one of the principal stockholders of which is Gennaro Angiulo, Patriarca's No. 2 man in the New England Mafia. The investigator checked the public records of the hospital's ownership at night. At three o'clock the next morning a moving van pulled up at the hospital and hauled away several large pieces of equipment from the basement. There were no bookies at the hospital the next day—or at any time thereafter.

Perhaps the largest slice of mob income comes from loan-sharking. In the Greater Boston area alone more than 200 loan sharks operate under the control of Mafia lieutenant Larry Baioni. Federal and state authorities say that the income from this lucrative service is a million dollars a week in New England. These loan sharks extort the standard Mafia rate of 20 to 30 percent a week. Their victims are gamblers and others who can't get credit at banks or legitimate finance companies. One victim, a near-bankrupt Boston businessman, told me about the deal he made with a Mafia loan shark. He borrowed $2,000, which he desperately needed to hold onto his retail store. He had to pay $75 a week in interest, which added up to $3,900 interest on the original $2,000 loan by the end of the first year—and he still owed the principal. When he offered to put up collateral for the balance, the loan shark took out a .45-caliber pistol, put it on the table, and said, "Your body is our collateral."

As in all Cosa Nostra enterprises in New England, the trademark of loan-sharking is violence. Charles Rogovin, expert on organized crime for the Massachusetts attorney general, says, "All other Mafia families have a tradition which they call 'stopping the clock.' That is, when you're bled dry, they stop the clock on the interest and just let you give back the principal. They stop short of killing, on the theory that a dead man can't pay. But not here. They're totally ruthless about loan-shark debts. Two thirds of the murders and maimings in New England involve people who have given up the collateral of their bodies to the loan sharks."

In a rare moment of candor Phil Waggenheim, ace "enforcer," or strong-arm man, for Mafia loan-shark boss Larry Baioni, explained to an undercover agent the schedule of punishments for loan-sharking delinquents in New England. "If a man is three weeks late in his vigorish [interest payments]," Waggenheim said, "he gets a broken arm or leg. If he's six to eight weeks late, he has an accident. We fix the brakes of his car, or we run him off the road, or we blow up his house or his business. Sometimes we go to his house and beat up his wife, or we break a leg on his kid on his way home from school. If the guy owes more than $15,000, or if he's arrogant about falling behind in his vigorish, he gets death."

The third major enterprise of the mob is hijacking. The Mafia specializes in stealing entire trailer loads of merchandise from the many truck-transfer depots that dot New England. For loot, it favors color-TV sets, bonded whiskey, sides of beef, produce, and for some strange reason, watchbands (a Mafia lieutenant named Albro Vitali was recently convicted in federal court of being in possession of a whole case of watchbands taken from a sealed freight car in an interstate shipment).

The mob uses country barns and vacant city garages for warehouses. Its "fences" operate from telephone booths at nightclubs, restaurants, barbershops and such, and you can call Big Tony, say, and order a ton of meat or a gross of appliances for cut-rate prices at any hour of the day or night. The hijack-and-fencing specialists also deal in side commodities—a specific make and year of stolen car (up to a thousand dollars below the list price), a legitimate medallion to operate a taxi in Boston ($27,000), and a phony driver's license ($500).

Few activities produce cash as readily as gambling, loan-sharking and hijacking, but even the Mafia can run short at times. Usually the loan-shark money is borrowed at six-percent interest from banks owned by wealthy non-Mafia allies of the organization. But sometimes, in an emergency, the mob taps other supplies. Assistant District Attorney John Irwin says, "Whenever I hear there's a serious shortage of loan-shark money on the street I expect another one of those armored-car holdups we're getting so famous for here in the Boston area." The Federal Government has information that the million and a half dollars stolen in the Plymouth mail-truck robbery in 1962 disappeared into Boston Mafia loan-shark operations within two days after the robbery.

Usually, though, the mob has more money than it needs and must bury its earnings in other enterprises to avoid unpleasantness with the Internal Revenue Service over income its members can't account for. The mob owns hundreds of cleaning-and-dyeing establishments (called cleansers in New England), diaper services, linen services, auto agencies, car-repair firms, drugstores and garbage-collecting firms. At one time it even ran a fleet of sightseeing boats in Boston Harbor. It controls numerous nightclubs, bars and restaurants, ranging from dives—in the seamy Revere area, in Boston's prostitute-ridden "combat zone" and in Providence's run-down Federal Hill—to some of the finest gourmet eating places in New England. The mob owns, or has owned, cemeteries, dude ranches, a New Hampshire ski resort and a country club north of Boston.

Most of these subsidiary enterprises serve a double function for the Mafia. The cleaning-and-dyeing establishments, for example, are handy for over-the-counter bookie and loan-shark operations. A dude ranch or ski resort has outbuildings in which hijacked goods can be stored. What better hiding place for cash and stolen jewels than graves and cemetery vaults? What better outlet for the sale of stolen goods than Arthur's Farm, a tacky roadside "discount house" in Revere, or an innocuous-looking diner near Boston's North Station? What better laboratory for making LSD, one of the newer Mafia industries, than the back room of a late-hours Boston drugstore near three college campuses where customers abound?

The New England Mafia family does not deal locally in heroin and other hard narcotics, but it uses vehicles from its auto agencies and car-rental firms to haul narcotics for Cosa Nostra families in New York—for a fee. Last year the New York state police closed down the regular route for narcotics entering the United States from Canada by putting close watch on Route 9, which runs from Montreal to New York. The New York families immediately established a new route, with the point of entry at Highgate Springs, Vt., and thence, by Routes 7, 89 and 93, across New England. The aid of the New England family was requested, and it has responded, according to informants, by recruting college students to drive mob cars. The heroin is hidden in girls' hairpieces, in the soles of ski boots and, during the summer, in hollowed-out compartments in surfboards.

But narcotics transport is not the only service performed by the New England mob for other Mafia families. The Patriarca group also specializes in fixed professional sports contests and horse races so that the Cosa Nostra's bookies all over the country can make killings on "sure-thing" athletic events. Informants say that there is a regular pay-rate in Boston: $5,000 for a football or basketball star who can come up with an illness or injury, attested to by a physician, that will keep him out of a game; $10,000 to an athlete skillful enough to blow key plays in the game itself. Some athletes, it is said, use these methods to get out of debt to Mafia loan sharks.

The technique with horses is simpler. New England tracks are famous throughout the United States for their so-called "banana races," in which the winner is known in advance to a select few. Because of the "'banana races," many independent bookies refuse to handle any action on New England tracks. The "banana-race" expert in the New England family is Blondy Simonelli, identified in McClellan-committee testimony as one of Patriarca's lieutenants in Providence. Simonelli, who has a long record of arrests and convictions for gambling and illegal possession of weapons, is field representative on New England tracks for the Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association, the all-powerful union of horse owners. Because of his criminal record he was once barred from Rhode Island tracks, but was inexplicably reinstated by the State Racing Commission in 1961.

Col. Walter E. Stone, superintendent of the Rhode Island state police, explains how Simonelli controls races: "Blondy can influence or intimidate owners to enter certain races and drop out of others so that one horse outclasses all the others in a given race. Through his power over the grooms he can arrange for a horse to be scratched at the last minute by coming up lame from a

blister or from a pinched shoe, or by developing colic from something he ate. Blondy's work on the tracks makes a lot of money for the mob."

The overlord of all this illicit commerce is boss Raymond Loreda Patriarca. He is 59 years old, ailing with diabetes and gallbladder trouble, and is indistinguishable in appearance from any number of pizza-parlor countermen. He is five feet seven inches tall, weighs 165 pounds, has a hatchet face and, according to one government agent who knows him, "a nice, shifty smile." He habitually wears white socks (he has complained for years about his "bad feet") and nondescript semiconservative clothing, with only an enormous diamond ring and expensive alligator shoes for show.

For a decade or more Patriarca ran his Mafia empire from a storefront office on Atwells Avenue in the heart of the heavily Italian Federal Hill district of Providence. The storefront also houses Patriarca's vending companies—Coin-O-Matic and the National Cigarette Service—whose machines needless to say, are the only ones used in most Rhode Island bars and grilles. It was in this office that the FBI planted its bug. When Patriarca found out about the bug—after it had transmitted for three years—he moved out of the office and has not entered the building since. He has his headquarters in the Nu-Brite Cleansers store, across the street, and is having its upstairs apartment remodeled, at a cost of $180,000, into a fortress home, presumably bug-proof.

Patriarca has also abandoned his home, a $35,000 white-clapboard house in a quiet, fashionable, mostly Jewish neighborhood in the east side of Providence. He lived there with his wife, Helen, until she died two years ago. Patriarca now has a buxom blonde mistress; they live in a well-protected lakeside cottage near Providence, awaiting completion of the fortress.

Patriarca shows up every day at his office in the Nu-Brite Cleansers to do business behind drawn blinds with a steady traffic of lieutenants. On warm afternoons, however, Patriarca occasionally sits on the doorstep of the Nu-Brite Cleansers to take the afternoon sun. He wears a white sweater, smokes a huge cigar, and waves at admiring passerby. Sometimes he chats with them. Until you notice Rudy Sciara and the other gunmen-bodyguards hovering watchfully in the area, Patriarca looks almost benign. He is not benign.

Patriarca served a routine Mafia apprenticeship, ably executing dirty lower-level assignments in various forms of thuggery to prove himself to his elders. He was born in Worcester, Mass., in 1908, of Sicilian parents. He moved to Providence when he was 18 and apparently was sworn in as a blood brother of the Mafia soon afterward. Phil Buccola was the New England boss then, and Patriarca's criminal record indicates that Buccola quickly tabbed young Patriarca as a comer. The boy was barely 18 when he was arrested for hi-jacking, and then got 30 days for breaking out of jail. After that came a variety of arrests and convictions for bootlegging, gambling, breaking and entering, larceny, suspicion of murder, lewd cohabitation, adultery, auto theft, armed robbery, illegal possession of weapons and white slavery. He served prison sentences of two years for larceny, three years for breaking and entering, 18 months for auto theft, two and a half years for burglary and one year—in a federal penitentiary—for violation of the Mann Act (transporting a string of prostitutes between Providence and New London, Conn.).

One stretch of the long Patriarca criminal record indicates clearly how high he had risen in the Mafia by 1938. He was convicted of burglarizing a Brookline, Mass., jewelry store and sentenced to three to five years in prison. After he had served only 84 days of this sentence, he received a full pardon from the governor of Massachusetts through the good offices of Executive Councilor Daniel H. Coakley. In 1940 a special Massachusetts investigating commission looked into this pardon and found that Coakley was guilty of "deceit and fraud" in pressing the pardon petition. Coakley was impeached. It was the first time a member of a Governor's Executive Council had been removed from office since 1821.

Patriarca was a valuable member of the Mafia, indeed, to require the services of so high-ranking an ally to spring him. It came as no surprise, therefore, that when Buccola decided to retire and return to Italy in the late 1940's, Patriarca became the No. 1 man in the New England family.

Patriarca soon developed an excellent reputation as an administrator not only within his own family but also among the other 11 heads of families with whom he sat on the National Commission, the ruling grand council of the Mafia in the United States. He was given a "piece of the action" in Las Vegas through front men at two of the largest casinos (one of the front men is registered with the Nevada Gaming Commission as a nine-percent owner), and he was cut in on lucrative deals by Mafia families in Florida and Philadelphia. The FBI "bug" transcript reveals that the ruling commission thought so highly of Patriarca that it chose him as the sole referee to adjudicate the bloody war between the Gallo and Profaci factions of the Mafia family in Brooklyn.

Until a short time ago, Patriarca seemed to be riding high. His crime empire was flourishing. His organization seemed airtight. In Providence he had a skilled and trusted executive officer in Henry Tameleo. In Boston, Gennaro Angiulo was a fine underboss, backed up by two knowledgeable elder statesmen in John (Johnny Williams) Guglielmo and Michael (Mickey the Wise Guy) Rocco. Even the outposts were well-manned, with such solid lieutenants as Sam (Big Nose) Cufari in Springfield, Mass., and Cosmo (Pinky) Panarelli in Worcester, Mass.

Patriarca seemed to have solved his manpower problem brilliantly. The commission in 1957 had put a stop on all new Mafia memberships, because it feared FBI infiltration. This ruling had put a strain on Patriarca's unusually small organization; he had a shortage of young hoodlums to do the low-level dirty work. Patriarca got around this by hiring non-Sicilian punks. He called them his "suckers." They were not taken into the Cosa Nostra family as members, but they were paid well, and they did their jobs efficiently. The structure seemed as solid as those of the bigger families in New York and Chicago.

But then, suddenly, the structure began to fall apart. The suckers, who had not been trained in basic Mafia skills, and who had not taken the Mafia oath of *omerta* (silence on pain of death)—got out of control.

It all began in 1961. At that time there were two Irish mobs in the Boston suburbs, one headed by Bernard McLaughlin and the other by Buddy McLean. They operated independently, but under Patriarca's license. One day McLaughlin got into a fistfight with McLean over a girl at Salisbury Beach. McLean beat up McLaughlin, who in turn tried to dynamite McLean's car. McLean then shot McLaughlin to death in broad daylight in City Square in Charlestown. After that the McLaughlin and McLean mobs obliterated each other in a series of killings that lasted into 1965, when Buddy McLean himself was gunned down.

Until then the New England family and its suckers had observed Mafia discretion in their murders. Victims were killed in private and disposed of in rural graves, in Boston Harbor or in automobiles being compressed for scrap. But the McLaughlin-McLean street massacres seemed to embolden and inflame the New England mafia—especially its suckers. Discretion was forgotten. There were rattles of gunfire and bloody bodies all over the Boston and Providence areas. Patriarca was incensed. On January 26, 1965, he was heard to say (via the FBI-planted "bug"), "If the killing doesn't stop, I'll declare martial law." But the killing didn't stop; it became freer and messier, an indication to some crime experts that perhaps the aging Patriarca was losing his grip.

There were 25 well-publicized assassinations in 1965 and 1966. Among them were the murders of gambler William Marfeo and tough-guy Rocco DiSeglio, who had defied the Mafia. There appeared to be very little out of the ordinary about these two executions at the time, but they were to loom very large in the New England Mafia's future.

The Marfeo murder seemed to slow down the pace of the killings for a while, but then a group of the suckers got completely out of hand. The leader of this particular group was Joe Barboza, 34, a savage young man of Portuguese descent who had gravitated to the Mafia in 1959. He had already served two reformatory sentences and a five-year term in prison for a series of house burglaries in New Bedford. At 20 he had led an escape from the Concord Reformatory, an act of leadership that marked him as a comer with Mafia members whom he met later at the state prison in Walpole, Mass. Six months after he got out of Walpole he was working for the Mafia.

On October 6, 1966, Barboza and three colleagues were en route to a Mafia assignment when their car was stopped by police in the heart of Boston. In the car were a fully loaded Army M–1 rifle and a .45-caliber pistol. The four men were arrested for illegal possession of firearms, and Barboza was held in unusually high bail, $100,000, because he already was on bail on a stabbing charge.

At this point there was a highly significant sequence of events. Barboza waited for "the office" to bail him out, as it had done on previous occasions, but this time there was no word from above. Two of Barboza's sucker friends, Thomas DePrisco and Arthur Bratsos, then decided to raise bail for him on their own. They made the rounds of Mafia joints in Boston and had collected $60,000 by the time they reached the Nite-Lite Café in the north end, an establishment owned by an important middle-level Mafia functionary, Ralph Lamattina, called Ralphie Chiong because of the oriental cast of his face. Ralphie Chiong asked Barboza's friends to wait until the nightclub closed, and then he invited them into a back room. The next day both Barzoba emissaries were found shot to death in a black Cadillac in South Boston.

Acting on an inside tip, the police arrived at the Nite-Lite Café shortly thereafter, and they found Ralphie Chiong in the back room, still mopping up bloodstains and attempting to cover holes in the wall with a mirror. There was a bullet in one of the holes, and it matched those in the bodies of DePrisco and Bratsos. Ralphie Chiong was arrested as an accessory after the fact of murder.

A few weeks later a high-level Mafia meeting took place on a Sunday afternoon in the Intermission Lounge in Boston's "combat zone." Henry Tameleo, boss Patriarca's executive officer from Providence, chaired the meeting. He said Patriarca had decided that Ralphie Chiong should plead guilty to the accessory charges, "because there was too much heat over the murders, and he didn't want a trial with a lot of publicity." The decision staggered Ralphie Chiong, but Tameleo assured him: Patriarca had seen to it that he would get only two years, and when he left prison he would get a lucrative enterprise.

Ralphie Chiong went to court and pleaded guilty, but somehow Patriarca's efficiency broke down. Ralphie Chiong appeared before the wrong judge. Instead of a light two-year

term, he got two concurrent maximum sentences of 8 to 14 years. The severity of the sentences attracted a lot of attention in the newspapers.

In the meantime Joe Barboza, the sucker whose bail problems had started the entire sequence of events, was serving a four-to-five-year sentence on the gun charge and faced life imprisonment as a habitual criminal. Still puzzling over his abandonment by "the office," he read about Ralphie Chiong in the newspapers. He nearly went wild in his cell when it finally dawned on him that "the office" not only had abandoned him but also had killed his two best friends.

A short time later Barboza was visited in jail by two FBI agents, Paul Ricco and Dennis Condon. They confirmed what he read in the newspapers, adding details. In later visits they gave him more and more evidence of how the Mafia men had indeed betrayed him, even tipping the police to pick him up on the gun charge—he was potentially the most troublesome of the suckers, and they wanted to be rid of him. Barboza didn't even know that the Mafia men referred to him as a sucker. The clincher came when the FBI agents played tapes made from the "bug" in Patriarca's office. Barboza heard boss Patriarca's voice saying, "Barboza's a —— bum. He's expendable." Barboza then did what he probably never would have done if he had been allowed to become a full-fledged Mafia member under the oath of silence. He talked.

As a result of Barboza's talking, United States Attorney Paul Markham went to the federal grand jury in Boston on June 20 and got an indictment charging that Raymond Patriarca and his executive officer, Henry Tameleo, conspired with Barboza and another man to commit murder. The murder involved was the killing of William Marfeo, the gambler who had had the temerity to run an unauthorized dice game in Patriarca's Providence. Patriarca is specifically charged with causing Barboza to travel interstate with the intent of commiting murder to further gambling. Tameleo is charged with the same federal crime, but with an additional count alleging that he made the interstate telephone call that summoned Barboza from Boston to Providence with the intent of committing murder. Barboza is under heavy military guard in the stockade of an army base, to which he was moved from a remote Cape Cod prison. He will be the principal witness against both Patriarca and Tameleo. If they are convicted, the No. 1 and No. 3 men of the New England Mafia family can get up to 10 to 15 years in the penitentiary respectively.

On August 8, District Attorney Garrett Byrne of Boston, acting on information from Barboza sent along by federal authorities, went to the Suffolk County Grand Jury and got an indictment against Gennaro Angiulo for conspiracy and accessory before the fact of murder. The murder involved in this case is the killing of Rocco DiSeglio, the ex-boxer who planned the holdup of the Mafia's floating crap game in Boston. If he is convicted on the accessory count of the indictment, Angiulo, the No. 2 man of the New England Mafia family, can go to the electric chair or get life imprisonment.

"And this is only the beginning," one high-ranking law-enforcement officer says. "Barboza is telling us enough to get many more more indictments. He's the most important thing that's happened in years in the war on organized crime. More important than Valachi, because Barboza actually took part in the conspiracies he's talking about." Under federal law, it takes only one conspirator's testimony in court to convict a co-conspirator.

United States Attorney Markham said, "The top Mafia bosses are usually so insulated by so many layers of command from the crimes they order to be committed by their 'soldiers' on the lower level, that they have indeed become 'untouchables.' The significance of what's happening here in New England is that the top echelon of the Mafia is untouchable no longer. This is the first time in history such a thing has happened."

Markham's assistant, E. F. Harrington, adds, "It looks as if the Mafia boys outsmarted themselves. They stopped swearing in new members in 1957 to prevent penetration by the FBI, but the FBI penetrated anyway. They thought they were safe by hiring outside labor who would not be privy to the secrets of the organization, but now it's an outsider who's wrecking them."

For all of Patriarca's apparent inperturbability, his once-invincible empire seems to be falling around him. The word is out in the Mafia that 49-year-old Larry Baioni, more suave than Patriarca but tougher, has been named to replace him. And prison isn't all all that Patriarca faces. The six brothers of William Marfeo want revenge: Two of them tried to kill him the day his indictment was announced. Patriarca's bodyguards drove them off in a wild car-to-car gun battle through the streets of Providence.

And, of course, anything that happens to the New England family of the Mafia has an effect on other Mafia families all across the United States. There are rumors that the Mafia commission, much as they like Patriarca, would prefer to see him dead. He's old, they figure, and likely to break during a long prison term—and a talking commission member would be a disaster of the first order for the whole organization.

But if all this past, present and potential adversity has affected Patriarca, he doesn't show it. He sits basking in the afternoon sun on the doorstep of the Nu-Brite Cleansers, puffing on his cigar and chatting with his subjects. He's still the Big Man.

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS RECOGNIZES 50 YEARS OF COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 4, at the Carnegie Endowment International Center at 46th Street near the United Nations in my district, I was privileged to address the Assembly of Captive Nations.

Their meeting was to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union, and to put it in true perspective as Communist imperialism.

The agenda of the meeting follows including the opening remarks of Chairman George M. Dimitrov, the address by Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, and the declaration by rapporteur Jozef Lettrich, which declaration was unanimously accepted by the delegation:

PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 129TH (EXTRAORDINARY) MEETING OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY PROTESTING 50 YEARS OF COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM IN EASTERN EUROPE: CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT INTERNATIONAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1967, AT 3:00 P.M.

Presiding: George M. Dimitrov, Bulgaria, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Balkunas.

Opening Remarks by the President.

Addresses: The *Honorable Theodore R. Kupferman*, Member of the House of Representatives from New York;

Christopher Emmet, Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations;

Francis Wazeter, President, Polish American Congress, New York Division;

Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary;

Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Chairman, Committee for a Free Lithuania, former Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James.

Declaration on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, (ACEN Doc. No. 432 (XIV) Gen.). Rapporteur: Jozef Lettrich, Czechoslovakia.

OPENING REMARKS BY GEORGE M. DIMITROV, CHAIRMAN OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, AT THE 129TH MEETING OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 4, 1967, NEW YORK CITY

Distinguished Guests, Members of the Assembly, Ladies and Gentlemen: On November 7, 1967, the Communist World will celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution by boasting about its achievements and victories. We, the democratic representatives in the free world of the nine subjugated nations of East-Central Europe, are gathered here today on the occasion of this Anniversary. But ours is not a festive gathering with fanfare and superlative boasts. On the contrary, ours is a solemn meeting of mourning and protest. We have assembled to pay tribute to the victims of Communism and to our compatriots still struggling under oppressive regimes to regain their freedom and independence.

The Soviets and their Communist satellites will mention with pride the landmarks of the Revolution: the storming of the Winter Palace in Petrograd, the exploits of the Kronstadt sailors and even their great victory of Stalingrad. We will mourn the machine-gunned victims of Katyn, the slaves deported to Vorkuta, Karaganda, the marshes of Rumania and Dobrudzha, and we will grieve the other examples of Communist atrocities. The Soviets boast of their economic achievements and military might. The exiled spokesmen for one hundred million East-Central Europeans mourn the loss of personal freedoms and human rights and the establishment of thought-control, censorship and persecution of religion that have taken the place of freedom.

We have assembled here today to protest the continued existence of oppressive Communist regimes in our nations imposed by Communist imperialism. We address our accusations at the heirs of the 50th Anniversary of Soviet communism: the record of Communist promises and performance in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania clearly demonstrates:

First, that the durability of a system in itself proves nothing about the quality of a way of life or rule. If twenty-odd years of communism in our countries have demonstrated anything, it is the awesome efficacy of modern totalitarianism, as developed first and most completely in the police state of the Soviet Union and then in the captive countries of East-Central Europe.

Second, that Communist economic and social experiment was purchased at the price of terror, forcible collectivization, slave-labor camps, purges, brutal exploitation of workers and farmers, persecution of all beliefs and views that do not conform to the system or its dogma. We accuse the Soviet Union and the bureaucratic Communist Parties of usurping the sovereignty of our captive peoples and of failure to fulfill their promises of personal freedoms, material well-being and self-government for the workers and peasants.

Our Assembly once more deems it essential that a clear-cut policy of democratic unity, solidarity and mutual assistance be established in the free world. Such an expression of concerted policy should be considered an official joint program of the free nations and should include a common stand on the captive nations.

In memory of our martyred democratic

leaders and compatriots, we must use this occasion to renew our appeal to the free world to acknowledge the fundamental right of national self-determination to our peoples and to aid them in their quest for its restoration. And we must dedicate our mutual efforts to the final victory of freedom, national independence, and social justice.

ADDRESS BY VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE LITHUANIAN DELEGATION TO THE ACEN, AT PLENARY ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 4, 1967

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Delegates: When the future historian will describe the post-World-War II era, he will present it as a period of prolonged afterwar convulsions and political restlessness.

At the root of this world turmoil and as one of the principal causes of the ills that plague our generation lies an ill-famed event which took place fifty years ago in Petrograd, then capital of Russia, namely, the overthrow of the democratic government and the seizure of power by a small yet determined and well-organized clique, headed by Lenin and Trotsky.

Today, viewed from a perspective of fifty years, the Communist reality stands completely divorced from the ideological and propagandistic myth. The closest Western neighbors of Soviet Russia—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania (not to speak about Finland and Poland)—have bitterly experienced the hollowness of the Bolshevik rhetoric on the right of non-Russian peoples to secede from the Soviet empire. As Eugene Lyons rightly stated in his excellent book *Workers Paradise Lost*, "the Kremlin's unswerving drive for one Communist world has been and remains a prime force in shaping the twentieth century."

The Soviet attempt to invade Western Europe immediately after the First World War was to a large extent frustrated by the opposing forces of the Baltic States and Poland. Their determined resistance gave Europe and mankind twenty years of relative peace and security.

Hitler's megalomania and blunders opened new vistas to bolshevik ambitions of world domination. I will limit my remarks to the Baltic States which are among the first and most tragic victims of Kremlin's imperialism.

The occupation and subsequent forcible incorporation and Sovietization of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania constitute a continued Soviet aggression against these states and a flagrant defiance of the recognized principles of international law and international morality.

The legacy of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States has been genocide, economic exploitation, and cultural levelling. Moscow's goal remains denationalization and Russification of the Baltic peoples. This colonization campaign has even grown in intensity since Stalin's death.

The aggression against the Baltic States was perpetrated by Stalin and his close collaborators, Molotov and Suslov, as well as Kremlin's emissaries to the Baltic States—Zhdanov, Vishinski and Dekanozov. Until and shortly after Stalin's death, Stalin's deeds were considered sacred and inviolate, to be accepted unquestionably by each Soviet citizen. The turning point, as some say, came on February 24, 1956, when Nikita Khrushchev mounted the rostrum in the Kremlin's assembly hall. By the time he had finished speaking several hours later, the stunned delegates in the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR had been treated to one of the most sensational exposures of our time. For Nikita Khrushchev told them, in an address punctuated by tears and fist-banging, that the man they had been taught to revere as God, had been a false idol. Joseph Stalin, Khrushchev's own mentor and for decades Russia's undisputed ruler, was shorn of his aura and branded as a tyrant and murderer.

And yet the Twentieth Congress speech was not a geninue turning point. Khrushchev was careful to limit himself to the castigation of Stalin's misdeeds at home, especially against Party members. Hardly an allusion was made to the dead dictator's long record of international crimes, ranging from the infamous pact with Nazi Germany to the forcible annextion of the Baltic States and interference in the internal affairs of every country in East-Central Europe.

The present Brezhnev-Kosygin regime, like that of their predecessor, Khrushchev, has shed some of the worst excesses of Stalinism, but retains its chief attribute—the concentration of all power in the hands of the Kremlin and denial of any power to the people. The Big Lie remains an essential part of the state structure, although the methods and forms of its application have become somewhat different, more palatable to the West, more deceptive. Most importantly, the present Soviet regime has retained Stalin's fruits of aggression. By continuing the occupation of the Baltic States, the Kremlin today remains burdened with Stalin's guilt.

Although relegated to the second plan by the events in the Far East and, quite recently, the Middle East, the European problems have never lost their importance and their actuality. It stands to reason that, as long as Europe is divided and the hundred million Europeans are subjected to alien rule or influence, there will be no peace and tranquillity in the Old Continent.

In his speech on September 23, 1966, in the General Assembly of the United Nations, Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko emphasized the following conditions for European security: "The maintenance and inviolability of the existing European borders and the prevention of access to nuclear weapons for the revenge seekers."

The emphasis on borders makes it clear that the Soviet aim is to consolidate its war-time imperialistic territorial acquisitions and its continued, although diminished, grip on the nominally independent states of East-Central Europe. Any legalization of these borders would also affect the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—for all practical purposes transformed in the colonial possessions of Soviet Russia.

The bustling Soviet diplomatic activity in Europe seeks to exploit the US involvement in Far East and, above all, to secure USSR's European flank, in view of the widening Moscow-Peking rift. During the recent months, Podgorny in Rome, Kosygin in Paris and London have advocated the convocation of a European conference—the United States, of course, excluded—and the conclusion of an overall European settlement—naturally, on their terms.

The Middle East crisis with all its ramifications has momentarily retarded but not halted these Soviet activities. They are bound to be revived as soon as the desert dust settles. And the problem of the Baltic States will again loom large in the context of the Soviet drive.

Those who are eagerly looking for signs indicating that the Soviet Union is inexorably becoming "normal," "law-abiding," member of the international community, will be sorely disappointed to find out that the Soviet attitude toward the Baltic problem has not changed an iota since Stalin's days.

The shopworn and discredited arguments of the Stalin era about the "voluntary" accession of the Baltic States to the Soviet Union are still paraded in utter solemnity as gospel truth. The crime of genocide against the Baltic people has not been admitted, and its perpetrators, Suslov included, still occupy high government posts. A gala demonstration of these Soviet Big Lies techniques was recently given during the so-called Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian Days at Montreal Expo '67. More recently Mrs. Dirzinskaite-Pilyushenko has been brought to the General Assembly of the United Nations to pose as a Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the fictitious Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania.

The problem of the Baltic States is an international European problem. The restoration of their independence is one of the main elements of the all-European settlement which is, as President Lyndon B. Johnson stated, to make Europe whole again.

The Middle East debate in the United Nations has again disclosed what passionate intensity the existential problems of small countries may generate and how much fire and urgency are contained in such seemingly abstract concepts as "aggression," "self-determination," "territorial integrity," "recognized principles of international law and international morality." These same concepts and a comparable urgency apply to the problem of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—overrun by Soviet troops on June 15–17, 1940, and then subjected to a rule that can be most accurately termed as colonial.

DECLARATION ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION INTRODUCED AT THE MEETING OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY HELD IN NEW YORK CITY ON NOVEMBER 4, 1967

(By Jozef Lettrich, Czechoslovakia, Rapporteur)

I

On November 7, 1917, a small group of Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky seized control of the Russian State from the democratic Provisional Government set up eight months earlier. This event set into motion forces which have shaken the world and kept it in turmoil to this day. The Bolshevik Revolution provided a base of operations for spreading an ideology, which is the official creed of oppressive regimes ruling over one-third of the world's population.

In Russia, before Lenin's death in 1924, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" had evolved into a dictatorship of the Communist Party leadership. Non-Communist parties were suppressed and any opposition to the Party line became a punishable offense. The same pattern, has since been applied in any state or territory that has fallen under Communist domination, where small minorities imposed by force came to power. The Communists enforced Russian supremacy over the non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union. The attempts of peoples long enslaved by Tsarist Russia to attain freedom and work out their own destiny were mercilessly crushed.

The Soviet-Nazi Pact of 1939 paved the way for Hitler's attack on Poland which started the Second World War. The Pact extended Soviet influence to the Baltic States, and the USSR promptly availed itself of this new latitude in 1940 by forcibly annexing Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Soviet Communist imperialism was on the march and made a thrust into East-Central Europe.

The Soviet Union emerged from World War II with its armed forces in command of all the strategic positions from the Balkans to the Elbe. Lassitude among the Western allies and the prevalent desire to avoid antagonizing the Russians left the Soviets a clear field for action during the crucial postwar years. The Soviets reoccupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and directly or indirectly foisted Communist regimes on Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and East Germany.

Moreover, the Soviets had annexed territories totaling 146,000 square miles belonging to Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania, and by 1953, the Communist rule had extended to China, Tibet, Mongolia, and North Korea. North Vietnam's turn came the following year, and that of Cuba six years later.

Until the death of Stalin in March 1953, the monolithic aspect of the Communist orbit was disturbed only by the defection of

Yugoslavia in 1948, while the other countries were under strict Soviet control. There was continued resistance to Soviet rule: guerrilla warfare in the Baltic States, underground fighting in Poland, workers' strikes and riots such as in Pilsen and Poznan.

It was the fateful year of 1956 which, in addition to Khrushchev's de-Stalinization speech, also witnessed the Polish October and the Hungarian Revolution that shook the Communist regimes. Since 1956 a number of ameliorative measures have taken place in Communist-dominated Eastern Europe under the pressure of popular discontent and the terror of Stalin's day has assumed a more refined form.

These changes, however, have not been substantive. Fundamental human rights are violated or denied. The people have no voice in government. Freedom of speech and of the press is nonexistent; freedom of worship and conscience severely restricted. Trade unions protect the regime's interests at the expense of the worker. Forced collectivization has deprived the farmer of his dignity and individuality.

II

After analyzing the record of fifty years of Communism, the Assembly of Captive European Nations lays the blame and responsibility upon the architects and heirs of the Bolshevik Revolution for the following conditions in the captive countries of East-Central Europe:

1. *Terror.*—The Communist carried out in cold blood deliberately calculated destruction not only of enemies, but of potential opponents or elements unwanted in their system. The Soviets have applied genocide and intensive Russification in order to change the ethnic composition of annexed territories. Communism from 1917 to 1967 has been directly responsible for millions of deaths through armed aggression, starvation, "liquidation of kulaks and bourgeoisie," purges and the very high mortality rates in forced labor camps. The Communist regimes spawned gigantic organs of surveillance, punishment, censorship and intimidation. The individual has no protection against the all-powerful and arbitrary police state.

2. *Thought control.*—The Communist regimes have tried to seal off their countries from foreign printed matter and radio. They parcel out information through absolute control of news and ideas. Censorship guards against the leakage of forbidden ideas through the press, books, on the stage and screen and on the air, in school rooms and lecture halls. Never before in history has there been such a massive enterprise in shaping and regimenting the thought of whole nations.

Some people have broken under this psychological strain, others have bowed meekly or paid lip-service. Yet, the overwhelming majority resisted Communist propaganda. The indoctrination of youth was a complete failure. Now more than ever before in the fifty years the writers, students and intellectuals rise to criticize and even to protest the methods of the Communist regimes.

3. *The political oppression.*—The self-perpetuating bureaucratic obligarchies exercise absolute power over the small ruling parties and through them over the rest of the citizenry.

Soviet Communism and its models in East-Central Europe have stamped out free speech, press, and assembly. "Elections" are limited to a single list of names, drawn up by the Party or by organizations under Party control. The citizen has no semblance of any role in government, in law-making and decision-making.

4. *Economic exploitation.*—In the economic field, the Communist regimes have unswervingly adhered, and still adhere, to a policy of strong preferential treatment of heavy industry and of boosting the power sector of the economy at the expense of consumer goods production. This policy, coupled with a waste of resources characteristic of the Communist economic system, has resulted in a failure to secure a proper growth of the real income of the population.

The burden on the peoples of East-Central Europe is aggravated by extortion of illegitimate profits for the benefit of the Soviet Union through price discrimination in trade, and by granting of credits by the satellite regimes for the development of Soviet basic industries.

5. *The moral cynicism.*—The humanitarian principles of Western Civilization have been rejected by the Communists in their vain attempt to reconstruct human nature in the pattern of their philosophy of historical materialism. A deep immoralism has marked Communist ethics from the start. It has turned the person into an object, a bloodless statistic. Solemn promises and treaties trodden underfoot, flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, unlawful seizure of power—all these are part of a record the protagonists of the Bolshevik Revolution and their heirs have added to the history of mankind.

III

In an era when old-style colonialism has been virtually ended, Communist imperialism has emerged as the largest colonial system in existence. There is hardly a major crisis anywhere from Southeast Asia to the Caribbean, from Africa to the Middle East, in which the expansionist ambitions of Moscow are not involved. The Communist drive for world domination creates international tension and keeps alive the fear of nuclear war. This drive has resulted in the division of countries and continents.

When measured by its costs in life suffering and moral depravity the fifty years of communism is demonstrably the most tragic failure on this scale in all history.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution reiterates its firm belief that only complete national independence, personal, political and religious freedom is the answer to the hopes and aspirations of the people of East-Central Europe, who will never accept Communist domination.

The Assembly therefore condemns the Communist totalitarian system, which has shackled the nine nations of East-Central Europe as a consequence of Communist aggression.

1. The Assembly asks for the restoration of freedom and independence to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania, as a prerequisite for establishing a durable peace in Europe.

2. This can be only achieved by:

a) Putting an end to interference by the Soviet Union in the internal and external affairs of the East-Central European countries;

b) Withdrawing Soviet troops and bases and agents from the territories of the captive nations;

c) Re-establishing democratic institutions through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people.

On the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution the Assembly of Captive European Nations pays tribute to the everlasting memory of the countless victims of Communist tyranny: to those who fell before firing squads; to those who died in prisons; to those who perished in forced labor camps and to the victims of mass deportations. The Assembly rededicates itself to the restoration of independence and freedom for which so many have given their lives in East-Central Europe. Peace with justice and freedom for all Europeans shall prevail.

REFUGEES—STILL A MAJOR WORLD PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I traveled in Europe for the purpose of reviewing refugee, migration, and related activities in the principal asylum countries; namely, Austria, Germany, and Italy. I also had an opportunity to examine the Cuban refugee problem in Spain and to receive briefings from representatives of the Jewish Voluntary Agencies on the situation of Jewish communities in the Arab countries. For more detailed information on these two points, I refer you to supplement A and supplement B which I will include in my remarks. I was accompanied on these visits by Ambassador James Wine, special assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, and Mr. James L. Carlin, chief, refugee, migration, and Red Cross affairs, U.S. mission, Geneva.

My legislative experience in the field of immigration and refugees extends now over a period of two decades. This experience, as well as my participation in some international activities related to the refugee and migration field, have given me what I believe to be a good appreciation of the refugee problem; still, it is a firsthand visit such as the one I have just made that renews the impact and improves the understanding of this continuing human drama. And let there be no mistake about it, the refugee problem in Europe is a continuing one. My trip has renewed my conviction that no single solution to it is possible as long as freedom and economic opportunities beckon from the free lands to human beings oppressed by tyrannical regimes regardless of the name under which they function.

Seeing thousands and talking with many of the new refugee-escapees from the various Eastern European countries in processing centers in Austria, Camp Traiskirchen; Italy, Camp Latina; and Germany, Camp Zirndorf, has provided vivid proof that not even a thaw in the cold war will stop the drive of people out from behind the Iron Curtain. On the contrary, the thaw with its attendant relaxation on travel restrictions is producing increasing numbers of refugees. Some 7,000 escapees from Communist-dominated countries have sought asylum in Western European countries during the first 8 months of this year. They have been predominantly from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia, with a sprinkling from Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R. For a complete breakdown, I refer you to supplement C. The refugee flow continues—I understand more than 1,000 arrived during September—and I am convinced that it will continue as long as totalitarian regimes attempt to oppress the minds of men.

The principal effort of the United States to assist these refugees is the U.S. refugee program—USRP. It was originally established in 1952 under the name of the U.S. escapee program to help keep

open the asylum conditions of Western Europe by assisting in the prompt reestablishment of those who flee communism. It operates primarily through the medium of voluntary agencies which provide supplemental assistance for the initial reception and care and maintenance of refugees and offers help to them in resettling permanently overseas or locally. For calendar year 1967, approximately 10,000 refugees will be helped by this program at an estimated cost of $750,000. A substantial number of these immigrate to the United States. The U.S. effort, however, is supplemental to that of the asylum countries. In my travels I visited both host country and our own facilities to determine how effective each separately and together were for the objectives which we seek.

On the day we visited the processing center in Latina near Rome, the camp population was 1,450, including 134 newcomers who had just arrived from the reception center in Trieste. Among the refugees with whom I spoke in Latina was a Rumanian doctor who explained that he had been severely restricted in pursuing his medical profession and was obliged to undertake undesirable work assignments in various parts of Rumania as directed by the regime. He and his wife had left Rumania by train on July 7, 1967, with permits to visit Yugoslavia. Once in Yugoslavia, they sought their way to the Italian border which they crossed illegally on July 9. They reported immediately to the Italian police and requested political asylum. They proudly announced that their processing for immigration to the United States was well underway and they expected to be departing for their new homeland in the early future.

The population of Camp Traiskirchen, near Vienna, at the time of our visit was 1,530, including some 90 new arrivees in the detention sector of the camp who were still being processed for asylum by the Austrian police. While in Traiskirchen, I had the opportunity to see and talk with the 12-year-old Sindar boy who had been captured at the Czech-Austrian border when the other members of the Sindar family had made their dramatic escape from Austria in a rain of bullets from the Czech border guards. The boy had been released by the Czech authorities and permitted to join his family in Austria only shortly before my visit. His release followed the Austrian Government's strong protest to Prague over this border incident.

Camp Zirndorf had a population of some 800 at the time of our visit—the majority having arrived in the Federal Republic during the past 3 months. A typical case in that camp was a young Czech journalist who had managed his escape after securing an exit permit to attend an international hockey match in Vienna. Explaining that he had become disenchanted with his homeland because of the strict control and direction over his journalistic work, he expressed a keen desire to emigrate to any country in the Western World where he might work at his profession with freedom of expression.

In these three camps I was much impressed by the contribution that was being made by the host Governments—Austria, Germany, and Italy. These Governments are bearing the brunt of the European refugee problem by assuming responsibility for the refugee's basic care and maintenance until he is either processed for resettlement overseas or integrated into the local economy. The high majority of the refugees choose overseas resettlement and their preferences are Australia, Canada, and the United States. A representative of Austria's Ministry of Interior informed me that the Government of Austria would expend 29,000,000 Austrian shillings, approximately $7,000,000, on the care of refugees during the current year. It would be reasonable, I believe, to estimate that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will expend a comparable amount and that the Government of Italy even more.

I was also very favorably impressed by the significant contribution that was being made by our own U.S. refugee program—USRP—under which supplemental assistance is rendered to the refugee/escapees and defectors through a network of American voluntary agencies. Whatever the agency, be it a Catholic group, a Protestant group, a Jewish group, or a nonsectarian one, it was inspiring to see what these dedicated people were doing in the asylum areas for the benefit of refugees.

The USRP clearly reflects the determination of the United States and its people to insure that persons who reject communism and risk the hazards of escape and defection will receive the necessary measure of assistance to make possible their reestablishment in the free world on the basis of personal dignity and self-dependence. One of the aims of the USRP is to reduce, to the maximum extent, the length of time the refugees remain in camps at Government expense through contractual arrangements with voluntary agencies engaged in projects designed to speed refugee resettlement.

These projects consist of early registrations and individual counseling services to acquaint refugees with immigration possibilities and requirements, language training to equip refugees to adapt more rapidly to their new social and cultural conditions, and orientation programs explaining the opportunities in various resettlement countries. For needy cases, USRP also finances immigration processing and documentation costs, as well as part of the overseas transportation costs, and occasionally, in the case of difficult-to-settle persons, pay fees for special placement in the country of resettlement. Emigration abroad is the preferred USRP solution but certain refugees unable to emigrate have received USRP local integration grants to secure out-of-camp housing and employment, thus enabling them to become useful and productive citizens in the asylum areas in which they find themselves. USRP also makes available to the individual refugee some supplies for personal needs. A printed greeting from the people of the United States is included.

Success in these various efforts has required the close cooperation of asylum governments, as well as smooth teamwork with immigration selection missions, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and voluntary agencies. I was impressed by the high degree of this cooperation which has narrowed the resettlement process for the average refugee to less than 6 months.

Apart from demonstrating the compassion of the American people for their fellow men in need and at the same time achieving certain foreign policy objectives, USRP's presence and patterns of assistance have been instrumental, I believe, in arousing the humanitarian conscience of host governments and achieving liberal asylum policies. I was gratified to learn during my travels that some time ago the Council of Europe adopted a resolution designed to insure the refugees the right not to be in danger of persecution—and affording them at least temporary asylum to enable their processing for admission to another country. Supplement D provides further information relating to asylum procedures.

Moreover, in providing assistance to refugee/defectors, USRP demonstrates, I believe, a positive, sympathetic understanding, not only of those fleeing Communist domination but also helps to keep alive the hope of those remaining in Eastern Europe that the United States still shares a concern and maintains an interest in their right to live in an atmosphere of freedom.

In summary, while USRP is a modest program—its budget for the current year totals only $750,000—it is an essential form of people-to-people activity. This is one Government program abroad that is very clearly identified to the refugee and the asylum country as a program conducted under the auspices of the United States. Moreover, since its inception it has played an important and successful role in advancing both general and specific U.S. foreign policy objectives. I consider, therefore, that this program merits our continued support. The scope of such support should be increased if—as expected—the influx of refugee escapees continues its upward trend.

The supplements referred to follow:

SUPPLEMENT A

THE CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION IN SPAIN

At the time of my visit to Spain, there were some 6,500 Cuban refugees being processed by the Embassy in Madrid for immigration to the United States. Although the Embassy has succeeded in increasing its monthly visa issuance to Cubans from 250 to about 400 during the first nine months of 1967, the Cubans have been arriving from Cuba at the average rate of 700 a month. In order to enable the Embassy to double its monthly visa issuance to Cuban refugees, the Department of State authorized the employment of four additional local employees for the processing of Cuban applications. Within a short time the Embassy should be issuing to Cuban refugees approximately 700-800 visas monthly, which is barely enough to offset the monthly increment of new arrivals. It appears that the backlog of 6,500 cases in Spain will remain for the foreseeable future unless arrivals from Cuba fall off or some other dramatic step is taken to dispose of the backlog.

I also had the opportunity to witness the departure of ICEM Flight MISAD 121411 on September 15 from Madrid to New York. Of the 179 Cuban refugees aboard, there were 7 women with children, 16 persons, who were joining husbands and fathers; 20 families,

77 persons; 4 small unaccompanied children; 25 youths who were preceding their parents in order to avoid military service; 14 couples; and 29 single adults.

SUPPLEMENT B

JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN ARAB COUNTRIES: SUMMARY BY COUNTRY

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

The situation in the UAR is the most serious on which there is reliable information. Many reports indicate that, during the recent conflict, there was extensive mob violence against Jews and Jewish properties in the U.A.R., and that on June 5 UAR authorities imprisoned all Jewish heads of households while also placing elderly community leaders under house arrest. Although some 200 Jews having foreign nationality and lesser numbers of stateless Jews have been permitted to depart, those of Egyptian nationality are being prevented from leaving. Sources including many of the evacuees arriving in Europe have stated that those imprisoned have received severe maltreatment. A very recent report estimates that from 400 to 500 are still incarcerated in Cairo and an additional 80 in Alexandria. The same report states that internees have been given permission to communicate with their families in Egypt via the ICRC or Egyptian Red Crescent and may receive parcels and money for use in prison canteens. One source believes that all Jews will eventually be permitted to depart the country but without their possessions.

The release of some Jewish political prisoners by the UAR indicates some relaxation of the harsh policy of imprisonment.

ALGERIA

The overwhelming majority of Jews left Algeria for France when the country attained independence in 1962. No instances of anti-Jewish violence or discrimination have been reported.

ADEN

The British authorities provided full protection for all Jews and soon after the conflict arranged for their evacuation by air to friendly countries.

IRAQ

While information concerning Jews in Iraq (which severed diplomatic relations with the United States on June 10) is very limited, it is nevertheless apparent that Jews in that country are being subjected to a variety of forms of harassment, discrimination and restriction. According to a qualified, nonpartisan source, Jews in Iraq face an extremely difficult situation. They are not permitted to leave the country, face danger if they leave their homes and are being subjected to such relatively minor but demoralizing harassments as the disconnecting of their telephones. Money transfers are strictly controlled and limited. All Jews under twenty would leave the country if permitted. Iraq still maintains no diplomatic relations with the United States.

LEBANON

There is no serious Jewish problem in Lebanon. From the outset of the conflict the Lebanese Government provided adequate protection for the Jewish population. Judaism, as one of the 14 recognized religions in Lebanon, enjoys protection, rights and privileges. Following an anti-Jewish riot in Beirut on June 10, the Government moved most of the Jews to protective custody in a mountain area, and has similarily protected those in Beirut and elsewhere. There has been no indication that most of the Jews wish to leave the country. Most Lebanese Jews are over forty years of age with few ties abroad. About 150 have emigrated to other countries during the last three months and some 500 additional persons have shown interest in emigrating. More than half of these are stateless Jews who entered the country from Syria during recent years.

MOROCCO

Following mob violence against Jewish persons and property in Morocco (involving the death of at least 2 persons), the Government took a firm stand to control the situation. It has announced and shown that it will not tolerate such action and Jewish agencies have been highly complimentary of the King's performance in this matter. Nevertheless, economic boycotts against Jews instigated by private groups have continued and there is a widening cleavage between Jewish and Moslem populations. In these circumstances there is increasing anxiety in the Jewish community and, although King Hassan has encouraged Jews to remain in the country, increasing numbers seek emigration opportunities. Most of those leaving would like ultimately to settle in Canada or the United States.

TUNISIA

Following initial disorders, President Bourguiba announced that he would not tolerate their resumption. The Government is fully protecting the Jewsh community and facilitating procedures for those who wish to leave. There is a continuous stream of about 1000 Jews per month to France where they are being assisted by Jewish voluntary agencies and where many are being absorbed into the local community.

SYRIA

It is reliably reported that the Government of Syria has been correct in its treatment of Jews, has detailed security forces to protect them, and there has been no major violence directed against Jews. Nevertheless, there have reportedly been many individual instances of petty harassments and abuse of Jews such as spitting and shoving and there are reports of Jews being held by police until payments are made for release. Those in mixed neighborhoods are being menaced and subjected to vexations. While the situation in Syria is bad it is considered "normal" as the Jews in that country were under constant threat even before hostilities. No Jews are permitted to leave the country regardless of nationality but the majority of the community is uneasy and would leave Syria if given that option.

LIBYA

During and immediately after the recent hostilities, mob violence directed against the Jews in Libya resulted in widespread destruction of Jewish property and reportedly in some deaths. Since these initial disorders, however, the Government of Libya has been able to provide necessary protection for its Jewish population. The Government has also permitted and facilitated the evacuation of all Jews wishing to depart for other countries (without most of their possessions) and has offered to pay transportation costs for anyone who has no other means of meeting this expense. Thus far approximately 3100 persons have been evacuated to Italy, which has granted them temporary haven and where they are being assisted by Jewish voluntary agencies. According to reports, the Libyan Government is willing, upon request, to extend indefinitely the 3-month re-entry visas issued evacuees when they leave the country. Most of the undetermined number remaining in Libya are expected to depart, and the evacuation is continuing although at a reduced rate. Jews remaining in Libya continue to face harassment, and many are reluctant to leave their homes.

ICRC

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is continuing its efforts—commenced soon after the end of hostilities—to assist Jews in Arab countries. ICRC, with its established capability for neutral intervention in situations of tension or conflict to provide humanitarian protective and emergency relief assistance to victims of war, has one or more delegates in most of the Arab countries. The delegates, among their other activities, are attempting as necessary to secure adequate protection for threatened Jewish populations and permission for the evacuation of those desiring to depart. The United States has contributed $100,000 to the ICRC for its emergency program for the provision of relief and other assistance in behalf of all victims of the Middle East conflict, through an allocation from the $5 million Middle East emergency fund announced by President Johnson on June 27. In addition, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is considering measures appropriate under the UNHCR mandate which he might take in behalf of threatened or persecuted Jews.

Jews in Arab countries

[Prehostility estimate]

	Total number
Aden	134
Algeria	2,000
Iraq	2,500 to 3,000
Lebanon	7,000
Libya	5,000
Morocco	60,000
Syria	3,000 to 4,000
Tunisia	20,000
United Arab Republic	2,500

SUPPLEMENT C

NUMBERS OF ESCAPEES, BY COUNTRY, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967

Citizenship	Austria	Germany	Italy	Greece and Near East	Western Europe	Total
Albanian	5	5	214	26	1	251
Bulgarian	70	94	45	88	13	310
Czechoslovak	581	435	110	3	135	1,264
Hungarian	674	545	330	12	92	1,653
Polish	141	116	92	7	205	561
Rumanian	29	30	162	45	19	285
U.S.S.R.	7	12	2	28	10	59
Yugoslav	447	732	1,784	.....	.....	2,963
Total	1,954	1,969	2,739	209	475	7,346

SUPPLEMENT D

ASYLUM PROCEDURES IN AUSTRIA, GERMANY, AND ITALY

AUSTRIA

The Federal Ministry of the Interior is responsible for the determination of refugee status in accordance with the Refugee Convention of 1951. The procedure is based on internal administrative decrees and instructions. Applicants for recognition are normally referred to the Federal Reception Center in Traiskirchen and their applications are examined by the Bundespolizeidirektion Vienna.

All proposed negative decisions are communicated to the Office of the UNHCR which is entitled to interview the applicant and, if appropriate, to submit a recommendation for recognition.

Cases in which UNHCR recommendations for recognition are not accepted by the Bundespolizeidirektion are referred to the Federal Minister of the Interior which consults with UNHCR. If after such consultation no agreement is reached, the Minister of the In-

terior—before taking a final decision—may refer the case to the Advisory Council on Asylum (Asylbeirat). This Advisory Council is composed of representatives of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Interior and Justice, the members of the Austrian Delegation to the Committee on Population and Refugees of the Council of Europe and the Representative of UNHCR, under the chairmanship of the Federal Minister of the Interior.

Applicants of Yugoslav nationality who enter Austria illegally in Carinthia and Styria may in exceptional cases be screened and interviewed by the local Police Authorities. Where a negative decision is envisaged, the Minister of the Interior informs the Office of the UNHCR which may request the transfer of the person in question to the Federal Reception Center where the case follows the normal procedure.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

By virtue of the Aliens Law of 28 April 1965 the "Federal Office for Recognition of Foreign Refugees" (Bundesamt fur die Anerkennung auslandischer Fluchtlinge), located at the Federal Reception Center in Zirndorf, is competent to decide on applications for asylum. Applicants for asylum are to be referred to the Federal Reception Center. Persons entitled to asylum are refugees as defined by the Refugee Convention and persons defined by Article 16 of the Basic Law which includes persons who are not covered by the Convention due to the dateline of 1 January 1951.

ITALY

Refugee status is determined by Eligibility Commissions in Trieste or in Rome. These Commissions, established by exchanges of Notes between the Office of UNHCR and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, are composed of a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a representative of the Ministry of the Interior and two representatives of the Office of UNHCR. The representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the senior representative of the Office of UNHCR act alternately as chairman with a casting vote in cases of disagreement. Decisions of the Commissions are normally final but if new elements are presented they may be reviewed.

CHICOPEE, MASS., POST OFFICE DEDICATION

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, November 4, 1967, it was my pleasure and distinct privilege to attend and participate in the dedication ceremonies of the newly expanded and renovated Chicopee, Mass., Post Office.

These exercises marked the culmination of a period of long anticipation by the citizens of Chicopee who for years had desired to be served by one consolidated post office bearing the postmark "Chicopee, Mass." I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks I delivered on this historic occasion of the dedication, the program for the event, and the news account taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of November 5:

ADDRESS BY MR. BOLAND

Rev. Clergy, Mayor Demers, Postmaster Dorval, Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Herodotus, the Greek historian, must have had in mind this kind of day when he coined the thought in 500 B.C., "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." Despite the grayness of this day, it is a happy and significant event for Chicopee. I am delighted to be a part of it.

This event embraces more than the routine dedication of a building with modern facilities. It signifies the realization of one general Post Office for this growing and thriving city of Chicopee. It was a long time in coming. It came because of the combined efforts of public officials, civic organizations, and the people of this city. The consolidation was grounded on more effective, efficient mail service for the inhabitants and businesses of this community. Its conception was tinged with the understandable civic pride that Chicopee should no longer be the satellite of another community in the matter of mail delivery.

I do not believe that anyone could quarrel with this position. I commend all those who have had a part in bringing this problem to a successful conclusion. I am delighted that I joined in this effort and gave it my support and assistance.

There are few other areas of government that reach the people and the business community so directly as does the Post Office Department. The task of delivering the mail is one of the biggest activities in the world.

Think for a moment of this gargantuan, herculean effort! Some 35,000 Post Offices, handling over 75 billion pieces of mail, more than 23 billion stamps are issued every year in the United States. Placed end to end, they circle the world fourteen times! The Post Office has more than 600,000 employees—receipts of almost $4 billion. The volume of mail equals the mail volume of the 68 largest countries in the United Nations—countries having a total population of 1.9 billion people—U.S. population, 195 million people.

This gives you an idea of what the Post Office Department faces in its constant and continuing effort to serve the people of this nation.

When our friend and neighbor, Lawrence F. O'Brien was handed the awesome responsibility of running this huge establishment, he was charged by the President of the U.S. to "provide this country with the finest mail service it has ever known, while managing the Post Office Department efficiently and prudently." All of us can take pride in the manner in which Postmaster General O'Brien has responded to this great challenge. All over this land he has sought to modernize and improve the service. He has brought imagination and initiative and drive to this task. Facilities, such as the one we dedicate here today, are eloquent proof of what is being done to upgrade his department.

But structures of brick and mortar and steel, filled with modern equipment, are nothing without the dedication and spirit of men and women who, in the final moments get the mail delivered.

We dedicate this Post Office today in the name of the United States—to the memory of all who have labored and will labor here—to the Postmasters, the Clerks, Carriers, handlers and maintenance crew.

I congratulate all who have been a part of the human side of this building—the employees, the architect, the builder, the artisans who fashioned this structure. I am privileged to bring to all of them and to the people of the city of Chicopee, the greetings of the United States of America.

DEDICATION PROGRAM OF U.S. POST OFFICE, CHICOPEE, MASS., NOVEMBER 4, 1967

Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States.

Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General.

William P. Dorval, Postmaster.

"Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

Musical selection: Eighth Air Force Band, Westover Air Base, Chief Warrant Officer William Berky, Director.

Welcoming introduction: William P. Dorval, postmaster.

Master of ceremonies: Attorney Thomas D. Murphy, special hearings officer, president, Chicopee Bar Association.

Invocation: Rev. Thomas A. Shea, pastor, Holy Name of Jesus Church.

Introduction of special guests: Attorney Thomas D. Murphy.

Greetings, city of Chicopee: Hon. Richard H. Demers, mayor.

Principal speaker: Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, Congressman, Second District.

Greetings from Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien: Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND.

Presentation of flag to postmaster: Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND.

Color Guard: Combined Chicopee American Legion Posts.

Raising of the flag.

National Anthem: 8th Air Force Band.

Vocalist: Mrs. Dolores Asselin.

Dedication address: Hon. Donald P. Steele, regional director, Post Office Department.

Musical selection: 8th Air Force Band.

Benediction: Rev. Charles W. Wakefield, pastor, Chicopee Falls Methodist Church.

Closing remarks: Francis S. Balicki, president, Chicopee Chamber of Commerce.

Post Office Dedication Committee: William P. Dorval, chairman, Joseph Ghareeb, treasurer, Howard W. Redfern, Conrad Goff, Charles Berube, Oscar Hilbert, Alphonse Dupuis.

CHICOPEE DEDICATES POST OFFICE

CHICOPEE.—Political, postal and civic leaders participated Saturday in the formal dedication of the new Chicopee central Post Office at ceremonies attended by more than 150 persons.

PRESENTS FLAG

The highlight of the day was the presentation and the raising of a new flag which had flown over the nation's Capitol and at the Post Office headquarters in Washington, D.C. Congressman Edward P. Boland made the presentation of the flag for Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien. Chicopee Postmaster William P. Dorval accepted the flag in behalf of his staff.

Flag-raising ceremonies were conducted by a color guard from the various Chicopee American Legion posts as Mrs. Dolores Asselin sang the National Anthem, accompanied by the Eighth Air Force Band of Westover Air Force Base.

Congressman Boland told the crowd, protected under the covered rear platform from the rains that forced the switch of the ceremonies from in front of the attractive million-dollar facility, that the construction of the Post Office represented a significant milestone in the history of this growing city.

Boland praised Postmaster Dorval for his work in helping to plan "The beautiful and functional building." He said that federal officials shared in the civic pride that marked this occasion for the city.

He also brought good news to the postal employees on hand including visiting postal officials and Chicopee employees, who went about their "appointed rounds" and duties in traditional fashion. Boland said that pay raise and increased postal rate legislation had progressed through House and Senate committees and would proceed to confirmation this week to be acted upon by Congress. The bill provides for six per cent wage increases spread out over a three-year period and retroactive to Oct. 1 for the first step and is tied in with postal rate increases to be effective Jan. 1.

TRACES HISTORY

Mayor Demers traced post office history in the city. He cited the central post office as

a marvelous step in unifying the city and a means of eliminating the sectionalism fostered under the previous arrangement of two first class Post Offices and services from Holyoke.

Mayor Demers, Postmaster Dorval and Atty. Thomas D. Murphy, master of ceremonies for the dedication, all praised Congressman Boland for his role as a prime mover in the plans and legislation which led to the construction and expansion of postal services in the city.

Donald J. Dowd, assistant regional director of the Post Office Department in Boston, reminded the audience that the Post Office is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing service to people. This principle is the motivating force in the continually improving postal services being developed, Dowd said. He urged all to use the ZIP code in order to assist in creating a more efficient postal system.

Others participating in the program were the Rev. Thomas A. Shea, pastor of Holy Name Church, who delivered the invocation; the Rev. Charles W. Wakefield, pastor of the Chicopee Falls Methodist Church, who gave benediction; and Francis S. Balicki, president of the Greater Chicopee Chamber of Commerce, who brought regards from the business and mercantile community.

Musical selections were played by the Eighth Air Force Band under the direction of Chief Warrant Officer William Berky, director.

Other officials seated on the platform included State Reps. Roger Bernashe and Steve Chmura, Aldermanic President Roger J. Roy, Howand Redfern and Oscar Hilbert, representing postal employees, and Westover Air Force Base representatives.

The Fireball Club of the Chamber of Commerce under the supervision of Charles Berube provided refreshments.

MARIE CURIE

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when an honorary degree was conferred upon Marie Curie by St. Lawrence University, the citation read:

Marie Curie, self-effaced and devoted scientist, teacher and author, exemplar of the art of living while directing to beneficent ends powerful forces of nature, single and persistent in purpose, triumphant in research, hastening the march of civilization by the discovery of radium, inspired and inspiring idealist, and practical dreamer.

The girl named Marya Sklodovska, whom the world was to know as Marie Curie, was born on November 7, 1867, in the ancient Polish city of Warsaw. Her parents were members of the minor landowning Polish nobility that had been impoverished by Russian rule of their area of the Polish homeland. Marya learned to read when she was only 4 years old. When she was graduated from secondary school in June of 1883 she won highest honors, but the university in Warsaw was closed even to the most brilliant women.

She was employed as a governess until 1891 when she went to Paris to attend the Sorbonne. There, for 3 years, she led a life devoted to study. Most of her attention was given to her studies in mathematics, physics, and chemistry. She was particularly adept in performing the experiments assigned to her in the science laboratories. By July of 1893, she had obtained a master's degree in physics, leading the honors list of the group that received the degree with her. She next obtained a master's degree in mathematics.

In 1895, she was married to a man destined to become an eminent physicist in his own right, Pierre Curie, then a professor of physics. Their scientific work together began as a study of radioactivity, the topic of Marie Curie's doctoral dissertation. Using a variety of compounds of uranium, Madam Curie discovered that the radioactivity of any uranium compound was a fundamental property of the uranium atoms of the compounds.

In July of 1898, Marie and Pierre Curie discovered the new radioactive element, polonium, named for Marie Curie's beloved homeland. In December of the same year, they discovered radium. They invented a means of laboriously isolating radium salts from pitchblende.

For their intensely creative scientific achievements, they were awarded the Nobel Prize in physics in 1903. After the death of her husband, Madam Curie succeeded him in 1906 as professor of general physics at the Sorbonne, and continued her research into the mysterious properties of radium. For this work, she received the Nobel Prize in chemistry.

The curie, a unit of energy in radioactive materials, is named for Madam Curie. Among her many scientific achievements were preparing uranium in a pure state and establishing its atomic weight.

In 1912, a Radium Institute was established in her honor in Warsaw. She returned to a triumphant welcome in her native city in 1913. Her love for Poland had never waned in her long years of exile.

In 1921, Marie Curie visited the United States, where a group of generous American women presented her with a gram of radium and with funds to be used as she wished. Characteristically, she used the money for the rental of still another gram of radium for the laboratory of the Warsaw Institute. She had, of course, contributed the first gram given to her to the Institute. When she visited the United States again in 1929, to dedicate the Hepburn Hall of Chemistry at St. Lawrence University, American friends presented her with another monetary gift which she also donated to the Warsaw Institute.

She died at the height of her powers on July 4, 1934, in Paris, universally mourned by Poles, Americans, and the scientists of the world.

COMMENDATION OF SECRETARY McNAMARA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in a democratic society we frequently exercise the right to criticize the public servants, the servants in the executive branch of Government, the men who are appointed, and in some instances, of course, the men who are career people.

This is as it should be, and no one would want to stop that type of criticism.

The same thing happens to Members of Congress. They are frequently criticized in their own districts by their constituents.

They are criticized in the local and national press and frequently these criticisms are inaccurate. Sometimes they are part story and part truth. Sometimes they are vicious. Sometimes they tend to destroy the confidence of the constituencies which they represent.

Mr. Speaker, for some time I have listened to criticism of a man who I think is one of the great public servants of all time. Now, I have disagreed with this man on many occasions. In fact, I have been a part of putting out a report in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which criticized the decision that this gentleman made. I speak of Secretary of Defense McNamara. I think at the time that he made the decision not to make the aircraft carrier *Kennedy* nuclear powered he was making a mistake. I still think that. The fact that the Department of Defense has reversed its position on nuclear aircraft carriers and surface vessels of that size and class and even smaller is an indication that they, too, realize that the unanimous report of our Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was a valid report and that the facts contained therein, which justified the installation of nuclear propulsion power in surface vessels, were valid facts and had the interests of national security at heart.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor for the purpose of saying a few words of praise for Secretary McNamara. As we all know, at one time he was one of the top officials in the Ford Motor Co. He had a salary, I am told, which was in excess of $400,000 a year at the time when he was asked by the President to come into the Government service at a salary of less than $30,000 a year. At great sacrifice to himself, selling his stock which he owned and forfeiting almost half a million dollars a year in salary, he came to the service of the Government. He has acted as Secretary of Defense ever since.

Now, I have been here for 25 years and I have seen a good many Secretaries of Defense come and go. In my humble opinion, this man has a greater grasp of the tremendous function of the Department of Defense than any Secretary of Defense within my memory. I have witnessed this man sitting for hours under questioning before various committees, including my own. He very seldom had to turn around and ask an admiral or a general or a colonel behind him for an answer to a question that was asked him by a member of the committee before which he appeared. He usually had the facts and the figures to sustain the answer that he gave.

It has been said that this man has a mind like a computer. Well, to some extent I think he does have a mind like a computer, because he has a faculty for remembering facts and figures and for

assimilating complicated problems which go far beyond that of the oridinary public servant.

I think he has been a good Secretary of Defense. I know he has made some mistakes, but I think we have been fortunate during the past 6 or 7 years in having a man of this caliber, a man who would be willing to forego his own personal financial advantage and to take over the onerous duties that he has performed. I do not suppose there is any man in Washington who works more hours a day in the service of our Government than this man does. In my opinion, he is a great Secretary of Defense. He is making a speech tonight before the National Association of Educational Broadcasters at Denver, Colo. I have procured a copy of his speech. Under consent heretofore granted, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be appended to my remarks of today.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California who is the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Mr. Speaker, I served on the Committee on Government Operations for many days and nights when we worked on and wrote the Unification Act of 1947. I think that is the greatest piece of defense legislation in the history of this country. It created the Central Intelligence Agency and was really the beginning of our space program. We had hearings that lasted for days, weeks, and months, and all of the top military came before our committee. If I recall correctly, at that time we envisioned a Secretary of Defense who would be a Secretary of Defense, who would maintain civilian control and yet who would coordinate all of the activities of the Department of Defense and really, frankly, knock heads together and save money.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that Secretary of Defense McNamara has come nearer to being exactly what we planned a Secretary of Defense to be when we first wrote the Unification Act. So, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for his taking this special order on this subject this evening.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, no individual is perfect. It is my opinion that he is on the way toward becoming the type of Secretary of Defense we planned for at the time this matter was considered.

I see sitting here present in the Chamber this evening the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives who served on that committee, and I recall very well the late James Wadsworth of New York who was also a member of that committee; I recall the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who served on that committee, and in my opinion at that time our Committee on Government Operations was one of the most effective and well-established committees of the House of Representatives. Truly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I was selected to serve on it as a freshman member of what was really one of the most outstanding groups with which I have served and which has represented this House of Representatives.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that committee was chaired at that time by our late colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Clare Hoffman, whom we eulogized yesterday. However, I wish to call attention to the Members of the House to the fact that the Department of Defense and the Unification Act was written by the best minds in this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who contributed as much to the enactment of that act as any man in this body of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we envisioned at that time a Secretary of Defense who would save money and who would coordinate and truly unify the various branches of the armed services of this country, services which so often in the past were prone to go in different directions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] in commending a man who I believe on the whole has really lived up to what we pictured him to be at that time as a Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] for his remarks. Further, I thank the gentleman for recalling to my mind something that happened about 20 years ago. As a matter of fact I had not thought of it in a long time. However, I do recall that at that time there was a great deal of fear that we were going to set up a so-called Prussian military system. There were arguments on the floor of the House at that time that this was what we were doing. But I think, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina has so eloquently stated, we did foresee the need to pull together the conflicting forces which existed between the three branches of the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Army.

We felt that there was not too much accommodation between the branches at that time and there was no one with authority, really, over there in the Pentagon to knock their heads together, to use the phrase of the gentleman from South Carolina, and to cause them to do the right thing for the benefit of the entire Nation as a whole. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks.

The speech previously referred to is as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY MCNAMARA TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS, NOVEMBER 7, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk to you this morning about the unused potential of the Department of Defense—a potential for contributing to the solution of the social problems wracking our nation.

The Defense Department is the largest single institution in the world: an institution employing directly four and a half million men and women, indirectly employing several million more, and directing the use of nearly 10 percent of the nation's wealth.

The question I want to put to you is this: can these vast resources be used to contribute to our nation's benefit beyond the narrow—though vitally necessary—role of military power?

As a basis for exploring this question, I want to describe to you three projects that are currently under way:

An Open Housing Program, to break through the barriers of racial discrimination in off-base housing for military personnel.

Project 100,000, a program to salvage the property-scarred youth of our society at the rate of 100,000 men each year—first for two years of military service, and then for a lifetime of productive activity in civilian society.

And finally, Project Transition, a program to assist the three-quarters of a million men leaving military service each year to select and train for the role in civilian life that will contribute most to their personal fulfillment and to the nation's benefit.

But before discussing these programs, let me make it unmistakably clear that our primary responsibility and our clear mandate from the President and from the Congress is to procure and maintain in a high state of combat readiness whatever military forces are necessary to protect this nation from external attack, keep our commitments to our allies, and support the objectives of our foreign policy.

We are meeting that responsibility.

Since 1961, excluding those forces added because of operations in Vietnam, we have increased our military capability in every essential category:

A 45% increase in the number of combat assigned Army divisions—from 11 to 16.

A 73% increase in the funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet.

A 200% increase in the number of guided missile surface ships—from 23 to 72.

A 300% increase in our inventory of nuclear-powered ships—from 19 to 77.

A 40% increase in the number of Air Force tactical fighter squadrons—from 67 to 94—and a 100% increase in the total payload capability of all our fighter and attack aircraft, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.

A 300% increase in helicopter troop lift capability.

A 340% increase in our fixed-wing airlift capability—an increase which will reach 1000% in the 1970s with the introduction of the mammoth new C–5A transport.

A 100% increase in the number of nuclear weapons deployed in NATO Europe.

A 160% increase in the number and total megatonnage of nuclear weapons in the strategic alert forces.

Nor do these increases tell the full story. We have developed in the past several years a broad new array of weapons which include:

The SR–71: a highly sophisticated reconnaissance aircraft that can fly three times the speed of sound.

The Poseidon intercontinental missile which has five to ten times the destructive power of the Polaris missile it replaces.

The MBT–70, a new main battle tank, providing increased firepower, protection and mobility.

The CH–54 flying crane: our first heavy-lift helicopter, which has paid for itself many times over in recovering battle-damaged helicopters, as well as performing an expanded range of supply and logistic functions in support of our troops.

The family of F–111 aircraft: the most sophisticated and effective attack aircraft

in the world today—and recognized as such by foreign governments who are buying it in preference to aircraft produced in their own countries.

The multi-warhead ballistic missile reentry system which multiplies the effectiveness of our missile force.

The Walleye guided bomb, which uses a television guidance system, enabling aircraft and conventional explosives to hit targets in Southeast Asia today with extreme accuracy and effectiveness.

The Lance tactical surface-to-surface missile, equipped with both nuclear and nonnuclear warheads, which has greater range, accuracy and reliability than the missiles it will replace.

The Spartan and Sprint anti-ballistic missiles which will provide defense against a possible Chinese attack in the 1970s.

The Phoenix air-to-air missile system, providing us with the capability of destroying formations of enemy aircraft in the air at substantially greater distances.

The SRAM air-to-surface missile, increasing the effectiveness of our strategic bombers, and enabling us to penetrate advanced enemy defenses.

The Cobra attack helicopter, providing faster, more flexible support of our ground troops.

The A–7 attack aircraft, giving our Navy and the Air Force an improved capability to support our ground forces, with its greater bomb capacity and longer range.

And scores of other weapon systems and sub-systems—many of them, of course, still highly classified.

Now, obviously, the real test of combat readiness is not simply to have an adequate arsenal of advanced weaponry—which we have greatly added to over the past six years—but to be able to respond rapidly and effectively to an emergency.

Such an emergency faced us in the summer of 1965, when it became apparent that Hanoi was on the verge of cutting South Vietnam in half by overwhelming force.

If we in the United States were to prevent that defeat, we had to respond rapidly and effectively.

That is what we did—and our accomplishments in the face of that emergency are the most realistic measure of our combat readiness.

In the first crucial months of the crisis we moved over 100,000 men to Southeast Asia in 120 days. We supplied them with hundreds of thousands of different items, at the end of a 10,000 mile pipeline—which at the time had only one deepwater port, and neither roads nor rail line to move the supplies inland.

In those first critical months we saved South Vietnam from complete and final defeat.

Today we are supporting some 600,000 men in Southeast Asia—at a standard of proficiency never before equalled in the history of warfare—and we are doing so without wage controls, without price controls, without profit controls—and indeed without the serious dislocation of the economy that has been the inevitable accompaniment of every other war we have fought in this century.

What is more, we are accomplishing this without calling up our reserve forces; without any significant movement of our men and equipment out of Western Europe; without any important change in our forces in South Korea; and without jeopardizing our ability to meet additional emergencies that might occur elsewhere in the world.

Now, how has all this been possible?

It has been possible because we have met our first and overriding responsibility in the Defense Department: we were, we are, and we will continue to remain in a high state of combat readiness.

Combat readiness is our primary responsibility.

But I want to stress that responsibility is not inconsistent with other goals.

We have been concerned, for example, with obtaining and operating the required level of military power at the lowest possible cost. That goal is clearly sensible in a Department that is spending over $70 billion per year.

Efficient, economical management does not detract from combat readiness. On the contrary, it strengthens it.

Our defense expenditures today—even including the full cost of our commitments in Southeast Asia—constitute a smaller percentage of the Gross National Product than they did in any fiscal year from 1952 through 1959.

That is due in part to the five-year Cost Reduction Program, which we initiated in 1962. Over the five years we saved the taxpayers in excess of 14 billions of dollars. Now that the initial phase has been completed, we have established the Cost Reduction Program as a permanent annual procedure—with stated goals and carefully audited results.

As part of reducing costs, we have to date initiated actions to consolidate, reduce, or close over 950 Defense installations or activities—all over the world—involving property that has become surplus to foreseeable peacetime or wartime needs.

The base closure program understandably created, in the beginning, a great deal of local apprehension and political pressure. And yet we have not reversed a single base closure decision due to pressure; nor has it been necessary to reopen a single installation to take care of the 25% expansion of our forces which has occurred in the past two years. The recurring annual savings of the base closure program alone, when completed—including the elimination of 200,000 jobs—will total $1.5 billion.

Furthermore, the usual pattern of these base closures is that the local communities—ultimately—benefit from the action. Our Office of Economic Adjustment works closely with the community leaders from the day a base closure is announced, and helps explore fully the growth potential of the area.

Now, just as efficient management and cost reduction are not the Defense Department's primary goals—but are nevertheless entirely consistent with our central responsibility of combat readiness—so it is becoming clear there are other measures that we can take that benefit the economy, and the social profile of the nation, which are equally consistent with our primary objective.

As I said at the outset, we are currently conducting three programs which are directed toward alleviating certain social inequities in the nation.

First, the Open Housing Program:

Racial discrimination—granting the great legislative advances that have been achieved in the past six years—remains a festering infection in our national life.

The Defense Department, beginning with the courageous executive order of President Truman in 1948 integrating the armed services, has been a powerful fulcrum in removing the roadblocks to racial justice—not merely in the military, but in the country at large.

But clearly the nation's road to equality is still strewn with boulders of bias.

Shortly after I became Secretary of Defense, I asked Mr. Gerhard A. Gesell, a leading member of the bar, to organize a committee to review the progress of equal opportunity in the Armed Forces.

That committee took a hard, realistic look at the problem. It reported that substantial improvement had been made on military bases. But it found that there remained severe off-base discrimination affecting thousands of Negro servicemen and their families. This discrimination was most destructive in the field of housing.

Open housing is a serious issue throughout our society. It is not confined to the Armed Forces. Too many of our citizens cannot live in the homes of their choice, on the streets of their choice, in the neighborhoods of their choice.

But this intolerable racial discrimination affects military personnel even more severely than it does the population at large. The serviceman and his family, on limited compensation and under military orders, must move every few years. While defending their nation, they are singularly defenseless against this bigotry.

My response to the Gesell Committee findings was to issue a directive incorporating its recommendations. Commanders everywhere were asked to organize voluntary programs to eliminate housing discrimination in the communities surrounding their bases.

In the Pentagon we turned our minds to other problems.

Early this year we reviewed the results of that four-year-old directive. We sent teams to a dozen bases to look into every aspect of equal opportunity. A special task force was set up for the greater Washington area. Seventeen thousand service families were surveyed. Their answers were analyzed.

One fact became painfully clear. Our voluntary program had failed, and failed miserably.

This failure we found intolerable. I put the matter to you bluntly: our nation should not, and will not, ask a Negro sergeant, for example, to risk his life, day after dangerous day, in the heat and hardship of a jungle war, and then bring him home and compel him to remain separated from his wife and his children because of the hate and prejudice that parades under the pomposity of racial superiority.

And yet, that is precisely what has been happening in this country.

The color of the blood that our men shed in the defense of Asia is all the same shade.

But when these men return home, it is not the color of their blood that matters; it is the color of their skin.

There are thousands of our Negro troops, returning from Vietnam, who are being discriminated against in off-base housing. When there is adequate housing on the base, Negro men in uniform are treated as all Americans should be treated. When there is not, and the Negro must depend on the civilian community for housing, he all too often is denied this equality of treatment.

Because of his color he suffers a penalty; his family suffers a penalty; and our national security suffers a penalty because of the impaired morale of our fighting forces.

We are talking here about a group of men who have distinguished themselves in the service of their nation. It is a fact that Negroes often volunteer for the most difficult and hazardous assignments. It is a fact that 20 percent of Army deaths in Vietnam last year were Negroes.

Earlier this year, in a visit to his home State of South Carolina, General Westmoreland paid tribute to the superb performance of these men.

"I say to the people of my native State and my country," the General noted, "that the performance of the Negro serviceman has been particularly inspirational to me. He has served with distinction equal to that of his white comrade in arms. The Negro serviceman, like all servicemen, has been a credit to our country. He has been courageous on the battlefield, proficient in a cross section of technical skills. Like his white colleague, he understands what the war is all about, he is loyal to his country and supports its policies, and is carrying out his responsibilities with a sense of responsibility."

The Negro serviceman has been loyal and responsible to his country. But the people of his country have failed in their loyalty and responsibility to him. The country which sent him to hazardous duty abroad refuses to permit him to live in the midst of the white civilian community when he returns.

Our original voluntary program to correct off-base housing discrimination floundered and fell apart. It lacked sufficient leadership from the top—starting with me, and going right on down through the senior echelon of the Defense establishment. And it lacked appropriately stiff sanctions for the violation of our anti-discrimination policy.

We have forged, therefore, a whole new set of tools to deal with this failure.

We have mapped out a two-pronged campaign. The first phase was to compile a nation-wide census of open off-base rental housing for military personnel. That we have completed.

The second phase is to mobilize—throughout the entire country—effective community support for non-discriminatory military off-base housing. That is now well under way.

We selected the greater Washington metropolitan area, including Maryland and Virginia, as our first objective. We wanted to make the area surrounding the nation's capital a model program—as it should be—and we wanted to learn quickly all the lessons we could that would assist us in the country at large.

Officials from the highest levels of the Defense Department—the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Service Secretaries, and senior commanders—met with realtors and landlords of the area and put the matter to them squarely.

The extent of off-base housing discrimination was appalling. The morale of our Negro servicemen and their families was being severely eroded. We told the landlords the Defense Department could no longer tolerate the situation.

We appealed to the landlords for voluntary compliance with our nondiscriminatory housing policy.

But we pointed out that the situation as it stood was so unjust that, whether we secured their voluntary compliance or not, we simply could not permit the conditions to continue. If, then, the landlords felt they would not or could not comply, we were going to have to prohibit any of our men—regardless of their race—from signing rental agreements in housing units where such discrimination was practiced.

Many proprietors complied voluntarily. Too many did not.

Let me say that in many instances their position—while shortsighted—was understandable. Some faced genuine economic pressures.

In any event, they did not comply. And so we were compelled to take the only action open to us. We prohibited all military personnel, both white and Negro, from signing new leases or rental agreements in their facilities.

This had the effect of applying a countervailing economic pressure, and our open housing program took on an altogether new and positive direction.

In Northern Virginia and Maryland, within 120 days, we more than trebled the number of non-discriminatory units—from about 15,000 to 53,000 units.

Now we are at work elsewhere throughout the nation. We have, for example, an intensified program going on in California at the moment. We are giving particular emphasis to this State, not merely because of the large number of Defense installations and military personnel there; but because of the 14 states with open housing regulations and laws, California has the lowest percentage of apartment facilities open to all races.

Indeed, we have plans to extend the program in a dozen additional states in the near future.

Everywhere our approach will be the same. We will survey the local situation of each military base. We will meet with the realtors and landlords and explain the problem fully. We will request their cooperation and seek their voluntary compliance. We will do everything possible to see that our military families act as good tenants: that they pay their obligations promptly, and that they respect the property of private owners. We will enlist the help of local and State officials. And only when, and if, all other actions fail, will we apply the appropriate sanctions.

I want to emphasize that I am fully aware that the Defense Department is not a philanthropic foundation or a social-welfare institution. But I want to emphasize just as strongly that I do not propose to let our Negro servicemen and their families continue to suffer the injustices and indignities they have in the past.

It is said that there are no atheists in foxholes. I can assure you that in South Vietnam there is no segregation in foxholes.

There is no segregation of our servicemen in on-base housing.

And the Defense Department cannot tolerate segregation of our servicemen in off-base housing.

Where we must use stiff sanctions, we will.

What we prefer, hope for, and expect is an overwhelming measure of voluntary compliance.

Now let me discuss with you for a moment our second program in the social field. It is called Project 100,000, and I first announced it in a speech in New York in August of last year.

I pointed out, at the time, that though there were roughly 1.8 million young men reaching military service age each year in the United States, some 600,000—a full third—were failing to qualify under our draft standards. Some had medical problems, but I was particularly concerned about those thousands who failed because of educational deficiencies.

In some areas, the failure rate for draftees ran as high as 60 percent; and for Negroes in some states it exceeded 80 percent.

What this clearly meant was that the burden of military service was not being shouldered equally. Inequities were serious: inequities by region; inequities by race; and inequities by educational level.

What was even worse was the obvious implication. If so massive a number of our young men were educationally unqualified for even the least complicated tasks of military service, how could they reasonably be expected to lead productive and rewarding lives in an increasingly technological and highly-skilled society?

Our studies confirmed that a great number of these draft rejectees were the hapless and hopeless victims of poverty: a poverty that is not the mere absence of American middle-class affluence, but something infinitely more complex: a corrosive and decaying mix of social, educational, and environmental deprivation.

What these men badly need is a sense of personal achievement—a sense of succeeding at some task—a sense of their own intrinsic potential.

They have potential, but the slow and silent poison of the poverty virus has paralyzed it in many of them. They have grown up in an atmosphere of drift and discouragement. It is not simply the sometimes squalid ghettos of their external environment that has debilitated them—but an internal and more destructive ghetto of personal disillusionment and despair: a ghetto of the human spirit.

Poverty in America pockmarks its victims inwardly.

If unchecked and unreversed, that inner ghetto of the poverty-scarred personality of these men can fester into explosive frustrations of bitterness and violence.

Chronic failures in school throughout their childhood, they are destined to a downward spiral of defeat and decay in a skill-oriented nation that requires from its manpower pool an increasing index of competence, discipline, and self-confidence.

Poverty destines thousands of young men today to a dismal future. Destines them, yes. But dooms them, no.

These young men—and they are typified by those who in the past have failed to qualify for military service due to educational deficiencies—can be saved from that futile future. They can be rehabilitated, both inwardly and out. They are men, we concluded, who given the benefits of the Defense Department's experience in educational innovation and on-the-job training, and placed in an atmosphere of high motivation and morale, could be transformed into competent military personnel. Beyond that, after their tour of duty, they could return to civilian life—equipped with new skills and attitudes—and thus break out of the self-perpetuating poverty cycle.

The Defense Department is the world's largest producer of skilled men. We provide enlisted men with highly professional training in 1,500 different skills, in more than 2,000 separate courses. And each year we return about three-quarters of a million men to the nation's manpower pool.

The goal of Project 100,000 was, therefore, to take in 40,000 rejectees the first year, and 100,000 each year thereafter. The program completed its first year on September 30.

I want to report to you on its progress.

Our goal was to take 40,000 men; we took 49,000.

They entered all of the services: Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps.

Now, what sort of backgrounds do these men come from? About 60 percent are whites; about 40 percent Negroes. Their average age is 21. Thirty percent of them are unemployed at the time they come to us, and an additional 26 percent are earning less than $60 a week.

What this means is that more than half of these men are gripped in poverty. Nor is that surprising. Their average reading score is a bare sixth-grade level; and 14 percent of them read at a third-grade level or less. Many are poorly motivated when they reach us. They lack initiative. They lack pride. They lack ambition.

If nothing were done to give them a strong sense of their own worth and potential, they, their wives and their children would almost inevitably be the unproductive recipients of some form of the dole 10 years from now.

I want to repeat: We have taken these men into the service because we are convinced that, given the proper environment and training, they can contribute just as much to the defense of their country as men from the more advantaged segments of our society.

Has that belief been borne out by the facts?

We now have had a full year's experience with this program, and let me tell you the results.

Ninety-eight percent of our traditional categories of recruits successfully graduated from basic training during the year. And the successful graduation rate of these 49,000 new category men was 96 percent—only two percentage points less than our traditional recruits.

I have insisted that these men should never be singled-out or stigmatized as a special group. Technically—and for our own internal record-keeping—men who would have formerly been draft rejectees are termed New Standards men. But the men themselves are never informed that they are in this category.

It is absolutely imperative that they believe in themselves and their own potential. They obviously cannot do that if we treat them with anything remotely suggesting condescendence.

The plain fact is that our Project 100,000 is succeeding beyond even our most hopeful expectations. Many of our commanders report that these men are turning out to be even more highly motivated than some serv-

icemen with a much more privileged background.

Now these are the initial results, and we are immensely encouraged. But obviously the real test is going to come later, when these men move back into civilian society. How will they fare then?

Will the vital sense of achievement and self-confidence they have experienced in their military service, as well as the skills they have learned, move them forward in society—or will they return to the depressing downward-spiralling, poverty-in-the-midst-of-plenty phenomenon that plagues our urban ghettos and our rural pockets of economic stagnation?

We cannot say for certain. But we intend to find out.

We are launching a careful follow-up study to test conclusively the ultimate outcome of Project 100,000. At least a decade of careful measurement of the performance of the men both in and out of the service will be required. We won't know until the end of that period what the definitive study will prove. But I am willing to make a prediction. I am convinced that the Project 100,000 men will continue to do a fully creditable job in the service; and that on return to civilian life, their earning capacity—and their overall achievement in society—will be two or three times what it would have been had there been no such program, and had they remained rejectees.

Hundreds of thousands of men can be salvaged from the blight of poverty, and the Defense Department—with no detriment whatever to its primary role—is particularly well equipped to salvage them.

We not only can do it. We are doing it. And the benefit to our society—and to the ultimate roots of our security—will be immense.

Now, let me describe to you briefly our third program in this field. We call it Project Transition.

As I mentioned, we return some 750,000 men from the services annually to civilian life. Some of these men can move readily into civilian jobs without difficulty, but a significant number of them are faced with genuine problems.

We surveyed the situation, and found that some 50 percent of the men about to leave the services need and want some degree of help to make the transition to a productive civilian life.

To provide that help, we have created a voluntary program—Project Transition—for men with 30 to 180 days of service time remaining. The project gives priority to certain groups: to those disabled in battle; to those with no previous civilian occupation; to combat arms servicemen with no civilian-related skill; to those who have such a skill, but who require additional training or upgrading; and finally to those who desire a completely new civilian skill, regardless of their current training status.

The program meets four basic needs of the man leaving the service: counseling, skill enhancement, education, and job placement.

We now have pilot programs—for each of the services—at five bases. I can report to you today that within sixty days Project Transition will be in operation at all eighty of the major installations in this country.

We have enlisted the cooperation of other federal agencies—the Labor Department, HEW, the Postal Service—as well as a number of State and local agencies that can assist with training, and offer employment to these men. A number of police departments around the nation, for example, are participating, not only with professional advice and technical assistance but with solid job offers as well.

Though the program is still in its pilot stage, it clearly has tremendous potential, and industrial leaders throughout the nation have already expressed enthusiasm for the idea. Further, the Ford Foundation has offered to work closely with us in solving the problems connected with placing the right veteran in the right job.

We are going to be able to give the returning Negro veteran—particularly the Negro veteran who without help might be compelled to drift back into the stagnation of the urban ghetto—an opportunity for valuable training and satisfying employment.

Every veteran—regardless of color, creed, or class—who has served his country in the Armed Forces deserves the opportunity to move back usefully and productively into civilian life. Project Transition will help give him the opportunity.

I think the point we must realize is this. There is no question but that the economic, social, and educational legislation of the current period eventually will transform American society immensely for the better.

But the very magnitude of the task will require a decade or two for the full effects to be felt.

This means that the present generation of the under-privileged youth of all races, caught in the self-perpetuating trap of poverty, are in danger of being left out of these eventual benefits.

The President has made clear that the United States cannot be satisfied with that situation. We must find ways to assist people now—even before our present legislation can reach its full potential for economic and social improvement.

This is manifestly a national responsibility—not primarily a Department of Defense responsibility.

Our primary responsibility—to repeat—is the security of this nation. But in the ultimate analysis, the foundation of that security is a stabile social structure. I suggest to you that the Defense Department can find ways to contribute to the development of such a structure without compromising the combat readiness of its forces.

The three social programs I have described to you today are the kinds of programs that will bolster the security of this nation. They are the kinds of programs that will reduce the criticism, some of it justified, that we are often bludgeoned with internationally: criticism that grows out of the discrepancy between our traditional preaching of the principles of liberty and equality—and our obvious lapses in the practice or those two bedrock constitutional guarantees. They are partial answers to the basic question: can our present American society afford to meet simultaneously its responsibilities both at home and abroad?

Can we continue to meet our commitments to contain aggression internationally, and at the same time take the measures necessary to cure our urban and racial ills here at home?

I say definitively that we can.

This nation is immensely powerful—both in material and human resources.

Our current Defense expenditures—as heavy as they are—are only 9 percent of the GNP. That is a lesser percentage of the GNP than defense spending in most of the years of the 1950s. The taxes we pay today are billions of dollars less than the taxes we would be paying under the tax rates of the 1950's. The modest surcharge that the President is recommending—and which makes eminent sense in our highly charged economy—will represent a recision of less than half of the tax cuts this Administration has achieved.

And yet, we appear to believe that we cannot afford to achieve all that genuinely needs achieving.

We appear to believe that we are stretching our resources too thinly.

We appear to believe that we cannot simultaneously wage war against aggression abroad, and a war against poverty, urban decay, and social injustice here at home.

That we cannot afford it is a myth.

That we may choose not to attempt it, is another matter entirely.

But if we make that choice, let us make it deliberately and rationally.

Let us not make that choice because of a mere mythology—the mythology that America is not now strong enough to do all that needs doing.

We are strong enough materially and technologically. We do have the resources in both money and manpower.

What we may lack is the will power.

If we do lack it, so be it. But let that be our conscious choice. Let us face the issues honestly, and admit to ourselves that we simply do not want to make the effort.

Let us not blame the lack of effort on the myth that we cannot do all that needs doing.

For the fact is, we can.

We can curb aggression abroad. And we can meet our pressing social problems here at home. And we can do both at the same time if we will use wisely existing institutions and available resources.

The simple question is this: do we have the requisite faith in ourselves?

Do we have the requisite confidence in our constitutional objectives?

Do we have the requisite resolve to complete the achievements that the United States was found less than 200 years ago to secure?

I, for one, say we do.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what say you?

Thank you, and good morning.

HON. SARGENT SHRIVER—AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN AND INCOMPARABLE PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier in general debate today on the poverty bill a statement was made to the effect that Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has indicated that he would resign from his position if Congress reduced appropriations below what he believes is the absolute minimum which he needs to carry on this program.

One of the Members during general debate expressed the desire that Sargent Shriver should resign from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and further had some rather unkind things to say about the Director of the poverty program.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver needs no apologists. He has written a record which speaks for itself.

He is one of the outstanding citizens of this country and has made a profound contribution to his Government at all levels.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver truly represents the very epitome of a good American and a good citizen.

However, I would not want this record to show that the statements made by an earlier speaker calling for the resignation of Sargent Shriver went unchallenged.

I know Sargent Shriver well.

I remember him as an outstanding citizen of the city of Chicago when he was president of the Chicago School Board and when under his administration Chicago developed one the finest school systems in the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, Sargent Shriver was brought to Washington by the late great President John F. Kennedy to head the Peace Corps. He was invited by President Johnson to take on the very difficult task of putting together an effective war on poverty.

I do not know of any man in Government who has a more difficult and thankless job, than Sargent Shriver.

We are the first nation in the world, Mr. Speaker, that has undertaken the herculean task, a difficult task, and a seemingly impossible task, of eliminating poverty from our ranks

Sargent Shriver has carried out and managed this battle with a dedication seldom found in a public official.

Sargent Shriver is independently wealthy. He has a lovely family that he would like to spend more time with, and yet week in and week out, and day in and day out, and night in and night out, Sargent Shriver is at his desk here in Washington or visiting some community action center, or some community action agency in the country, to make a personal observation of the programs, and to make sure that the great hope and confidence that the American people have placed in the poverty program will be effectively carried out.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am no deep student of the poverty program, but I do want to say that in my judgment Sargent Shriver has diligently sought to do a good job with the program. I realize that many mistakes have been made, and I believe anyone will agree that mistakes would be inevitable in trying to do what amounts almost to the impossible in dealing with this poverty problem.

Mr. Speaker, I further want to say that I have the greatest respect for Sargent Shriver. I believe he is a brilliant and capable man, and I believe he has given unstintingly of his efforts to serve the Nation in an important capacity.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. I would certainly join the gentleman from Texas in saying that this country and all of us, rich and poor, in politics and out of politics, in Government and out of Government, owe Sargent Shriver a monumental debt of gratitude.

It will be a great loss for America if and when the day does indeed come when for personal reasons and reasons known best to himself, he will remove himself from the poverty program.

He has given this program direction and hope, and if we are winning this war—and we are winning this war against poverty in community after community in America—it is a tribute to the determined, honest, and dedicated leadership that Sargent Shriver has given to the program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during the 4 months in which I have been conducting an investigation of the American Farm Bureau and its affiliates, not one of my charges has been refuted. Instead, the Farm Bureau uses an intriguing end run of personal attack and distortion of my views.

For example, in the October 2 edition of the American Farm Bureau Federation Official Newsletter, I read that—

Representative Joseph Y. Resnick (D) of N.Y. has launched an attack on all farm cooperatives.

This scurrilous and irresponsible account of my investigation ignores the fact that I have repeatedly said I am concerned with the practices of only those giant cooperatives—usually affiliated with the Farm Bureau—which have been victimizing the American farmer by issuing worthless patronage dividends.

Many cooperatives—certainly a large majority—are truly farmer controlled and farmer owned. Since they represent the farmer, they return co-op profits to him within a reasonable period of time. Such a co-op is the New York Dairymen's League.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following statement of the Dairymen's League, which describes their policy of distributing patronage dividends, in the RECORD. It is a model which all cooperatives would do well to follow:

DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS

1. Dairymen's League Certificates of Indebtedness represent, in effect, a legally binding agreement between the Cooperative and its individual members. Each member under the bylaws of the Association, loans the League 10c a hundredweight on all of his milk marketed through the League. In return, he receives each April a Certificate representing the monies so loaned during the preceding 12-month period. This Certificate has a due-date 10 years from the date of issue. In addition, it pays (presently) 5¼% interest each year until called. The money is used exclusively for capital purposes: building plants; buying businesses; plant improvements etc. It is separate and distinct from the 2c a hundredweight members contribute to the day-to-day operations of the League.

2. For more than 40-years League Certificates of Indebtedness have been used by members of the Association as a regular part of the financial operations. They are often used as security when negotiating a loan. In instances of this type, the bank holds the Certificates until the loan has been paid, but the League member continues to collect the interest.

3. There has always been a ready market for League Certificates. In most cases, the member can sell his Certificates for 100 cents on the dollar to other members or to other private parties looking for a secure investment for surplus cash. There is also an active dealers market for Certificates. At least two or three such dealers regularly advertise in the Dairymen's League News to buy all Certificates offered. As is customary in such cases, the dealers buy at some discount below the face value of the Certificates.

4. The League has never failed to redeem its Certificates—usually a year or two before they are legally due to be called. No interest payment has ever been missed.

5. Beginning in 1967, the League issued an *additional* type of Certificate called a "Certificate of Investment." This is *purely voluntary*. It is intended to provide the Association with long-term capital and members with opportunity for long-term investment at a high rate of interest. These Certificates of Investment are for 25 years and carry 6% interest. As one mark of the confidence members have in the Association, some $700,000 have already been invested in the new Certificates by members. There is no doubt that this success reflects the reputation earned during the past 40 years by the original Certificates of Indebtedness (which, of course, continue to be the mainstay of the Association's capital financing.)

A SALUTE TO MARIE CURIE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today let us pause to consider and to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the world's most important and heartwarming scientists—Marie Curie. Every American school child has heard the story of the Curies—Pierre and Marie—who persevered through the harshest circumstances to isolate polonium and radium. Marie Curie is considered a scientist par excellence whose life should be studied by any young person aspiring to scientific endeavor. Madam Marie Curie was born Marie Sklodowska in Warsaw, Poland, on November 7, 1867. She grew up in an atmosphere of scientific pursuit—her father was a professor of physics—and in 1891 traveled to Paris to study physics and chemistry at the Sorbonne.

Mademoiselle Sklodowska married Pierre Curie, a professor of physics, in 1895 and together the Curies began their researches into radioactive substances. In 1903 they were awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics for the discovery of radioactivity. After Pierre was killed in 1906, Marie continued their work. In 1911 she was awarded the Nobel Prize for Chemistry for the discovery of radium and the study of its properties. She became the first person to receive the Nobel Prize in two subjects.

In 1921 and again in 1929 she visited the United States where she was enthusiastically received and aided in her radiology research. Marie Curie encouraged the establishment of a radium institute in Warsaw, the city of her birth, and attended the dedication of the institute in 1932. She died in Paris on July 4, 1934, but will never really die so long as we continue to look to her fortitude in the face of adversity as a source of inspiration and courage.

POLLS TAKEN BY KOB–TV

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues would appreciate being provided with the results of recently taken polls in Albuquerque, N. Mex., by KOB–TV news station, directed by Mr. William F. Tucker, radio-TV news director, and substantially representative of the thinking of the Southwest—and specifically of New Mexico—in the fall of 1967. The results of the polls are as follows:

Should the Government force a ban on cigarette advertising and also try to halt the sale of cigarettes?

[In percent]

Yes	60.1
No	39.9

Should Congress pass Federal gun registration and strict gun control laws?

Yes	22.3
No	77.6

Should teachers be permitted to strike?

Yes	64.9
No	35.1

Do you feel 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote?

Yes	55.4
No	44.6

Do you think a stoppage of the bombing in North Vietnam would lead to useful negotiations?

Yes	71.1
No	24.9

Are you in favor of abolishing capital punishment?

Yes	28.6
No	71.4

Do you think the Job Corps is doing a good job?

Yes	29.6
No	70.4

Do you think labor unions have become too powerful?

Yes	70.4
No	29.6

Do you think members of the clergy should participate in civil rights demonstrations?

Yes	19.7
No	80.3

Do you think Congress should cut back and completely reexamine the war on poverty?

Yes	69.7
No	30.1

Do you think draft card burners should be charged with treason?

Yes	78.1
No	21.9

THE 95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on October 23 to 27, the American Public Health Association held its 95th annual convention in Miami Beach, Fla. It may seem somewhat incongruous to my colleagues that I draw their attention to this meeting rather than to last year's APHA meeting which was held in my home State, but I do so for two reasons. First, this outstanding association, with a membership of over 19,000 persons working in official and voluntary public health agencies, at the Miami Beach session named as its president-elect, Dr. Lester Breslow, director of public health of California's State Department of Public Health. Dr. Breslow has a well deserved reputation as an outstanding leader in public health activities. California is fortunate to have a man of Dr. Breslow's competence directing its public health programs. I compliment him on the honor which has been given him and commend the American Public Health Association for its wise choice.

Additionally, my colleague on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Congressman PAUL ROGERS, presented an unusually perceptive address at the convention's first general session on the Partnership for Health Act. Congressman ROGERS, whose interest in and whose many contributions to this Nation's health programs have long been recognized by members of our committee, skillfully outlined our view of the potentials which this bold new program offers in better coping with the health problems of this country. I believe that Congressman ROGER'S remarks, which I am including, will be of interest to all Members of the House.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS AT THE 95TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION IN MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

At the onset, I want to say all Floridians were complimented by your selection of our state for your meeting this year. Your choice reflects the sort of keen judgment all of us in the Congress have come to expect from the American Public Health Association.

I am also delighted that you are interested in such a vital way in the Comprehensive Health Planning Program which we passed last year and are in the process of amending and extending this session.

As little as five years ago the comprehensive health plan was just a dream. We knew something was needed to improve our health services and planning. But at the same time there was little on the horizon that would indicate just when we would have relief. This caused anxiety.

It was rather like the man who felt there was something wrong with him and scheduled a visit with his doctor to get a checkup. The doctor ran the man through three hours of testing and while the patient was dressing somewhat confirmed his patient's fears by asking, "How do you spell incurable?"

Well, I don't think any of us really felt that our health services were in such straits. And I think we are now proceeding to find an effective cure for many of the problems which have plagued our health services.

I think the single most encouraging and enlightening item in making our health legislation is the fact that we have begun to define our goals. I consider this most important.

With your help, we are shaping legislation that in turn will re-shape the structure of public health programs across the nation.

The main tool in this effort, I feel, will be the Comprehensive Health Act, or, the Partnership for Health Act.

I assure you that we in the Congress will be closely watching the planning and execution of this program as to quality, cooperativeness and of course, the ultimate effectiveness of the program. In many ways the legislation is an experiment. The success of the experiment depends largely upon the ability of all the parties concerned to meet their responsibility.

I know that some organized elements of the health enterprise may be hesitant in participating for fear that they will lose their identity. But I submit to you, that to get your state and the nation moving along on the same road to better health services, there must be comprehensive health planning to unify our health effort.

When we reported this year's amendments to the Comprehensive Health Act from the House Committee, we took particular pains to indicate to the House our concern that the planning process was to be inclusive of every health element—not exclusive.

As we envisioned this legislation, the future should bring about plans for each portion of a state where there are health problems. We may see geographic areas which encompass several counties combining to submit a plan which is particular to that area. Of course, the individual county with a large population will most probably submit its own plan.

Evolving finally, however, we hope that each area of each state will participate to the extent that all will fit together like the pieces of a puzzle which, in the end, will represent the state plan.

The Comprehensive Health Planning Act, or the Partnership for Health Act, evolved from a finding by the Congress that (A) the changing character of health problems demanded a comprehensive planning for (1) health services (2) health manpower, and (3) health facilities at every level of government. That (B), desirable administration required strengthening of the leadership and capacities of state health agencies, and (C) that support of health services provided people in their communities should be broadened and made more flexible. Under these headings come more specific items which demand our attention.

(1) Health services require more planning and concern for delivery of health services, using and disbursing the latest techniques. Our heart, cancer, stroke legislation—which in reality is a continuing education program—is a good example of this.

(2) Health manpower requires planning for more effective use of highly trained and skilled personnel and a means to help solve our existing shortages. Use of supporting allied health personnel is a necessity. The Allied Health Professions Training Act should be of great help to train those interested in the supporting health professions. The development and use of electronic devices to free limited manpower should be given greater emphasis.

(3) Health facilities—better planning and coordination in placement of facilities, and in particular, better planning in placement and use of expensive, yet limited-use equipment.

A major priority in all health planning must be a consideration heretofore not emphasized sufficiently—and that is a reduction of the cost of health services to the American people.

Hospital and medical costs have skyrocketed alarmingly. The Brookings Institution published a study which has projected a

$100 a day hospital room cost in the very near future. Health services have risen 7 to 8 per cent a year in the past two decades and jumped 14 to 16 per cent each year in the last two years. A concentrated effort in planning must be undertaken to solve this problem.

Planning must give greater emphasis to preventive medicine rather than just curative medicine. There must be more extensive use of examinations and check-ups to catch and prevent critical health problems before they develop and require extensive and expensive care and hospitalization.

Your organization can perform a major service to the American people if you will devote your abilities to help meet and solve this challenge and assume a leadership role.

As you know, we are moving into a new concept of Federal-State relationship—a Partnership for Health—with greater responsibility thrust upon state and local governments to develop comprehensive, imaginative and effective plans and programs for health. How the states meet this responsibility will determine the continuance of this program. As to the Act itself, there are four provisions I would like to briefly mention.

(1) Block grants to the states will replace the old categorical grants. The planning done by the state—not by Washington—will be the determining factor in the allocation of these funds. In other words, the states will say where this money will go, determined by the priorities set by the state. The plan must be comprehensive.

(2) Project grants must conform to the state plan. It is my feeling that in the near future the Congress will look at the division of funds between block grants and project grants, which presently are equal, to see if more of the funds should be allocated to the block grants and a subsequent reduction in project grants.

Special programs like Migrant Health, as well as new and innovative programs will continue to need special attention.

(3) Personnel exchange and training in the new legislation is also a most significant step. The law is designed to again carry out the Partnership in Health approach in a realistic manner. Federal health personnel and state health personnel may be interchanged as agreed upon by the Secretary and the State. This will allow a greater knowledge and understanding of health problems and solutions. I hope that extensive use will be made of this provision not only by the states, but also by the Federal agency, so that those in Washington may obtain a better working knowledge of the problems in the *field*.

(4) Training programs for state public health personnel should be developed and used immediately as authorized by the Act.

The Congress has been responsive in trying to meet the health needs of the nation in formulating legislation. In fact, 37 separate pieces of health legislation have been approved by the Congress and signed by the President in the past six years. When we consider the number of people who have been affected by medicare and medicaid, we can see just how Federal health legislation has gone to the heart of some of our largest problems—health protection and service for the elderly. We did not have this six years ago.

Clearly, health programs are an increasingly important part of our national effort. And their growth is as certain as the growth of our total population.

The momentum caused by this health legislation led the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to establish a Special Subcommittee to investigate the health activities of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It was my honor to chair this Subcommittee. I feel certain that we will soon see a continuing and effective reorganization of the Federal Health Agency.

Perhaps the most significant recommendation by the Committee was for the establishment of a Department of Health with a Sub-Cabinet post for health—either of Secretary or Undersecretary of Health under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—in order to provide a single focus for health planning and coordination of Federal health activities with the Department.

An amendment has already been proposed to establish such a position. Reorganization must follow. All of us, I am sure, will be interested in watching these developments.

It was the intent of the Committee that health functions be focused in the Health Department, and I am concerned with an initial transfer of the Crippled Children's Services—basically a health program—to the new Social Rehabilitation Services. I hope that the Committee's recommendations will not be misinterpreted.

In the Partnership for Health Act we have said to the states, "Let's get organized, let's plan, let's obtain optimum results from available money and Health Manpower."

It does not appear too much to ask our Federal Health Agency to do likewise.

In conclusion, may I say that, along with many members of the Congress, I deeply value the voice and opinions of the American Public Health Association. I join with all of the people of this nation in expressing our appreciation and thanks for your dedication to the cause of better health for all our people.

CONGRESSMAN DANIELS CITES NEW JERSEY CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent following my remarks I place in the RECORD a resolution of the Captive Nations Committee of the State of New Jersey.

I think it is well that we frequently bring to mind the fact that many millions of our fellow human beings still suffer under the yoke of Communist oppression.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS' COMMITTEE OF NEW JERSEY

We, the delegates of Czech, Bulgarian, Byelorus', Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovakian and Ukrainian organizations representing our peoples who are citizens of the United States of America and who at the same time preserve cultural and spiritual ties with the peoples of our original homelands, do solemnly declare:

1. The forthcoming 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik (Communist) Revolution fills our hearts with anguish for it represents the beginning of the Imperialist movement which has culminated in the military conquest of our original homelands and in the serfdom of our peoples.

2. Our peoples held under the alien Communist yoke have been deprived of all freedom. On the soil of their own homelands our peoples cannot benefit from their own natural and human resources. The wealth of the land and people has been confiscated by the Communist rulers to perpetuate their positions of power and by brutal suppression and to extend the boundaries of Communist Imperialism by international subversion.

3. The unrelenting resistance by our peoples to Communist oppression in our original homelands is a continuing source of inspiration to us in our new homeland. In recent years we witnessed repeated attempts to regain greater freedom in the development of their national identity and culture. Particularly persistent efforts were made to restore the cultural achievements of their nations and to impress the youth with the feeling of national pride. The entry into the cultural life during the recent years of hosts of nationally-minded, patriotic men and women clearly reflects a powerful reservoir of resistance to Communist oppression.

4. The Communist tyrants have reacted in typically brutal fashion to crush the persistent aspirations of our peoples to regain the benefits of national liberation and cultural freedom. They have recently suppressed several leading literary persons by imprisonment, bullying, humiliation or by depriving them of their rights of citizenship. They have produced an increasing number of pseudo-historical works degrading our national movements, distorting our political and cultural leaders and deriding the activities of our immigrants in their adopted homelands. They continue to deny all religious freedom in our original homelands, and have increasingly interferred with the affairs of our emigrant churches. The increasing sharpness of these attacks serves as a measure of the Communist rulers' apprehension regarding the tenacious yearning of our peoples for freedom.

5. For the above stated reasons, we firmly resolve to persist in our efforts to alert the government and people of our new homeland to the continuing fight of our peoples remaining in their original homelands, and to increase cooperation in our efforts in a brotherly manner. We further pledge to maintain and strengthen moral and material ties with our peoples subjugated within the Communist Colonial Empire.

6. We fervantly hope that the government of the United States of America, chosen by us and our fellow citizens, will fulfill our aspirations which are embodied in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence by giving its moral support for the liberation of our enslaved peoples from Communist regimes' attempts to conceal its true totalitarian nature behind a facade of pseudo-democracy.

7. We solemnly implore the government of the United States of America to refrain from sending congratulations to the Soviet Empire on the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik (Communist) Revolution, but to join us in mournful silence remembering the millions of our peoples who have perished from Communist brutality. We also implore our government to refuse to send official representatives to any official observances sponsored by the Soviet Empire, its colonies or protectorates for we deplore the thought that our representatives will be greeting Communist brutes whose hands are smeared with the blood of our peoples.

On behalf of the Captive Nations Committee:

DANIEL MARCHISHIN,
Chairman.

THE HONORABLE JOHN V. KENNY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1967, the Jersey City chapter of UNICO named as their "Man of the

Year," a man who is Jersey City's man of the year every year, the Honorable John V. Kenny.

Because John V. Kenny means so much to so many in Hudson County, N.J., there is not enough time to list all of the good things he has done for his city, his county, his State, and, as an original backer of the late President Kennedy, for his country. Suffice it to say that John V. Kenny is a man who brought tolerance and decency to politics and opened the doors to those who had previously known only closed doors. His achievements are many but truly this was his greatest gift to his community. There are very few of whom it can be said that we shall not see his like again. John Vincent Kenny is one of those.

All of the things I would like to say were said so well on the occasion of the presentation of the UNICO Award by the Honorable William J. Flanagan, executive director of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, that I will include his remarks, which were given at the Skyline Cabana in Jersey City on October 27, 1967, in their entirety at this point in the RECORD. Mr. Flanagan's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM J. FLANAGAN

John Vincent Kenny, as a subject matter could not be adequately covered in any single evening. The history of his life and times recounting the colorful days of "Shagger" Cummins, lovable Tom Boyle and "Bug Juice" Morrisey would alone fill a volume. But as I move on to other chapters perhaps he can be persuaded to regale you with tales of their activities.

Tonight I'm going to tell you about the John Vincent Kenny you know by telling you some things you do not know.

It is of course acknowledged that he is a master of the political art. As a leader, his string of political victories is phenomenal.

As a working office holder, no other mayor of this town ever did as much in the five years he served as John Kenny. No other chief executive had ever achieved so great and rapid change.

He built five new schools, new housing projects and new hope in the hearts of our people.

He erased political prejudice and offered the opportunity for high elective office to Americans of Polish and Italian extraction for the first time.

He wiped out the enforced discipline and the old fears and replaced them with a freedom the city has never known.

He encouraged and developed young men and changed the course and fortunes of more young lives than any man I know.

His experience in politics made him a student of the past and a prophet of the future.

A full eighteen years before the remainder of the United States awakened to its necessity John Kenny launched his own equal rights and equal opportunity programs.

He moved Negroes into positions of trust and responsibility. He appointed them to the Board of Education, the Housing Authority, the city Law Department, the Fire Department and as superior officers in the Police Department.

He took them by the hand—without urging from anyone—and prompted by a sense of justice, led them through doors that had been forever closed to them.

True, he is your man of the year—but he was a man of his time eighteen years ago when the times could have used more men like him.

He served in that high ceilinged and paneled office on the second floor of City Hall for five years, though he never intended to stay that long. In fact, he never intended to run at all.

Peace loving but courageous, like any true son of Irish ancestry, he responded to the natural urge to swing back when someone swung at him.

I recall being separated from my appendix back in 1948. I was in St. Francis Hospital when he walked into my room. We talked of many things and he revealed—although he wasn't to announce his intention until almost a year later—that he would be a candidate.

"I don't want to run," I can remember him saying, as he stood at the foot of my bed. "But I have to run—to show them I'm not afraid of them and to show them I can beat them."

He then recounted the harassment he and his family was being subjected to; that he was followed constantly; that he and the members of his second ward club were under constant surveillance by a Jersey City Police Sergeant who had been placed within his group. The fact that he was supposed to be a friend was part of the deception.

"When I beat them," he said with characteristic confidence, "I'll serve one term and hand it over to someone else."

So sweeping was his victory and so dramatic were his changes that in the course of human behavior it was inevitable that there would be those who would seek to throttle him.

Few men in public life had been successful against such odds. Fewer still have ever been subjected to personal harassment as malicious and as persistent.

John Kenny was hounded and pounded, probed, investigated, interrogated and degraded. But never once did he hide, never did he run, nor ever lower his head.

Through years of countless degradations the lie was continually hurled back into the teeth of his detractors. To his everlasting credit, never once did any accuser—and they were legion—never once did they succeed in placing a mark against his character.

Your man of the year is a man by many measurements, and most surely by those standards set down by Rudyard Kipling in his immortal "If."

"If you can walk with kings and keep the common touch; then you're a man, my son," was one of the conditions he wrote.

John Kenny has walked with the great and near great and has never been affected by their presence. He has dined with Mrs. Kenny at Morven and at the White House on more than one occasion. Yet he finds the same satisfaction at Sunday dinner with his wife, with his daughter, Catherine, her husband Paul and the children—grand and great-grand.

Perhaps an explanation of that can be found in the fact that he had so much to do with assisting those kings to the throne.

In Los Angeles during the summer of 1960 following the waste of New Jersey's convention votes I told John Bailey, the national Democratic chairman, of our bitter frustration.

"I'll tell you something," he confided. "Jack Kennedy knows very well where Johnny Kenny stands for there are only three men in this country who formed the keystone that originated his candidacy. One was Congressman Charlie Buckley of New York, the second myself and the third Johnny Kenny."

Relaying these assurances to Mayor Kenny he revealed to me an incident that occurred in his apartment in Miami Beach early in 1959. He received a phone call, he said, from Joe Kennedy who told him his son, Jack, wished to discuss an important matter.

"He probably used the family plane to come down from Palm Beach," the Mayor recalled, "because he was there in a very short time. We had a pleasant conversation. He asked me if I would support him for the presidency. I encouraged him, we shook hands and I gave him my word."

That handshake and that word are the hallmarks of this man. They are symbols of sincerity to the thousands who have received them.

As contemporaries it may be difficult to fully appreciate his greatness. I imagine that is because of his disarming demeanor and his simple style.

He likes to laugh and to hear people laugh.

He is a charitable man.

He is an unaffected, humble man.

He is a devout man.

Like all Irishmen he is a sentimentalist, and while he is eloquent and truly literate before an audience he is at his best in a small group, reminiscing and re-living the glories and the lives of the people who have enriched his life.

There are a thousand other ways to describe your Man of the Year.

Barney Doyle referred to him as "Quarters" because of his classic habit of jingling change from hand to hand. The late Johnny Connell, whose lexicon was as famous as it was colorful, called him "Two Fingers" in honor of the ever present V-for-victory sign he flashes during campaigns.

Redheaded Joe Culloo, his dearest friend, affectionately dubbed him "The Little Guy", though he stands tall, crowned by the sun, casting a giant shadow.

The Man of the Year for 1967? Indeed.

But more than that—he is a man for all seasons!

HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE: A COMPANY OF VISION AND RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call attention to another outstanding achievement of the remarkable pharmaceutical firm, Hoffmann-La Roche of Nutley, N.J. This splendid company has just announced an 8-year, $300 million expansion program which will be of incalculable benefit to Nutley, Essex County, and the State of New Jersey. This is a magnificent project, which Hoffmann-La Roche's president, Dr. V. D. Mattia, terms "unparalleled anywhere in the world." It is also a heartening expression of confidence and faith in the future of the community and the strength of our economic system.

Hoffmann-La Roche has already embarked on several enlightened and public-spirited programs. Since 1962, it has had in operation an indigent patient program, whereby the company's drugs are made available without cost to the indigent sick. Hoffmann-La Roche also initiated a landmark medicare reimbursement program, which provides a 25-percent discount on all Roche drugs used by medicare patients during hospitalization. And more recently, plans were announced for a unique institution, the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology, which will be dedicated to fundamental research on basic life processes.

I am extremely proud that Hoffmann-La Roche is located in my congressional district, and even more privileged that its

president, Dr. V. D. Mattia, is also a resident. Dr. Mattia is a man of vision and courage, with genuine concern for humanity. Under his direction Hoffmann-La Roche's progressive and innovative policies are helping meet the most basic problems and needs of our country. I include at this point in the RECORD a Newark Star Ledger editorial of November 7, commenting on the latest benefit which we will derive from this great company:

THE RIGHT RX

The mammoth expansion program that will be undertaken by Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., the major pharmaceutical firm based in Nutley, is a tangible, substantial expression of faith in the nation's economy.

It is an example of what the private sector can do to bolster sagging confidence in the capacity of the nation to underwrite an extremely costly conflict and to maintain a domestic stability with programs designed to relieve ghetto tensions and to help in the rebuilding of America's older cities.

The spending of $300 million over an eight-year period projects even more significant benefits for Essex County and the state. It will mean thousands of new jobs, an expanded tax source for Nutley and the county and the spinoff of benefits that accrue to the commercial and financial communities from the growth of a corporate entity.

When the drug firm's capital construction program is completed, it will represent a complex of manufacturing and research facilities that in the words of its president, Dr. V. D. Mattia, will be "unparalleled anywhere in the world." It is a corporate asset that should be highly prized by the Garden State, providing a vital impetus for New Jersey's future growth.

THE VISTA VOLUNTEER

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the life and work of a VISTA volunteer who serves with the Office of Economic Opportunity's VISTA program is far from easy or glamorous. Fighting poverty at its source requires patience, dedication, and hard work. Those of our fellow Americans who join the VISTA program are truly making a remarkable contribution to the war on poverty.

I believe my colleagues will find the following article about a VISTA volunteer serving in New York City interesting and reassuring; interesting because it describes some of the unique daily challenges and problems posed by urban poverty to a young lady who is a VISTA volunteer serving in Harlem; reassuring because the volunteer is a 23-year-old member of the younger generation who is making a contribution to those less fortunate.

It is with knowledge of this kind of work that we should approach the bill before us today, and quickly remedy the "freeze" on appropriations which is currently bringing the VISTA program to a halt.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include this excellent article from Sunday, the Courant Magazine, about the good work VISTA volunteers are doing in their service with the OEO at this point in the RECORD:

SHE HELPS THE POOR IN HARLEM—RADCLIFFE GRADUATE FROM KENT TAKES THE SLUMLORDS IN COURT

(By Betty Murphy)

Ceilings were falling in. Streams of water ran through living rooms from bathroom leaks. There were many rat holes. Windows were broken and children were freezing cold.

A 19th century tenement house was falling apart around 18 Puerto Rican families in East Harlem, N.Y., last December, but the landlord wouldn't repair it. One-third of the tenants of the filthy, gloomy walk-up couldn't speak English. They didn't know what to do.

A 23-year-old girl from Kent who lived on the next block knew about the situation. Even with a college degree, she didn't know exactly what to do either, but she decided to find out.

Mary Breasted, a tall, pretty VISTA (Volunteer in Service to America), who looks like a Radcliffe College girl (which she was) was starting her second year with Block Communities as a worker on East 119th where the apartment house was located. She knew many of the tenants. In fact, one was her closest friend in Harlem.

She sought legal advice on the situation and a rent strike seemed to be the only answer. The tenants would stop paying their rent until the landlord repaired the building, but certain technicalities must be observed to do it within the law.

Miss Breasted united the tenants and had them apply for free legal services from public social agencies and other sources. In a short time, CORE provided them with a young lawyer who explained the legalities involved.

Two means by which New York apartment dwellers can legally go on a rent strike are through court action under Article 7–A of the Real Property Actions and Proceeding Law or through the Welfare Department under the Spiegel Act.

Provided the tenants can prove that the building has dangerous conditions, they can petition the court for an Article 7–A ruling. If their case is passed, a court-appointed administrator (who may be the landlord) collects the rents and makes the necessary repairs. The repairs are made under the supervision of the court and the case continues until they are completed and enough rents have been collected to pay for them.

Or, if the large majority of the tenants are on welfare, they can request the Welfare Department to invoke the Spiegel Act under which a rent stoppage is ordered until all dangerous conditions have been repaired Rent money is not included in the welfare checks and the landlord is not paid until the building is up to accepted city standards.

The lawyer helped the tenants write a proper letter requesting the Welfare Department to invoke the Spiegel Act, but got no response. Therefore, they decided to act on their own and file for an Article 7–A.

At the first court session on Jan. 9, the landlord agreed to repair the general conditions listed: i.e., fallen plaster, broken windows, leaky pipes, etc. Two months later no repairs had been made except in two apartments, which were occupied by the most active tenants in the strike.

Miss Breasted, the lawyer and some of the tenants returned to court where they were ordered by the judge to present a detailed list specifying each defect—each area of fallen plaster, each leaky pipe, each broken window, etc. This was done and the case was brought to court again.

The landlord's lawyer was appointed administrator and the landlord was ordered to make all necessary repairs with the rent moneys under Article 7–A. The tenants, who were told to periodically inform the court of his progress, thought they had finally won.

In late March, however, each tenant received a bill for one month's rent from the Emergency Repairs Division of City Housing, which had repaired flood damage to the building the previous December and had no knowledge of the rent strike. When repair costs come to approximately the same amount as one month's rent for the building, the Division will frequently bill the tenants directly, notifying the landlord that this has been done. The tenants would not have been billed if Emergency Repairs was aware that a rent strike was in progress.

In the midst of this tangle, the Welfare Department invoked the Spiegel Act, withdrawing all rent money from the welfare checks. The families, all but one or two of whom were on welfare, were being billed for rent by both Emergency Repairs and the court-appointed administrator. And, with the invocation of the Spiegel Act, they didn't have money to pay anybody.

The landlord, receiving neither money to pay the repair bills nor rent, gave each tenant a 72-day eviction notice.

Confused and dejected, Miss Breasted and the tenants requested another court hearing. Fortunately, a sympathetic judge invited representatives of all concerned to his chambers for an informal discussion. The results: Emergency Repair withdrew its bills. The Welfare Department cancelled the Spiegel Act and gave the tenants rent money for the landlord's lawyer who agreed to see that the landlord resumed repairs. The tenants had finally won.

The informal session took place on a Wednesday. Friday a fire broke out in the building and City Housing condemned it as unsafe.

The fire, presumably started by a couple of trespassing drug addicts heating dope injections, gutted the roof and one apartment, before the firemen, who had to break all the windows, put it out.

The tenants were scattered to hotels throughout New York City by the Welfare Department while they looked for other apartments in other buildings where they may have the same fight ahead of them again.

Miss Breasted, who still keeps in touch with some of the tenants, is now trying to unite the residents in another dilapidated building, but is finding it more difficult this time. Dope addicts, pushers and people in the numbers game among the tenants are not willing to cooperate.

Before she arrived in Harlem in December, 1965, she had never seen a dope addict or racketeer, let alone worked with them. Born in Washington, D.C. she was 10 years old when she moved to Kent, where her father is an art history instructor at Kent School, a boys' prep school.

She received her education in Kent and in small progressive schools in Switzerland, Germany and Vermont before attending Radcliffe. During college, she did volunteer teaching at a women's correctional institute and a boys' reform school. Interested in social problems, she "looked around for something like VISTA" after graduating from Radcliffe in 1965, read about VISTA in the paper and applied.

Miss Breasted had her first glimpse of slum life in Chicago where she received her six weeks' Volunteer training. Stationed at Hull House, she worked and lived with Appalachian immigrants in poor neighborhoods on the North Side, but this did not prepare her for Harlem.

"I was scared at first—scared of not knowing how to approach Negroes not used to contact with white people," she admits. "I was also frightened of the dope addicts—thought they were some kind of maniacs. They were

so out of it. Actually, while they might rob apartments for money to buy drugs, they wouldn't want to touch a flea and don't often approach a person directly.

The first time she walked around her block on 119th Street and knocked on doors to get acquainted, the inhabitants, mostly Puerto Ricans, just stood and looked. Later when they talked, it was mostly, "What do you want from me?" It took her about six weeks of door knocking and "talking about everything under the sun" to reach her neighbors.

After establishing friendly relations with a number of residents, she and her roommate, former VISTA Volunteer Judy Lewis, helped a group of teenagers organize a summer recreation and education program—planned trips with them, gave them ideas for recreation projects, assisted them in remedial reading and arranged workshop sessions. They also told the kids about job opportunities and training courses for college and encouraged their interest.

Miss Breasted spends much of her time trying to organize tenant unions, encouraging community meetings and participating in a block worker training program which consists of discussion and group therapy sessions at the Block Communities office.

She is one of 32 block workers, including 12 VISTAs, who recruit and help train Harlem residents in informal courses in which social problems are thrashed out and group behavior analyzed by voluntary individual criticism. "For example," said Miss Breasted, "if a participant continually interrupts discussions, we take him aside and ask him, 'how do you think you came across in the group?' If he seems concerned over his behavior and able to take criticism, we ask if he'd mind if the group answers the question."

Those who take these discussions seriously and continue attending become block workers after four weeks' paid training.

A large part of Miss Breasted's work consists of walking. When not involved in collective community action, she strolls up and down her block talking with the residents most of whom she knows quite well. She inquires about their problems, informs them about social agencies who could help them and encourages them to do as much as they can for themselves.

One of the hardest things about being a VISTA Volunteer, according to Miss Breasted, is that "we're never allowed to do anything for people directly, even fill out forms. We can only inform them of resources available to them and tell them how to take advantage of them. This isn't always easy, but they'd never learn if we did it for them. It's the only way."

Miss Breasted, who served a second year in VISTA because she felt that her work wasn't finished, hopes to remain in the neighborhood next year, working as a salaried writer for Block Communities and studying for her masters degree at Columbia School of Journalism. She wants to do more for her friends in Harlem because, in her words, "I don't feel I've done that much."

PERCEPTIVE ARTICLE ON THE "AGONY" THE UNITED STATES IS EXPERIENCING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks we have seen many disturbing events in our country—from the bitter and hate-filled demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, to the brutal and senseless murder of two harmless young people in New York City's West Village, from the black separatist explosions on our colleges, to the harsh counterreactions spawned by each of these. It is hard for those of us who are caught up in the flow of day-to-day crises to stand aside and take a dispassionate and philosophical look at their meaning.

Tom Wicker, chief of the New York Times Washington bureau, who has been abroad for this month of October, has written a most perceptive article on the "agony" the United States seems to be living through these days. I insert it herewith in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

ABOARD SS "FRANCE"—COMING HOME IN OCTOBER

(By Tom Wicker)

ABOARD SS "FRANCE," October 28.—October was a better month than most to be away from the United States. It is a difficult time of year, anyway. The true season of beginning is the fall, when a new class of children goes off trustfully to school; and the autumn nostalgia is not really for the closing of another year but for our own forgotten beginning, our own lost trust.

From abroad, this seemed a special October. "Your country," said a distinguished British diplomat, "is in rather an agony, isn't it?" It was, of course, a courteous understatement, for the agony was apparent.

DISTORTED PICTURE

Perhaps it was summed up in a picture widely printed in the European press—the contorted face of a young American pacifist screaming with hatred, the veins of a passionate contempt outlined in his neck, his fists clenched under a policeman's blank riot mask. In what manner could a pacifism so fierce and so despising differ from the violence and cruelty of men in iron helmets?

But as the American agony was apparent even in Europe, the nature of the trial still was not clear. Was all this soul-searching, this passion, this bitterness, this hatred in the cause of love, inspired only by a far-away war engaging a fraction of a nation's men and resources, distasteful and of such dubious validity as that war is? Had modern communications, bringing napalm and the B–52 into the den and the game room, truly made what the 19th century never worried about into something unthinkable in the 20th?

This is a proposition hard to accept, particularly when it also is a time of riots in the cities, of youthful rejection of so many formerly accepted standards of behavior and belief, in the age of LSD, when pot is not so much fun as defiance.

It is more likely that if the war in Vietnam did not exist at this particular time in American life, it might have had to be invented. Something, it seems from the vantage point of distance, was needed to symbolize, and thus to give focus and energy to, a profound but voiceless discontent with the land of the free and the home of the brave—to a deep and brooding sense that something was wrong, some failure was distorting and perverting the idea of America.

This is not new to American intellectuals; it is as plain in Norman Mailer's writings about World War II as in his current novel, *"Why Are We in Vietnam?"* But the issue of Vietnam seems to have evoked this sense of perversion, for the first time, in a large part of the population. Perhaps it was an inability to halt or change the inexorable march of the war, making plain the plight of the individual in that vastness of the 20th century; or the contrast of the war's flagrant expense with the misery and poverty of the Negro ghetto—distasteful affluence careless of the rot within; or perhaps it was only the ancient American sympathy for a brave underdog, transformed into revulsion at the spectacle of marvelous technology, vast resources and splendid young men trying to pound a small and backward nation, of whatever moral and political character, into submission.

Or perhaps it was all of these things, and more. Whatever it was, the war in no way expressed the idea of America in which men wanted to believe, and so the drama of Vietnam gave them their choice in dissent—not just dissent from the war but from their country, what they thought it was and where they thought it was going.

It was a needed voice, but now there is something repugnant in it, too, in the intolerance and ferocity of disaffection, as if human failure were evil, as if a sort of inquisition were needed to scourge the money changers from the American temple.

POISONOUS ATMOSPHERE

An American who has been living abroad for two years is aboard this ship, returning with some reluctance to his own country. It is a bad time to be going home, he fears, because "the atmosphere seems poisonous."

That, of course, is the question. Will an America profoundly in conflict with itself poison its own soul with hatred and contempt and bitterness? Or will the agony of a nation lead, as in the mighty Greek dramas, to catharsis, to a renewed sense of American life in its common humanity, its promise and its reality?

One is not more important than, nor can either transcend, the other. From reality man reaches toward promise, fails, and in the agony of failure finds his greatness by reaching again. And so it must be with a young country passing at last into middle age.

That is why this agonized October has been a good time to go away and look back, while the autumn nostalgia whispered its sadness and its knowledge. We do not need to cling to old trusts and old faiths so much as we need to remember that while trusts fade and faiths die the generations come on ceaselessly, in the season of beginning and renewal.

COMMEMORATION OF VICTORY OF CONTINENTAL FORCES AT YORKTOWN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago on October 19 while we in both Houses were engaged with the many problems which beset a nation in conflict, there was commemorated in my district of Virginia the concluding effort of the conflict which brought independence to our Nation. This was the 186th anniversary of the victory at Yorktown of the Continental Forces and their allies under the leadership of Gen. George Washington.

As is its patriotic custom, the Thomas Nelson, Jr., Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, singled out a great living American for special honor. The honor is annually bestowed to a present-

day patriot whose devotion to the principles of liberty have made him a true and noble descendant of the Founding Fathers of the Republic.

We in this great House were honored this year by the selection of the Honorable WILLIAM MUNFORD TUCK, the distinguished Representative of the Fifth District of Virginia and a former Governor of the Commonwealth. Congressman TUCK was the recipient of the Thomas Nelson, Jr., Medal presented in memory of that distinguished Member of the Continental Congress, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and likewise Governor of Virginia.

October 19, 1967, was a great day at Yorktown when Representative TUCK received the award, responding in his time-honored fashion which has both thrilled and delighted us in this House on so many occasions. It was by reflection a great day here in Washington because Representative TUCK is the third Member of the Congress to be so honored. The late Senator Harry Flood Byrd and the Honorable Howard Worth Smith, the former dean of the Virginia delegation were previous recipients.

We of the Virginia delegation take exceptional pride in this tribute to "The Governor," the title by which we shall always know and respect our esteemed colleague, and on behalf of the other Representatives of our great Commonwealth I take particular pleasure in including in the RECORD the citation to Representative TUCK and his response in which he rededicated himself to the principles of American liberty:

A RESOLUTION FOR A CITATION TO REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM MUNFORD TUCK

Who: in a life of devoted service to his beloved Commonwealth, early forged the fundamental principles that would guide him through forty-six years of unswerving dedication to the esteemed values of the Founding Fathers: and thereupon set a course which would take him to the House of Delegates, the State Senate, the Lieutenant-Governorship, the Governorship, and the Congress of the United States.

Who: personifying the axiom that responsibilities gravitate to those who best can direct them, implacably steered the Commonwealth through the wrenching changes in political directions by eschewing opportunism and by hewing to the solid doctrines of The Constitution.

Who: while devoting the latter years of his public life to bulwarking the rights and privileges of the individual, comported himself throughout with an engagingly frank good humor while agonizing over the ever-increasing encroachment of the federal establishment.

And who: through this dedication to the American tradition of man's dignity, best exemplifies the Sterling Virtues of Thomas Nelson, Jr.

Who: served in the Virginia House of Delegates, was a member of the first General Convention, signed the Declaration of Independence, was Governor of Virginia and led Virginia's forces in the Battle of Yorktown and whose patriotism led him to pledge his own credit in raising funds for the Revolution since it was a surer guarantee than that of the National Government: advocate of sound government and of strong national defense, and devoted Patriot.

THE THOMAS NELSON, JR., CHAPTER, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK AT "SURRENDER DAY" CEREMONIES AT YORKTOWN, VA., OCTOBER 19

You have paid me a great honor today. To be chosen an exemplar of the sterling characteristics of Thomas Nelson, Jr., is a distinction indeed to be cherished. I do not consider myself worthy of such, and I do not find words to express adequately my appreciation for this honor which you bestow upon me.

However, I can assure you of my deep gratitude to the Virginia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution for such recognition. I understand that it is the third award of its kind that the organization has made and that the two previous recipients were my friends, the late Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., and the Honorable Howard W. Smith, gentlemen for whom I have always had the highest admiration.

In accepting this presentation of the tribute expressed in your citation and so fittingly symbolized in the medal you have struck, I recognize the occasion as one for rededication to the great American principles for which Nelson fought and for which the Sons of the American Revolution stand.

Thomas Nelson, who as the third Governor of Virginia succeeded Thomas Jefferson in that office, perhaps gave more of his time, talent and wealth to his state and country than any other man in history. He gave so much of himself that his health was broken; he gave so much of his wealth that he was threatened with poverty. In fact, he gave so much that, as you know, the epitaph on his tomb here at Yorktown reads: "He gave all for liberty."

He was a statesman, a soldier, and a benefactor in the cause of American freedom. History has shown him to be a man of selfless patriotism, a gentleman with the highest order of personal integrity.

He it was who introduced the Virginia Resolutions of 1776 calling upon the Continental Congress to declare the Colonies free and independent. He was one of the immortal signers of the Declaration of Independence. He served in the House of Burgesses and in the Continental Congress. He raised troops for the Continental Army and he served as commander of the Virginia Militia. The fact that he ordered the bombing of his own home in the Battle of Yorktown is a clear demonstration of his patriotism.

In view of this Virginia patriot's completely admirable qualities, no award could be more appropriately named. It serves as a pledge on the part of all of us to preserve and protect free constitutional government.

The Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution have always supported and defended the fundamentals and principles of our form of government, the very essential foundations which have made this country great. Thus I shall ever cherish and appreciate the citation and the high honor which you have bestowed upon me today. I hope and trust that I may always be worthy.

URBAN CRISIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about our "urban crisis." In an attempt to solve the many problems surrounding our cities, the President has asked this and previous Congresses to pass a number of most important bills. These have touched upon the problems of urban sprawl, mass transit, urban renewal, and so forth.

Unfortunately, despite the demonstrated need, passage of these bills has been like "pulling teeth."

As a member of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, I have been vitally interested in this legislation, not only because of the nationwide impact of these various programs, but because of the need for them in various cities in Pennsylvania.

In last year's gubernatorial election, we were honored to have as the Democratic candidate, Milton J. Shapp, of Philadelphia. No one has researched deeper into the problems of our cities and no one speaks with more authority on this subject.

Because of this, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report of a press conference which Mr. Shapp held on October 30 which contains some interesting statements and revealing statistics:

Milton Shapp, Philadelphia executive, today called upon Governor Raymond Shafer to "put muscle behind his pledge to whip his party's Pennsylvania Congressional delegation into line to support manpower training, anti-poverty, urban renewal and other federal welfare programs."

Shapp noted that at a press conference last Wednesday, following a meeting in Harrisburg with Mr. Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Governor said he would call upon the Pennsylvania delegation in the Congress to seek maximum federal money for anti-poverty urban aid and manpower retraining.

Shapp called the attention of the Governor to the record of his party in the U.S. House of Representatives and indicated it would take strong action on his part to correct their voting record.

"When the model cities program came before the House of Representatives in Washington this year, the GOP led a fight that resulted in an authorization of only $300 million, a figure which has prevailed in the House-Senate conference despite a Democratic effort in the Senate to double this amount. Yet, even the smaller amount was fought by the Pennsylvania Republican House delegation which voted against it by a 10–3 majority.

"When the original rent supplement bill was killed in the House of Representatives last May, all thirteen of Pennsylvania's Republican members voted for its death. The House later agreed to a paltry $10 million and the Senate Democrats upped the amount to $40 million. When the measure was returned to the House for concurrence on Tuesday, October 24, all Pennsylvania Republicans voted to reduce the amount to $10 million.

"On July 20, the U.S. House of Representatives voted down a $40 million rat control bill by 207 to 176. Only two of the 13-man Pennsylvania GOP delegation voted in favor. When public uproar caused the House to switch to a two-year $40 million authorization, seven of Pennsylvania's GOP delegation were still opposed.

"I would suggest," Shapp said, "that the Governor immediately inform his own party's Congressional delegation of his own altered views, and that he publicly call each Congressman to account by name when any of the delegation refuses to support programs

that benefit all people in the nation, including the citizens of Pennsylvania."

THE 3D MARINE DIVISION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, like many another former marine, I took great and solemn pride in reading the Presidential Unit Citation presented to the 3d Marine Division by Vice President HUMPHREY during his visit to Vietnam last week. When the Vice President pinned another streamer on the division colors, he added further to the record of "uncommon valor" achieved during the Pacific campaigns of World War II and the Korean conflict.

The 3d Marine Division was activated in September 1942, and participated in the campaigns of Bougainville, Guam, and Iwo Jima. As a rifleman and Japanese interpreter, it was my honor to have a part in each of these campaigns. Many of my fellow marines gave their lives, and many others were wounded during these assaults against heavily defended Pacific islands; and in each of them the Marine record of superb training and great courage won new laurels for the division.

The Presidential Unit Citation for 2½ years of service in Vietnam speaks for itself, and I am honored to place it in the RECORD at this point:

For extraordinary heroism and outstanding performance of duty in action against the North Vietnamese Army Viet Cong forces in the Republic of Vietnam from 8 March 1965 to 15 September 1967. Throughout this period, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced), operating in the five northernmost provinces of the Republic of Vietnam, successfully executed its three-fold mission of occupying and defending key terrain, seeking out and destroying the enemy, and conducting an intensive pacification program. Operating in an area bordered by over 200 miles of South China Sea coastline, the mountainous Laotian border and the Demilitarized Zone, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) successfully executed eighty major combat operations, carrying the battle to the enemy, destroying many of his forces, and capturing thousands of tons of weapons and material. In addition to these major operations, more than 125,000 offensive counterguerrilla actions, ranging from squad patrols and ambushes to company-sized search and destroy operations, were conducted in both the coastal rice lands and the mountainous jungle inland. These bitterly contested actions routed the enemy from his well-entrenched positions, denied him access to his source of food, restricted his freedom of movement, and removed his influence from the heavily populated areas. In numerous operations, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) demonstrated the great efficacy of combined operations with units of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. In July 1966, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) moved to the north to counter major elements of the North Vietnamese Army moving across the Demilitarized Zone into the Province of Quang Tri; its units fought a series of savage battles against the enemy, repeatedly distinguishing themselves and, time and again, forcing the enemy to retreat back across the Demilitarized Zone. Imbued with an unrelenting combat spirit and initiative and undeterred by heavy hostile artillery and mortar fire, extremely difficult terrain, incessant heat and monsoon rains, the Third Marine Division (Reinforced), employing courageous ground, helicopter and amphibious assaults, complemented by intense and accurate air, artillery and naval gunfire support, inflicted great losses on the enemy and denied him the political and military victory he sought to achieve at any cost. The outstanding courage, resourcefulness and aggressive fighting spirit of the officers and men of the Third Marine Division (Reinforced) in battle after battle against a well-equipped and well-trained enemy, often numerically superior in strength, and the great humanitarianism constantly shown to the peoples of the Republic of Vietnam, reflected great credit upon the Marine Corps and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

A TRAGIC CRUSADE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we shall hear much this week about crusades, about who is really helping whom, and about means and ends.

We shall be saying these things in discussing the future of a program which began in hope and now may end in dismantling an agency to express our frustrations.

The New York Times today, in the following analytical editorial on the politics of crusading, should make us suspicious of the disemembering of OEO which has been proposed and of the "opportunity," which its proponents see in their crusade:

WHOSE "OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE"?

"Tragically weak . . . reckless waste . . . ineffective." The words ring forth in the statements of Representative Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, as he denounces the antipoverty program.

It is strange that Congressmen who would not dare break faith with cotton and tobacco farmers over price supports or with the Rivers and Harbors Congress over a navigation project have no compunction over breaking faith with the nation's poor.

Because of Congressional irresponsibility, the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been seriously disorganized. Projects are stopped and started, funds slashed arbitrarily, hopes raised and then dashed. The agency's employes are becoming demoralized and its politically feeble clients—the unorganized poor—are increasingly disheartened. It is a shameless performance.

Because Congress has not acted on this year's appropriation and has allowed the temporary continuing resolution to expire, O.E.O. has had to cut off the $30 a month paid to each Job Corps member. The 4,000 VISTA volunteers are deprived of their pittance of $50 a month. Community action programs that run day-care centers for working mothers and provide legal and health services have folded. The Head Start program for preschool youngsters cannot be made into a year-round program. The Follow Through program, which was intended to capitalize on the achievements of Head Start, now looks like a budgetary casualty.

Bitterness and social unrest in the urban ghettos and the rural slums can be the only consequences. Those who are guilty of this planned disaster are Representative Ford, his senior Republican colleagues in the House, and their allies, the reactionary Southern Democrats. They are guilty of killing the continuing resolution that is shutting down antipoverty programs across the country as funds run out. They are guilty of the political guerrilla warfare against the antipoverty program which is now under way in the House.

Representatives Goodell of New York and Quie of Minnesota, the principal Republican spokesmen on the antipoverty bill, insist they are all for the aims of the program but just want to improve it. But their voting record makes their substitute "Opportunity Crusade bill" look suspect.

In every year since the antipoverty program started in 1964, Messrs. Goodell and Quie have voted against final passage, for recommittal and for every crippling amendment. The weight of their influence is not to improve or strengthen the program. They are willing to kill it but not accept the responsibility. The "opportunity" they are seeking is their own political advantage. It takes a lot of gall to vote against the poor and then call it a "crusade," but many a gentleman in Congress is brave when it comes to defeating the defenseless.

POVERTY AMENDMENT

Mr. Speaker, the mood of our House, and of the Federal Government, is one of economy. This sentiment is proper and laudable and should be encouraged in our consideration of the antipoverty program.

I am especially concerned that economy become a working element within the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. To that goal, I shall propose amendments to the OEO authorization bill to insure that consumer action programs be given proper emphasis in ending the barriers of poverty which encircle one-fifth of our Nation.

For the word "economy" meant, in its original Greek form, "household management." It is both in this original meaning and in its popular form, that the word is appropriate to my amendments. I shall propose a plan to improve both the efficiency of the dollars we devote to the antipoverty program and the efficiency with which the poorer consumer spends his dollars.

That the "poor pay more" remains one of the paradoxes of our time. What is wrong with a system where the poor, who, by definition, have less than others, has to pay more than his affluent neighbors for food, for clothing, for his housing, and even for his credit?

The facile answer is that the poor must learn to shop more carefully, to compare before he buys, to favor those merchants who are fair and to shun the unscrupulous, that he must, in short, exercise the judgment, initiative, and resourcefulness which some critics of the poor modestly think are the hallmarks of the solid middle class.

Mr. Speaker, my experience with both the American consumer and with human nature itself, suggest two flaws in this criticism of the poor: First, the middle-class consumer, is not such a great shop-

per himself, especially if unaided in his purchasing; and second, it is fruitless, and self-deceiving, to think that the poor will learn through exhortation and admonition, instead of by education, and practice.

What shall I propose is a program of education, self-help, and good example. A comprehensive consumer action, as conceived under this program, would help the poorer consumer to use existing and new institutions to become a better consumer.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that a few poor consumers can learn these hard lessons in the marketplace alone, through trial and error and through profit and loss. But we err, I believe, in thinking that the extraordinary effort, the rare and inspiring example of the few which constitutes heroism in any field, should be presented to the poor as the norm for their education and development.

And just as we should not expect only heroes in the ghetto (although we welcome them as they arise) we should not expect only villains, though there will be several of these also.

We should expect simply that people will respond when they are given hope, which this consumer education program will give them.

We do not need to look farther back than last summer's riots to see what hopelessness yields nor beyond our more enlightened moments in this House, for example, when we enacted the antipoverty legislation, to see what great good may come when people have hope.

WALT W. ROSTOW: ANOTHER ALGER HISS?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17, on page 29118, and in the Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on October 18, page A5125, respectively, I commented on the security status of Walt W. Rostow, now special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, with particular reference to the case of Otto F. Otepka and the recently proposed Panama treaties of which he is alleged to be the "chief architect."

The latest information concerning Rostow is an extensively documented article in the November 3, 1967, issue of the Herald of Freedom, which recommends a "thorough investigation" of his background and activities and predicts that such inquiry "should produce more shocking revelations than the Alger Hiss case."

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would invite special attention to Rostow's close association with Harold R. Isaacs, a research associate for the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for the establishment, which Rostow is alleged to have obtained a grant of $6 million from the CIA and which is now subsidized by the State and Defense Departments as well as the CIA. Isaacs was formerly an editor in Shanghai, China, and had close connections with Miss Agnes Smedley and others involved in the celebrated spy case of Richard Sorge, and was under surveillance of the Shanghai municipal police. Additional information on this case is available in the volume, "A Partial Documentation of the Sorge Espionage Case," prepared by Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, chief of intelligence for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, on request of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and printed in May 1950 by the Military Intelligence Section, General Staff, General Headquarters, Far Eastern Command. This documentation is available in the files of the indicated committee.

Because of the far-reaching consequences of high officials of our Government relying upon reports prepared by such tax-subsidized organizations in the formulation of important foreign policies, the people of our country have a right to know the full history of such individuals as Rostow and Isaacs and the institutions and policies that they serve.

As the indicated article constitutes a splendid exposé of this facet of communism in our Government circles and should be of interest to appropriate investigating committees of the Congress and security agencies in the executive branch of our Government, I quote it, as follows:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Nov. 3, 1967]

THE HONORABLE WALT WHITMAN ROSTOW

Walt Whitman Rostow has been quoted as stating that Vietnam may be the last great confrontation of the Cold War. This means that by the time the planners decide to bring the Vietnam War to an end, the need for play-acting will be over. The United States needs no longer pretend to be the enemy of Communism—for it is just a pretense as at home the present government is ignoring Communism and abroad it has been supporting it for years.

David Lawrence asked in a recent column: "Why can't the government 'see' Reds?" He states: "For some undisclosed reason, officials of the Johnson Administration are reluctant to concede that Communists inside America are responsible to no small extent for some wildcat strikes, violence in street demonstrations, and riots. "We have an answer for Mr. Lawrence—the reason could be the presence of such persons as Walt Whitman Rostow in positions of power in the U.S. Government.

In his present position as special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Rostow reads top secret intelligence reports from the C.I.A., F.B.I., the State Department and even our military strategy reports. He sees them all before the President himself does. Yet he had been refused a security clearance three times under the Eisenhower Administration. He came in with the pro-Communist Kennedy Administration and is important enough that he is remaining in the Johnson Administration when other Kennedy men are out.

Walt Whitman Rostow, the security risk, is in and Otto Otepka, the security officer who tried to do his job, is out. This is the way the U.S. Government is being run today. As a result of a brief filed by counsel for Otto Otepka before a State Department hearing officer, Rostow's failure to secure clearance was revealed. Sen. Strom Thurmond stated in the Congressional Record of October 19, 1967 (29509): "The specific issue is whether Rostow was initially rejected for a high-level clearance by the Department of the Air Force; and again in 1955 by Herbert Hoover, Jr., then Under Secretary of State; and again in 1957 by Roderick O'Connor, then Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security. Rostow has not denied these allegations because he knows he cannot truthfully do so.

"When Rostow says that he has had security clearance from various agencies since 1961, he is trying to obscure the issue. Anyone who knows anything about security clearances knows they are granted for various degrees of accessability and by various agencies. The standards of each agency may be, and frequently are, entirely different; and they may be bypassed completely by high-level command. . . . Whatever level of clearance he (Rostow) may have had, the fact is that he has been denied strict high-level clearance on the three occasions mentioned. For example: under the Hoover action of 1955, Rostow was disapproved to attend meetings of a psychological warfare panel of the Operations Coordinating Board—OCB—which operated directly under the jurisdiction of the National Security Council. . . .

"The fact that Rostow was denied high-level clearance three times indicates that the security factors involved were not taken lightly.

"State Department security standards are spelled out in law and regulation. It is a fact that Rostow did not meet those standards. Today Rostow is special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The fact that he now presumably has a high-level clearance—that is permission to have access to sensitive data—shows clearly that the security standards in our top echelons have been lowered." (or changed—Ed.)

When John F. Kennedy became President of the United States he brought into government a number of strange people. The security officer of the State Department at the time was Otto Otepka and he was visited by Bobby Kennedy and Dean Rusk (two of the many strange people) who wanted him to give clearance to another strange person, Walt Whitman Rostow. When Otepka pointed out that Rostow had been refused security clearance three times, one of which was by the Air Force, Bobby is reported to have snapped: "The Air Force crowd are a bunch of bums and idiots." However, Otepka's refusal to clear Rostow did not keep him out of government; it only made it clear to the Kennedy boys that Otepka had to go.

Walt Whitman Rostow was born in New York City on October 7, 1916, the son of Victor Aaron Rostow and Lillian Helman Rostow. His father was a metallurgical chemist. The family moved to Irvington, N.J., remaining there till Walt was ten, and then moved to New Haven, Conn. Walt attended Hillhouse High School and Yale University where he majored in Economics, obtaining his B.A. Degree in 1936 and a Ph. D. in 1940. He was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford from 1936 to 1938, and a Larned Fellow at Yale and in Europe 1938–9. He married Elspeth Vaughn Davies June 26, 1947 and they have two children.

The political orientation of the Rostow family may be deduced from the names of their children. Walt Whitman Rostow was named after the homosexual poet. One of the early American Communists, Ella Reeve ("Mother") Bloor described Whitman in her book, "We Are Many," as a childhood idol who "somehow transferred to me, without words, his own great longing to establish everywhere on earth 'the institution of the dear love of comrades.'" She states:

"The poem of Whitman's I love best, The Mystic Trumpeter, always seemed to me to be a prophecy of the coming of the new world which so many of us have dreamed about and worked for and seen come into being with the

success of the Russian Revolution. . . . Some of his own closeness to nature, his great love for human beings, was passed on by Whitman to all of us who knew and loved him.

"We who had the privilege of knowing Whitman have a special understanding of each other. We have no inhibitions, no reserve. There is a kind of understanding among us that makes it impossible for us to offend one another, no matter what we say, and this has given me the most free and frank human relationships I have ever known."

The Rostow parents named another son (Eugene V.) after Eugene Victor Debs, also a friend of "Mother" Bloor, and hero of all American Communists. Debs was convicted for violation of the Espionage Act and sentenced to ten years in prison. On March 12, 1919 at a Socialist rally in Cleveland, Debs said: "With every drop of blood in my veins I despise your laws and I will defy them—I am going to speak to you as a socialist, as a revolutionist and as a Bolshevist, if you please." (from Revolutionary Radicalism Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of N.Y. Investigating Seditious Activities, Vol. I, Page 555)

Walt Rostow originally entered government service during our first left-wing administration, that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. After having been an instructor of Economics at Columbia University he went into the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) where he remained from 1941 to 1945. The transfer of former OSS employees to the State Department at the end of World War II created serious security problems as a substantial number of OSS personnel were Communists or Communist-sympathizers. Among those transferred from the OSS to the State Department was Walt Rostow who became assistant chief of the German-Austrian Economics Affairs Division of the State Department. Eugene Victor Rostow was also in government service working for the Lend-Lease Program, and had eventually become executive assistant to Dean Acheson.

In 1946 Walt Rostow left the State Department to become Harmsworth Professor of American History at Oxford University, a post he obtained on the recommendation of W. Averill Harriman who was U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain in 1946 and on the Selection Committee. In 1947 Rostow left Oxford to become Special Assistant to the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. In 1949 he became a professor at Cambridge University and in 1950 an Associate professor of Economic History at Mass. Institute of Technology, where he remained for eleven years.

In 1951 the Center for International Studies was established at M.I.T. with a reported initial grant in excess of five million dollars from the U.S. Government. A research staff was assembled and since that time it has been working on studies involving U.S. foreign policy, national security, international communications, disarmament and defense policies. Rostow was associated with the Center until he was appointed by President Kennedy as deputy special assistant for national security affairs at the White House in 1961. (For more information concerning this center and those associated with it, see H.O.F. issue entitled "Toward A Soviet America.") The Washington Observer of October 1, 1967 in an article entitled, "High Level Treason," states: ". . . in 1950, Rostow got $6 million from the Central Intelligence Agency to set up the Center for International Studies, which is now subsidized by the State and Defense Departments as well as the CIA. Harold Isaacs, a dangerouus Leftist, is now the top Brain Truster of this pro-Soviet garrison which has received million dollar fees to make secret studies for Dean Rusk and Bob McNamara on how to handle international affairs with a view of effecting a world government after a period of peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union which they claim is 'mellowing.' They also make reports for the guidance of the CIA in its cloak and dagger operations at home and abroad. One of their pro-Soviet comrades is Jerome Wisner who is now Provost of MIT."

The 11th Annual Report—1962 of the MIT Center for International Studies gives us the following information on activities of the "dangerous Leftist" Harold Isaacs whom intelligence reports reveal to be a close contact of Walt and Eugene Rostow.

"Identity and World Politics. During the past half-dozen years Harold R. Isaacs has been examining some of the effects of major political change on patterns of group identity, especially those brought on by the ending of the system of colonial empire and some of its supporting philosophies, mythologies, and modes of behavior. Through interviews with a panel of writers, educators, key governmental and political figures, and others influential in shaping the attitudes of large segments of the population, he first inquired into changing American perceptions of the Chinese and Indians. The results of this study were published in 1958 as 'Scratches on Our Minds: American Images of China and India,' recently reissued in a paperback edition . . .

"Mr. Isaacs' latest book, 'The New World of Negro Americans,' published by John Day in the spring of 1963, traces some of the links between the ending of the white supremacy system in Asia and Africa and its quickening decline in the United States . . .

"In a new study supported by a grant from the National Institute of Health, Mr. Isaacs is enlarging the scope of his research to include groups in a variety of cultural settings. He left Cambridge in February to spend a year interviewing individuals in Israel, India, Malaya, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Japan. His object will be to take a brief look at various groups which are undergoing the impacts of political change and are, as a result, having to acquire new ways of looking both at themselves and at others . . . His ultimate purpose is to bring all these clues and impressions to bear on a study of the new world-view of the younger generation in America."

These are some of Isaacs' more recent activities but his earlier activities are recorded on the pages of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations. P. 2607—"In the last issue of Pacific Affairs there appears an article by Harold Isaacs entitled 'Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution, A Marxist View.'" P. 3627—"Some years ago, Mr. Isaacs published a book called 'The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution,' with a preface by Leon Trotsky." P. 4103—(letter to Owen Lattimore from Frederick Vanderbilt Field, both Communists). "Since I first learned that you had arranged for an article on the Chinese Communist movement from Harold Isaacs, I hoped it would be possible to find someone to write a reply. I was very pleased with the way Isaacs' article turned out." P. 1220—"Agnes Smedley (Communist) was an associate of Harold Isaacs and C. Frank Glass, locally classified as a card bearing Communist. Isaacs was for some time Editor of the China Forum, an English language Communist periodical first published in 1932." P. 1221—"Agnes Smedley joined the Noulens Defense Committee which was organized in behalf of Paul and Gertrude Rougge, alias Noulens, who were jailed by Chinese authorities for espionage activities and tried and convicted as bona fide Comintern agents. Associated with Smedley on the Committee was Harold Isaacs." P. 1238—"Irene Wiedemeyer (Soviet agent married to a Chinese Communist), as well as Agnes Smedley and Harold Isaacs were in close contact with John M. Murray, the American correspondent for the Pacific News Agency, listed as an outlet for the Comintern." P. 1247—"The Society of Friends of the USSR, Shanghai branch, was founded in 1932 by Edmond Egon Kisch, a Czech journalist, and long known as a Comintern agent. Among the more important members was Harold Isaacs (G–2 Document No. 31, S.M.P. File D–4718)." And more of the same.

Since it was on the basis of his associations with Isaacs, intelligence reports that he had two aunts who were members of the Communist Party, and a general pro-Soviet attitude that Rostow was originally considered to be a security risk, it was laughable to read an article in the N.Y. Times of Feb. 20, 1962 concerning Rostow and entitled "Challenger of Marxism." The article stated that Rostow won "an international reputation in 1958 for drafting a sort of 'non-Communist manifesto,' an alternative to Karl Marx's theory of history." As Rostow had by this time become a top adviser to President Kennedy this article was presumably to allay any misgivings which the American public might have.

Although Kennedy had never met either Rusk or McNamara when he named them to high government posts, he had been previously acquainted with Rostow. While still a senator, Kennedy had sought Rostow's help and, according to the Times article, Rostow "had a major part in shaping several of the Senator's foreign policy statements. When the Presidential campaign got under way, Mr. Rostow supplied foreign policy material to Senator Kennedy's speech writers."

In 1960 Walt Rostow made a secret trip to Moscow with Dr. Jerome Bert Wiesner of MIT and met privately with Vasily V. Kuznetsov, Soviet 1st Deputy Foreign Minister. He also attended the 6th Pugwash Conference to discuss nuclear disarmament. In November 1960 Rostow attended a series of closed meetings with Soviet officials at Dartmouth College. The scrapping of our manned bomber program reportedly was the result of Rostow's talks with Kuznetsov.

When Kennedy was unable to get Rostow into the State Department through the front door, he brought him into the White House and then moved him into the State Department as someone who had already been given a clearance. Human Events of October 21, 1967 states: "Identified as the author of a State Department policy paper promoting unilateral disarmament, trading with the Communists and a generally 'soft-line' toward Soviet Russia and Communist China, Rostow has come under considerable attack and was even the subject of a special congressional hearing."

Rostow's position in the State Department under Kennedy was counselor and chairman of the Policy Planning Council, a post carrying the rank of assistant Secretary of State. In the post Rostow was involved in long range foreign policy planning and giving advice to the Secretary of State and other high officials in the State Department. Rostow remained in this post until President Johnson appointed him to the position he now holds in the White House on March 31, 1966, after having previously given him the additional job of United States member of the Inter-American Committee on The Alliance for Progress. Rostow is now one of our top planners, and architect of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

A profile in the N.Y. Times of April 13, 1967 states:

"Since McGeorge Bundy and Bill D. Moyers left the White House, Mr. Rostow . . . has been emerging as the White House spokesman on foreign affairs.

"This is widely regarded as an appropriate role, for Mr. Rostow is probably the most loquacious American official since Walt Whitman himself worked at the Interior Department more than 100 years ago."

Rostow has never made a secret of his views, having stated them in books, speeches and policy papers. From his book "The United States In The World Arena:" "It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial

military force to pursue their own interests." The book argues for a movement in the direction of a "federalized world organization under effective international law" and states that it is "an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined."

Rostow is given credit for formulating the policy which resulted in Kennedy working with Khrushchev to force a "coalition" government on Laos. He was involved with Richard N. Goodwin and Teodoro Moscoso in attempting to force Haya de la Torre down the throat of the Peruvian people in the June 10, 1962 election. Haya participated in the Berlin Session of the Communist International in February 1930 and was the founder of the APRA Party which a pastoral letter of the Roman Catholic Church in Peru pronounced to be Communistic and atheistic. Ambassador to Peru James Loeb was booted out of Peru for his interference in the elections.

In a policy paper on "U.S. Handling of Uprisings in Eastern Europe Should They Occur," prepared by Rostow under Kennedy, he stated: "It is U.S. policy to refrain from encouraging or supporting uprisings in the Eastern European satellites. If revolts break out in East Germany, Poland or any other satellites we should maintain a hands-off posture and urge our allies to do the same . . ." Human Events of March 10, 1962 quotes Rostow as stating that the danger in Vietnam is "internal" and that only defensive and not offensive measures should be taken against the Reds. (Since he is "architect" of our present policy there this could explain why our military people are not allowed to go beyond certain boundaries.)

Rostow, Richard Goodwin and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. were among those attending a conference of the Organization of American States at which the U.S. delegates "failed" to "get what they went for" which was decisive collective action against Castro. It is doubtful if any of the above-mentioned persons would consider that a "failure" any more than they would consider the Bay of Pigs a "failure." Such "failures" have to be carefully planned.

Human Events of March 17, 1962 stated: "It has been strongly contended in some military quarters that Rostow was behind the Administration's plans to kill further production of B–52's and B–58's (now the backbone of the Strategic Air Command) for the purpose of relieving 'tensions' with Soviet Russia. Rostow's hand was also seen in the Administration's adamant position . . . to block the proposed production of the B–70, a supersonic, manned bomber that was supposed to have replaced the B–52 and B–58 . . . although the administration last year was given over $500 million to produce B–52's it refused to spend the money."

Walt Rostow is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, believed by some to be the "invisible government of the United States." Writing for their publication, Foreign Affairs, October 1963 issue, Rostow recommended that the United States take a slow course of action to help Communist nations have "a place of dignity" among other nations of the world, and stated that the United States and the Soviet Union actually disagree "only over a very narrow range of issues." We must wonder if the war in Vietnam, on which Rostow is supposedly taking the "hard line," falls into the narrow range of issues on which the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. disagree. Or is it going to be used as the catalyst to effect what Rostow and his cohorts are working toward—a merger of U.S. and U.S.S.R. with the resultant Soviet America?

A thorough investigation of the background and activities of the Rostow brothers, Walt and Eugene, and Harold Isaacs, together with their contacts in and out of government, including the CIA and the MIT Center, should produce more shocking revelations than the Alger Hiss Case.

ELLINGTON AIR FORCE BASE TO CELEBRATE 50 HISTORIC YEARS IN AVIATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 1917, the people of Houston and Harris Counties turned out for a great occasion—the dedication and first air flight of Ellington Air Force Base.

The 50 golden years since then have been marked with historic achievement in aviation by this airbase, and the thousands of men who have been stationed there.

This great base, and the tremendous role it has played in our national defense effort, have long been a source of pride to our people. And our support for its continued operation has been warm and generous.

Located just east of Houston, the airbase is named for 2d Lt. Eric L. Ellington, who died in the tangled wreckage of his aircraft near San Diego, Calif., on November 24, 1913. This fine young pilot would have been proud to know the great part this airbase named in his honor has played in aviation history, for it holds a long record of honors and achievements. Virtually every type of aircraft in our inventory has operated out of Ellington—from the original JN–4 "Flying Jennies"—to the most modern jets and NASA's giant "Super Guppy" that transports our massive rockets.

We, in Harris County, are indeed proud of this great airbase and the men and women who have served there. And on behalf of those I am privileged to serve, I extend a warm and sincere greeting on 50 great years of achievement. All of us know that the years ahead will be filled with exciting and spectacular achievements in the field of aviation.

Mr. Speaker, because the history of Ellington is the history of military aviation, I am taking the liberty of bringing to my colleagues' attention an excellent article from the golden anniversary edition of the Skylander, award-winning newspaper published for the men and women of Ellington:

ELLINGTON 50 YEARS OLD THIS MONTH—ELLINGTON AFB HAS HAD 50 YEARS OF UPS, DOWNS

Ellington Air Force Base this month celebrates its 50th Anniversary. November 27, 1917, marked the beginning of a half century of service dedicated to the training of young men to assume important roles in the national defense posture of the United States.

On that memorable day five decades ago, Lt. Colonel John F. Curry (retired as Major General, October 31, 1945) assumed command of Ellington Field and directed the first aircraft to fly from what was to become one of the busiest air fields in the country. Just 73 days after ground was broken, the training field became operative. The Houston Chamber of Commerce was one of the most ardent supporters of this new project and was untiring in its efforts to rush completion of the field. Then, as now, prominent figures throughout the Houston area contributed their best efforts in support of this new and critical facility.

The base was originally located on 1,280 acres of Texas prairie owned by Dr. R. W. Knox but through the years has expanded to its present 2,200 acres, owned and leased.

Actual construction of the base began on September 14, 1917. Almost over night the field came into being in spite of a change in plans that involved the construction of many more buildings than anticipated to make the base a two-unit field. Two companies of infantry were sent from nearby Camp Logan to help control the several strikes that plagued the work. All disagreements were satisfactorily settled, however, and the field was built in record time.

The first detachment of Air Service personnel, the 120th Aero Squadron under the command of 1st Lt. William J. Dunn, Jr., arrived from Kelly Field on November 10. This unit was composed largely of airplane mechanics. Aircraft were shipped in to the new facility and were quickly assembled by the expert crews.

Colonel Curry arrived shortly after the planes were delivered and assumed command of the new base on November 27. It was on that date the first airplane was launched from the new airfield. The first formation flight occurred a few days later when Colonel Curry led a flight of ten airplanes over the city of Houston and dropped Red Cross literature to the curious and enthusiastic throngs in the street below.

During the ensuing year, four commanders participated in the development of the new base: Colonel Curry, Major John McDonnel, Major Walter H. Frank and Lt. Colonel Ira A. Rader. It was during Major McDonnel's tenure that a full bombing course was outlined and implemented. The program consisted of both the theoretical and practical bombing practice that soon put Ellington in the number one position in the Air Service for this activity. The dropping of live explosive bombs began in April 1918.

Major Frank was greatly loved and respected by all members of the command and the entire personnel of the field paid homage to him when he was transferred on November 11, 1918. On that date it was reported the airdrome was a sea of ships, many flown in from other bases to pay their respects to a man who had done so much in developing the new air field. Colonel Rader succeeded Major Frank and assumed command of the base on November 4, 1918. He was known throughout the young Air Service as a man of extraordinary executive ability whose primary concern was for his men. As a result he was held in high esteem by all members of his command.

Ellington Air Force Base was named in honor of a young second lieutenant, Eric L. Ellington, who was killed in the tangled wreckage of his flying machine near San Diego, California, on November 24, 1913.

The Curtis JN4 (Flying Jenny) was the first training-type airplane assigned to Ellington Field. This was a biplane with a "powerful" 150-horsepowered Hispano-Suiza engine. It was an extremely versatile plane and was used in all types of training. As an experiment, a Jenny was converted into what was claimed as the first "aerial ambulance." The cowl in front of the rear cockpit, the rear seat and two feet of the fuselage covering behind it were modified so they could be removed. The floor of the body was altered to accommodate a regulation army stretcher which would be fastened down to prevent its shifting while the plane was in flight. The patient was strapped to the stretcher by broad bands around his ankles, waist and chest. The plane was coated with white enamel and red crosses were painted on the wings and sides of the fuselage. One remarkable round-trip mercy flight was made between Houston and Brenham, Texas, a distance of 180 miles, in the unbelievable elapsed time of only two hours and forty minutes.

Virtually every type of plane in the Air Force inventory has flown from Ellington AFB during the past half century, from the Flying Jenny to the most modern jets and NASA's Super Guppy. Ellington has truly been the "Gateway to the Stars" through its pilot and navigator training programs; its gunnery and bombardment training; and today the home of proficiency training for United States astronauts, who fly the supersonic T–38, Talon.

Through the years Ellington has experienced triumphs and sorrows but always emerging victorious. After the success of its early beginnings, the War Department decided the base was excess to the needs of the military and in 1920 directed that it be closed. In 1925 final wrecking operations began. Fire razed the last of the wooden buildings in 1927 and by 1930 the only remnants of the field were the concrete water tank and some concrete slabs on which small hangars had been built. For the next ten years the government leased the land to ranchers.

During its short life span, however, Ellington boasted of many "firsts". Among these were:

First to gain credit for designing, testing, implementing, and having an assigned aerial ambulance.

First to incorporate night flying and the use of calcium lights.

First to make long distance flights such as flying the great distances to Michigan, Washington and Denver, Colorado.

First to adopt a three-day practice bomb raiding trip while flying in formation.

First to receive the DeHaviland 4–B planes with the mighty Liberty 400 engine.

First to be designated an official bombing and navigator school of the flying service.

First to establish an aerial gunnery range. The range was located at San Leon, Texas, on a piece of land jutting into Galveston Bay.

First to introduce "girl canteen workers" to the military. These girls blazed the trail for the highly respected United Service Organization workers.

First to be credited with having its own military camp newspaper.

A non-stop transcontinental south-to-north record flight from Ellington to Gordon, Ontario, was completed by Lt. H. G. Crocker on 26 May 1923. Lt. Crocker's flying time in his DeHaviland 4–B, powered by a Liberty 400 engine, was 11 hours 55 minutes.

In 1940 Congress authorized a construction program of over seven million dollars to rebuild Ellington. On November 23, 1940, Ellington Field was officially designated as an Air Corps station under the temporary command of Capt. H. L. Bordon. Col. Walter H. Reid assumed command on December 1, 1940 and the base was ready for occupancy in the Spring of 1941. Then began the training of thousands of pilots, navigators and bombardiers. On March 15, 1946, the base was again inactivated under the Air Defense Command and later that year was placed under the jurisdiction of the 10th Air Force. It remained in inactive status until 1947. When the Air Corps was officially separated from the U.S. Army on September 18, 1947, Ellington Field became Ellington Air Force Base and was transferred to Air Training Command. Col. Benjamin T. Starkey was assigned as commander of the base on April 15, 1949 and the 3605th Navigator Training Wing was activated.

Successive commanders to Colonel Starkey were Col. William L. Lee (March 1950); Col. Merlin I. Carter (August 30, 1952); and Col. Norman L. Callish (July 21, 1953). The latter served as commander until the training wing was phased out on March 31, 1958.

On April 1, 1958 the base was transferred to the Continental Air Command under the direct supervision of the 10th Air Force. Colonel Howard F. Bronson was designated commander of the newly activated 2578th Air Base Group. He, in turn, was succeeded by Lt. Colonels Bennett T. Browder and Kenneth H. Powers who phased out the base as a full-blown Air Force activity. Brig. General Russell F. Gustke (ART) assumed command of the "civilianized" base on November 1, 1960.

On 1 February 1963 the base was reactivated as a complete Air Force activity. The 2578th Air Base Squadron became the host unit under the command of Col. Lewis P. Ensign. Col. Marion R. McCrackin followed him as commander (August 26, 1964) and was, in turn, succeeded by the present commander, Col. Karl T. Rauk (August 13, 1965).

The present mission of Ellington Air Force Base (the 2578th Air Base Squadron) is to effectively and economically operate and monitor all the facilities of a modern air base, provide necessary services to support the Air Reserve Program and represent the Commander of the Fourth Reserve Region in all matters in the greater Houston, Texas, metropolitan area. These services include logistical and administrative support for the 446th Tactical Airlift Wing (M) (Res), and the 147th Fighter-Interceptor Group (Texas Air National Guard), and other assigned tenant units.

A secondary mission is to provide military training, upgrading training, on-the-job training, collateral training, management training and special training as prescribed by higher headquarters to support the primary mission and enhance the prestige of the United States Air Force in the community.

THE STORY OF HARYOU-ACT, THE POVERTY AGENCY FOR CENTRAL HARLEM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the program and accomplishments of Haryou-Act, the poverty agency for Central Harlem, and a statement by Andrew R. Tyler, chairman of its board of directors.

Mr. Tyler will be addressed, I am sure, after today as Judge Tyler. He is the nominee of the Democratic Conservative, and Liberal Parties for justice of the civil court in today's elections in New York. He exemplifies the kind of thoughtful, responsible, responsive leadership we need in the poverty program.

THE STORY OF HARYOU-ACT—THE CENTRAL HARLEM PROGRAM DESIGNED AS THE "BLUEPRINT FOR CHANGE" FOR YOUTH IN THE GHETTO

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY PROGRAM

Number served: youth, 4,500; adults, 15,500.

Present number in program: 250.

Number of locations: 15.

Number of times classes meet per week: 3.

No child, we say—in Harlem or anywhere else—is expendable. Yet, our statistics on the Harlem youth in the vital area of education, are astounding!

Of the 31,469 students in the elementary and junior high schools in the Harlem community in 1967, the data suggest that at least 50 percent of those in the elementary schools are sufficiently retarded in the basic academic skills to require *intensive* remedial work, and at least 80 percent of those in the junior high schools require extra help if they are to function effectively in high school. These indelibly-etched figures, patently outline in depth the desperate need for After School remedial or corrective Centers in Harlem.

The need is both desperate and staggering. In order to meet the goal Haryou-Act would have to provide for a minimum of 12,000 elementary pupils and nearly 6,000 junior high school students through the establishment of Sixty After-School Centers.

Our After-School Study Centers Program is a community-based education service which has as its goal the upgrading of the in-school achievement level of in-school youth.

ARTS AND CULTURE

Number served: youth, 2,080; adults, 208.

Present number in program: 1,309.

Number of locations: 22.

Number of classes per week: 476.

Number of classes per year: 6,188.

Number of class hours per year 34,782.

The Arts & Culture program has reawakened the Harlem community to the Social, Educational and Economic values of the cultural arts in the war on poverty. Through its unique training and demonstration program, launched in 1954, Arts & Culture has served the thousands of Harlem residents.

More than *two thousand* students have received quality training in commercial art, dance, drama, fashion and design, film and sound, graphics and plastics, journalism, music, vocal training and still photography.

Students trained in Arts & Culture Workshops have performed and exhibited publicly on more than 100 occasions before audiences totalling more than 100,000 people.

The Haryou-Act Documentary and Educational Movie "Summer Story," produced by the Film and Sound Workshop, has been shown more than 175 times locally and throughout the country.

More than *one hundred* workshop and Community Center classes are conducted weekly by Arts & Culture instructors.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The Business Enterprise Department of Haryou-Act began operations in November, 1964 at two locations: 180 West 135 Street (Headquarters), and 268 West 133 Street (training center). The work of the Department was in two major areas: Building Renovation and Repair training, and Business Advisory Services.

Since November, 1964, 197 youth have received training in building renovation and repair involving the elementary use of hand tools while engaged in actual repair projects. Trainees have gone on to further instruction and job placement. To date, 27 major projects have been completed in the Harlem community. These include the refurbishing of three basements at 212, 214, and 260 West 114 Street, whose spaces were allotted to the Haryou-Act Cadet Corps; the complete refurbishing of St. Paul's Baptist Church, 249 West 132 Street, which included electrical wiring, carpentry, painting and the installation of new flooring; and minor repairs at St. Marks Methodist Church, 137 Street and St. Nicholas Avenue, and Beulah Baptist Church, 125 West 130 Street.

Also 62 repair jobs have been completed with Haryou-Act facilities. These include work at Central Administration, Arts and Culture, the Cadet Corps, the Photography Shop, etc.

Since November, 1964, the Business Advisory Service has secured 31 loans for businesses in Harlem; has held 178 conferences with local businesses to assist with business problems including tax accounting control, purchasing aid and modern business techniques; and has given 54 lectures and demonstrations to some 3,600 persons in church groups and non-profit clubs.

CADET CORPS

Number served: youth 18,500.
Present number in program: 2,158.
Number of locations: 21.
Number of classes per week: 83.
Number of class hours per week: 249.
Number of classes per year: 4,316.
Number of class hours per year: 12,948.

Contrary to what some believe, our Cadet Corps is not projected as a training ground for military preparedness as are some such programs as the ROTC in many schools and colleges.

Our Cadet Corps program endeavors to fill the need for prestige, confidence and security for our Central Harlem youngsters. Each activity is geared to the needs of the youth and to serve as a bulwark against delinquency; and to stimulate, educate, and develop constructive activities for those youth who might otherwise "go astray".

The main emphasis of the Cadet Corps program is to present an attractive "package deal" to youth who cannot be reached effectively, by the traditional group work, or resocialization program. *Social education, recreation* and remediation are the components of our Cadet Corps program.

COMMUNITY ACTION INSTITUTE

The Community Action Institute is the central training and orientation arm of Haryou-Act.

CAI is divided into two main categories: The Heritage Program and In Service Training for Haryou-Act members. Approximately 200 persons a week are trained or serviced by CAI. The larger percentage of these groups are young people. Since April 1966 CAI has served approximately 3,000 people in Central Harlem.

The present location of the CAI offices are: Haryou-Act Headquarters and 180 West 135th Street. Classes are held every day (2 hours) in the Heritage Program for 25–30 people with an equal percentage of youngsters and adults. In Service Training is requested by other departments at various times.

CAI reached the community in an effective way by training the residents of Central Harlem in Housing, Education and Welfare. Their central theme being to train Harlem residents for Community Action.

EMPLOYMENT DIVISION

Ask almost any Harlem youth about getting a job and you will find him painfully and emotionally aware of the economic deprivations which have submerged him and his parents in the squalor and powerlessness of the ghetto. He will hasten to proclaim that jobs are the key to his future, since jobs are the fulcrum upon which progress turns.

During the past year, Haryou-Act has sought to give a second chance of securing compensatory education for jobs, to but a part of the Negro youth in Harlem who are already the victims of educational deficiencies, discriminations, and the other crippling effects of forced isolation in the ghetto. We have succeeded only to the extent of our far-too-few funds, and the natural roadblocks of opposition we fully expected to encounter.

We hasten to add, however, that much of our success is to be attributed to the helpful cooperation given us by leaders of unions, business and industry.

Since March, 1965, the Employment Department has serviced 28,342 Harlem residents (15,767 youth and 12,575 adult) in the areas of testing and remediation, vocational counseling, job referral and job placement. The Department has also continued a successful on-the-job training program and has placed youth as trainees in TV repair, stenography, bookkeeping, auto mechanics, carpentry, photo production, printing and office machine repair.

One of the Employment Department's major accomplishments was the successful launching of a taxi driver training program in cooperation with the Metropolitan Taxicab Board of Trade. Between September, 1966 and April, 1967, 1,294 applicants registered with the Employment Department for this training; 906 of them were referred to training classes or directly to the MTBT; 420 graduated from the optional training course and a total of 520 received Hack licenses. The Haryou-Act tax program was directly responsible for the shortened period required for qualification for Hack Licenses.

The Employment Department presently employs a staff of 92 youth and adults at its five locations.

HARLEM YOUTH UNLIMITED

Number of youth served: 40,000.
Present number of youth in program: 500 (on stipend)
Number of locations: 10.
Number of times classes meet per weeks: 4.

The primary components of HYU are: Community Action, Community Services (Group Work), Public Relations and Personnel.

Harlem Youth Unlimited is the youth counterpart of Haryou-Act with the ultimate objective of creating a youth movement. This is being done by bringing together all the youth of Ceneral Harlem through training in a specific area, with constant orientation to the overall goals of community change, thus helping them to coalesce into a unified, active group.

HYU now is comprised of basically two elements: *training* and *service* to the community. For instance, Group Work Trainees are themselves trained and prepared to work in group programs.

HEADSTART

Number served: *Youth 1,300.*
Present number in program: *420.*
Number of locations: *10.*
Number of classes per week: *5.*

Haryou-Act's Headstart, a year-round preschool program for youngsters between the ages of 3 and 5-years-old is designed to prepare children for kindergarten or the first grade. Originally known as "Operation Spark," Headstart was launched in Harlem on July 6, 1965. Because of its initial success, the program was later adopted by antipoverty officials in Washington and officially renamed Headstart.

In addition to preparing youngsters for elementary school, Headstart also works in the following areas of child development: (1) Involves the parents in the educational growth of their children; (2) Initiates teaching techniques and materials to enable culturally deprived children to overcome deficits, auditory and visual discrimination, which hinder their progress in the public school system; and (3) Encourages its staff to attend seminars aimed at aiding them to focus on special problems of the pre-school disadvantaged children and to develop techniques for working with the youngsters and their families.

The Family Service Unit of Headstart provides baby-sitting services, when necessary, and supervises parents' meetings and special programs, functioning as an important link between the home and the school.

NARCOTICS INSTITUTE

The lack of funding for the Narcotics Institute is a clear and somewhat ironic example of Haryou-Act's handicaps. Recognizing the crucial nature of this program, 40 per cent of the city's dope addiction is said to be in Harlem, Haryou-Act produced a proposal for a program. The proposal was highly commended by everyone, but underwritten by no one. Out of sheer desperation, the Board of Directors of Haryou-Act reallocated $100,000 which was promptly utilized in a pilot project that eventually graduated 20 ex-addicts. Today, the antipoverty agency is without funds for this program. Why?

The answer must be forthcoming. With all public harping in the press about dope in Harlem, it is an amazing paradox that Haryou-Act could adequately demonstrate its own willingness and expertise to tackle this problem, yet find no funds coming from the Federal, State, or City Governments or from private sources.

Nevertheless the program's 12 counsellor aides, all of them ex-addicts have lectured in more than 62 schools and colleges to more than 60,000 students during the past two years. They also have made 26 appearances in churches and on scores of panel discussions on radio and television, including two appearances on the Alan Burke Show.

Beside the director, the staff consists of 24 persons. Ten of them are regarded as experts in the narcotics addiction field and 14 are former addicts.

Since the summer of 1965, the ex-addicts or counsellor aides have talked to more than 200,000 persons.

Serving as lecturers with the Police Department's Mobile Unit, they have visited every borough in the city to campaign against the dangers of addiction.

NEIGHBORHOOD BOARDS

For organizational purposes, Central Harlem has been divided into 5 sections called Neighborhood Boards, bounded on the north by 159th Street, on the south by 110th Street and extending from the Harlem River and 5th Avenue on the east to Bradhurst, St. Nicholas and Morningside Avenues on the west. Neighborhood Boards are coordinated by Haryou-Act, Inc.

Neighborhood Boards began organizing in July, 1965. For the next five months an implementation plan was hammered out and, on December 6, 1965, a task force of more than 100 Board staffers began a door-to-door campaign to register approximately 48,000 residents of Board area #1. Their purpose was to procure the "maximum feasible participation of the poor" who were, in this instance, about 40% of those registered.

By mid-February, on snow-covered streets, actual voting for block representatives began and was completed by May, 1966. The immediate result was that on May 31, 1966, in the Renaissance Casino, before an audience of some 1,500 concerned citizens, certificates were awarded to more than 200 block and organization representatives, youth and adult, from Board #1.

During the summer of 1966, registration continued in Board areas 2, 3, 4 and 5. Consequently, on October 1, 1966—Neighborhood Boards Day—1,800 elected representatives, of whom more than 700 were youth from every block in Central Harlem, were installed in impressive ceremonies at Canaan Baptist Church, 10 Lenox Avenue. Mayor John V. Lindsay, Council President Frank O'Conner, State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, Borough President Percy E. Sutton, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and other dignitaries were among those present to witness the occasion.

Significantly, these "grass roots" delegates were chosen by 62,026 voters of Harlem's 155,000 eligible registrants. An almost unbelievable 80,072 (52% of the qualified) were registered.

The staff in the five area centers and the coordinator's office, at 2092 Seventh Avenue, total 390, of whom 47 are youth.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW R. TYLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

What the nation has failed to accomplish in solving the problems of "Youth in the Ghetto" throughout the land, Haryou-Act has accomplished to a great degree in Harlem: It has documented and chartered a way out from powerlessness and has—for three years—fought valiantly to make that way a reality.

The result? A community in which the seeds of hope have at the least been planted;

a ghetto in which thousands of youths have in the least been stirred with pride.

The 620-page Haryou-Act document, "Youth in the Ghetto," is the only blueprint of its kind and depth to be found anywhere among the antipoverty agencies of the nation. It was published in January of 1964 after 18 months of concentrated research, study and writing by Harlem youth and adult sociological experts. Thousands of copies have been distributed throughout the nation as a guide for other programs. Interpreting and carrying out this document has been one of Haryou-Act's key contributions to the Harlem community and the nation.

Since its inception in late 1964, Haryou-Act programs have annually served some 30,000 youth directly and thousands more indirectly. Thousands of adults, including parents, have been touched directly and many more indirectly while witnessing parades, presentations and forums conducted by Harlem youth.

In 1965, the Haryou-Act staff grew to a force of 1,500, about one-third youth, and has remained at the level serving the community in 89 locations spread over Central Harlem. The bulk of the staff is teaching and supervisory personnel engaged in instruction, guidance and counseling. Every program contains basic instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic; one program has worked after school to help students keep up with their classes and remain in school. All the while, a course in Heritage aimed at pride has been created and carried on in the Harlem community for the first time.

Through Haryou-Act, some Harlem youth—but not nearly enough—have discovered new careers and have gone on to work at them in private industry.

How much is hope worth? Indeed, how much is pride worth? No one can say.

How much is the beginning Haryou-Act has made worth? No one can be certain. But what can be said is that the Haryou-Act, despite its tribulations, came to be recognized as perhaps the most innovative and dynamic new force in Harlem and the nation at the time when such a new institution with grass roots impetus was sorely needed.

The story of Haryou-Act was foreordained by its innovative nature to be one of trial and error; success and failure; happiness and heartbreak; defeat and victory.

To be or not to be? That is no longer the question, Haryou-Act is! It is perhaps the largest and most dedicated and powerful community institution created to work as an integral force for good within the ghetto community.

The report of our accomplishments for three years, which we are submitting today, is positive testimony both to the men, women and youth who have served here in all capacities, including Board members who have done so at a great sacrifice and with no monetary compensation, and to the Congress and the City of New York.

In view of today's demonstrated worth of Haryou-Act and the increasing needs of the people of Harlem, we strongly urge the Members of Congress to pass the antipoverty legislation now before them without any further delay.

EXPANDED STUDY OF CREDIT CARDS NEEDED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House Banking and Currency Committee will begin an important set of hearings on unsolicited bank credit cards. It is the hope of the committee that the hearings will lead to legislation which will dampen the proliferating issuing of unsolicited credit cards.

A recent article in Parade magazine reported one bank in Chicago was hit with $46,000 in fraudulent credit card charges in one day. Another Chicago bank reported 5,700 cards on its blacklist.

Fraudulent use of credit cards promises to multiply as more and more banks enter the field. Some 700 banks now offer some kind of credit card plan, with most of the 9,300 remaining banks expected to enter into the field in the very near future.

Although the present Banking and Currency Committee hearings will be primarily confined to unsolicited bank credit cards, the problem does not end there. More than 140 million credit cards have been issued by more than a thousand companies Although accurate estimates are difficult to come by, most authorities agree that fraudulent credit card practices are now costing upward of $100 million a year.

A recent American Banker's Convention heard a number of speakers, including Rudulph Peterson of Bank of America, predicting that the United States is entering into a cashless, checkless economy where the majority of day-to-day transactions will be handled by all-purpose credit cards. At the rate the use of credit cards are proliferating Mr. Peterson's predictions may be reality even sooner than he expected.

One of the last businesses to succumb to the credit card is retail groceries. However, with the advent of the master charge plan in California some 36 of the State's food chains are now accepting credit cards for grocery purchases.

What are the implications of this movement to the credit card economy? I doubt if anyone really knows. The hearings tomorrow will attempt to open the dialogue on this issue. However, it is doubtful that because of the time allotted, and the narrowness of the announced subject matter these first set of hearings can do little more than scratch the surface.

What is now needed is a detailed Government study, either under the auspices of the Congress or the Federal Reserve, on the implications of the credit card society. The sooner we understand the ramifications of the credit card, the better prepared we will be for what almost certainly seems to be one of the most significant trends shaping the future structure of the market place.

One of the more sinister implications of the proliferating, and unregulated use of credit cards has been the attendant escalation of fraud and abuse resulting from both carelessness and downright inability to deal with credit card crooks. At this point in the RECORD Mr. Speaker, I insert a recent Parade magazine article on the growing problem of fraudulent use of credit cards. I commend the article to all those who now hold credit cards, and to those who anticipate obtaining one in the near future:

A MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR RACKET SWEEPS THE UNITED STATES—GUARD YOUR CREDIT CARDS

(By James D. Snyder)

Last May, somewhere between his Connecticut home and New York's LaGuardia Airport, John Morgan discovered his wallet was missing. The $85 in cash was the least of his worries.

As a $16,000-a-year salesman for a top electronics firm, Morgan carried the complete executive survivor's kit: 14 credit cards ranging from the all-purpose American Express and Diner's Club to assorted hotel and oil company cards he hadn't sought, but had added to his collection when they arrived unsolicited in the mail.

Morgan reported the loss, then waited hopefully to hear from some honest citizen. He didn't. A month later the bills started rolling in: $1500 on two oil company cards and $2150 on a central charge card—all for purchases in the local area. The next month it got worse: $450 in Air Travel Card fares and $1800 for hotel bills that had apparently taken the happy new cardholder on a Caribbean holiday. Then a month later a new twist: the "new" John Morgan had used the card collection as a reference to open a checking account in nearby New Jersey, quickly leaving a trail of bad checks at stores throughout the Eastern Seaboard.

The fact that the card companies agreed to absorb the bogus bills hardly soothed the seething Morgan. By July he'd spent the equivalent of two weeks' working time helping police and credit card security officers unravel the mess. He's also faced the humiliating ordeal of fending off phone calls and overdue bills from area stores which had honored checks on the account opened in his name. The crushing blow, however, came in August when he tried to buy a new car on time. A routine inquiry from the auto dealer to the computerized, areawide credit bureau showed that Morgan had been labeled a "poor risk."

"They told me to come back after everything was straightened out," he says ruefully. "So far, it hasn't been."

If Morgan has any consolation, it's that he's not alone. The nation's sudden swing to credit cards (140 million from a thousand companies this year) has been accompanied by an even greater rise in theft and fraud. The "hot lists" of the big four credit card companies (American Express, Diner's Club, Carte Blanche and Universal Air Travel Plan) currently include more than 25,000 cards. The 300 oil companies who comprise the American Petroleum Credit Association already report more than 30,000 fraud cases this year—double the 1966 total. In Chicago, where several banks began deluging metropolitan area citizens with unsolicited cards early last winter, losses traced to theft or fraud at one point averaged 4 percent of total sales. One bank got hit with $46,000 in fraudulent purchases in a single day. Another, the First National Bank of Chicago, had 5703 cards on its blacklist.

Estimates from different investigative agencies vary, but they indicate that credit card thieves may be stealing as much as $100 million a year.

Some of the schemes devised by amateurs and smalltime crooks are a back-handed tribute to American ingenuity. Recently, a Beaumont, Tex., man, through a newspaper ad, arranged for a collegiate-type youth to drive his car to California. He also loaned the stranger his oil credit card to cover expenses; it did—as well as $8000 worth of automotive merchandise the rider bought and disposed of along the way. Thirty-five-year-old Francis Triola of St. Louis devised a more steady source of income. He'd memorize vital statistics about solid employees encountered on his many jobs, then order credit cards in their name to be sent to postoffice boxes he had established in advance. He even used one victim's name to buy a $3700 Chev-

rolet on time, to obtain a sizable bank loan, and purchase $2500 in furniture on time.

Then there was the plan devised by three Suffolk County, N.Y. housewives who succeeded in bilking Macy's department store out of $16,000 worth of merchandise in just two months. Armed with three stolen credit cards, and relying on a tip that Macy employees need not make credit checks on transactions under $25, the trio made over 600 small purchases at several of the company's suburban outlets and just as quickly returned them for cash refunds.

All of the above parties are now in jail or on extended probation. So are Clifford Heck and Carol Glen Burton, who victimized Indianapolis with perhaps the most inventive of all plans. Heck, a 26-year-old, off-again-on-again, door-to-door salesman, was last employed by a food freezer company in the Indiana capital which subscribed to a list of new arrivals to the area for its sales leads. The list included not only names and addresses, but personal and credit data on each family.

Heck armed with names and facts, soon left the job and launched his own "business." In early July 1966 the Shell Oil Co. received a phone call from a man who gave his name as David L. Copenhaver of 3315 E. 51st St., Indianapolis. He said he was going on vacation soon and wanted a Shell credit card. He quickly supplied all the pertinent credit history asked by the clerk, who said he could expect his card in the mail within a couple of weeks. Days later, Mrs. Paul Petrowski, the real occupant of 3315 E. 51st St., got a call from the same man, identifying himself as David Copenhaver, who explained that there had been a mail mixup. He had been waiting for a Shell card to be sent to his home at 3315 E. 57th St., and had been told by the Shell home office that it had been mistakenly sent to the 51st street address. Would she be kind enough to hold the card when it arrived until he could pick it up?

Certainly, said Mrs. Petrowski. Not long afterwards, a smiling Clifford Heck (alias David Copenhaver) dropped by, picked up the credit card, tipped his hat, and was off with the first of several tickets that would take him and 20-year-old Burton on a six-state vacation and shopping spree. A driver's license was taken out in Copenhaver's name. Autos were rented, driven a few thousand miles, and ditched. A Sears credit card, obtained in Copenhaver's name with the aid of another unsuspecting homeowner, was used 71 times in eight Indiana cities over three weeks to buy clothing, mixers, shoes, automatic blankets, radios, and furniture—most of it resold for whatever cash it would bring. Three months and several credit cards later, when U.S. postal inspectors finally caught up with the two travelers, they had already run up fraudulent bills of more than $10,000.

Just a year ago, police and postal inspectors were convinced that credit card misuse was pretty much confined to smalltimers like Heck and Burton. Now there is alarming evidence that organized mobsters are rushing to join the buy-now-pay-never plan.

Early this year the FBI closed in on a six-state bookie network which had placed some 6500 long distance calls to gamblers on pilfered telephone credit cards. Police in several cities have been alerted to a scheme known as "bustout," where underworld front men buy into a floundering business, obtain dozens of credit cards in the name of various "employees," run up thousands in fraudulent purchases, and disappear after leaving the company in bankruptcy. New York City police recently cracked a racket in which three professional criminals ordered airline tickets by mail, using the credit card number they had wangled from a large industrial firm, then sold some $25,000 worth of tickets at discounts to individual travelers.

The most alarming indication of what *could* happen is a case now pending before a federal grand jury in New York City. Postal inspectors have charged that a repairman with Dashew Business Machines, Inc., the firm which prints Diner's Club cards, made a deal with a local mob to supply them with embossing machines, printing materials, names of Diner's members, and 5000 blank cards. In turn, the inspectors charged, the gang would churn out counterfeit copies of members' card and mobilize a nationwide network of pushers to embark on a shopping binge unprecedented in American history. According to Diner's Club officials, the operation was smashed after only 200 cards had been printed and used for one month. But the bill for that month, which Diner's Club agreed to absorb after angry protests poured in from cardholders, is expected to total at least $50,000.

Postal and police officials unanimously agree that these cases are just the top of the iceberg—that the underworld below is fast organizing the business of credit card theft, fraud and counterfeiting as an everyday moneymaker alongside such other proven industries as gambling, prostitution, and narcotics.

Thus far, efforts to combat the trend have been limited and inadequate. A handful of credit card companies have tightened their credit checks while a few others (mainly banks) have abandoned the unsolicited mailing in favor of more costly but less risky deliveries by registered letter. There is also talk (but no action yet) of requiring I.D. photos on all cards, and of creating an industrywide computerized data bank to coordinate facts on pending investigations.

Another shortcoming is the nation's law enforcement machinery—almost all of it set up before the credit card became vogue. At present, 12 states have no laws at all to police illegal credit card use, while many existing state statutes are toothless. One bright light on the horizon is a new industry-sponsored model state law that has already been passed in California, Florida, and North Carolina. Efforts at enacting tough federal legislation, however, have been greeted with yawns in Congress. Current federal responsibility is shared by the Post Office Department and the FBI, both of which labor under handicaps. POD's 1,050 mail inspectors are so busy chasing down 67 other categories of fraud that credit card abuse rates only 3 percent of their combined time. The FBI, on the other hand, is limited by a law restricting its jurisdiction to interstate shipments of stolen property valued at more than $5000.

Besides the lack of enforcement machinery, credit card cheats get a headstart from the system itself. They know, for example, that it's often a week or more before a cardholder discovers his loss—and that even when reported properly it may take company headquarters another two weeks to record the loss on a list and circulate it to participating merchants. In fact, some lists (such as Universal Air Travel Plan's) are so crowded that the only way to keep them from becoming hopelessly unwieldy is to confine them to cards already misused.

A THIEF'S DREAM

And now comes the thief's dream: unsolicited mailings. The only way some Americans find out they've been sent cards is when they get the bills for some interceptor's shopping binge.

Despite such alarming flaws, the outlook is for an even greater outpouring of credit cards in the next few years. The Federal Reserve Board expects that the 700 or so banks now proferring "instant money" through card plans will be joined quickly by most of the 9300 remaining banks which have thus far held off. With the $60 billion supermarket industry set to follow suit (36 California food companies have already done so), and with a continued lag in anti-crime controls, the nation may be heading for a checkless, cashless catastrophe.

Until the system does change, the burden of theft and fraud protection falls on the honest individual cardholder. Congress may soon enact legislation to control the indiscriminate proliferation of credit card offers. But the feeling is that the industry will begin to police itself—to cut its increasingly high loss rate. Meanwhile, credit card companies repeatedly urge their members to play safe by: (1) obtaining low-cost credit card insurance; (2) keeping their cards with them at all times; (3) keeping cards in something more secure than the plastic containers; (4) keeping a list of all cards and their numbers; (5) reporting losses promptly by phone or wire.

Then again, some persons have considered switching to a radical, controversial medium for their shopping and travel needs. Word is that it is accepted by all merchants, can be used to buy anything from bubble gum to mink coats, and if lost, can only purchase a limited amount depending on its face value.

It's called *cash*.

USING OUR WEALTH

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the AFL–CIO News notes correctly, I believe, that the Nation's long-sustained and solid economic growth gives a hollow ring to the argument that we cannot afford to fully implement and expand every possible avenue to a full measure of social and economic justice for every American. I think the points the editorial makes merit the attention of us all, and under unanimous consent I insert it at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

USING OUR WEALTH

The single overriding fact about the nation's economy is that by the end of 1967 the total value of all goods and services produced will be at the $800 billion level and that this once undreamed of figure is the result of 80 months of almost consecutive economic growth.

According to the Commerce Department's latest report, the gross national product has increased $156 billion since 1964. Allowing for price increases, the real value of the GNP has increased about $100 billion—a tremendous sum reflecting the wealth and economic strength of the nation.

In face of this continuing, solid growth, the sheer hypocrisy of those who would cut back on anti-poverty programs, of those who would deny critically needed aid to the cities and the urban areas takes on a particularly hollow ring.

To a nation with an $800 billion economy the question is no longer "can we afford this" but how and where can we use our resources to continue our growth and bring justice and equity to all Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATHIAS of California (at the re-

quest of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of official business, as congressional advisor to the U.S. delegation to the 14th session of the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from November 6 through November 17, on account of illness.

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. HOLIFIELD, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include a speech by Secretary McNamara.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. COLLIER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1946. An act to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2029. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than 500; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2419. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2514. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 219. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 1391. An act to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 2179. An act to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals; and

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87–752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

The LATE HONORABLE JOHN NANCE GARNER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 969

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable John Nance Garner, formerly Speaker of the House of Representatives and Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 8, 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:

1204. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting observations on the U.S. balance-of-payments position; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1205. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting observations on the U.S. balance-of-payments position; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1206. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the sixth report of the Federal voting assistance program, covering the period from September 1965 to September 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84–296; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. MORGAN: Committee of conference. S. 1872. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 892). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6157. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotments (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 13489. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan, investment, and dividend provisions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; with amendment (Rept. No. 895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FARBSTEIN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of special factfinding mission to Israel (Rept. No. 896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13901. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 13902. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 13903. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13904. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain losses sustained by patrons of cooperative organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 13905. A bill to prohibit federally insured banks from voting their own stock and to provide for cumulative voting in federally insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13906. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.J. Res. 921. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in January 1970, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 575. 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. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 576. Concurrent resolution concerning the development of the ocean floor through international cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con Res. 577. Concurrent resolution concerning the development of the ocean floor through international cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 968. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion, race, or nationality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13907. A bill for the relief of Lesvia M. Doukellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13908. A bill for the relief of Maria Cavallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 13909. A bill for the relief of Domenico La Forgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 13910. A bill for the relief of Riley C. Melton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 13911. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg.) George T. Ankrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 13912. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13913. A bill for the relief of Miss Kotoko Abe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13914. A bill for the relief of Miss Lolita J. Jaramilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13915. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andres Nathan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13916. A bill for the relief of Rachel F. Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting *President pro tempore* (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the abiding peace of the universe, we bow before Thee in humility and reverence. In the mercies of yet another day, we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that, by a strength not our own, our individual record may be kept by any word or act unworthy of our best.

To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty. In the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

Inspire and guide with Thy spirit these servants of the people—the few among the many—lifted to high pedestals of power and responsibility, to the end that they may be found faithful stewards of the Nation's trust.

Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to set men free;
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 6, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had pasesd, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 219. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 1391. An act to cancel certain construction costs and irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 2179. An act to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals; and

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies; expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles; provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions; authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to establish a National Commission on Product Safety, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1341. An act to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional accumulation of leaves in certain foreign areas;

H.R. 2138. An act to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit naturalization for certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations engaged in disseminating information which significantly promotes U.S. interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3639. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3982. An act to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services;

H.R. 6692. An act declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States;

H.R. 8547. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12912. An act to give the consent of Congress to the State of Ohio to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the acts of November 1, 1966 (79 Stat. 1157), and November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1156);

H.R. 13165. An act to extend the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President; and

H.R. 13669. An act to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes; to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities; and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1341. An act to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize