United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.—John 2: 17.

God of grace and God of glory, pour Thy power upon us as we wait upon Thee in prayer. In days of darkness we have no light but Thine, in times of trouble no refuge but in Thee, in periods of perplexity no strength but the strength Thou dost bestow upon the believing heart. To Thee do we commit ourselves and our Nation praying that in weakness we may be made strong; restless may we find rest in Thee, and when confused may we be aware of Thy presence.

Grant unto us the courage to walk in the way of Thy commandments, the confidence to do Thy will and the consciousness that Thou art with us every moment of every day. So may we live as we pray and as we pray so may we live. In the Master's name we offer this our morning prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 13, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 10, 1967, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2536. An act to terminate the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills, concurrent and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 95. An act for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Eileen Iris Punnett;

S. 233. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis;

S. 324. An act for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson;

S. 327. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Victor De La Concepcion Garcia;

S. 499. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Zuniga;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka);

S. 608. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu;

S. 650. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Anthony J. Corso, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 714. An act to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committees, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions;

S. 819. An act for the relief of Charles H. Thurston;

S. 965. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act to enable Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments;

S. 966. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1045. An act for the relief of Alton R. Conner;

S.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission;

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days";

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day;

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1967 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States," and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 286) entitled "An act to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, 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. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84–1028, appointed Mr. JAVITS as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy in lieu of Mr. ALLOTT, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 80–843, appointed Mr. JAVITS as a member of the delegation to the International Labor Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, June 7–29, 1967, in lieu of Mr. DOMINICK, resigned.

WHO IS CREATING THE CREDIBILITY GAP?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of chatter in the press and on television about a credibility gap. I thought the House would be interested to know that Ropev Research Associates did a survey on the believability of the various media.

Forty-one percent of the people said that they would believe what they saw on a television news show; 24 percent what they read in the newspaper; and 8 percent what they read in a magazine.

If there is a credibility gap—it is upstairs—and they created it.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. CLANCY. 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. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site. The purpose of the bill is to have the birthplace of William Howard Taft in Cincinnati declared to be a national historic shrine.

This distinguished Cincinnatian climaxed his long and illustrious career of public service by serving as President of the United States from 1909 to 1913 and as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1921 until 1930, when illness forced him to resign.

There is no adequate memorial in honor of former President Taft. We have honored many other former presidents and certainly former President Taft deserves similar tribute.

Under the provisions of the bill I am introducing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by donation or purchase, such land and buildings in the vicinity of the home necessary for the establishment of the shrine.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Taft family, through a nonprofit corporation, the William Howard Taft Memorial Association, has, with its own funds, restored the outside of the house to its original condition. In addition, I am informed that the association will attempt to bear the costs of producing pamphlets and brochures and promoting visits by school children, tourists, and other visitors.

I am introducing this bill because the association has encountered obstacles and cannot proceed further without this assistance.

I am hopeful that early action will be taken on this proposal so we can preserve in public ownership this historically significant site.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSSIBLE CHANGE IN THE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 17, 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a possible change in the program for the week. The gentleman from South Carolina, the distingushed chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has advised that the bill H.R. 6167, authorizing the loan of certain naval vessels, programed to come up Wednesday, would be called up under a unanimous-consent request tomorrow, following disposition of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1968.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program. A moment ago he said the bill H.R. 6167 would be called up by unanimous consent on what day? Did he say on Wednesday?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I said the bill would be called up tomorrow, following disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The gentleman from South Carolina is present. He notified me that he would undertake to call up the bill by unanimous consent. The bill had been programed for the next day.

Mr. GROSS. Does the bill have a rule?

Mr. ALBERT. No; but we expect we may get a rule tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Then it would be considered under a rule and not by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALBERT. It will be before the Rules Committee tomorrow, and, of course, consideration of it under the rule would be dependent upon what the Rules Committee does between now and tomorrow.

If, of course, the gentleman from South Carolina obtains unanimous consent to call the bill up tomorrow a rule will not be necessary.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6424) to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of this bill if admission fees are to be charged?

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Admission fees will be charged at this facility just the same as at any other facility where the Department of Interior feels they should be charged.

Mr. GROSS. And the admission fees will be dedicated to what? Will they be dedicated to maintenance of the site?

Mr. ASPINALL. Admission fees will be dedicated to the purposes for which such fees are used under the present practices in the Department of Interior.

Mr. GROSS. To the maintenance and other costs?

Mr. ASPINALL. They would be used in the general category of funds collected by the procedures followed in like matters.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I should like to continue this colloquy to ask if, in the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the use towards the annual cost of $32,500 a year for operation and maintenance of this national historic site properly does come under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act? It has always been the understanding of the gentleman from Missouri that these funds which are gained in the land of the "free" on Corps of Engineers, reservoir, and reclamation projects, for which our people have already paid, and which should be a part of their recreational activities in the land of the free, would go for further acquisiton, not for operation and maintenance of the reservoirs or other historical sites. I wonder if, technically, the conversion of these fees from the land and water conservation fund, to the operation of this proposed historical site—I find not fault with that—is not a dereliction from the original intent with regard to such funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

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

Mr. ASPINALL. When I answered the question of the gentleman from Iowa I tried to make reference to the fact that some admission fees go to one source and some admission fees go to another. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. If these fees are covered into the land and water conservation fund, then they will be dedicated for the purposes set forth in the fund. The expenses that will be necessary, in taking care of this facility, just like a similar facility for the late President Grant, will be taken from our general appropriations from the Treasury.

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

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

H.R. 6424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, or interests therein (including scenic easements), together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a national historic site. The acquisition shall include, but not be limited to, the property in the town of Brookline, county of Norfolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with the improvements thereon, situated on Beals Street, being shown on a plan entitled "Subdivision lot 47 Beals' Estate, Brookline, Oct. 1897, Joseph R. Carr, C.E." recorded with Norfolk Deeds, book 1080, page 461, and bounded and described as follows:

northwesterly by Beals Street, 50 feet;

northeasterly by lot 50 on plan recorded with said deeds at the end of book 800, 72.46 feet;

southeasterly by lot 48 on said last mentioned plan, 50.51 feet; and

southwesterly by a part of lot 47 on said last mentioned plan conveyed by Robert M. Goode to Estille C. Ralph, by deed recorded with said deeds, book 1092, page 53, 80.33 feet,

such property being the birthplace of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

SEC. 2. The properties or interests therein acquired under the provisions of this Act shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior by publication in the Federal Register as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall administer the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended.

SEC. 4. The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized to conduct a study to develop a suitable plan for the operation and maintenance of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site as provided in this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in order to preserve in public ownership and for the purpose of establishing the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire by donation the property in the town of Brookline, county of Norfolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with the improvements thereon, situated on Beals Street, shown on a plan entitled "Subdivision lot 47 Plan Beals' Estate, Brookline, Oct. 1897, Joseph R. Carr, C.E." recorded with Norfolk Deeds, book 1080, page 461, and bounded and described as follows:

"northwesterly by Beal Street, 50 feet;

"northeasterly by lot 50 on plan recorded with said deeds at the end of book 800, 72.46 feet;

"southeasterly by lot 48 on said last mentioned plan, 50.51 feet; and

"southwesterly by a part of lot 47 on said last mentioned plan conveyed by Robert M. Goode to Estille C. Ralph, by deed recorded with said deeds, book 1092, page 53, 80.33 feet.

such property having erected thereon a dwelling which is the birthplace of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Secretary is further authorized to acquire personal property used and to be used in connection therewith.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the privilege to present for your consideration H.R. 6424, the purpose and intent of which, simply expressed, is to preserve for the public benefit the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States.

In just a little over 2 months, it will be 50 years since John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the second child and son of Joseph Patrick Kennedy and Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, was born on May 29, 1917. The birthplace is an unpretentious but comfortable wooden house of nine rooms, standing at 83 Beals Street, in a residential neighborhood not far from Coolidge Corner, in the suburban town of Brookline, Mass., which is adjacent to Boston.

The house at 83 Beals Street was purchased by Joseph P. Kennedy just prior to his marriage to Rose Fitzgerald, daughter of John F. Fitzgerald, mayor of Boston, on October 7, 1914, and remained their home until the early autumn of 1920, when it was sold, and the family moved to a larger house at 51 Abbottsford Road, about a quarter of a mile away but still within the limits of the town of Brookline. By this time, the future President had passed his third birthday and, besides his older brother, Joseph, Junior, born at Hull in 1915, had two sisters, Rosemary, who arrived in 1919, and Kathleen the next year.

It was while the family was residing at 51 Abbottsford Road that young Jack and his older brother Joe, Junior, began their formal education by attending the Dexter School, a private nonsectarian academy only a few blocks distant and still active as an institution of elementary learning. Here Jack advanced as far as the fourth grade, when the family made a major move to Riverdale, N.Y.

When Joseph P. Kennedy and his wife started housekeeping at 83 Beals Street in 1914, Mr. Kennedy had just passed his 26th birthday and as head of the Columbia Trust Co. at Maverick Square in East Boston was probably the youngest bank president in the country. In 1917, the year the 35th President was born, the United States declared war on Germany and Joseph P. Kennedy left the Columbia Trust Co. to become assistant general manager of the Fore River Shipbuilding Yards of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. in Quincy, only a few miles from his Beals Street home in Brookline.

Joseph Kennedy remained in his position at the Fore River Yards for the duration of World War I and it was during this period that he made an acquaintance which soon ripened into a close friendship with Franklin Delano Roosevelt, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who was to become a candidate for Vice President in 1920 and finally, and gloriously in 1933, the 32d President of the United States. To state the historical facts succinctly, Joseph P. Kennedy was helping the future 32d President of the United States win World War I at the same time he was raising the 35th President as a youthful member of his household at 83 Beals Street in Brookline.

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy birthplace at 83 Beals Street passed through several hands and was continually used as a private residence until it was repurchased by a representative of the Kennedy family in November of 1966. The one person with an intimate knowledge and recollection of the house as it was at the time of the birth and infancy of our 35th President—a person no less than the late President's mother who gave him birth, Mrs. Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, is now busily engaged in having the interior of the birthplace restored and furnished to conditions as she knew them in 1917.

Work in the house will progress rapidly in the course of the next 2 months and through the legislation I have introduced as H.R. 6424, I urge, Mr. Speaker, the Congress take favorable action to enable the Nation to accept the generous donation by the Kennedy family of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy birthplace. This action should be consummated promptly and in sufficient time for a formal acceptance and dedication of the birthplace to be held on the 50th anniversary of the birth of John Fitzgerald Kennedy on May 29, 1967.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support H.R. 6424, a bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

First, I want to congratulate our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] for having introduced this bill and for his vigorous support of it. Second, I want to thank Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, our late President's mother, for making it possible for us to consider this bill at this time. We owe to Mrs. Kennedy and other members of her family the generous offer to donate the house in which John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born, an offer that makes this bill so very attractive at this time.

H.R. 6424 is worthy of the support of all Members of the House. If it is enacted, the home in which President Kennedy was born will be added to those of five other Presidents—Washington, Lincoln, Hoover, and the two Roosevelts—which are being preserved as units of the National Park System. As I have said, the President's mother is going to donate the home to the Nation. Not only this, but she is currently engaged in restoring it to the condition in which it was in 1917 when President Kennedy was born, and she is furnishing it as it was then furnished. Much of the furniture, in fact, is the very furniture that was in the house at that time. It has been in storage in the meantime. Thus we will have complete authenticity in the new national historic site, a result which is often difficult to achieve.

I would like to add just this—the present is a very appropriate time for us to be considering this bill. May 29—6 weeks from today—will mark the 50th anniversary of J.F.K.'s birth. The other body has already passed a bill similar to this one. A few minor differences will need to be resolved, but I see no difficulty in this. In other words, we can, if we pass this bill today, make it possible for dedication of the new national historic site to take place on the anniversary. Would that John Fitzgerald Kennedy himself could be present for the dedication. Since he cannot be, the next best thing is to have it take place on what would be his 50th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to give H.R. 6424 the same unanimous support that it received in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is now before the House, H.R. 6424, proposes that the home in which J.F.K. was born be recognized as a national historic site and provides for its administration as a unit of the national park system.

The Kennedy home, located at 83 Beals Street, Brookline, Mass., has been purchased by members of the late President's family and will be donated to the United States. The generous offer to donate is contained in a letter dated March 15, 1967, from Mrs. Rose Kennedy, the President's mother, to the Secretary of the Interior, which is printed at the end of our committee's report on H.R. 6424.

President Kennedy's parents purchased this home in 1914, about 6 years after it had been built, and lived there until 1920, when they sold it. It has continued to be used as a private residence ever since then. It is a frame structure of two stories and nine rooms and stands on an approximately 4,000-square-foot lot. The neighborhood is zoned residential. Ample parking space is close at hand, both in the street and on several near-by municipal parking lots.

After reacquisition of the home by the Kennedy family not long ago, the President's mother undertook the task of restoring it and refurnishing it in the style in which it was in 1917 when J.F.K. was born. The Nation will thus acquire, if H.R. 6424 becomes law, not only a valuable memento of its late President, but also a good example of the way in which many American families lived

during the period just before World War I burst upon us. Although this latter point may not seem to be of great significance to many of us today, familiar as we are with this manner of living, we can rest assured that its importance will grow as the years roll by. Early 20th century America is disappearing faster than most of us like to admit.

The National Park Service has estimated that proper care of the home, once it is turned over to the Government, will require an expenditure of about $32,500 a year at present prices. This includes the salaries of a curator, a year-around guide, and seasonal guides plus janitorial service, heating, lighting, and other maintenance work as needed from time to time.

I know of no objection to this legislation. The people in the neighborhood are pleased, and the bill was approved by the House Interior Committee unanimously. In fact, the members of our committee regard this as a worthy addition to the national park system and are grateful to Mrs. Kennedy and other members of the family for making it possible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6424, a bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The bill establishes the residence at 83 Beals Street in Brookline, Mass., the birthplace of the late President, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site. This residence was built by the Kennedy family and was the home of the 35th President of the United States during the first 3½ years of his life.

Presently, this two story frame structure is being restored by the Kennedy family. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is informed that, by a letter from the President's mother to the Secretary of the Interior, the Kennedy family will make a donation of this property to the United States for administration through the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that Congress enact H.R. 6424, authorizing the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in Brookline, Mass., in commemoration of the late President.

The birthplace of five of the 36 men who have served as President of the United States are administered by the National Park Service, the birthplace of 13 other Presidents of the United States are in State, local government, foundation, or institutional ownership.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to comment on the role which history has destined the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy to play in the annals of the United States. It is our duty to preserve that history and the role played by such a distinguished and beloved American President from its beginning for all succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend and urge the passage of H.R. 6424.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1161) to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a similar bill to the bill just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

S. 1161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise all right, title, and interest in and to such lands, or interests therein (including scenic easements), together with any improvements thereon, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary for the purpose of establishing the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a national historic site. The acquisition shall include, but not be limited to, the property in the town of Brookline, County of Norfolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with the improvements thereon, situated on Beals Street, being shown on a plan entitled "Subdivision lot 47 Plan Beals' Estate, Brookline, October 1897, Joseph R. Carr, C.E." recorded with Norfolk Deeds, book 1080, page 461, and bounded and described as follows:

northwesterly by Beals Street, 50 feet;

northeasterly by lot 50 on plan recorded with said deeds at the end of book 800, 72.46 feet;

southeasterly by lot 48 on said last mentioned plan, 50.51 feet; and

southwesterly by a part of lot 47 on said last mentioned plan conveyed by Robert M. Goode to Estille C. Ralph, by deed recorded with said deeds, book 1092, page 53, 80.33 feet,

such property being the birthplace of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1161 and insert the provisions of H.R. 6424, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 6424) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I, the gentleman from North Carolina, and any Member of the House may have the privilege to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed (H.R. 6424) immediately prior to passage.

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

There was no objection.

JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE UTE INDIAN TRIBES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6629) to provide for the distribution of judgment funds among members of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indian Tribes.

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

H.R. 6629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to divide the trust fund belonging to the Confederated Band of Ute Indians appropriated by the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1965, and deposited in the United States Treasury pursuant to the final judgment entered in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 327, including the interest thereon, by crediting 60 per centum to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation and the Ute Distribution Corporation, 20 per centum to the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, and 20 per centum for the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation. The trust fund, upon its division as herein directed, shall be available for use in accordance with existing authorizations for use of funds of the tribes and the Ute Distribution Corporation, including the Act of August 21, 1951 (65 Stat. 193, as amended), Act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 540), Act of June 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 300), Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), as amended. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we now have before us, H.R.6629, is not a controversial measure. Its sole purpose is to provide for the distribution of judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission to the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians as fair payment for lands in Colorado ceded to the United States in 1873. The judgment amounts to $7,908,586.16.

Appropriations covering this judgment were included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1965. Distribution of the funds among the tribes, however, has been delayed because there is, apparently, in the minds of some, a legal question involved. This bill will resolve that issue.

The Southern Ute Tribe has developed, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs has approved, the customary plan for the use of its share of the judgment funds. Testimony before the committee indicated that this tribe needs these funds to proceed with its ambitious and constructive programs and it has requested that its share of these moneys be made available in accordance with the ratio agreed upon by the tribes involved. Once this legislation is enacted, the other tribes will be able to proceed to finalize

their plans and to submit them for approval.

Similar legislation has been considered and approved by the other Chamber; however, H.R. 6629 differs somewhat from that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objections to this legislation. Its enactment will enhance the prompt utilization of the judgment funds in accordance with approved plans and programs for the benefit of the members of the tribes involved. As chairman of your authorizing committee, I am pleased to recommend the enactment of H.R. 6629.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1191) to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation of Colorado, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1191

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation that were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 108), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 327, and the interest thereon, less payment of attorneys fees and expenses, may be invested, expended, or advanced for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1191 and insert the provisions of H.R. 6629 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to provide for the distribution of judgment funds among members of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indian Tribes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6629) was laid on the table.

CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7345) to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation of Montana.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1177, an identical bill, be considered in lieu of H.R. 7345.

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

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

S. 1177

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation that were appropriated by the Act of October 27, 1966 (80 Stat. 1065), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 61, and the interest thereon, less payment of attorneys fees and expenses, may be invested, expended, or advanced for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribes shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7345, introduced by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], is a bill providing for the disposition of the judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

The $4.4 million judgment arose from an action by these tribes against the Government of the United States which was based on unconscionable consideration paid for some 12 million acres of lands in Montana which were ceded to the United States as a result of a treaty of 1855.

These moneys were appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act last year; however, additional legislation is usually necessary before the funds can be distributed to the tribes for use in accordance with approved plans and programs. In this case, the claims legislation report for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes has been completed and they are ready to utilize the judgment funds in accordance with an approved family improvement plan.

No one appeared before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs in opposition to the enactment of the bill H.R. 7345, but witnesses for the tribe spoke in favor of it. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to recommend this measure to the Members of the House and I urge its approval.

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. 7345) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF NICKEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5786) to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile.

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, nickel is vital in the production of jet engines, aircraft frames, armorplate, magnets, and electrical plating. In other words, it is necessary for our defense needs. It seems to me that there should be some debate on this bill and some justification for reducing our stockpile so low. We should certainly bring it up under a somewhat different procedure than on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the feelings and the reservations that the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], has concerning the procedure by which this legislation is brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful that this bill could be approved today through the use of either this procedure or under the procedure of the suspension of the rules, or by any other means or methods consonant with the procedures of the House of Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do understand the observations which have been made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. There are some fine minority views expressed in the committee report that should be called to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives, as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish to take this time, because of my deep interest in seeing favorable action taken on the legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], if we are not able to consider this legislation under the Consent Calendar procedure, would it be the gentleman's intention to have a rule requested and then the bill be scheduled for consideration, if the Committee on Rules acted favorably later during this week thereon?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course, if the Committee on Armed Services requests such a rule and if such a rule is granted by the Committee on Rules in time to do this, I shall undertake to add it to the legislative program for consideration this week.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as an objector I would think that even if this bill came up under the procedure of a suspension of the rules, it would at least give the period of 20 minutes to each side

so that there could be a legislative record made on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a simple bill, which should go by under the procedure of the Consent Calendar and by unanimous consent.

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

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] that if the gentleman desires a statement in regard to this bill I shall be glad to provide such a statement, since the gentleman has raised this question.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services, and especially the subcommittee which considered this legislation, held most thorough hearings thereon, the most thorough hearings which we have ever conducted since this subject matter has been under consideration by the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of the merits of the bill. It is a matter that this bill is of sufficient importance to our country so that there should be some sort of legislative record made and it just should not slide by under a unanimous-consent request or under the Consent Calendar procedure.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield further to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion and judgment that there have been ample records, hearings, and consideration of this matter in the committee.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that there are no ambiguities contained in the bill. I do not believe it is an extremely complex bill.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure only represents the question of getting to the consideration of a very important and a very urgently needed material, nickel, and getting that nickel out of the national stockpile and into the hands of industry that needs the materials most urgently for defense-rated orders.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only question involved in this bill, may I inform the distinguished gentleman from Washington. I wish those facts to be clearly established in the RECORD—that of the increments of nickel that would be disposed of under this procedure, almost 90 percent will be allocated for defense-rated orders.

Mr. Speaker, the defense industry needs this release from the stockpile at this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the gentleman and I plead with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] not to object to this bill at this time, because such action would only delay the consideration of the subject matter as covered by this bill, the release of nickel that is urgently needed by the defense industry.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] that the need of industry is not the purpose of the stockpile. Further, it is my opinion that this request should be more fully justified than the very strong statement that the gentleman has just made.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is no doubt but what there is some merit to the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Washington wishes to object to the bill, that is his privilege to do so. However, I would like to point out to the gentleman the fact that every aspect of this bill has been adequately considered; first, whether we could safely take this quantity of nickel out of the stockpile, a question upon which we have had abundant testimony in support of that point.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have great faith in the gentleman from Massachusetts and the committee on which he serves. However, I do know that there were two members of the gentleman's committee whose remarks indicated that they had some doubts about this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; and they are very able members of the Committee on Armed Services, but I do not believe that those gentlemen object to the consideration of this bill at this time.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who filed separate views on this legislation, I would like to state for the benefit of the Members of the House my reason for doing so. That reason was due to the fact that I have differing opinions as to the validity of the present stockpile objective from responsible parties other than the witnesses who testified before the Committee on Armed Services. And, Mr. Speaker, in order to serve my own conscience, I felt dutybound to express my objection.

However, I want it quite clearly known and understood that I, in no manner, wish to impede the passage of this bill, and I have no intention of registering an objection to it today.

But I do feel very strongly that the stockpiling objectives are not being properly served, and I felt dutybound to state my opinion of the bill. I have no intention of trying to stop the bill.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to impede passage of the bill either, but I certainly agree that if it is an important piece of legislation it can come up under some other procedure within 2 or 3 days.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts be agreeable to my making a unanimous consent request that this bill be put down for suspension of the rules on Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PHILBIN. That will be agreeable.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would say that would come on a rather unfortunate date as far as I am concerned. Being a member of the subcommittee, I would prefer that it be brought up on Thursday, if that does not interfere with the legislative program already scheduled for Thursday.

Mr. PHILBIN. That would be agreeable.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be put over until Thursday of this week, and that the bill may be brought up under suspension of the rules, and that the Speaker may recognize any Member insofar as the calling up of this bill is concerned on this coming Thursday.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be passed over without prejudice.

This completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—H.R. 7796

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7796, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

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

There was no objection.

THE NEW JOHN W. McCORMACK SCHOOL IN BOSTON, MASS.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many honors have come to our beloved Speaker in his long life of publice service, during the many years that he has devoted himself without stint to his country, to this House, to his district, and to his constituents.

He was recently the recipient of the coveted Silver Helmet Award of that outstanding veterans organization, AMVETS, for his years of achievement in Congress. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts observed JOHN W. McCORMACK Day on March 16 of last year. On that occasion he returned to the Great and General Court of Massachusetts where his distinguished career had begun 46 years before, and addressed a joint session of the body he once had served as a representative from South Boston. He told his friends, his State's legislators, how moved he was by the honor which they had accorded him. He

spoke with the wisdom and understanding of a lifelong public servant of the responsibilities that are the burden and the glory of a career devoted to the public interest.

Speaker McCORMACK said that:

These years have been active, trying, sometimes disappointing, but I think on the whole they have been great years for our people and the human race. If we should learn one thing from that period of history, it is that the militant aggressor considers weakness and fear as an invitation to make greater and greater demands. A basically comparable situation exists today. Their strategy and purpose is and has always been to subvert, divide, and conquer, and I say to you here today that under the leadership of action of President Lyndon B. Johnson, this they shall not do.

Stirring words of courage like these have characterized the leadership and service of JOHN W. McCORMACK throughout his public life. Now the people of Boston, who hold him in such high honor and respect that they are constantly seeking an appropriate way to convey their feelings for him, have at last discovered an honor that has not previously been granted to a public figure during his lifetime, the naming of a new public school.

The new school to be named in honor of the Speaker will be the best and, therefore, the most costly school building ever constructed in Boston. It will be the largest single school building constructed in Boston since the Hyde Park High School was built in 1929. On a 5-acre site on Mount Vernon Street in Dorchester, the new building will provide for the education of more than 1,100 pupils each year. The total cost of this investment in the future of Boston's young people will be $3 million.

There will be 32 classrooms, four special classrooms, a remedial reading laboratory, a library, an art room, a sewing room, a food laboratory, a drafting room, special guidance and administrative offices, metal and electronics shops, and science laboratories. The school will serve youngsters in grades four to eight. The John W. McCormack School in Dorchester will be either the equal of or better than any comparable public school in the entire country.

It is entirely fitting that this splendid new school should be named for a man who has done so much for the cause of education in this country. Under his leadership as Speaker, the 88th and 89th Congresses passed laws for the support of education that were historic achievements. In his support and leadership of so many magnificent education bills during his speakership, JOHN W. McCORMACK was following the path he marked out for himself as a young Member of the House of Representatives and as majority leader. Whenever a bill under debate was one which would aid America's children in their quest for an education, JOHN McCORMACK was always to be found enthusiastically and skillfully battling for its passage. From his own youthful struggles for an education he knew that anything he could do to help our country's educational program he should do, and how well he did it.

Many institutions of higher learning have honored him for his work in education and for his efforts in other legislative areas directly affecting the well-being of our children. He holds honorary degrees from Boston College, Holy Cross College, Boston University, Tufts, Providence College, Stonehill College, Georgetown University, and the Catholic University of America. He has been honored by the Vatican as a Knight of Malta. He holds the Peace Medal of the Order of Catholic Laymen.

He has always been a deeply conscientious Representative of the district that he loves so well. He has been a credit to every cause he has espoused. He is a very great Speaker.

Now a school has been named for him during his lifetime. He must be very proud, but his constituents are very proud, too. They are proud of him.

I include a news story from the South Boston Tribune of April 6, 1967, at this point:

NEW BOSTON SCHOOL TO HONOR SPEAKER McCORMACK—DORCHESTER UNIT WILL COST CITY $3 MILLIONS

The most expensive school building ever constructed in Boston and the largest single building to be undertaken since the completion of Hyde Park High School in 1929 will be named in honor of John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The school, on Mt. Vernon street in Dorchester, is being constructed on a five acre site and will accommodate 1100 pupils. Total cost is three million dollars.

The Honorable John W. McCormack is a lifelong resident of South Boston. He was born on Mercer street, lived on Vinton street and graduated from the John A. Andrew School.

Speaker McCormack was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1920, the Massachusetts Senate in 1923, and was elected to the 70th Congress to fill the unexpired term of Congressman James A. Gallivan. He was elected Majority Leader of the Congress in 1940 and Speaker of the House in the 87th Congress.

Speaker McCormack holds honorary degrees from Boston University, Holy Cross, Boston College, Tufts, Providence College, Stonehill, Georgetown, and the Catholic University in Washington, D.C. He has been honored as a Knight of Malta and holds the Peace Medal of the Order of Catholic Laymen. The Speaker lives at 726 Columbia Road.

The new John W. McCormack School will house 32 classrooms, 4 special classrooms, a remedial reading laboratory, library, art room, sewing room, food laboratory, drafting room, special guidance and administrative offices, metal and electronics shops and science laboratories. The school will serve grades 4 to 8 and will be comparable to any in the nation.

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no greater tribute than that of having a school named in one's honor, and I cannot think of anyone so deserving of that honor than is the distinguished and beloved gentleman who presides over this body. He is an inspiration to young people and one of our great statesmen in the effort to advance and expand education.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman, and I do appreciate that the citizens of Boston realize the greatness of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the public officials of the city of Boston have shown extremely wise judgment, and I emphatically compliment them in naming a school after our beloved and highly respected Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. It is a well-deserved tribute to a great American.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for his remarks.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present to hear the presidential messages.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. 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. 69]

Anderson, Tenn.	Fino	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Dak.	Friedel	Passman
Ashbrook	Galifianakis	Pepper
Ashley	Gallagher	Pickle
Bell	Giaimo	Pool
Blanton	Hagan	Quillen
Blatnik	Halleck	Randall
Bolling	Halpern	Rarick
Brademas	Hanna	Reinecke
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Brinkley	Hébert	Roberts
Brock	Heckler, Mass.	Ronan
Broomfield	Herlong	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Hull	Rostenkowski
Button	Hutchinson	Roybal
Cahill	Irwin	Ruppe
Cederberg	Jacobs	St Germain
Celler	Jonas	St. Onge
Chamberlain	Jones, Mo.	Scheuer
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Cohelan	Karth	Sisk
Conyers	Kupferman	Smith, N.Y.
Corbett	Landrum	Snyder
Cowger	McCarthy	Steed
Delaney	McDonald, Mich.	Steiger, Wis.
Dent	McEwen	Tunney
Dickinson	Macdonald, Mass.	Utt
Diggs	Madden	Watson
Dingell	May	Whalen
Downing	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Dulski	Moorhead	Williams, Miss.
Edwards, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams, Pa.
Erlenborn	Myers	Willis
Evans, Colo.	Nelsen	Wydler
Feighan	Nix	Young
		Zablocki
		Zion

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

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

THE 1966 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 1966 Annual Report of the National Capital Housing Authority.

Impressive progress has been made by the Authority. More than 3,200 dwelling units are now being built or planned to provide better homes for low-income families in the District of Columbia.

Imaginative new approaches to provide decent housing are being tested—and with good results.

The first "turnkey" project in the Nation has recently been completed in Washington—a 343-unit building for low-income elderly families. This technique marshals the full resources of private enterprise—

To plan a low-cost public housing project.

To finance its construction.

To build the project.

After the housing has been completed, it is purchased and maintained by the local housing authority. Washington's "Turnkey" project has shown that this technique can speed housing availability, reduce administrative costs, and improve the quality of housing through the genius of private enterprise.

In addition, the Authority has begun to lease units in privately owned dwellings to meet the immediate housing needs of low-income families in the District.

Another new program of the Authority is rehabilitating older homes for use by low-income families. A 10-unit pilot program successfully completed in 1966 forms the basis for a major effort to rehabilitate 240 units in 1967.

The National Capital Housing Authority maintains over 9,000 units of public housing. Still, the need for low-cost housing far exceeds the supply. Many needy applicants face years of waiting before decent housing can be made available. This shortage is complicated by rising construction costs and scarcity of land, making the need for new approaches more urgent.

The complexity of the task which lies ahead must not be allowed to diminish our resolve to make the Nation's Capital a city of which all Americans can be proud. For, as I said last year in my message to the Congress on American cities, "The prize—cities of spacious beauty and lively promise, where men are truly free to determine how they will live—is too rich to be lost because the problems are complex."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 17, 1967.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the message, together with the accompanying papers, is referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There was no objection.

THE 1965 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 1965 annual report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The year 1965 was a milestone in the history of America's effort to provide decent housing for its citizens and to improve the quality of urban life. It saw not only the creation of the new Department, but the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

The Housing and Urban Development Act provided the new Department with powerful tools.

The Congress has since supplied others:

The model cities program, making possible the coordination and concentration of Federal, State, and local efforts for the physical and social rehabilitation of deteriorating neighborhoods.

Funding for the rent supplement program.

Authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase an additional $3.7 billion in home mortgages to help meet the shortage of mortgage funds.

An additional 2-year authorization for the urban mass transportation program.

In addition to reorganizing five separate, semiautonomous agencies into a single cohesive organization, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has begun the work for which it was created.

Since it commenced operations on November 9, 1965, the Department has:

Begun the model cities program, inspiring hope and generating a commitment to excellence as American cities plan their attack on urban blight.

Approved grants for the construction of 71 neighborhood centers in low-income areas, bringing services to those who need them most. At the same time it has joined with other departments and agencies to develop a 14-city pilot program of multiservice neighborhood centers which will bring together a wide range of Federal, State, and local services.

Enabled hundreds of poor people to live in decent privately owned housing under the new rent supplement program.

Moved about 600,000 persons into low-rent public housing.

Initiated a new "turnkey" program to lower costs and speed construction of low-income public housing by permitting private industry to build houses for sale to local housing authorities.

Provided better housing for 100,000 college students.

Made available 8,900 apartment units for elderly persons through loans of $113 million.

Stimulated the upgrading of older areas in more than 40 cities by approving $53 million in grants for intensive code enforcement.

Stimulated the rehabilitation of low-income homes through some 2,300 grants totaling $3 million and nearly 800 loans amounting to $4 million.

Approved an additional 157 urban renewal projects, and increased grant commitments for urban renewal by $931 million.

Approved more than $400 million in loans, grants, and advances to promote more than 1,500 community projects, including mass transit, urban planning, development of water and sewer facilities, and acquisition of open space.

On the occasion of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's first anniversary, Secretary Weaver reported to me:

> In just 1 year, significant strides have been made in program development, Departmental organization, and legislation. This is a Department on the move.

Today, with cities in every State of this Nation planning their assault on urban blight under the model cities program, we know that the pace will—as it must—be quickened.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 17, 1967.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the message, together with the accompanying papers, is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed, with illustrations.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8363) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8363

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan of development of each river basin under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army referred to in the first column below, which was basically authorized by the Act referred to by date of enactment in the second column below, an amount not to exceed that shown opposite such river basin in the third column below:

Basin	Act of Congress	Amount
Alabama-Coosa River	Mar. 2, 1945	$34,000,000
Arkansas River	June 28, 1938	170,000,000
Brazos River	Sept. 3, 1954	9,000,000
Central and Southern Florida	June 30, 1948	14,000,000
Columbia River	June 28, 1938	153,000,000
Missouri River	do	20,000,000
Ohio River	June 22, 1936	38,000,000
Ouachita River	May 17, 1950	8,000,000
San Joaquin River	Dec. 22, 1944	2,000,000
South Platte River	May 17, 1950	2,000,000
Upper Mississippi River	June 28, 1938	4,000,000
West Branch Susquehanna River	Sept. 3, 1954	9,000,000
White River	June 28, 1938	2,000,000

(b) The total amount authorized to be appropriated by this section shall not exceed $465,000,000.

SEC. 2. In addition to the previous authorization, the completion of the initial phase of the bank erosion control works and setback levees on the Sacramento River, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1960, is hereby authorized at an estimated cost of $7,000,000.

SEC. 3. The plan of improvement for the Brazos River Basin, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1954, is hereby modified to provide that all additional construction costs occasioned by the occurrence of the slide in the embankment of Waco Dam on the Bosque River during the fall of 1961 shall be borne by the United States.

SEC. 4. This Act may be cited as the "River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1967".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, and ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8363, the river basin monetary authorization bill. H.R. 8363 provides increased authorizations for the prosecution of river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

At the present time there are 20 basin development plans subject to basin monetary authorization limitations. Authorizations provided to date, including the most recent provided by legislation in June 1965, are generally adequate for work to be performed through the end of fiscal year 1967. However, the 14 basins listed in sections 1 and 2 of H.R. 8363 will run out of authorization in fiscal year 1968 unless additional authorization is provided.

All of these 14 river basin plans have already been approved by Congress as you will note opposite the name of each basin in H.R. 8363 which gives the date of enactment at the time each basin was basically authorized by Congress.

The total number of projects in these basins for which the additional authorization is required to permit use of the anticipated appropriations is 82. These range from 1 project in Central and Southern Florida Basin to 21 projects in the Arkansas River Basin.

The operations and expenditures of the Corps of Engineers in the river basins must be planned to fit the construction season which does not coincide with the fiscal year, but in general extends from late spring through the summer and fall of the year. If the basin monetary authorization is insufficient for contract payments work must either be suspended or the contractor must fund his own activities. To avoid increasing costs which will eventually be reflected by higher contingencies in bidding, it is necessary to increase monetary authorizations for the entire construction season of the calendar year of 1968.

Since this bill will provide only for scheduling work permitted by the proposed fiscal year 1968 appropriations, there will be a need for further review of monetary authorizations for all basins early in the second session of the 90th Congress so that action can be taken to permit continuing accomplishment of the water resource program as it was intended by Congress originally.

Therefore, passage of this bill is necessary to continue orderly and efficient operations in these 14 river basins. I strongly urge that the House approve H.R. 8363.

The bill provides for increased authorizations totaling $472 million for the above mentioned 14 river basin plans. Of this amount $465 million is the total amount authorized for the first 13 river basins listed in the table in section 1—the total of $450 million shown in the report, House Report No. 192, is a typographical error—and $7 million for the Sacramento River Basin shown in section 2 for the completion of the bank erosion control works and setback levees on the Sacramento River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1960, which completes the entire project.

Allowance is made for the amount of monetary authorization carried over on June 30, 1967.

The figures in the bill were developed in the following manner using the Alabama-Coosa as an illustration.

In the Alabama-Coosa River Basin, as shown on pages 3 and 4 of the report, there are five projects which will require $56 million in appropriations to carry them through the summer and fall of the calendar year 1968. There is now $22 million left over in the monetary authorizations from previous bills. This means that the total additional authorization required is $34 million, which is the figure shown in the table.

The other figures in the table are based on the same kind of analysis, and the total estimated cost of the basin plan, the available monetary authorization, the amounts now left over, and the funding required through the summer and fall construction period for the calendar year 1968, are all shown in the committee report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 3 of the report dealing with section 1, the total figure is $450 million, but on page 2 of the bill, section 1, the expenditures total $465 million. Which figure is correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is a typographical error. The figure in the bill is the correct figure. I am sorry I did not point that out in my explanation of the bill itself.

Mr. GROSS. That then adds up to $472 million with $7 million for the Sacramento project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask why the Federal Government is called on to pick up all the damage on the Brazos River in Texas—I believe it is in Texas.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is a very unusual situation. The Flood Control Act of 1954 authorized the Brazos River project and took into account the types of works that would be needed to complete a comprehensive Brazos River project. It included an arrangement made by the city of Waco, Tex., that they would reimburse the Federal Government for water withdrawals in the immediate vicinity on the Brazos River for municipal and industrial water supplies.

Subsequent to the agreements that were made with the city of Waco and also with the U.S. Government, a slide occurred in the embankment of the dam and it was estimated that a payment in excess of $1 million would be required to repair this slide as a proportionate share of the cost from the city of Waco. The dam was actually constructed and through some difficulty—it is said that it might have been an act of God—there was a slide at the dam. It was necessary to reconstruct that portion. The agreements had already been made and the city of Waco had assumed their obligations and made their arrangements for local taxation and credit based upon, as I said, the original figure. So we thought as a matter of equity that the city of Waco should not be liable over and beyond the original commitment.

Mr. GROSS. Who was responsible for the construction of the dam or wherever the earth slide occurred?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The Corps of Engineers.

Mr. GROSS. Turning to the Arkansas River—will there be enough water to provide for river traffic to Little Rock on the Arkansas River?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes. The Arkansas River is one of the great streams of the country, as you know, extending some 870 miles and there is considerable enthusiasm not only on the part of the people who would like to have navigation features added to the Arkansas River but it is coming into focus as a financially qualified project.

Mr. GROSS. With the expenditure of $170 million. Will that be enough to make the river navigable to Little Rock, or will it cost a good deal more?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The $170 million is enough to make the Arkansas River navigable to Little Rock.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today will continue the orderly and historic advance of one of the Nation's greatest water resource development programs—the multipurpose development of the Arkansas River.

The Arkansas Basin is one of 14 basin projects included in this bill, which provides the authorization necessary to justify appropriations needed to continue construction through the summer of 1968.

Assuming the appropriation of the

sums requested in President Johnson's budget, the Arkansas River program will remain on schedule and navigation to eastern Oklahoma will become a reality in 1970.

No other development in Washington means as much to Arkansas and Oklahoma as does this great river program's continued advance.

No other program of our Government means as much to the full economic development of the State of Oklahoma. The continued support of this great program by the President and the Congress is deeply appreciated, not only by Oklahoma's entire congressional delegation, but also by millions of Oklahomans.

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

I join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] in support of the legislation that came out of the committee unanimously. The ranking minority member of the committee on our side, the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN], has done a very fine job relating to this legislation, and he will discuss it in greater detail in just a moment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall a time in the history of the Committee on Public Works when there has been greater accord and understanding in the working relationships of the members of the committee as there was during the consideration of the bill now before the House. The gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and the other members of the committee have been most cooperative and helpful. Your usefulness has been proven in the fact that we have what we consider to be a very fine bill which has been reported out through the cooperation of the members of the committee. We can be proud of the fact that we do have this splendid relationship.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Maybe the 90th Congress will be one of togetherness in the Committee on Public Works. We can hope so. Certainly that spirit was evidenced by our consideration of this legislation.

For the information of the Members, we have a necessity for projects already authorized, flood control projects which are running out of money. Two years ago, in 1965, we considered this matter. They are running out of money now. They cannot consider the 1968 expenditures in the Appropriations Committee until additional authorizations are voted. That is why this bill is here. If it were not here, these projects would have to be stopped, many of them, in 1968. The Appropriations Committee cannot consider the needed money for the 1968 budget or spending without additional authorizations. Hearings are underway, or will be shortly, relating to these projects, that is, in the Appropriations Committee, and adequate authorizations must be made available.

It is also essential to have orderly contracting and orderly progress on the projects. I can cite the central and southern Florida flood control project as an example in that they have only a $4 million authorization left. They need $5 million-plus additional money to meet the appropriations that they recommended in the budget for consideration by the Appropriations Committee. They have a serious problem with regard to Everglades National Park. I am sure that Members have been reading about the destruction of deer due to the drought in the park, in one instance, and then a few months later the flooding of the park. The control of the water in the surrounding area to the north and east is the responsibility of the Southern Flood Control District. This flooding, this destruction of one of the finest potential parks in this Nation, in my opinion, is being encouraged by, and the proper development of the park is being prejudiced and jeopardized as a result of not having adequate control structures. Therefore, the additional amount of $14 million needed for this emergency purpose is contained in this legislation.

Basically, the legislation contains authorizations equal to the minimal amount that was determined to be needed for this year, that is for 1968, and for construction and proper management and contract letting through September 30, 1968.

This is a good bill. I trust it will be supported.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] such time as he may consume.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Further, I thank and commend the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, for his kindly comments, because certainly cooperation is a two-way street.

I rise in support of this legislation. H.R. 8363 is not an authorization for new projects, but it does increase the monetary authorization for projects already authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Flood Control Act. I find myself basically in agreement with all the comments made by the gentleman from Alabama.

I would like to refer briefly to a couple of the projects in California. We have cooperated with the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who watches with regularity over these Central Valley projects.

I believe this is a very good bill. It is needed at this time and should be approved by this body.

The project for flood protection on the Sacramento River was first enacted in the Flood Control Act of March 1, 1917, and has been amended subsequently by further acts of Congress, the most recent of which was the 1960 Flood Control Act. This provides for modification of the existing flood control project to include a long-range program for bank erosion control work and setback levees, at a total cost of $21,260,000. There are other projects which, I believe, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] will probably want to comment on further.

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, who has worked with us with interest on these projects.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 8383 and express my appreciation for the hard work done by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, the gentleman from California, as well as the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of that committee, and other Members in bringing before this House this important piece of legislation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 8363, the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1967.

One of the items contained in this bill is the authorization of an additional $2 million for fiscal year 1969 for the Chatfield flood control project on the South Platte River in Colorado.

This authorization represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the increase requested by the Corps of Engineers for various river basins. But, Mr. Speaker, even though this is a comparatively small item, I doubt that a more pressing requirement exists anywhere in the Nation.

My district is blessed with some of the finest climate and scenery in the world. Beautiful mountain streams spill out onto a fertile and productive plain which, in recent years, has grown up with modern industry and sprawling and attractive housing developments.

But this fertile, productive, and populous plain has another dimension—one which has not been entirely clear until recent years. We now know that, several times each century, a weather phenomenon peculiar to the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains occurs.

Storm systems of incredible intensity will, in the space of 6 hours or so, dump a veritable waterfall onto a relatively broad watershed.

As a matter of fact, the town of Elbert, Colo., which is located in this general area, just out of my district, is believed to hold the record for rainfall in a 6-hour period in the United States. In May, 1935, a total of 24 inches of rain fell, according to U.S. Weather Bureau records.

Such a rainfall would cause disaster wherever it occurred. But falling into a hilly country—with the deluge being concentrated very quickly in valleys which slope steeply toward the plains—the results are devastating. The destruction in the path of onrushing flash floods is comparable to that of severe earthquakes and tornadoes.

Such a storm occurred on June 15, 1965, in the watershed of Plum Creek and other South Platte River tributaries. Rainfall of 12 to 14 inches in a 6-hour period was common.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will recall the headlines, because in a matter of a few hours 13 lives had been lost in the Denver area and downstream, and property damage estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $509,325,000 was inflicted.

Today, nearly 2 years later, the scars of the flood still are in evidence and the repair work goes on. There also is fear

in the South Platte River Valley—fear brought out by the fact that cloudbursts like the ones of June 1965 not only can happen again but will happen again. The relatively brief Weather Bureau history in the area, plus physical evidence in the floodplain, indicate this. The question, then, is not "if" there will be another great floodcrest, but "when."

Mr. Speaker, the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Congress acted swiftly following the 1965 flood. The Chatfield flood control project, principal feature of which is a dam and reservoir at the confluence of the South Platte River and Plum Creek upstream from metropolitan Denver, was authorized. Preliminary planning is completed, and acquisition of land and re-location of highways and utility facilities is about to begin.

Progress is not as rapid as the situation seems to warrant, primarily because, last November, the President ordered a slowdown of this project as part of his scheme to throw a wet blanket on the U.S. economy. Moneys he ordered withheld were released this month. But several valuable months of progress were lost forever.

The people of Colorado—and particularly those of my district and the city of Denver—are deeply concerned that further delays may occur.

Mr. Speaker, one way which Congress can make certain that no further delays occur in the Chatfield project will be to authorize this additional $2 million for fiscal year 1969.

Basically, this additional authorization is an insurance policy—money in the bank to make sure that vital contracts can be let during the summer of 1968 until the main funding for fiscal year 1969 is available.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the chairman of the Public Works Committee; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking Republican member; Mr. JONES of Alabama and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and the other members of the committee for the fine work they have accomplished in reporting this bill. I was pleased to present testimony before the Public Works Committee in support of the Chatfield project and I know that all of the members of the committee put in long and hard hours in considering this legislation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I conclude simply by asking for unanimous support of a bill which is badly needed. It is our policy on the committee to try to bring this type of legislation not only to the committee but to the House hopefully on an annual basis, so we can control the overall authorizations.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], a member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of our Subcommittee on Flood Control and also the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN], for their very fine cooperation in putting together this bill that is before us today. We have the San Joaquin and the Sacramento River projects for flood control and bank erosion works which have to be brought up to date each year. We certainly need these authorizations.

I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], in their having done a very fine job in working out all of the details in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. The Flood Control Subcommittee is a very active and very necessary one and they do a very fine job in preparing to meet the needs of flood control throughout our Nation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the members of the committee my appreciation for bringing to the House this bill, H.R. 8363, particularly inasmuch as it has reference to $2 million for the Chatfield Reservoir in Colorado. On June 16, 1965, there was a big flood, which carried waters of the South Platte River through the city and county of Denver. The Chatfield Reservoir was authorized in 1950.

From then until the time of the flood no action was taken to construct the Chatfield Dam. However, since that time moneys have been appropriated; $6 million was provided last year, and there is now before the Appropriations Subcommittee some $7 million plus for this year. With the $2 million authorized as provided in this bill, the Chatfield Reservoir can proceed forward with adequate construction and not have a lag.

I hope the Army Engineers will follow through and start early construction of the Chatfield Dam.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to note that the authorization includes funds for the San Gabriel River project in the Brazos River Basin.

The project has been in the making some 18 years and through the cooperation of local and Federal interests we have come to the stage where the proposal stands today. These years represent much planning, surveying, and research in many areas.

The project will materially alleviate the flood hazard of the San Gabriel watershed and provide additional flood protection to many thousands of acres of land along the Brazos River into which the San Gabriel flows.

I applaud the efforts of those who have had a hand in planning for this project and for the foresight of the House today in securing the initial step to fruition of the San Gabriel River. I hope the appropriations for this bill will follow quickly. They are much needed and long overdue.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and commend the Public Works Committee for its recommendation that $14 million in additional monetary authorization be provided for the central and southern Florida flood control project and I urge my colleagues to adopt this recommendation in its entirety.

This $14 million figure represents the bare minimum amount with which the C. & S.F.F.C.D. will be able to proceed toward completion of the project in an orderly, efficient, and businesslike manner at the greatest possible saving to the taxpayer.

With the present authorization running out, and with the need to provide for continuing contracts, failure to authorize an adequate amount at this time could bring the project to a halt with ensuing loss of efficiency, upset planning, and increased costs to the Federal and State Governments.

Furthermore, emergency situations exist which require immediate action. For example, in the coming fiscal year it is almost certain that some type of provision to prevent salt water intrusion into Everglades National Park arising from the removal of an earth fill plug at canal C–111 will have to be made. This additional monetary authorization will allow for such a provision to be made and thus assure that the unique ecology of the Everglades National Park will be protected from any possible damage.

For these vitally important reasons, I urge my colleagues to concur with the committee's report and authorize $14 million for the central and southern Florida flood control project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8363.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 8363, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TAX EXEMPT BONDS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED—ANSWER TO PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received a form letter from Goodbody & Co., an investment firm in New York, asking my opinion on tax-exempt bonds. From the nature of the letter, I presume that a simliar communication has

been received by all Members of Congress.

Goodbody & Co., of course, is a big dealer in tax-exempt bonds and it has an obvious self-interest in wanting to see these tax exemptions continued.

The letter and opinion poll are apparently prompted by the Banking and Currency Committee hearings of March 15. At this hearing, I, along with other members of the committee, discussed the problem of tax-exempt bonds with Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin.

In answer to questions propounded by committee members, the Federal Reserve Board chairman stated that he would be glad to see the tax-exempt feature of bonds eliminated. In addition he stated:

I think we have too many tax-exempt securities.

Mr. Speaker, I am—in this instance—in full agreement with Mr. Martin. The growth of tax-exempt securities has been fantastic in recent years and I believe it is presenting a serious problem for the country.

The loss of tax revenue is extremely high. In fact, I received a letter from Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, on April 12, in which he discusses this problem and indicates that the loss of revenue through the tax-exempt securities issued in just 1 year is around $3.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the tax-exempt bonds have been used for many worthwhile purposes by local school boards, municipalities, and other governmental subdivisions. The construction of school buildings, water and sewage plants, and other needed facilities must go forward, and I am sure that all of us want to see this done at the lowest cost possible.

However, I question whether the tax-exempt bond is the best method and I believe that the figures bear me out. At the present time, these tax-exempt securities are purchased primarily by the wealthy, the banks, and the other large financiers, seeking a method of avoiding taxes. It is obviously possible for those with sufficient funds to purchase tax-exempt bonds in such quantities that their entire income is totally exempt from Federal income taxes.

It is an open secret that substantial numbers of taxpayers in the upper brackets completely escape the income tax through various tax exemptions. The purchase of tax-exempt bonds is a favorite device of this group.

I do not believe this is good public policy. There are other ways that these local political subdivisions can carry out the necessary financing for facilities. I suggest that the tax-exempt feature be eliminated. At the present time, the tax-exempt feature of a municipal bond saves the local subdivision not more than one-half of 1 percent at current rates. This saving, of course, is important to the hard-pressed local districts, but, the same saving can be accomplished without such a tremendous loss in Federal tax revenues.

In other words, the municipal bonds should be marketed the same as any other government bond, without tax exemption to the purchaser. The difference between the lower interest rate—with tax exemption—and the higher interest rate—without such tax exemption—could be made up in the form of direct subsidy by the Federal Government to the local political subdivision.

This would mean a net gain to the Federal Government, with no loss to the local governmental units. The Federal Government would gain much more in tax revenues than it would be required to pay out to make up the interest rate difference to the local governments.

This point is clearly established in Secretary Fowler's reply to my letter on the question of tax-exempt securities. I quote from this letter of April 12:

The belief that you expressed in the last sentence of the first page of your letter would seem to be a reasonable possibility, namely, that the Treasury would gain more in revenue in taxing these securities than it would pay out in compensating the difference.

In addition to providing more revenue, this method would also be much more equitable without the handful of privileged and wealthy people, banks and others, gaining such tax windfalls. This would help the tax burden to fall more evenly on the people.

In recent years, the commercial banking system has been gathering up more and more of these tax-exempt bonds, thus lowering their tax liability to the Federal Government. In 1966, the commercial banks held about $40.3 billion worth of the $104.8 billion of municipal bonds outstanding. This has been a major device for tax dodging by the commercial banking system. It is an unnecessary special privilege to the big banks.

Other large blocks of these tax-exempt bonds are held by individuals and institutions which do not need additional subsidies in the form of tax loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the entire question of tax-exempt bonds will be studied carefully by the Congress so that these inequitable tax exemptions can be eliminated without damage to local governments.

VIEWS OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR., ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 2, 1967, an article appeared in the Charlotte, N.C., Observer relating to our distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina, Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, JR. This very fine article was written by James K. Batten of the Observer Washington bureau.

Senator ERVIN, a resident of the 10th Congressional District, is one of North Carolina's most distinguished sons. I am proud of his wonderful record of service. His leadership in the U.S. Senate in many areas of legislative activity is of the highest order, and all of us who are privileged to know him intimately take great personal pleasure in that record.

When the article appeared in the Observer I contacted Senator ERVIN and asked that he permit me to place it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He very kindly consented, but requested that any insertion in the RECORD by me include a fuller statement on his part of his views on civil rights legislation. I, of course, readily agreed with him that this should be done.

On April 14, 1967, Senator ERVIN wrote a letter to me stating his position more fully than was done in the article by Mr. Batten.

I insert Senator ERVIN's letter of April 14, 1967, and the article by Mr. Batten dated April 2, 1967, as a part of the RECORD at this point:

APRIL 14, 1967.

Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BASIL: I am deeply gratified to you for suggesting the desirability of placing in the *Congressional Record* the feature article entitled "Sam J. Ervin Just Won't Fit in a Mold," which appeared in the *Charlotte Observer* on April 2, 1967. As you know, the author, James K. Batten, is one of Washington's ablest young reporters. I would be glad to have you place this item in the RECORD together with this letter.

The article was exceptionally well-researched and typically well-written, and I am flattered by the time and trouble he devoted to the project. Nevertheless, he makes one point which deserves an answer—a point which has particular significance as Congress begins its annual consideration of an Administration civil rights bill.

It is implicit in the article that my opposition to so-called civil rights bills is inconsistent with my defense of individual liberty. Unfortunately, the view that civil rights legislation is synonymous with freedom is a common attitude, and, in my view, a common mistake.

For the record—and I do not think Mr. Batten has indicated otherwise—I have never said an unkind word about any race or about any man because of his race. My stand is unequivocal: No man should be denied the right to vote on account of race; no man should be denied the right to seek and hold any job, the right to live by the sweat of his own brow; no man should be denied the right to have a fair and impartial trial by a jury of his peers; no man should be denied the right to a decent education or to enjoy any other basic human right. I have publicly and privately deplored violence or threats of violence against any man because of his creed or color; and, where necessary, I have supported Federal remedies for such violence.

But we will not fool history as we fool ourselves when we steal freedom from one man to confer it on another. When freedom for one citizen is diminished, it is in the end diminished for all. Nor can we preserve liberty by making one branch of the Federal government its protector, for, though defense of liberty be the purpose, the perversion of it will be the effect. The whole fabric of our Constitution—the Federal system and the separation of powers doctrine—is designed to protect us from such centralization; but even the language and lessons of the Constitution cannot stop a people who are hell-bent on twisting the document to the will of a temporary majority. In the words of Madison: ". . . a mere demarcation on parchment of the constitutional limits of the several departments, is not a sufficient guard against those encroachments which lead to a tyrannical concentration of all the powers of government in the same hands."

Yet, we have ignored all of this American political philosophy in considering civil rights legislation. We have stolen the freedom of one man to hire and serve whom he

wishes in order to give another the false freedom to work in the first man's business or buy in his store. We would rob a man of his freedom to sell or rent his own home in order that another have a choice of locations. Every recent voting rights bill, every current Federal proposal concerning alleged discrimination in State Courts, represents an effort to centralize, with a loss of liberty the end result.

It is particularly sad that encroachments come in the area of the right to vote and to have an impartial jury, because effective and constitutional remedies for discrimination have existed for almost 100 years in the form of Federal criminal and civil statutes prohibiting a denial of rights. Each year for over a decade the representatives of three Administrations have come to Congress seeking new tools. Each year I asked them what they had done with the old ones; and always the answer was "Nothing." Not one prosecution brought for denying the right to vote, yet wholesale denials were claimed! In the face of this, Congress is asked to substitute its wisdom for that of the States and set up new systems for voter registration and juror qualification. My answer remains that constitutional innovations are unthinkable answers for a Justice Department that is either lazy in its enforcement or untruthful in its pronouncements.

The preservation of liberty is tedious work, and we must not be distracted from it by the civil rights side shows which rob us in their own name's sake.

Civil rights legislation has been urged in Congress by sincere men, and I attribute to them only the loftiest of motives. However, as Justice Brandeis said:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

It is not the "civil rights" of some, but the civil liberty of all on which I take my stand.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Apr. 2, 1967]

SAM J. ERVIN JUST WON'T FIT IN A MOLD—HE'S STILL A MAN TO RECKON WITH

(By James K. Batten)

WASHINGTON.—To a casual visitor peering down from the Senate Gallery, he might look like some windbag Senator Claghorn, a walking Washington stereotype.

There, behind a desk piled high with lawbooks, is Sen. Samuel James Ervin, Jr., eyebrows rippling up and down, fulminating against the latest civil rights bill and regaling the Senate with crackerbarrel humor from the mountains of North Carolina.

But if stereotypes are always misleading, they are downright laughable in the case of Sam Ervin.

After 13 years in the Senate, Ervin still regularly enrages first the liberals and then the conservatives. He defies all the easy generalizations of political journalism.

Now, at the age of 70, when most men are savoring quiet hours with their grandchildren, the senior senator from North Carolina has never been busier.

And in his own peculiar way, he is at the height of his personal influence in the world's most exclusive club.

In the last Congress, Ervin had his fingers in an incredible variety of legislative pies.

He helped push through a landmark immigration act. He fought invasions of federal employees' privacy. He filibustered successfully against repeal of right-to-work laws. He held hearings on the rights of American Indians.

He pushed a bill that would permit the courts to determine the constitutionality of federal aid to parochial schools.

And as always, Ervin was slugging away at civil rights legislation, killing where he could, amending and diluting where he could not.

HE WILL RUN AGAIN IN 1968

Then, after adjournment late last fall, Ervin gently explained to his wife that he would "rather wear out than rust out." Soon afterwards, he let it be known that he would seek reelection in 1968.

While Margaret Ervin, the senator's wife of 42 years, would much prefer to be going home to Morganton in 1968, her chagrin is minor compared to that of the liberal wing of the N.C. Democratic Party led by former Gov. Terry Sanford.

The liberals had hoped that Ervin, whom many of them regard as an incorrigible mossback, would step down and open the way for a younger, more progressive man to represent North Carolina in the Senate. That man, of course, was Terry Sanford.

Sanford may yet choose to tackle Ervin in a primary, but most informed politicians in both camps believe that unless Ervin's health falters—and he is described as "healthy as a bull"—Sanford will reluctantly sit out in the 1968 campaign.

Thus for the foreseeable future Sam Ervin is likely to remain a man to reckon with in the politics of North Carolina and the Senate of the United States.

It is safe to say that Ervin enjoys his life as a senator. He is, in some ways, a shy man, but he has come to relish the senatorial routine that keeps him constantly in the spotlight.

The Ervins live in a comfortable fourth-floor apartment in the Methodist Building, just across the street from the Supreme Court and a five-minute walk from the senator's office.

He usually gets to his desk by 9:30 in the morning to begin a round of committee meetings, conferences with his aides, appearances on the Senate floor and after-hours engagements that often keep him going until late in the evening.

His social calendar is particularly jammed early in each session of Congress, when a long line of North Carolina groups—from the American Legion to the savings and loan industry—pile into Washington for congressional receptions and dinners.

Mrs. Ervin enjoys embassy parties, and when she wants to accept those invitations, the senator usually agrees.

On the cocktail circuit, Ervin prefers bourbon whisky. He gave up smoking 20 years ago, and he uses occasional Metrecal lunches to keep his weight under control.

Ervin usually gets to bed around midnight, after watching the 11 o'clock news on television.

"There are two things I hate to do," he says with a chuckle. "One is to go to bed, and the other is to get up after I'm there."

Occasionally, Ervin wakes up in the middle of the night with an idea for a speech he's preparing or a bill he intends to introduce. When that happens, he lies in bed with the light still off and works out the idea in his head. The next morning at the office, he dictates it to a secretary.

In other years, the senator enjoyed an occasional fishing trip, but now his sole diversion is reading—primarily on legal and historical subjects, plus a lot of poetry. He belongs to three different book clubs. One of his latest enthusiasms is Catherine Drinker Bowen's book on the making of the Constitution, "Miracle in Philadelphia."

For Ervin, reading is not only relaxation. It also is a way to keep the daily demands of the Senate in perspective.

"You know what's wrong with Lyndon Johnson?" he once demanded of a colleague. "I'll bet you Johnson has never read a book unless it was written about him."

Ervin is known in the Senate as a man who does his own research, and unlike the 99 other senators, Ervin uses the well-stocked Senate library regularly. At least once a week, he usually can be found settled in a big upholstered leather chair, burrowing through the lawbooks.

His penchant for personal research contributes to Ervin's stature among his colleagues.

"He undertakes to be as prepared as if it were his first court case and his whole reputation were at stake," says one senator. "He does his homework like not many people around here do."

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, an old friend of Ervin's, despite their frequent political differences, makes a similar point:

"Whether you agree or disagree with Sen. Ervin—and on occasion we have disagreed—you learn from him. He has a tremendous intellect and vast learning. I have benefited from his friendship, his advice and his great human warmth."

Sam Ervin is a man full of paradoxes, and one of them is that despite his power both in North Carolina and in the Senate, he is, some ways, no politician at all. Instead, he is a skillful lawyer with what a friend calls "that great lumbering mind," a legal man who loves constitutional theories more than political maneuvering.

"Sam Ervin has never been a politician," said one North Carolina political insider. "He's never even had a race. He holds himself above what he considers to be the petty political arena."

Ervin has been a U.S. representative, a N.C. Supreme Court justice, and a U.S. senator, but he originally got all three jobs by appointment, not election. And in facing the voters later, he never had serious opposition.

In some respects Ervin verges on being—if there can be such a thing—an apolitical senator.

It shows up in Washington, where Ervin remains relatively aloof from the backstage tugging-and-hauling of the Senate cloakrooms.

"He is aloof," remarked a northern liberal senator who differs with Ervin but deeply admires him. "Maybe that's part of his charm. It may dilute his effectiveness, but he's not always meeting somebody in the corridor and mumbling about some amendment."

Ervin's aloofness from politics also shows up in North Carolina, where he has no political organization worthy of the name. (But his personal influence is profound enough that when he makes a major political move—like backing Dan K. Moore for governor in 1964—he can help convert a political unknown into a winner.)

For years there has been a widely held but grossly oversimplified belief that Ervin's junior colleague, Sen. B. Everett Jordan, was the meat-and-potatoes man looking out for North Carolina interests in Washington, thus presumably freeing Ervin to worry about larger, less provincial issues.

That contention is well summed up by the Tar Heel politico who said recently, "as for looking out for North Carolina's interests in the political arena, Sen. Sam Ervin holds himself above that to a considerable extent. His office is not as politically attuned as Everett Jordan's."

The impression probably is heightened by the senators' contrasting committee assignments.

Two of Jordan's committees—public works and agriculture—are crucial to North Carolinians who want dams and water projects and tobacco programs.

Ervin's assignments—government operations, judiciary and armed services—have less flavor of pork about them.

But it would be a mistake to insist, as some people do, that Sam Ervin is divorced from the pork-barreling, large and small, that is part of any senator's routine. He may not relish it, but he is inextricably involved in it.

In 1965, to cite one notable example, the Defense Department was threatening to shut down an airplane rehabilitation center at Cherry Point, N.C. About 2,000 jobs were at stake.

Ervin sat down with Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., and Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., two titans of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the next day, it was certain that the rehab center would stay in business.

But Ervin's power in the Senate does not come, for the most part, from being a senatorial politician. A great portion of his influence flows, instead, from his reputation as a "constitutional expert." He cherishes that role and plays it to the hilt.

Ervin's claims to constitutional expertise is accepted by many scholars and lawyers.

THERE ARE SKEPTICS WHO DO SMIRK

"Sam Ervin's scholarship is real," said one. "He's a graduate of the University of North Carolina and Harvard Law School. He's smart. He's not a phony."

But both in Washington and North Carolina, there are skeptics who smirk at such a claim. Said one:

"I get the feeling around here in talking to men who really are constitutional experts, like Prof. Paul Freund at Harvard, that they're somewhat amused that Ervin sets himself up as an expert because he was a state supreme court justice."

The skeptics point particularly to Ervin's stubborn refusal to accept the constitutionality of the Supreme Court's decisions in the field of civil rights, beginning with the landmark school desegregation decision of 1954.

"He's a good lawyer of the old school," said one renowned constitutional scholar. "But in many ways he resists the current trends. Reliability as a constitutional expert depends not merely on being familiar with the precedents but on being able to sense currents, trends and tendencies in the law."

Yet a surprising number of impartial scholars, many of whom differ sharply with Ervin on civil rights, insist that in the context of the Senate, he is easily the best authority on the Constitution.

"He's not a scholar," conceded Prof. Philip Kurland of the University of Chicago, one of the nation's best-known law professors. "But in terms of senators, you'd be hard-pressed to name anybody since Daniel Webster and Henry Clay who are as well-grounded as Ervin on the Constitution."

It is important to remember that in terms of political power in the Senate, the academicians' debate over Ervin's credentials as a constitutional authority is, in a sense, irrelevant.

A sizable bloc of senators regard Ervin as a constitutional expert, and whether they are correct or not, there is real power in that reputation.

One young liberal in the Senate puts it this way:

A SIZABLE BLOC GOES WITH ERVIN

"On constitutional questions, if you get Sam Ervin sold, that's a sizable bloc of votes. Those in the Senate that shrug him off are those who wish he would get out of their hair."

If Ervin's influence on constitutional and essentially legal matters—like prayer in the schools, presidential succession and bail procedures—is generally conceded to be great, there is less agreement on his broader power in the Senate.

"I don't think he can be regarded as a leader in the Senate," said one high-ranking administration official. "He falls totally under the shadow of (Sen. Richard B.) Russell (D–Ga.)."

But columnist William S. White, one of the Senate's most celebrated journalistic observers, gives Ervin higher marks:

"He has a very high place in what I used to call 'The Inner Club.' He stands very high in the esteem of the Senate particularly the Southern wing of it. He might one day succeed Russell, if Russell ever left, as the untitled leader of those fellows."

In a place where seniority counts for so much, Ervin's 13 years in the Senate have inevitably given him some power that comes to any veteran senator who does not defy too many rules of the club.

A PLACE TO GO FOR A NEEDED VOTE

To cite one small but illustrative case, in 1964 when Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D-S.C.) died, Ervin was next in line among members of the Senate Judiciary Committee to take over chairmanship of the subcommittee on improvements in judicial machinery.

That chairmanship, with its control of a $150,000 staff payroll, was a modest but juicy political plum. But Ervin was already running two Senate subcommittees, and when freshman Sen. Joseph D. Tydings, D-Md., came to Ervin and asked for the job, Ervin helped him get it.

Now, although Ervin would never mention it, Tydings now is a man to whom Ervin could turn for a vote or a favor if he ever really needed one.

Beyond seniority, another source of Ervin's influence in the Senate is his ability as a folksy raconteur. Sometimes his endless supply of Tar Heel stories taxes the patience of other senators, but on occasion, the right story at the right time is a useful weapon.

In his book on labor racketeering, "The Enemy Within," Robert F. Kennedy speaks warmly of Ervin's service on the Senate Select Committee investigating that problem in the 1950's. Kennedy was the committee counsel.

"I heard Sen. Ervin on several occasions destroy a witness by telling an appropriate story which made the point better than an hour-long speech or a day of questioning," Kennedy wrote. "He could be particularly devastating when a witness was pompous or overbearing."

But wherever Sam Ervin stands in the over-all Senate pecking order, the heart of his life in the Senate revolves around the Constitution, and since 1961, the subcommittee on constitutional rights.

In that year, Ervin succeeded the late Sen. Thomas C. Hennings, D-Mo., as chairman of the subcommittee. It has been his principal focus of interest ever since.

But here in the work of the subcommittee, there has surfaced the biggest paradox of all in the senatorial career of Sam Ervin. It can be simply stated:

Ervin, to the man in the street in North Carolina and perhaps in New York is known only as an unrelenting foe of the civil rights legislation.

SENSIBLE GUARDIAN OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

Yet at the same time, to a smaller, more sophisticated audience centered primarily in Washington, he has also established a reputation as a sensitive guardian of civil liberties.

For a man soon to gain this sort of Jekyll-Hyde reputation on civil rights and civil liberties, Sam Ervin's arrival in the Senate on June 11, 1954, was auspicious in its timing.

Twenty-five days earlier, the Supreme Court had declared "separate-but-equal" schools for Negroes and whites unconstitutional, thus helping unleash the Negro Revolution of the 1950's and 1960's, which Ervin would struggle to turn back.

As the American Negro took his demands for equal treatment into the courts and into the streets, Ervin generally was to remain unmoved. He became, in effect, the legal advisor to the Southern anticivil rights bloc in the Senate.

He was always ready with intricate constitutional arguments to prove why Congress had no business passing laws to insure the Negro's right to vote, to take his family into a decent restaurant, or to compete on equal footing for a good job.

But in that same first summer in the Senate, Ervin found himself appointed to a six-member select committee that ultimately backed Senate censure for Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, whose anti-Communist witch-hunts had run roughshod over a variety of basic civil liberties.

In a memorable speech on Nov. 15, 1954, the freshman senator from North Carolina told a story about Uncle Ephraim Swink, an arthritic mountaineer.

When Uncle Ephraim was asked at a revival meeting to say what the Lord had done for him, he struggled to his feet and declared, "Brother, he has might nigh ruint me."

And that, Ervin told his colleagues, was what McCarthy had done to the Senate. The issue, Ervin said, was this: "Does the Senate of the United States have the manhood to stand up to Sen. McCarthy?" Soon afterwards, the Senate showed, belatedly, that it did.

Thus, as some Washington oldtimers see it, the pattern for Ervin's Senate career was set in his tumultous freshman year of 1954.

While Ervin's adamant opposition to civil rights bills drew big headlines, his role as a champion of civil liberties developed with little public fanfare.

There were misgivings among the bulldogs of the American Civil Liberties Union and other civil-liberties groups when, in 1961, Ervin took over as chairman of the constitutional rights subcommittee.

But today, most of them are staunch Sam Ervin admirers. They wince at his civil rights stands, but they applaud as "excellent" his campaigns for the rights of the mentally ill, American Indians, federal employees, members of the armed services, and indigent criminal suspects unable to muster money for bail or legal counsel.

In the eyes of the civil libertarians, one of Ervin's finest hours came during last year's Senate debate on Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen's proposed constitutional amendment permitting prayer in the public schools.

Ervin had been an early critic of Supreme Court decisions on prayer in the schools, but after long, personal study, he changed his mind and said so on the Senate floor in an eloquent address. The court, he concluded, was protecting religious liberty, not threatening it.

Dirksen's amendment was voted down, along with a milder resolution by Sen. Birch Bayh. The Washington Post, not known for its love of Sam Ervin, called him "an authentic hero of the Senate debate."

Marvin Braiterman, a lobbyist for a coalition of Jewish religious groups, called Ervin's prayer speech in a recent interview "one of the finest documents of civil liberties uttered in debate in Congress in a long time."

The Dirksen amendment had been popular in "Bible-belt" North Carolina, and Ervin predictably drew scalding criticism from many of his constituents. He characteristically shrugged it off.

Many in Washington who admire Ervin, the civil liberatarian, believe that his education on such issues began when he took over the constitutional rights subcommittee almost seven years ago.

There is good reason to reject that view. Undeniably, the subcommittee has given Ervin a forum for his views and broadened his knowledge. But the instincts he has displayed in the chairmanship apparently were there all along.

Back in 1925, for example, when young Sam Ervin was a legislator in the N.C. General

Assembly, he helped defeat a bill that would have banned the teaching of evolution in the state's public schools.

If the bill had passed, the famous Scopes "monkey trial" in Tennessee could have easily happened in North Carolina. But Ervin saw a threat to free speech in the bill, and he fought against it.

"Such a resolution," declared Ervin in the folksy style he would later carry to the Senate, "serves no good purpose except to absolve monkeys of their responsibility for the human race."

But the enigma of Sam Ervin remains, and every friend of civil liberties, after praising Ervin on that score, raises the same puzzled question:

"How can a man so obviously sensitive to the rights of Indians, bureaucrats, army privates and the mentally ill be so stubbornly opposed to legislation to protect the rights of Negroes?"

Ervin, of course, would never accept the premises of that question.

In most cases, Ervin would say, the civil rights legislation of the last decade was unnecessary. He would add that the bills were conceived in a cynical attempt to pander to the growing Negro vote.

To those who agree with Ervin on civil rights, this position embodies self-evident truth. But to those who disagree—while still admiring and respecting him for other reasons—his attitude is difficult to fathom.

There are some who blandly assume that Ervin doesn't really believe what he says about civil rights. They assume he is behaving the way a southern senator must behave to get elected.

"You have to remember his practical need to get returned to office if he's going to do this other good work," remarked a well-known law professor unfamiliar with North Carolina.

"He's essentially a man of good will. If attitudes in North Carolina would shift, you'd find him among the moderate ranks in the Senate."

A Washington civil rights lobbyist tends to agree. He recalls that Ervin came to Washington not long after the bitter 1950 race in which Willis Smith knocked liberal Frank P. Graham out of the Senate in a campaign badly stained by the racial issue.

"Ervin is the product of the post-Frank Graham panic among North Carolina political people," said the lobbyist. "Prior to Graham's defeat, I think the North Carolina politicians were thinking it was all right and safe to take a moderate position on civil rights.

"But then there was the complete rout, and I think Ervin was a product of those times."

Others, who perhaps know Ervin better, admit that like all men, the senior senator from North Carolina was shaped by his environment—in his case, an environment where racial segregation was taken for granted.

But they insist that Ervin is no racist, nor does he consciously play politics with the civil rights issue.

"Sam Ervin is far above the mere stereotype," said columnist William S. White. "There isn't an ounce of Bilboism or that kind of rubbish in him at all."

A liberal senator, who has been a leader among congressional civil rights strategists, agrees with White.

"I do not feel him to be a prejudiced man," he said. Then, the senator murmured almost apologetically, "That's crazy, I know."

Ervin himself has always taken pains to dissociate himself from the Anti-Negro racism apparent in many of those who share his distaste for civil rights laws. There is nothing of the gallus-snapping Southern demagogue in his behavior.

Last year, after the shooting of James Meredith in Mississippi, Ervin sorrowfully conceded that civil rights bills "are the natural reaction to the activities of a few demagogic politicians and a few murdering criminals in the South."

But Ervin's critics reply that if he sidesteps racism himself, he provides an unfortunate veneer of intellectual respectability for those segregationists whose motives are less high-minded than his own.

Among Ervin's liberal admirers who deplore his civil rights stand, it is widely suspected that Ervin's outrage is not aroused during civil rights debates because he fails to grasp the Negro's plight in the Deep South.

Because he is from Western North Carolina, where the Negro population is small and racial relations traditionally amicable, these admirers suggest that Ervin just doesn't understand Alabama and Mississippi and South Georgia.

If he did, they say, his proven sense of decency would force him to find a way around his legal objections to civil rights legislation.

"I think he's convinced in his own mind that there's no discrimination in his state," remarked a liberal senator from the Midwest.

"He thinks it's no worse in North Carolina than anywhere else in the country. I think he's opposed to discrimination in his own mind. But I think he's a bit naive not to see what's going on in some of his neighboring states."

Whatever the underlying reasons for his stand, it is clear that Ervin's widely publicized aversion to civil rights legislation has made him popular in North Carolina.

One of the state's most experienced Democratic politicians, put it this way:

"Sam Ervin is riding a tide of considerable influence in North Carolina, not because of his political pull in Washington, but because of the civil rights issue.

"His stand is popular in North Carolina. It's not because of what he's done for the State."

When this tangle of speculation about his civil rights position is taken to Ervin himself, the senator seems a little grieved.

"When I was elected to the legislature," he recalled, "the first thing I did was introduce a bill to provide for a local bond issue to give the Negroes an adequate school in Morganton.

"I have always fought for adequate educational opportunities for all children of all races. I have never spoken an unkind word in my life about any race of men. My personal relationships with Negroes have always been very good."

But the civil rights bills, he went on, have been a different kettle of fish.

Every one of them, Ervin said, has either tended to centralize governmental power in Washington, or has stripped rights from some citizens and given them to others.

He is deeply distressed about concentration of power in the federal government, especially the executive branch.

"Centralization of governmental powers is inconsistent with freedom," he likes to say, and he can quote everybody from James Madison to Thomas Hobbes to prove his point.

But when Ervin is pressed to consider the plight of Southern Negroes as a group, he sidesteps the question and quickly heads back into the thicket of constitutional theory.

He seems more comfortable dealing with the abstractions of the law than the grievances of flesh-and-blood.

"What Ervin doesn't have," mused lobbyist Marvin Braiterman, "is a profound understanding of social change as, for example, Frank Graham had.

"But he has an unusual ability to think of the Constitution as it relates to individual people."

A Washington rabbi, musing about Ervin's relations with other men as individuals, suggested that a Yiddish word captures the senator to perfection.

"Ervin," said the rabbi, "is a mentsch." "Mentsch" is difficult to translate into English, but it describes a man who is warm and human, a responsible man who takes his dealings with other men seriously.

So the paradox of Sam Ervin emerges:

An immensely successful politician who is not really a politician at all . . . A man who seems to battle the Negro revolution for one reason, but whose battle wins popularity for another reason . . . A sensitive man who recoils from wrongs against individuals, but who is curiously obtuse about an injustice that many admirers regard as one of the greatest moral questions of our time.

SUMMIT MEETING OF CHIEFS OF STATE AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have been eagerly and hopefully following the summit meeting of American chiefs of state, the news from Punta del Este has been tremendously heartening.

The Latin American Presidents have given evidence to the world of their determination—and that of their peoples—to pay the price of development, however rough it may be in terms of self-help and self-denial.

The good news from Punta del Este represents nothing less than a personal triumph for President Johnson. He has kept faith with his lifelong interest in the destiny of our neighbors to the south. He has given ample proof to the Latin American nations of our solidarity with them—and, to quote his own words, that "we will be at their sides."

Let us bid him "bienvenide" upon his return.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS AT INTER-AMERICAN SUMMIT

Following is the text of a speech given Thursday by President Johnson at the Summit Conference of American Chiefs of State today:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Chiefs of State, Ladies and Gentlemen:

First, President Gestido, may I express, on behalf of my entire delegation, gratitude to you for the courtesy and generosity that Uruguay has offered her sister nations at this conference.

We have come to Punta del Este as the leaders of 20 governments—and as the trustees for more than 400 million human beings.

We meet in a city where, five and a half years ago, an Alliance was formed—a pledge made—and a dream begun.

Now we must measure the progress we have made. We must name the barriers that still stand between us and the fulfillment of our dream. Then we must put in motion plans that will set us firmly on the way toward the proud destiny that is our people's right.

We meet as friends, as neighbors, as allies. Hundreds of years ago we were the new world. Now each of us faces the problems of growing maturity—of industrialization, of rapid urban growth, of sharing the opportunities of life among all our people.

We no longer inhabit a new world. We cannot escape from our problems—as the first Americans could—in the vastness of an unchartered hemisphere. If we are to

grow and prosper, we must face the problems of our maturity. And we must do it boldly—wisely—and now.

If we do, we can create a new America—where the best in man may flourish in freedom and dignity. If we neglect the planning, if we ignore the commitments that it requires—if our rhetoric is not followed by action—we shall fail not only the Americans of this generation, but hundreds of millions to come.

In unity—and only in unity—is our strength. The barriers that deny the dream of a new America are stronger than the strongest among us—acting alone. But they cannot stand against our combined will and common effort.

I speak to you as a ready partner in that effort. I represent a nation committed by history, by national interest, and by simple friendship to the cause of progress in Latin America. But the assistance of my nation will be useful only as it reinforces your determination and builds on your achievements—and only as it is bound to the growing unity of our Hemisphere.

Here, as I see it, are the tasks before us:

First, you will be forging a great new common market—expanding your industrial base, increasing your participation in world trade, and broadening economic opportunities for your people. I have already made my position clear to our Congress: If Latin America decides to create a common market, I shall recommend to the Congress a substantial contribution to a fund that will help ease the transition into an integrated, regional economy.

Second, you will design, and join together to build, great multination projects that will open up the inner frontiers of Latin America. These will provide—at last—the physical basis for Simon Bolivar's vision of continental unity. I shall ask my country to provide, over a three-year period, substantial additional additional funds for the Inter-American Bank's Fund for Special Operations, as our part of this special effort. I have also asked the Export-Import Bank to give urgent and sympathetic attention, wherever it is economically feasible, to loans for earth stations that will bring satellite communications to Latin America.

Third, I know how hard you are striving to expand the volume and value of Latin American exports. Bilateral and multilateral efforts to achieve this are already under way. But I made clear yesterday afternoon in our private session that we are prepared to consider a further step in international trade policy. We are ready to explore with other industrialized countries—and with our people—the possibility of temporary preferential advantages for all developing countries in the markets of all the industrialized countries. We are also prepared to make our contribution to additional shared efforts in connection with the International Coffee Agreement.

Fourth, all of us know that modernizing agriculture and increasing its productivity is an urgent task for Latin America—as it is for the whole world. Modernizing education is equally important. I have already urged our Government to expand our bilateral assistance in the fields of agriculture and education.

Fifth, you are engaged in bringing to Latin America life all that can be used from the common fund of modern science and technology. In addition to the additional resources we shall seek in the field of education, we are prepared to join with Latin American nations in:

Creating an inter-American training center for educational broadcasting, and supporting a pilot educational television demonstration project in a Central American country.

Establishing a new Inter-American Foundation for Science and Technology.

Developing a regional program of marine science and technology.

And exploring a Latin American regional program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Sixth, the health of the people of Latin America ultimately depends on everything we do to modernize the life of the region. But we must never forget that when children are not provided with adequate and balanced diets, they are permanently affected as human beings—and as citizens. Therefore, we propose to increase our food program for pre-school children in Latin America, and substantially improve our school lunch programs. We are also prepared to set up in Latin America a demonstration center in the field of fish protein concentrates. We believe that this essential ingredient of a balanced diet can be provided at much lower cost than in the past.

Finally, I shall urge funds be provided to help establish Alliance for Progress centers at colleges and universities in the United States. Our partnership must be based on respect for our various cultures and civilizations. And respect is built on knowledge. This new education program will offer new opportunities for students and educators of your countries and mine to work together.

Our discussions here are couched in the technical terms of trade and development policies.

But beyond these impersonal terms stands the reality of individual men, women, and children. It is for them—not the statisticians and economists—that we work. It is for them—and especially for the young that the hope and the challenge of the Alliance exists.

For them, we must move forward from this hour:

Building more schools and hospitals and roads.

Producing more food.

Developing more trade.

Taking on the hard problems of tax reform and land reform.

Creating new jobs and economic opportunities.

Cleaning out the red tape and acting with the sense of urgency our times require.

And above all, following through on the plans we make.

I pledge to you today that I will do all I can, in my time of leadership, to help you meet these challenges.

One of the first groups I met with after I became President was composed of your Ambassadors to Washington. From that time to this I have accelerated America's commitment to the Alliance, by increasing substantially the contribution of my country by more than 35 percent of the previous three years. I know what is at stake for you, and for my country, in Latin America.

And I know that the clock is ticking. I know that the dream of the new America will not wait. I know that you sense the same urgency—the same need for speedy decision and effective action in your country, as in mine.

My fellow Presidents, I should like to conclude by speaking not only to you, but to the youth of our nations—to the students in the schools and universities, to the young people on the farms and in the new factories and labor unions and in the civil service of our governments—to all those who are moving into their time of responsibility.

This is the message I bring to them:

All that has been dreamed, in the years since this Alliance started, can only come to pass if your hearts and minds become committed to it.

It is our duty—we who hold public office and bear great private responsibilities today—to create an environment in which you can build your part of the new America.

It is your duty to prepare yourselves now—to use the tools of learning, and the idealism that is your natural heritage, for the human purposes that lie deep in our common civilization.

You cry out for change, for what Franklin Roosevelt called a New Deal. And you do not want it imposed from above. You want a chance to help shape the conditions of your lives.

You—the youth of the Americas—should know that revolutions of fire have brought men in this Hemisphere, and in jungles half the world away, still greater tyrannies than those they fought to cast off.

Here in the countries of the Alliance, a peaceful revolution has affirmed man's ability to change the conditions of his life through the institutions of democracy. In your hands is the task of carrying it forward.

The pace of change is not fast enough. It will remain too slow—unless you join your energies and skills and commitments in a mighty effort that extends into the farthest reaches of our Hemisphere.

The time is now. The responsibility is ours.

Let us declare the next ten years the decade of urgency.

Let us match our resolve and our resources to the common tasks—until the dream of a new America is accomplished in the lives of all our people.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS TO HEAR REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to extend to you and all Members of the House a cordial invitation to join your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at our meeting on Wednesday, April 26, at 10:45 a.m., room 1324 Longworth Building, when the committee will receive a report on the progress and status of work of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

While we will be glad to have the public present, if seats are available, we will reserve all of the seats in the meeting room for Members of the House until after the briefing has gotten underway.

The work of the Public Land Law Review Commission has significance for all Americans; it is of utmost importance in many regions, districts, and communities. The Commission, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, has completed its basic fundamental task of laying the foundation for its overall review. As we enter the next stage of our work—entering into contracts with research organizations, universities, individuals, and, as appropriate, Government agencies—it is fitting that the House be informed of these activities, and that the committee having legislative oversight responsibility should review the work to date.

Most of the work at this stage has been performed by the staff under the direction of Milton A. Pearl, who, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, served the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for many years as a consultant on

public lands. Mr. Pearl will make the presentation next week accompanied by senior staff personnel. All of these people will be available for questioning by the committee.

We are particularly interested in having Members whose districts contain public lands to be present along with newly elected Members who were not in Congress when the law establishing the Puplic Land Law Review Commission was enacted.

For the benefit of the Members, under permission previously granted, I enclose in the RECORD at this point a short summary of the composition and purpose of the Commission:

BACKGROUND AND COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Because of the multiplicity of statutes, the lack of clear policy, and the division of jurisdiction among executive agencies, Public Law 88-606 provided for the establishment of the Public Land Law Review Commission. The Commission is charged with the following responsibilities: (1) study all existing statutes and regulations governing the public lands, which includes, in addition to the public domain, all national forests, wildlife refuges and game ranges, and the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf; (2) review policies and practices of the Federal agencies administering these lands; (3) determine present and future demands on the public lands; and (4) recommend changes in laws and administration which will enable the general public to realize the maximum benefit from the public lands.

The Commission is composed of 19 members, with bipartisan representation from both Houses of Congress and Presidential appointees: six appointed by the Speaker of the House, six by the President of the Senate, and six by the President of the United States. The congressional members, which are divided equally between the majority and minority parties, must come from the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The first 18 members named were authorized by Public Law 88-606 to elect a nineteenth member as Chairman. At the Commission's organization meeting it chose Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado, as Chairman; H. Byron Mock, a Presidential appointee and practicing attorney at Salt Lake City, Utah, as Vice Chairman; and Milton A. Pearl as Director.

The present composition of the Commission is as follows:

Chairman: Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall

Appointed by the President of the United States:

Laurance S. Rockefeller, of New York City, New York

Governor Philip Hoff, of the State of Vermont

H. Byron Mock, of Salt Lake City, Utah—Vice Chairman

Dr. Robert Emmet Clark, of Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Maurice Goddard, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Nancy E. Smith, of San Bernardino, California

Appointed by the President of the Senate:

Henry M. Jackson, Senator from Washington

Clinton P. Anderson, Senator from New Mexico

Alan Bible, Senator from Nevada

Thomas H. Kuchel, Senator from California

Gordon Allott, Senator from Colorado

Len B. Jordan, Senator from Idaho

Appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Walter S. Baring, Representative from Nevada

Roy A. Taylor, Representative from North Carolina

Morris K. Udall, Representative from Arizona

John P. Saylor, Representative from Pennsylvania

Laurence J. Burton, Representative from Utah

John Kyl, Representative from Iowa

LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL REPRESENTS PENNSYLVANIA IN THE FESTIVAL OF STATES

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud today to call to the attention of my colleagues the achievement of a contingent of young people from the Keystone State who journeyed to Florida last week. These young people and their director, Mr. Ronald P. Sherry, comprise the Liberty High School Grenadier Band of Bethlehem, Pa., which was chosen last fall to represent Pennsylvania at the 46th annual "Festival of States" in St. Petersburg, Fla.

Last October 20, I made note of the honor bestowed on the Grenadiers by their selection to represent Pennsylvania during the Festival of States. I confidently assured my colleagues then, "they will represent Pennsylvania with distinction during their forthcoming visit to St. Petersburg."

In reality, Mr. Speaker, my remarks of last October did not do justice to the Grenadiers and their director. Last Friday, the Grenadiers marched proudly along the 22-block Festival of States parade route through the heart of St. Petersburg. Their appearance, precision and performance captivated the 200,000 persons who lined the parade route.

The impression they made on the parade judges became evident Friday night when the Liberty High School Grenadiers were awarded the coveted "Governor's Cup"—the feature award of the 1967 Festival of States.

Citizens of Bethlehem turned out 10,000-strong yesterday afternoon to welcome home the Liberty High Grenadiers. These same citizens had raised $20,000 to finance the trip to Florida, to afford these young people and their capable director the opportunity to demonstrate their talent and ability.

Their confidence in the Grenadiers was richly rewarded when this fine band returned home "Champion of Champions."

They were acclaimed in Florida, not only for their musical performances but also for the admirable standards of conduct they observed throughout their visit there.

Mr. Speaker, I am seeking now to arrange to have the Grenadiers visit our Nation's Capital and to demonstrate their talents on Capitol Hill. Each of my colleagues will be invited to see and hear the Grenadiers at that time.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD, two articles from the April 15, 1967, edition of the Bethlehem Globe-Times which detail the distinction won by the marching band of my high school alma mater and the Bethlehem community's reaction to this achievement:

BETHLEHEM TO CHEER VICTORIOUS BAND

Thousands of Bethlehem residents are expected to gather tomorrow night to greet the triumphant Liberty High School Grenadier Band on its return from St. Petersburg, Fla.

A familiar sight will meet the bandsmen's eyes as they approach the city, for the star on South Mountain will be illuminated to mark the occasion.

The Grenadiers, as Pennsylvania's representatives in the 46th annual Festival of States, yesterday captured the coveted Governor's Cup—and also the hearts of just about everyone in the Florida metropolis.

This city's citizens have been asked to begin assembling in the west stands of Liberty High School stadium at 6:30 p.m. tomorrow, and while they are awaiting the arrival of the Grenadiers, they'll be entertained by three other Bethlehem musical units; the American Legion Band, the Municipal Band and the Northeast Junior High School Band —all under Ray Houston's direction.

The exact time of arrival, will depend on travel conditions that the five-bus caravan encounters along the way, but should there be any change in the schedule, area residents will be notified by radio station WGPA during the afternoon.

POLICE ESCORT

A police escort will meet the band at the city limits and guide the happy travelers into the stadium through the Laurel St. gate.

Those on hand to welcome the band home have been asked by planning officials to occupy the west stands for the ceremonies.

The three bands taking part in the festivities will serenade the Liberty High youngsters as they arrive, and as soon as everyone is assembled, the invocation will be given and the National Anthem will be played.

The speakers will include Harry Trend, executive secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, who will express the city's gratitude for the honor that the band has brought to the city; the Rev. Harry Colver, school board president, who will talk on behalf of the school board.

Dr. John W. Khouri, superintendent of schools; John A. Heske, Chamber of Commerce president, who led the citizens' drive to raise the necessary funds to send the band to Florida, and Charles A. Klein, Liberty High's principal, will be on hand for remarks.

The response for the band will be given by its director, Ronald Sherry and by John Tripp, student band president.

Officials have asked that the public not park cars on Laurel or Clifford Sts., immediately adjacent to the stadium, since this is the route the band will use to enter the reception area.

All day today, city and school officials—along with many others—have been busy preparing for the welcoming home celebration.

Those who have been making the necessary arrangements include Mayor Payrow, Heske, Trend, Houston, Phil F. Phillippi, Liberty High's director of athletics, Albert P. Delgrosso, superintendent of buildings and grounds, Dr. Khouri, the Rev. Mr. Colver, Joseph J. McIntyre, principal of the new Freedom High School and Klein.

A large banner—approximately 4 by 12 feet—is being prepared for display in the stadium, and there will be a Marine Corps color guard to participate in the program.

PRINCIPAL'S STATEMENT

In his statement, Klein said that "the entire Liberty High School community and the community of Bethlehem are thrilled by

the splendid efforts of the Grenadier Band in winning the Governor's Cup as the outstanding band in the festival of states."

In noting that he offered his personal congratulations last night to Sherry, the LHS principal declared that "the band has brought great credit to the community of Bethlehem and to the state of Pennsylvania in its singular achievement and Mr. Sherry and the band members are to be highly commended for their skilled musicianship and exemplary conduct which made this achievement possible."

Klein also noted that there will be a school assembly on Wednesday morning at 8:15 in the school gym during which the 3,200 youngsters will pay tribute to their fellow students.

Just in case there should be inclement weather for the homecoming tomorrow night, officials have made the necessary provisions for moving the ceremonies into Memorial Gymnasium.

SOME 200,000 VIEW PRIZEWINNING PERFORMANCE

(By Robert Hampson)

With probably the greatest prize it's ever won safely tucked away, the Liberty High School Grenadier Band is speeding homeward this afternoon, knowing that it's the best musical organization of its kind in the entire country.

An almost flawless, 22-block march through the heart of St. Petersburg, Fla., in sweltering, 90-degree heat yesterday earned the Bethlehem outfit that coveted Governor's Cup—emblematic of the championship of the 46th annual Festival of States.

An estimated 200,000 people watched the 46 bands pass in review, but the best was saved for almost the last, as the Pennsylvanians were the 40th unit to step off in quest of the grand prize.

The Bethlehem youngsters, attired in their sparkling parade best—the familiar uniform that local residents see during the Liberty High football games each fall—waited patiently under a shade tree in the park for their turn to swing into action.

Those tall, bearskin hats, high collars and long trousers may be just dandy for cool, fall afternoons, but they can be mighty uncomfortable under the merciless rays of a brilliant Southern sun.

But, with sweat pouring down their faces and determination in their hearts, the Liberty unit strode along the more than two-mile route in almost perfect fashion.

Starting near the waterfront, the parade route took the bands through the heart of the downtown section and then swung uptown before finally winding up.

HAD TO IMPRESS

Although the parade started at 12:30 p.m., the Liberty Grenadiers didn't step off until almost 3 o'clock. By that time, the judges had seen 39 other units pass in review, so the Bethlehem squad really had to be "terrific" to catch the judges' attention after seeing so many other outstanding musical aggregations.

When the final block had been marched, there was a drum roll cadence, the Grenadiers halted, formed a large huddle, gave a heartwarming cheer, looked hopefully at one another and then piled into their buses for a trip back to the hotel to await the grand climax—last night's award ceremonies.

ONLOOKERS AMAZED

Many onlookers along the way watching in amazement, some claiming that this was the best band that they'd ever seen in this or any previous festival.

And the Liberty unit had to be close to perfect to bring home the grand award. The Grenadiers nailed down 295 out of a possible 300 points, and although there was no official announcement as to who was second and by how much, highly reliable sources noted that the Alabama band was just two points in back of the Keystone Staters when the final judging tabulations had been recorded.

The announcement of the winner was made at 10 o'clock last night during the victory dance in the Bayshore Arena.

Herbert Melanie, the festival's executive director, just about was able to make the announcement. While everyone waited excitedly for the proclamation, Melanie was just able to say "The feature award for 1967—the Governor's Cup—goes to the Keystone State . . . "

The more than 300 Pennsylvanians—including the 163 band members who made the entire thing possible—broke into a tumultuous cheer that all but drowned out the rest of the presentation announcement.

Handshaking, kissing and hugging—intermingled with tears of joy—greeted the realization that Bethlehem was indeed the best high school band in the land.

SHERRY BEAMS

Band director Ronald Sherry strode from his seat at the rear of the arena, beaming from head to toe in his brilliant orange sports jacket, to receive the cup. Sherry was almost swamped by well-wishers and jubilant Grenadiers as he clutched the grand prize.

"I just can't believe it," was about the only thing the tired, but overjoyed Sherry could say.

After the dance, the band returned to its festival headquarters, the Soreno Hotel, and immediately grabbed its instruments to play "Bethlehem Forever" and the schools "Alma Mater."

The runnerup Alabama band was also there to give the Pennsylvanians a little musical argument, with the playing of the traditional Southern marching song, "Dixie," but the Bethlehemites answered right back with a rendition of "Yankee Doodle."

This 11 p.m. spontaneous concert was brought to a noble conclusion when the Liberty band played the National Anthem and Craig Eby, student announcer, made a brief, good will speech.

Lights out was scheduled for 1 a.m. this morning, but many a band member continued to relive the events just passed far into the night.

This morning, everyone was up again by 7:30 o'clock, for there was a lot of packing to do in preparation for the noon departure. There was time for a trip to the beach and a swim in the clear, blue Florida waters before bidding a fond farewell to the host city.

Mayor H. Gordon Payrow telephoned his congratulations to the band last night, telling Sherry that the entire city of Bethlehem is sharing in the excitement of the great achievement.

DEMONSTRATIONS OUT OF HAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, free speech even in the United States does not include license to incite to riot.

The right of freedom of speech can be abused. It is being abused by the rabble rousers and hatemongers of the hour. Demonstrations of the proportions witnessed in recent times make a mockery of constitutional peaceable assembly.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than by what happened in New York City last Saturday. Wholesale violation of law and order, burning the American flag, burning draft cards in quantity and in uniform. The only characterization of such conduct is disgraceful.

Why were there no arrests of these open violators of law?

For a Nobel Peace Prize recipient to play a leading role in such undermining of our Armed Forces makes public travesty of the award itself. And Carmichael's public incitations to violence should no longer be shrugged off as the rantings of a soapbox demagog. His subversive intention has been so often expressed that not even a majority of the present U.S. Supreme Court would sanction his inflammatory provocations under the first amendment.

Such conduct in the Granite State of New Hampshire would mean jail—and quickly.

Demonstrations grown out of hand are a menace to freedom.

What must our men feel who daily put their lives in the line of enemy fire for that flag, when they see such scenes on the front pages of American newspapers? When an enemy burns our flag in the streets of Hanoi, at least the motivation is understandable. But when citizens claiming to be American burn their flag in the streets of New York City, it is time for patriotic Americans to act. To be sure, these groups represent a minority and minority opinion is protected in our Republic, yet our laws should not allow such havoc in public streets of this country with its inevitable confusion in foreign capitals who look to us for guidance.

This type of protest, if not treasonable under present law, certainly represents "a clear and present danger" and should be dealt with quickly and firmly if our American values are to be protected and preserved.

BURNING THE AMERICAN FLAG

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, what is treason? The dictionary gives this definition:

> The offense of attempting by overt acts to overthrow the government of the state to which the offender owes allegiance or to kill or personally injure the sovereign or his family.

It is easy for us to recognize treason when it results in the outright killing of the heads of government or in going over to the enemy on the battlefield and turning against your own fighting forces. But what about calling a gathering of 100,000 people where the flag of our country is publicly burned and the heads of our Government are called "fools," "liars," "murderers"? Are not such acts pretty close to the dictionary definition of treason "attempting by overt acts to overthrow the Government"?

All of these things happened last Sat-

urday in New York and in San Francisco. The American flag was burned in Central Park during a meeting organized by Martin Luther King, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Stokely Carmichael, and several professors who were recent welcome guests of the Communist government in North Vietnam. Under such circumstances and while nearly a half million Americans are fighting the Communists in Vietnam, I submit that burning the flag is an act of treason. I further submit that those who are parroting the Moscow-Peking-Hanoi line for a peace which is not only defeat, but will sacrifice the freedom of South Vietnam are coming very close to treason. These misleaders cannot excuse themselves from blame for the excesses by saying they personally have no part in the desecration of the flag or the abuse of our President and other high Government officials. It was their meeting. They called it. They provided the agitation to work up the thousands into tirades of hate against America. In spite of all their pious phrases, their words and their actions and the chaos they are achieving with the result that the war in Vietnam is being prolonged and thousands of Americans will die who need not have died, are bordering on treason.

It is even worse that some of those who encourage the sort of action that took place in New York on Saturday are still serving on Government boards and agencies. Mr. Speaker, let us put an end to such activity. For the sake of America and in the name of freedom everywhere, let us sort out the traitors in our midst and, for heaven's sake, let us at least take them off the Federal payrolls.

Last week I introduced a bill, H.R. 8536, which would punish by fine and imprisonment, anyone desecrating the flag of the United States. I hope speedy action will be taken on this legislation. It is the least we can do for those we are asking to fight and die to protect our freedom.

BURNING THE AMERICAN FLAG

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of associating myself with the splendid remarks just made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

WELFARE STATE IN SWEDEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the April 24, 1967, issue of U.S. News & World Report carries an article which I believe every Member of this House should read and reread. It outlines the "dilemma in Sweden" caused by too much welfare statism. The article follows:

STOCKHOLM.—Here is a country that seems to have gone the limit in cradle-to-grave security—and finds nothing settled, problems growing, not eased.

The Swedes in a material way enjoy the highest standard of living in Western Europe. In addition to other things, they get housing subsidies, rent rebates for low-income groups, free hospitalization, subsidies for doctors' bills and drug bills, free care in childbirth, cash allowances for maternity, free higher education, sick pay, unemployment insurance and old age and disability insurance.

There is little of what can be called poverty in the nation, and there are no real slums. Racial and minority problems are nonexistent.

The Swedes have kept out of wars. Their population growth is slow.

All this and discontent. Despite their boons, people are discontented, restive. The Labor Party, which gave the people many of the supposedly wonderful social benefits, has suffered a political setback. There is a revival of left-wing Socialism and of Communism. Radical slogans are becoming fashionable.

American officials are watching Sweden's experience as the United States embarks on ever more ambitious welfare projects in the hope, or expectation, that they will solve all social problems.

The fact Americans will discover is that, after 20 years of building the world's greatest welfare state, Sweden finds most of the original problems unsolved and, in some cases, grown greater instead of fading away.

In this country, the costly welfare and educational reforms have not curbed such social ills as crime, alcoholism and drug addiction. Sweden's crime rate has doubled since 1950, with juvenile crime largely responsible.

Police are particularly worried by the steep rise in crimes of violence. During the last three years, the number of homicides and robberies, while low by U.S. standards, has climbed by 80 per cent; the number of rapes reported to police has risen by 56 per cent.

Acute alcoholism is growing fastest in the age group between 15 and 24. Drug addiction among young people is spreading like an epidemic, police say.

Officials attribute the rise in crime and antisocial behavior among youths to a deterioration in family life. It appears, these officials say, that the welfare state has not strengthened either family ties or moral standards. One comment heard in Stockholm:

"The Swedish example shows clearly that material welfare and social security are not enough to solve the social problems of our times."

Housing subsidies are one of the achievements of which the social planners are most proud.

Yet housing today is one of the worst of the messy situations troubling Sweden's welfare state.

Although home building has increased a good deal in the 1960s, Government controls, and the way they are administered, have tended to discourage the private building of homes.

The result is that Sweden, with a low population growth, is in the midst of a housing crisis much more severe than it was 20 years ago.

In 1947, the waiting list for housing accommodations in Stockholm totaled fewer than 23,000 applicants. It now includes more than 120,000 in the Swedish capital—a city of about 800,000—plus 50,000 looking for places to live in Stockholm's suburbs.

Young married couples often are forced to live with relatives. Many face a wait of 10 years before they can have homes of their own. Profiteers offer "black market" apartments for a bribe of "key money"—usually between $1,000 and $2,000 per room. Despite Government controls, rents for new apartments keep soaring. Building costs have skyrocketed.

HEALTH DEMANDS

Sweden's version of medicare is another trouble area.

Demand for medical and hospital treatment under Sweden's compulsory-health-insurance plan has expanded much faster than had been anticipated. Hospitals are so overcrowded that people with such ailments as gallstones or hernia may have to wait for more than a year before being hospitalized. In some hospitals, seriously ill and dying people are shunted into corridors because rooms are full.

Welfare, as Americans are learning, costs money.

To pay for all the "good things" offered "free" in Sweden requires taxes that are the most burdensome in Europe. It turns out that most of this load has to be borne by the people who draw most of the benefits—those in the lower and medium-income brackets. The service they receive is socialized, but paid for largely by them.

Total taxes in Sweden, including social-security taxes, now amount to 40 per cent of the gross national product, up from 31.3 per cent in 1960.

The Swedish tax load is at least one-third heavier than in the United States—which has enormous military expenses. In Sweden, cost of welfare is twice that of defense.

Workers in the lower and middle income brackets pay in taxes twice as much as Americans in the same brackets. Examples: A married Swede with an income of $5,000 a year pays 25 per cent of that in income and social-security taxes. A single man earning $5,000 a year pays 35 per cent. On an annual income of $10,000, the tax rate for married persons is 37 per cent; that for single persons, 44 per cent. On incomes of $20,000, the "take" in Sweden is 48 per cent for married couples, 52 per cent for those who are single.

Consumer taxes, too, keep going up. A general sales tax, introduced in 1960, was first levied at a rate of 4.2 per cent. In addition, indirect taxes on tobacco, liquor, autos and gasoline have gone up time and again. So have special welfare taxes levied on employers and employes.

Taxes represent two-thirds of what a person pays for a gallon of gasoline, 80 per cent of the price of a package of cigarettes, up to 90 per cent on the price of a bottle of liquor.

A recent study shows that a Swedish family with just $3,000 of taxable income pays 38 per cent in direct, indirect and social-security taxes; a family with $6,000 of income pays about 45 per cent—and the burden grows in size as income increases.

Yet so voracious is the appetite of the welfare programs for money that higher taxes have failed to wipe out Government budget deficits. As revenues go up, new social-welfare programs are started. These along with other spending keep the Government in the red, adding to inflationary pressures.

Wage-price spiral. Consumer prices have more than doubled in Sweden since 1950. Living costs have risen 30 per cent since 1960, compared with 12 per cent in the U.S.

In this welfare state, wages and salaries have risen even faster than prices, but higher taxes have swallowed most of the gains in pay.

Wage inflation now is beginning to undermine the competitive position of some industries. As a result, workers are beginning to be laid off as employers are forced to cut labor costs. Unemployment has climbed to the highest level since 1959—close to 3 per cent of the labor force.

Widespread discontent over high taxes, inflation, the housing shortages and other flaws in the welfare state led to a setback for the Labor Government headed by Prime Minister Tage Erlander in last autumn's elections. Voter support for the Labor Party dropped to 42 per cent from 50 per cent in 1962.

Sweden's top Communist, Carl-Henrik Hermansson, has greater popularity than any Communist has ever before enjoyed in Sweden. He is urging more-drastic economic controls as well as higher taxes on big business and wealthy people to ease the squeeze on those with low incomes.

New "radical" moves. The Labor Government hopes to arrest the trend toward the left by making "radical" moves. One recent example is a Government plan for a state-run bank to facilitate and control industrial development. In a move to spread the tax burden, capital-gains taxes have been boosted.

As the Labor Government moves leftward to meet the Communist challenge, it loses support from business and other "moderate" elements. Good relations between the Government and business, traditional in Sweden, are deteriorating and a period of instability may lie ahead.

So when you look behind the facade of Sweden's "Great Society" you find a disturbing picture—a picture of developing crisis, not one of social problems solved and a nation having discovered the formula for contentment.

Here in Stockholm, suggestions are heard that the U.S. Congress, inundated with new ideas and new plans for bigger and broader benefits to be financed by taxpayers, might take a long, hard look at what has happened in Sweden.

SOVIET NUCLEAR STRATEGY

Mr. HOSMER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the nuclear affairs committee of the House Republican conference from time to time issues background material for the use of its members. The following data relative to Soviet nuclear strategy has just been issued:

APRIL 16, 1967.

From: Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Chairman, Nuclear Affairs Committee.
To: House Republican Conference.
Subject: Soviet Nuclear Strategy.

PLEASE NOTE

Events in Viet Nam should not divert our attention from other vital ramparts which must be watched. Article I (8) (1) of the Constitution establishes in the Congress the power—and therefore the duty—to "provide for the common defense." This material is furnished the House GOP Conference to assist its members in the execution of that duty. It is based on military strategy discussions *inside* the Soviet Union amongst its leading military figures. These include, but are not limited to, the following: Marshals Sokolovsky, Sacharov, Rotmistrov and Malinovsky; Colonel-Generals Lomov and Schtemenko and Major-General Tscherednitschenko. To a substantial extent the conclusions here drawn are confirmed by what is known of the USSR's military budget, its inventory of military manpower, weapons and equipment and disposition thereof, and plans and construction in progress.

MILITARY STRATEGY AND MARX-LENINIST DOGMA

The Soviet military establishment reflects both the natural and political environments which created it. Its structure and doctrines are responsive to both. Marx-Leninist concepts particularly influencing Soviet military structure and strategy are:

1. The communist and non-communist worlds are totally incompatible and thus in an inescapable conflict which must proceed until one conquers the other—and the conqueror shall be the communist world.

2. The conflict itself will be a protracted one waged over a wide spectrum of actions ranging from non-violent to most-violent, i.e. "cold war" through "hot war."

3. In order to speed the day of final victory, the particular amount of violence to be applied by the communist world at any particular place or time is the greatest amount that can be employed without serious risk of breaking the next rule. (*Note*: current differences between Soviet and Chinese Communist leaders revolve largely around the degree of violence which should be applied at the moment.)

4. Do not escalate up the scale of violence to a point which invites a non-communist opponent to respond with violence that will do unacceptable damage to the communist homeland and base of power. (*Note:* U.S. strategic nuclear retaliatory forces are maintained in practical recognition of this Marx-Leninist concept.)

NUCLEAR WEAPONS PERMEATE SOVIET STRATEGIC THINKING

Nuclear weapons, and more especially strategic nuclear weapons, occupy a predominant place in the strategic thinking of Soviet military commanders. These weapons have been introduced as the principal means of destruction in all Army units. In addition to this they fix the basic principles and procedures for military operations by the armed forces, including the Navy.

SURPRISE ATTACK

Soviet military and political leaders are no less acutely aware of the advantage of surprise in the initiation of hostilities, particularly intercontinental nuclear hostilities, than other nationalities. They admit that technical developments, such as anti-missile defenses, can reduce the risk of surprise attack. In fact they make no bones about being in the process of installing them. They allege a fear of a U.S. "first strike" surprise attack. However, another interpretation of their protective effort is that its primary purpose is to thwart our retaliation after they have struck first. (*Note*: This is relevant to the current U.S. discussions relative to ABM deployment.)

In any event, their respect for surprise attack is such that Soviet doctrine requires both (a) "hardening" of strategic missile sites and (b) maintenance of strategic nuclear forces on permanent alert.

ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING CURRENT SOVIET MILITARY STRATEGY

The military strategy of the Soviet Union today is based on the following assumptions of fact:

1. The United States has become the economic, political and military mainspring of "aggressive imperialism."

2. After World War II the center of non-communist world power shifted from Europe to the U.S.A. and remains here.

3. Under existing conditions a war between major powers of the non-communist world is unlikely.

4. The next war will be a war between communist and non-communist powers, specifically between the Soviet Union and the West.

5. The next world war will be a nuclear conflict involving the use of ballistic missiles.

a. Such a war, however, cannot be waged with nuclear weapons alone and will require substantial conventional forces.

b. It may be of long duration and call for the utmost effort by all the armed forces involved.

c. It will bear the character of a coalition war and, from a spatial angle, be of tremendous dimensions.

d. Military operations will be intercontinental in scope and the role of space will undergo a fundamental change.

e. The struggle for mastery of the seas will take place mainly below the water, since surface vessels equipped with even the most up-to-date technical devices will prove too vulnerable.

f. As the initial phase of a nuclear war is of decisive importance to its ultimate outcome, armies will no longer occupy the leading position, but will be superseded by strategic missile forces.

g. Development and maintenance of armies cannot be neglected, however, for they are still indispensable, even in the nuclear war, for the complete elimination of the enemy and his defeat.

6. Strong nuclear armaments contribute to the maintenance of peace. Scientist and soldier must continuously develop new nuclear weapons' strength in order:

a. To keep the choice of time of initiating hostilities from slipping to the enemy.

b. To be able to suppress to the extent possible the enemy's damage inflicting capabilities when hostilities commence.

SOVIET NUCLEAR STRATEGY EVOLVES (1965–66)

Based on secrets stolen from the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory by the atomic master spy Klaus Fuchs and similar espionage, the Soviet Union early claimed membership card No. 3 in the world's "Nuclear Club." By the mid-1950s it achieved a respectable stockpile of A-bombs and H-bombs. A quick shift was made in strategic thinking from emphasis on massive conventional armies to emphasis on strategic missilery. Naval efforts concentrated on building a nuclear submarine fleet. During this period the "Thirty Minute War" concept took hold and Khrushchev even ordered some rather substantial cutbacks in the Red Army's size.

Soon, however, the Red high command regained its regard for heavy investments in conventional forces. It became apparent that conventional military adventures of considerable extent might still be carried on under an umbrella of mutual deterrence. Events in Korea and Vietnam have proved this out.

Further, the idea came into being that the deterrent umbrella might even be big enough to permit carrying on limited nuclear war. In this event tactical battlefield nuclear weapons would be employed extensively, while the major combatants withhold using strategic nuclear warheads against targets outside the battlefield.

It is impossible to determine whether or not Soviet military leaders privately believe limited nuclear war can be kept limited. Many shrewd observers believe they do. However, Soviet political leaders to a man insist on the inevitability of escalation. They believe that if this story can be sold, the fear of escalation will render impotent the United States' rather substantial tactical nuclear capability created to deter a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. (*Note*: Secretary McNamara's recent withdrawal from Europe of Davey Crockett tactical nuclear warheads.)

In any event, further experience with nuclear weapons on both sides of the Iron curtain has revealed much that was unknown in the mid-1950s about their capabilities. It also has revealed much about their limitations. As a consequence the "Thirty Minute War" concept has been discarded by Soviet military strategists. Now it is believed the initial strategic nuclear exchange can fix the eventual outcome of a fairly prolonged war, but only by following up an initial advantage with large-scale conventional operations.

Khrushchev's Red Army cutbacks were short lived. Under Brezhnev and Kosygin, Soviet forces have been kept large, made flexible and mobile, and logistics systems tailored to supplying swiftly moving combat troops engaged in exploiting advantages gained by

surprise attack throughout a very large theater of operations.

A further reason seen by Soviet high commanders for substantial troop strength is insurance against technical developments which might preclude or hamper the use of strategic nuclear rockets. Based on this Soviet armored units and parachute brigades both have been beefed up.

SOVIET WORLD WAR III SCENARIO

As seen by L. J. M. van den Berk writing in NATO's Fifteen Nations (1965–1966 Winter Edition) the Soviet scenario for World War III is as follows:

"Rocket troops form the chief component of the whole military machine. Their task is to destroy, by means of intercontinental and medium-range ballistic missiles—aimed respectively at the U.S.A. and Europe—strategic targets in the enemy's rear as well as groupings of his armed forces and other important targets on the various battlefields.

"Together with the nuclear submarine and the strategic air arm they will dominate the initial phase of nuclear hostilities—in which they may be supported by other rocket troops for tactical purposes.

"Immediately after this first nuclear strike, paratroops will be dropped over the adversary's territory so that they may quickly exploit the gains. Then ground forces are thrown into action, their first task being to engage and eliminate any fighting units that still remain intact on enemy territory.

"At the same time the Navy takes action to support landing operations in coastal waters, to intercept convoys and to destroy naval installations. For this purpose the Soviet High Command relies primarily on nuclear-powered submarines supported by missile-carrying aircraft.

"The armies then take the offensive. Their operations have to be carried out very swiftly in large-scale maneuvers and in different regions simultaneously.

"As stable and continuous fronts will be practically non-existent, the armies will be engaged mainly in mobile fighting, which must be done with close cooperation between armored divisions, aircraft and paratroop units. They will no longer advance in skirmishing order, but in small dispersed units which can operate independently.

"Mopping up operations will continue until all pockets of resistance—organized or unorganized—are destroyed and Soviet forces are in total control."

A $400 MILLION TAX TRIBUTE TO THIRD-CLASS MAILERS

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, midnight tonight is the deadline for the payment of the Federal income tax. I would like to point out that $400 million of the taxpayers' money will go toward the deficit which has been created by the junk-mailers, those who mail third-class mail and create a deficit of $400 million annually. This is a tax tribute of $2 on the average on the part of every man, woman, and child in the country and, of course, inasmuch as every individual American is not a taxpayer and many pay more than others, the tax tribute paid on behalf of third-class mailers can be pretty high for some. I am hopeful that the Congress will take positive action and sharply increase the postage rates on third-class mail so that the third-class mail will pay its way.

An article from the Washington Post on the subject of third-class mail is as follows:

AT WIT'S END

(By Erma Bombeck)

The EDITOR, SCHNOOK MAGAZINE,
New York City, N.Y.

Dear EDITOR: Ordinarily, I do not answer letters sent to me in plain, brown envelopes with a bulk rate stamp and permit number in the upper right hand corner. Obviously, from the familiar tone of your letter, we do know each other and you are doing a little under-the-table embezzling from your mailing department. (Now, now, we all take a paper clip now and again.)

I'll admit at first I was a bit suspicious, as the name did not ring a bell. However, when I spit on my finger and rubbed it over your signature, it smeared and that's good enough for me.

First, about that plaintive little message you scribbled on the envelope, "I hate to lose an old friend." What kind of a friend would desert a man who's a little down on his luck and selling magazine subscriptions?

About the check you enclosed which would give us "Schnook" magazine for 15 years at a saving of $145. My husband and I talked it over and we can't let you do it. We have destroyed the check. You may bill us for the full price. Come to think of it, you must be the one we met on a street corner in New York last spring who wanted to cut us in on his wonderful invention to do away with air pollution. Incidentally, how is that crazy extension cord for electric automobiles coming? We have always been sorry we couldn't swing it.

Well, enough about business. How is that family of yours? We are all fine. Last summer we vacationed in Michigan as the guests of another old friend whom we had forgotten until he wrote us a letter in a plain, brown envelope with a permit like yours.

His name was Tom Travel and he worked for a gasoline company. He wrote us such a nice note about how he valued us as friends and hoped he could count on our business for another year. We dropped in on him just to reminisce about the good times.

Now, for the exciting part. We are taking the kids to New York during spring vacation. We know they would be disappointed if they couldn't spend at least two or three days with you. Don't fuss. We've slept on roll-away beds before. As you said in your letter, "Old friends are the best." If this is not convenient, you have us in your personal address book, I'm sure.

Sincerely,

"OCCUPANT," U.S.A.

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF MRS. PHOEBE APPERSON HEARST, COFOUNDER OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it always gives me great pride to see American citizens given public recognition for their outstanding contributions to our Nation. It gives me even greater pride to know that one of these great Americans was a native of Franklin County, Mo., in my congressional district.

This December will mark the 125th anniversary of the birth of Mrs. Phoebe Apperson Hearst. Mrs. Hearst was a remarkable woman and is best known as the cofounder of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Her most valuable contributions to our country were in the field of education. It is only fitting that such a great American woman should be given public recognition for her great work in fostering education and the Parent Teachers Association.

For some time now, efforts have been generated throughout the country to obtain approval of a commemorative stamp to honor Mrs. Hearst. As Congressman from the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri, I have had special interest in the issuance of a postage stamp to honor this great American lady.

Mrs. Hearst's outstanding contributions to education are known not only in Missouri, but throughout the United States.

Several State legislatures have passed resolutions memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States for issuance of a Phoebe Apperson Hearst Commemorative Stamp.

Each year the Post Office Department receives far more meritorious requests for commemorative stamps than the 15 they issue annually. I regret that a postage stamp for Mrs. Hearst was not included in the recommendations of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee to the Postmaster General this year.

However, the Postmaster General is well aware of the work of this outstanding woman, and intends to give future consideration to issuance of a stamp in her honor on some significant anniversary of the Parent-Teacher Association movement.

In connection with the great interest of citizens throughout the United States to give public recognition to Mrs. Hearst, I herewith insert in the RECORD the Senate concurrent resolution passed by the Missouri State senate, memorializing the Postmaster General for issuance of a Phoebe Apperson Hearst Commemorative Stamp:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 8

Memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States for issuance of a commemorative postage stamp

Whereas, Phoebe Apperson Hearst was a great American woman humanitarian and philanthropist who is noted as the cofounder of the Parent Teachers Association and the organizer of the Travelers Aid Society and as being instrumental in the restoring of Mount Vernon; and

Whereas, by her generosity and consciousness of the tremendous requirements of education today, Mrs. Hearst gave millions of dollars to education and has properly become known as the "greatest single benefactor" of the University of California; and

Whereas, it is only fitting and proper that recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp be given to Phoebe Apperson Hearst for her multitudinous projects and activities;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring therein that the General Assembly of the State of Missouri memorialize the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Phoebe Apperson Hearst; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Missouri in the Congress of the United States.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SUCCESS AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] on his statement and join him in what he has had to say with reference to the Punta del Este Conference and its accomplishments.

All who have followed the proceedings at Punta del Este were witness to one of the most remarkable demonstrations of statesmanship by an American President in modern times.

President Johnson voiced America's friendship with a quality of sincerity which disarmed his severest critics. His appeal for a fervent dedication to social and economic development without regard to petty differences and quarrels inspired a new sense of confidence and determination. The high hopes of Punta del Este in 1961 were born anew.

In my view the new Declaration of the Presidents is worthy of this Nation and its American partners. It is based on our historic unity. It is a document to cherish because it is forged from principles and ideals, not tied to financial commitments. I believe it will win wide support in the other Republics.

The President made no promises which his countrymen and Congress cannot wholeheartedly support. Neither did he offer gimmicks or prizes.

We can support Latin America's physical and economic integration because that represents a logical plan for mobilizing the hemisphere's vast resources for the good of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the favorable outcome of Punta del Este in 1967 reflects the fact that the President conducted himself as an equal partner in the Alliance for Progress. He listened patiently and spoke with utter candor.

President Johnson's success at Punta del Este is a notable tribute to the excellent planning and preparation which preceded this historic mission. The United States and her sister Republics are the true beneficiaries of this labor.

I insert at this point President Johnson's statement at the summit meeting along with his closing statement and a draft of the declaration:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT AT SUMMIT SESSION, APRIL 12

(Following is the text of a statement made by President Johnson Wednesday at an informal and closed meeting of the Inter-American Summit Conference:)

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Chiefs of State:

I shall be presenting some thoughts on the agenda of our conference tomorrow, but as we enter into our private discussion of the Declaration before us which our Foreign Ministers have prepared, I wish to make a few specific observations.

First, I want to restate my support of the program which you have set for yourselves.

In my message to the Congress on March 13, I recommended increased financial assistance to your countries in the areas covered by the Declaration before me: Economic integration, multinational projects, agriculture, education, and health. This represents my convictions and my policy today.

The decisions which you take here—and the follow-up action which you take in the months ahead—will enable me to pursue that policy.

Second, I wish to state my country's position on how we might assist in expanding Latin American trade.

Much of our thought and work in the Hemisphere has centered in recent years on ways to expand the volume and the value of Latin American exports.

We all know that basically the answer lies in the diversification of agriculture and in making overly protected Latin American industry competitive and efficient. This is one of the reasons that we all support Latin American economic integration.

But we wish to be as helpful as we can in this transitional period in Latin American history.

We are now devoting a major effort to try to make the Kennedy Round negotiations a success. If they succeed, they will help us all—including Latin America.

But the process of freeing trade from unnecessary restrictions will not come to an end when the current important Kennedy Round negotiations are completed.

We have been examining the kind of trade initiatives that the U.S. should propose in the years ahead. We are convinced that our future trade policy must pay special attention to the needs of the developing countries in Latin America and elsewhere in the world.

We have been exploring with other major industrialized countries what practical steps can be taken to increase the export earnings of all developing countries. We recognize that comparable tariff treatment may not always permit developing countries to advance as rapidly as desired. Temporary tariff advantages for all developing countries by all industrialized countries would be one way to deal with this.

We think this idea is worth pursuing. We will be discussing it further with members of our Congress, with business and labor leaders, and we will seek the cooperation of other Governments in the world trading community to see whether a broad consensus can be reached along these lines.

We also recognize the very special importance for certain Latin American countries of earnings from coffee exports. In our programs for assistance for agricultural development, we are already helping prevent chronic surpluses. As a further step in this direction, we are prepared to lend $15 million to the proposed International Coffee Diversification and Development Fund with the understanding that the coffee producing countries agree to contribute $30–$50 million per year over the next five years, and to lend up to $15 million more to match contributions by other coffee-consuming members of the International Coffee Agreement.

I have been informed of the great importance which you attach to the use of Alliance for Progress funds to finance procurement in other Alliance for Progress countries as well as in the United States. I know that you are all aware of the United States balance of payments problems and we deeply appreciate your cooperation in helping us meet them.

The cooperative nature of our Alliance is very important to me. I want you to know that we shall undertake consultations on this matter. We shall try to establish whether we can agree that aid funds for capital projects and related technical assistance can be used in Alliance for Progress countries in ways which will protect the U.S. balance of payments.

The final point I would make has to do with the Declaration which is before us. As the political leaders of our countries we have the responsibility to translate complex issues into understandable language for our people. The decisions reached at this meeting are complicated decisions. Though essential to the progress and prosperity of our people, they may seem removed from pressing everyday needs, unless we extract them from the language of the economists and diplomats—on whom we so greatly rely.

I know that when I return home, I shall try to make clear to our people these basic decisions we have made together. And I am sure you will all wish to do the same.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CLOSING STATEMENT AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

(Following is the text of a statement released today by President Johnson at the close of the Hemispheric Summit Conference:)

The leaders of the Americas met in Bogota and Punta del Este six years ago to inaugurate one of the most audacious programs in the annals of mankind.

The goal was to demonstrate that freedom and economic development are not enemies—that massive social and political transformations can be accomplished without the lash of dictatorship, or the spur of terror.

That was a time to state the challenge. The years that have passed prove beyond any doubt that the nations and peoples of the Americas responded creatively to this challenge.

We returned to Punta del Este for an assessment of our achievements and our future obligations. We met in a spirit of candor, with a full realization of the scope of the problems that confront us.

We have looked at the past and the future with cold realism, knowing that our cause will not be served by either naive optimism or cynical pessimism.

We have learned much, and much that we have learned confirms the judgment of Ecclesiastes that he who increaseth wisdom, increaseth sorrow. We have long since abandoned the view that rhetoric could alter a social system—or that blueprints could guarantee economic growth.

Economic and social development is a task not for sprinters but for long-distance runners.

We know now that transforming the lives of over two hundred and fifty million people requires a commitment to specifics. It requires a fierce—a stubborn—dedication to those undramatic, day-to-day attainments that are the sinews of economic and social progress. This is especially true of the United States and Latin America.

We are greatly impressed by the steps that have been taken—the progress made by Latin America in recent years. We are also impressed by the high level of cooperation that has developed among the proudly independent nations of the Americas.

In my judgment, this has been an extremely valuable conference. We have set our priorities for the next stage.

First, we have made some vital structural commitments. The fulfillment of these objectives will not only be a major accomplishment in its own right, but will make possible wide-ranging improvements presently beyond our reach.

The Latin American Common Market, once achieved, will alter the whole economy of the Hemisphere, and will have consequences in every sector of social and political organization. Multi-national projects—opening

the way for the movement of people, goods, electricity—will have a similar impact.

Second, we have moved to deal with a number of immediate problems:

To expand Latin American trade.

To modernize Latin American agriculture and increase food production to meet the needs of an expanding population.

To combat illiteracy and improve educational systems.

To provide access to the latest scientific and technological developments, and so to help bridge the technological gap.

To expand health measures so that the latest fruits of medical science will be at the disposal of all our people.

To eliminate unnecessary military spending.

The first phase of the Alliance has been a success by any realistic standard.

The second phase is now under way. It will cut to the heart of the problem—the modernization of over-protected Latin American industry, under-financed Latin American agriculture and education. It will be difficult and demanding. It will require sustained effort.

The American people have responded generously to the needs of their fellow Americans, and I am sure that our friends in Latin America realize that we can be depended upon in the long struggle that will follow, as we could in the beginning of the Alliance.

I return to my country in good heart for this reason. I have met all of the Presidents of the Latin American Republics—and the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago. I am convinced that the leaders of Latin America are serious and determined to develop their nations. And I believe the people of the United States will continue to respond to their efforts.

DRAFT DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY PRESIDENTS AT SUMMIT MEETING, PUNTA DEL ESTE, AS APPROVED BY FOREIGN MINISTERS

The Presidents of the American States and the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago meeting in Punta del Este, Oriental Republic of Uruguay,

Resolved to give more dynamic and concrete expression to the ideals of Latin American unity and of solidarity among the peoples of America, which inspired the founders of our countries;*

Determined to make this objective a reality within our own nations, in keeping with the economic, social and cultural aspirations of our peoples;

Inspired by the principles which underlie the Pan-American system, especially those contained in the Charter of Punta del Este, the economic and social act of Rio de Janeiro and the protocol of Buenos Aires amending the Charter of the Organization of American States;

Conscious that the attainment of national and regional development objectives in Latin America is based essentially on self-help;

Convinced, however, that the achievement of those objectives requires determined collaboration by all our countries, complementary support through mutual aid and expansion of external cooperation;

Pledged to give a vigorous impetus to the Alliance for Progress and to emphasize its multilateral character, with a view to encouraging balanced development of the region at a substantially faster pace than attained thus far;

United in the intent to strengthen democratic institutions, to raise the living standards of our peoples and to assure their increased participation in the development process, creating in these purposes suitable conditions as much in the political as in the economic, social and labor fields;

Resolved to maintain a social harmony and fraternal relations in the Americas, where true racial equality must prevail.

We proclaim the solidarity of the countries we represent and their decision to achieve to the fullest measure the free, just, and democratic social order demanded by the peoples of the hemisphere.

LATIN AMERICA WILL CREATE A COMMON MARKET

The Presidents of the Latin American Republics agree to create progressively from 1970 the Latin American Common Market which must be substantially in operation in a period of no more than fifteen years. The Latin American Market will be based on the complete development and progressive convergence of the Latin American Free Trade Association and of the Central American Common Market, taking into account the interests of the Latin American countries not yet affiliated with these systems. This great task will reinforce our historic bonds, will promote industrial development and the strengthening of Latin American industrial enterprises with more efficient production and new opportunities for employment, and will permit the region to play its deservedly significant role in world affairs. The ties of friendship among the peoples of the continent will thus be strengthened.

The President of the United States of America, for his part, declares his firm support for this promising Latin American initiative.

WE WILL LAY THE PHYSICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR LATIN AMERICAN ECONOMIC INTEGRATION THROUGH MULTINATIONAL PROJECTS

The undersigned Presidents affirm that economic integration demands a major sustained effort to build a land transportation network and to improve transportation systems of all kinds so as to open the way for the movement of both people and goods throughout the continent; to establish an adequate and efficient telecommunications system; to install inter-connected power systems; and to develop jointly international river basins, frontier regions, and economic areas which include the territory of two or more countries.

WE WILL JOIN IN EFFORTS TO INCREASE SUBSTANTIALLY LATIN AMERICAN FOREIGN TRADE EARNINGS

In order to increase substantially Latin American foreign trade earnings, individual and joint efforts shall be directed toward facilitating non-discriminatory access of Latin American products in the world markets; toward increasing Latin American earnings from traditional exports; toward avoiding frequent fluctuations in income from such commodities; and finally, toward adopting measures that will stimulate exports of Latin American manufactured products.

WE WILL MODERNIZE THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF OUR RURAL POPULATIONS, RAISE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY IN GENERAL, AND INCREASE FOOD PRODUCTION FOR THE BENEFIT OF BOTH LATIN AMERICA AND THE REST OF THE WORLD

We will transform the living conditions of the rural workers and farmers of Latin America, to guarantee their full participation in economic and social progress. For that purpose integrated programs of modernization, land settlement, and agrarian reform will be carried out as the countries so require. Similarly, productivity will be improved and agricultural production diversified. Furthermore, recognizing that the continent's capacity for food production entails a dual responsibility, a special effort will be made to produce sufficient food for the growing needs of our own peoples and to contribute toward feeding the peoples of other regions.

WE WILL VIGOROUSLY PROMOTE EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

In order to give a decisive impetus to education for development, our literacy campaigns will be intensified, education at all levels will be greatly expanded and its quality improved so that the rich human potential of our peoples may make their maximum contribution to the economic, social and cultural development of Latin America, our educational systems will be modernized taking full advantage of educational innovations, and exchanges of teachers and students will be increased. Latin America will share in the benefits of current scientific and technological progress so as to reduce the widening gap between it and the highly industrialized nations in the areas of production techniques and of living conditions.

WE WILL HARNESS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO THE SERVICE OF OUR PEOPLE

National scientific and technological programs will be developed and strengthened and a regional program will be started; multinational institutes for advanced training and research will be established; existing institutes of this type in Latin America will be at the same time be strengthened and contributions will be made to the exchange and advancement of technological knowledge.

WE WILL EXPAND PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLES

The fundamental role of health in the economic and social development of Latin America demands that the prevention and control of communicable diseases be intensified and that measures be taken to eradicate those which can be completely eliminated by existing techniques, and that programs to supply drinking water and other essential sanitary services for urban and rural areas will be speeded up.

LATIN AMERICA WILL ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The Presidents of Latin American Republics, conscious of the importance of armed forces to the maintenance of security, recognize at the same time that the demands of economic development and social progress make it necessary to devote to those purposes the maximum resources available in Latin America.

Therefore, they express their intention to limit military expenditures in proportion to the actual demands of national security in accordance with each country's constitutional provisions avoiding those expenditures that are not indispensable for the performance of the specific duties of the armed forces and, where pertinent, of international commitments that obligate their respective governments. With regard to the treaty on the banning of nuclear arms in Latin America, they expressed the hope that it may enter into force as soon as possible, once the requirements established by the treaty are fulfilled.

In facing the problems considered in this meeting, which constitute a challenge to the will of the American Governments and peoples, the Presidents proclaim their faith in the basic purpose of the inter-American system: To promote in the Americas free and democratic societies, existing under the rule of law, whose dynamic economics, reinforced by growing technological capabilities, will allow them to serve with ever increasing effectiveness the peoples of the continent.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include President Johnson's statement at the summit session on April 12, and President Johnson's closing statement at Punta del Este, with

---

* Wherever the term "Latin America" is used in this text, it is to be understood that it includes all the member states of the OAS save the United States of America. The term "Presidents" also includes the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago. The term "Continent" comprises both the continental and insular areas.

a draft of the declaration to be signed by the Presidents at the summit meeting as approved by the Foreign Ministers.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the items mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma, there was an editorial in yesterday's New York Times by James Reston, which I believe is a very fairminded appraisal of the results of this conference. I ask unanimous consent that this article might be included following the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

PUNTA DEL ESTE: THE FERTILE GIANT

(By James Reston)

PUNTA DEL ESTE, April 15.—Even on the most modest assumptions, the conference of the American Presidents at Punta del Este was an admirable and maybe even significant occasion.

After a hundred years of dreaming rhetoric, Latin America has plenty to be modest about. Presidents do not really preside over the turbulent life of this fertile giant. Words, it seems, do not divert the waters of the Amazon or conquer the terrifying altitudes of the Andes. Nor is it clear that these nations are governable in their present state of human fertility, poverty and ignorance. But within the narrow limits of political influence, the conversations here were useful.

THE POSITIVE SIDE

At least they influenced for a few days the attitudes of influential men on both sides of the Rio Grande. Instead of concentrating on their separate national problems, the Presidents dealt with their common problems. Instead of talking about the divisive demons of history and ideology, they talked about the stubborn problems of geography. Instead of talking about themselves and the past, they talked about the continent and future.

In the process, it was possible to see, not change but the possibility of change. Latin America had doubts about the sincerity of Washington's purpose in supporting a common market in Latin America. Why should the powerful *gringo* of the North want a unified Latin America? Why not keep the nations below the Rio Grande weak and divided and dominated by Washington's policies and Wall Street's capital?

PERSUASIVE THEME

President Johnson helped minimize these ancient fears. He talked about the weakness and division of Latin America as a threat, not only to the civil order of the Latin states, but as a threat to the security of the United States. He put forward his theme, not as an act of generosity, but of national self-interest for the United States, and there is some evidence that he managed to persuade the other Presidents that he was genuinely for a strong Latin America that could achieve in unity a more equal partnership with the United States.

This was one important imponderable. Another was that the idea of a cooperative interdependent Latin America moved in this conference from the level of technical discussion to the arena of political decision. Latin America has been developing for many years a growing company of expert economic and social technicians who recognize that even the largest and most advanced of these nations cannot compete alone in the modern world of science and technology. But their concepts, like Keynesian economics, remained textbook theories until they became an issue for political decision at the highest levels of government. And this is what happened at Punta del Este: the Presidents accepted the integration concepts of the technicians and committed themselves to try to transform them into policy.

Also, this conference provided a forum for political leaders of continental scale. The Presidents of the Latin-American republics have been isolated figures in their own seperate areas, like Governors in the United States, with limited constituencies. But at this conference, all of Latin America heard the voices of men like President Eduardo Frei of Chile and President Fernando Belaunde of Peru, and these two men—to mention only two—demonstrated that Latin America is producing wide-ranging political minds worthy of comparison with any political leaders in the present world.

At the very least, this conference was an educational experience for all the participants, including Lyndon Johnson, who conducted himself with great dignity and sympathetic understanding. He made many friends here and discovered in the process that money is not the only, and maybe not even the main answer to an effective hemispheric policy.

"No external aid," President Frei of Chile said, "can replace our own domestic effort.... The alternatives cannot be ignored: either there is a way leading to a free human society, or we shall inevitably fall into disorder and violence. . . ."

"Appeal to our peoples," President Belaunde of Peru said, "in the conviction that the solution to their problems lies within themselves. . . . It does not depend on a given credit or loan which might be convenient. . . . I say it will depend above all on their own will to work. . . ."

RAYS OF HOPE

It is far too early to talk, as many here are now doing, of "turning points" and "new eras," but there are some important glimmerings among these most deprived peoples.

Not so many years ago, many people were fearing that the whole of Latin America might go the way of Cuba, with Castro talking of the Andes becoming the Sierra Maestra of South America. The theme, as least, is different now. They are talking about developing the River Platte into a vast productive international transportation and industrial system, of conquering the Amazon, and mastering the Andes, and binding the continent together with a common communications network via satellite.

Maybe it is just talk; that depends on the implementation of the Punta del Este concepts, but it is pretty good talk reaching out for what Lyndon Johnson called a New America.

BEEF IMPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. REIFEL. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] in introducing legislation to tighten controls on meat imports.

My bill (H.R. 8505) and Mr. MARTIN's bill (H.R. 8293) would bring under import quotas all processed, canned and prepared beef and veal shipped into the country. Because this category of meat imports is not covered by the Meat Import Act of 1964, some 1.2 billion pounds of these products were imported last year.

These bills also would eliminate the 10-percent above-quota-imports "trigger clause." The President would be required to impose import restrictions when the predetermined base figure of 905 million pounds annually of imports has been reached. At present the President has discretionary authority to impose restrictions only after the damage has been done and imports have reached 995 million pounds.

I join Congressman MARTIN in urging the House Ways and Means Committee to take early action on this legislation. No other State in the Union is more severely hurt by excessive meat imports than is South Dakota, where more than 70 percent of farm income is derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products.

Some interest in stepped-up school lunch program purchases by the Agriculture Department has been expressed by the American National Cattlemen's Association. While it would be helpful to have a 90-day supply of imports removed from the market, I point out that this is but a stopgap solution. What we really need to strengthen the position of the American livestock producer faced with sagging prices is a strengthening of the Import Act of 1964 through legislative action by Congress.

Many of us warned the act was inadequate at the time it was passed. I believe events of the intervening years have proven this thesis.

In January of this year alone, imports of fresh, frozen, and chilled beef climbed 51 percent over the figure for the same month a year earlier.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in my remarks two items of printed material. The first is the GTA Daily Radio Roundup of Wednesday, April 12, 1967, reporting on the Minnesota poll finding, wherein more than 7 out of 10 Minnesota residents, or 72 percent, feel the American farmer is not getting a fair return for his products and 57 percent would be willing to pay higher food prices if it would assure a higher return for the farmer.

The second item is my current newsletter, Reifel Shots, of April 11, 1967, in which I discussed the current position of the farmer and available means to assist him.

The items follow:

[From the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, Apr. 12, 1967]

For whatever reasons, agriculture's image seems to be improving in Minnesota. This may well be true in other states also. Nonfarm people seem to understand better the problems of farmers.

We say that because of a poll taken recently by the Minneapolis Tribune. This is the Minnesota Poll, which is widely recognized and quoted. Here, in summary, is what the poll shows:

More than seven out of ten Minnesota people, 72 percent, think the nation's farmers are not getting a fair return for their products.

A majority of the Minnesota public, 57 percent, would be willing to pay higher food prices if it meant higher income for farmers.

Some of those polled, of course, think that farmers are getting a fair return now. The percentage thinking that is 21 percent in this Minnesota Poll. But a year ago 38 percent thought farmers were doing all right, and two years ago it was 28 percent. So the percentage that think farmers are getting a fair return is doing down.

As we said, 57 percent of the Minnesotans said they would be willing to pay higher food prices if farmers benefited. But 36 percent said they would not. Those are state-wide percentages.

The Minnesota Poll breaks this down in various ways. It found that 60 percent of the men, but only 53 percent of the women, would be willing to pay higher food prices.

In the larger Minnesota cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth 48 percent of the people would pay higher food prices. That same percentage held in the smaller cities.

The percentage went up significantly to 67 percent in the towns of Minnesota. Townspeople, of course, are close to agriculture. They understand what is happening in the country. They know first-hand that farm families spend more when their incomes improve, and the towns are the first to feel that additional spending. So it is understandable that 67 percent of the townspeople would be willing to pay more for their food to improve farm incomes. That's significantly higher than the 48 percent in the larger cities.

How about farmers . . . would they be willing to pay more for food? In this Minnesota Poll 80 percent of the farmers said they would. These days, you know, farm families buy food from the stores just as city families do. They don't live off the land, so this overwhelming farm willingness to pay more for food is significant.

Going back to that question of whether or not farmers get a fair return for their products, 94 percent of the farmers polled said they do not. The state-wide percentage, you'll remember, is 72.

This Minnesota Poll would seem to indicate that Washington's great fears about consumer unhappiness over food prices are not founded in fact.

(By Congressman BEN REIFEL)

WASHINGTON.—For a long time I have maintained that big-city consumers wouldn't mind paying higher grocery bills if they understood the farmer's plight and could be assured he was getting the increase. Consumer resentment is understandable when all they hear about from their politicians is "farm subsidies." They need some education.

Secretary Freeman has made some useful statements on the subject. But not until farmers were dumping milk on the ground, in an effort to get a 2-cent-a-quart increase, did his department take action to investigate current prices and the impact of dairy imports.

One of the best recent statements I have seen came from the National Limestone Institute. It pointed out all the articles in the shopping cart that cannot be classified as groceries or food. It showed how the American shopper is spending a smaller percentage of his disposable income for food than ever before:

Year	Disposable income	Total expenditures	Expenditures for food	Percent of personal disposable income
1947	$1,179	$1,115	$303	25.7
1957	1,801	1,643	373	20.7
1966	2,568	2,363	464	18.1

A recent Agriculture Department report had a comparison of food expenditures as a proportion of spending in various countries. Here are the five lowest and highest:

Lowest	Percent	Highest	Percent
United States	19.8	Ghana	58.7
Canada	21.5	Korea, Republic of.	58.5
Denmark	22.0	China (Taiwan)	50.8
Australia	22.4	Ceylon	50.0
Puerto Rico	25.2	Vietnam	48.2

So we're paying less for food in comparison to total expenditures than in any other nation. We also get more built-in maid services, such as pre-packaging and quick freezing, than in any other nation. And we eat better.

Yet the farmer's price for many commodities is less than that of 20 years ago. He is getting only 74 per cent of a fair return as measured by parity. His income is only 66 per cent of the $2,618 per capita average for non-farm people.

What's being done about it? The President didn't even send a farm message to Congress this year. He did, however, recommend a 25 per cent step-up in poverty war spending. Freeman's department seems content to issue reports about record farm income. Chairman of the Agriculture Committees say this is a year for review of farm legislation, not one for enacting price increases.

Congressmen representing rural districts (at least 20 per cent rural population) make up only 12 per cent of Congress, compared with 38 per cent in 1950 and 57 per cent in 1920. Farm population, 25.2 per cent under FDR, has shrunk to 16.7 under Truman, 13.9 under Eisenhower, 8.7 under Kennedy and 6.4 under Johnson. And it's still shrinking.

In a recent article for the *Aberdeen American-News* I outlined some things that ought to be done and could be done, even in a city Congress, if we got some help from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue:

1. Set out on a realistic, planned campaign to give full price parity to the farmer, even if it does mean higher prices for consumers.

2. Boost the farmer's return under existing wheat and feed grains programs.

3. Pass meaningful import restriction laws, with teeth in them, for both meat and dairy products. End the "foreigners first" policy in agriculture.

4. Get public recognition that rural poverty often is translated into urban poverty. Displaced farmers shouldn't have to go to the cities for help they can't get working for themselves on the farm. Instead, oppressed city dwellers should be offered opportuntiies in sparsely settled rural areas.

5. Authorize and construct without delay such projects as the Oahe Irrigation Unit, which will intensify land use, stabilize farm income, encourage industry and keep farmers on the land.

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert the following correspondence and material in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: This is to respectfully request an investigation by the General Accounting Office of contractual and construction procedures involving the new $32 million Federal office building in Cleveland, Ohio.

Originally contracted for completion by September 1, 1966, it will not be finished until sometime in 1968, and its history is marked by building practices unique in modern construction.

Not the least remarkable of these is the apparently close and amiable relationship between the General Services Administration and the general contractors, Huber, Hunt & Nichols of Indianapolis, Indiana, and Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Newark, New Jersey.

When the original completion date, September 1, 1966, was not met, a five-week extension was granted to the contractors by GSA to October 8, 1966 and the $3,000 per day penalty excused for that period. Last June 17 I was advised that the building would be finished and turned over to the government by February 15, 1967. It is now the middle of April and I am advised by GSA spokesmen that my office in the building will not be ready for occupancy before next December. Yet within the last month, Mr. Knott of GSA has said, "We have excused some penalties and will excuse more."

One year ago this week a Cleveland newspaper commenting editorially on the delay in completing the structure said, "GSA has been slipshod in riding herd on the project." That was putting it mildly. My investigation has disclosed:

1. Sloppy housekeeping. After my last criticism to GSA about this condition, many truckloads of debris and rubbish were hauled from the partially occupied building.

2. Total disregard of ordinary safety measures. The accident rate is so high on this structure that industrial compensation rates for all contractors in the Cleveland area very probably will be raised.

3. Poor planning, or acceptance of poor planning, by GSA. In this connection I would ask why master valves and by-passes were not installed in the piping on each floor to avoid a total shut-down should repairs be necessary on only one floor.

4. Disregard of specifications by contractors taking shortcuts to get the work done. A typical example of this malpractice is the "bending" of horizontal pipes to accommodate the out-of-plumb condition of the building.

5. Reports that architect's warnings on unsafe structural practices were completely unheeded. Witness the collapse of an unbraced wall, despite the architect's admonition about its lack of safety.

Because GSA has tolerated these practices despite reports and complaints made by their own inspectors and other responsible persons on the job, and, further, because GSA has avoided answering my specific questions or has applied the whitewash brush to them, I am respectfully requesting GAO to make the following specific determinations:

1. Who pays for the cost of the freeze-up

last December when 210 fan coil units were destroyed and 420 Johnson pneumatic control valves had to be replaced? Reports indicate this cost will run between $100,000 and $500,000.

2. Who stands the cost of the $100,000 fire damage to the ninth floor last February? I have never been informed as to the exact cause of the fire.

3. Who is going to pay for the cost of breaking through plaster walls to repair leaks in pipes which were covered with insulating material and "plastered" in before being subjected to pressure tests? Last week they had not replastered walls on the lobby floor which they had to break down to get at pipes.

4. What, approximately, will the contractors' "extras" total?

5. Is it possible at this time to ascertain how much of the extension time granted by GSA to the contractors will be liable for penalty?

I also request that General Accounting conduct an immediate audit of the financial status of the contract: How much has been paid by the government to the general contractors; how the contractors have handled their bills with the sub-contractors, and how much above the original bid the final cost will be.

Attached for your guidance is a chronology of the construction program.

Also enclosed is an affidavit obtained from Mr. David Jennings, 3152 West 48th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, who supervised a crew of some 75 men as construction foreman in charge of installing hot and cold water and steam lines in the new Federal building. In addition I am enclosing for your information statements given on a confidential basis to my staff from other individuals who are or have been connected with the project. The correspondence I am enclosing with this supplemental information is from a firm now in litigation with the contractors.

My long acquaintance with the outstanding performance of GAO encourages the anticipation of your prompt consideration of what appears to be an imposition on the taxpayers and a structural threat to the health, safety and comfort of the building's occupants.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT MADE BY DAVID JENNINGS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, ON MARCH 14, 1967

I have spent 22 years in the pipe-fitting trade. I was employed by Ray Hoge, of Wrightco, Inc., 4300 Carnegie Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, and Limbach of Pittsburgh, Pa., in November of 1964 as construction foreman in charge of the installation of hot and cold water lines and steam lines in the New Federal Building. I supervised the work of 75 to 80 men on this job.

During the two years and five months I was employed in that capacity I observed many operations in connection with the building project which, in my opinion and experience, resulted in sub-standard installations. I shall endeavor to relate these instances as accurately as possible:

No expansion joints were installed in the main steam mechanical quarter, a condition that very probably will lead to a major shutdown at some future date.

Armaflex (a rubberized covering on copper and steel lines to prevent sweating) was not properly applied on some lines and is hanging loose. This condition permits some sweating which will become more pronounced in hot weather and could result in ceiling damage. Most of the covering on fan coil units is in this condition.

Shut-off valves and by-passes in the plumbing system were not installed at each floor. Because of this omission if work has to be done on the hot or cold water lines on (for example) the 7th floor, all lines from the 1st through the 15th floors must be shut down. Floors 1 through 15 and 16 through 32 are served by two distinct systems.

The colonnade piping has no pitch, which means it will not drain itself by gravity. And the importance of this situation is emphasized by the fact that some valves have been enclosed behind plaster or between ceiling and floor so that the stainless steel ceiling in the lobby and colonnade will have to be removed to do any work on, or drain, any of these lines or valves.

All pipe was covered before being subjected to pressure tests. I never before heard of covering pipe before pressure tests as this makes it almost impossible to definitely trace leaks. Pipes in this building were covered with Johns Mansville #90, fibre glass, and Armaflex.

I have always held it to be standard practice to flush all lines (cleaning out all dirt and foreign matter) with a chemical substance, usually Calgon, before putting the lines into actual operation. This was not done on this project, with disastrous results. Scale that flecks off in pipe and tubing, along with dirt nominally introduced during construction, remained in the pipes with the result that whole rows of fan coils (heating and air-conditioning units) now are clogged and inoperative. There are nearly 5,000 of these fan coils in the building and it is my best judgment that 30% to 40% of them are clogged today, including many in the now occupied first seven floors. Some have been found to be plugged solidly by [name deleted] of GSA's building maintenance staff.

Floating thermostats inside the main steam traps dual duct units are being replaced at considerable cost because of foreign substances in the steam lines. Fifty per cent of the strainers in the steam system are clogged right now.

Careless or faulty welding of joints (branch lines to main lines) left micro weld stubs and unburnt welding rod bits internally in pipes. When the lines are put into operation these stubs (tiny metallic particles) clog strainers, jam fan coils, and damage pumps. Altogether, basing my estimate on actual experience, I figure that the dirt and foreign matter in pipes, pumps, valves and coils eventually will add up to amount a million dollars' damage.

Many of the pipes to the fan coil headers from the risers were threaded too deeply. Then when they were screwed into the valves they had to be inserted for the full length of the thread or they would leak. Thus the pipe so screwed into the valves jammed at least 50% of the valves so they are inoperative. Wicking and other compounds were used in an effort to correct leaks caused by faulty threading of pipes. This constitutes slovenly work and is only makeshift and temporary in its ultimate effect. The valves referred to in this paragraph now are enclosed behind plastered walls which must be broken into to make repairs or adjustments. It is impossible to reach the valves any other way. Other valves on the chill and hot water main feeder risers have been so enclosed in construction that in order to gain access to them ceilings must be torn out. This condition was mentioned earlier in this statement with reference to the lobby and colonnade ceilings.

In preparing for the installation of riser piping, sleeves are installed in each floor, one directly above the other, before concrete is poured. By precise measurements these sleeves are located alongside the upright columns in very exacting perpendicular locations, with practically no allowance for tolerance so that the risers will run exactly straight up and down. These sleeves (on this job) have an inside measurement of 5½ inches and are about 6 inches long. They extend 1" above and below the concrete flooring and "Q" deck. The pipe that runs upward through these sleeves has an outside dimension of 3⅛", thus allowing a 1" clearance on all sides.

I explain this because as we extended the pipe upward we discovered the building had shifted from the perpendicular to such an extent that we had to force the pipe through the sleeves, using strong leverage to make it fit. This condition became so pronounced on some floors that we actually had to resort to heating and bending the pipes, although before the concrete was poured the sleeves were within ⅛th of an inch of perfect alignment. The only conclusion I can come to is that the building "tilted" or shifted after the concrete was poured.

Aside from the above aspects of the construction, all of which were within the field of my operations and all of which I reported to my superiors who told me "don't worry about it", I am personally aware of the following conditions:

The steel under the curtain wall, starting at the second floor, was never painted with prime and finishing coats as specified. The steel received a prime coat, but none received the finishing coat.

Above the 18th floor something went wrong with the curtain wall clips and they had to weld to the mullion stubs—couldn't use the usual bolting operation. It appears now if they have to remove any window frames for any reason they'll have to use a burning torch. All the curtain wall is leaking air—so much so that it is apparent to anyone standing along a windward wall when a stiff breeze is blowing.

Concrete on the lower levels was poured under adverse conditions and this could be responsible for some of the cracking and porosity that has caused serious waterproofing trouble.

Three weeks ago water was running down the walls of Sub Basement Room 122 and also the walls of the storage room next to the fuel oil tank at the south end of the building. A small room south of Room 122 held 3 to 4 inches of water. Water and moisture problems are so severe that sooner or later an elaborate system of dehumidifiers will be needed to rectify the condition. (Dye markers have been used in an effort to trace the source of the water leaking into the building).

Doors installed and working one day become jammed in the next day or two. Some doors just cannot be closed.

Attest.

DAVID L. JENNINGS.

CONFIDENTIAL STATEMENTS TO STAFF OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM E. MINSHALL IN RE FEDERAL BUILDING

[Name deleted], an asbestos worker, confirms statements of slovenly workmanship. He also says the pipes were covered before pressure tests were made, resulting in the reinsulating of many pipes. He also knows of dirt in pipes. Mr. ——— also insisted "they are covering up mistakes as fast as possible." He insists there was a big crack in the concrete flooring "somewhere between the 20th and 29th floor so big I could put my thumb in it." He cannot recall the exact floor, but observed that "it probably has been tiled over by this time." He points out that tolerances were not up to specifications in many instances to such a degree that specified amounts of insulation could not be applied. In other words, there wasn't enough room to install the proper amount. He was not inclined to make a signed statement (Friday, April 7—his birthday and he was getting ready for a celebration) but probably would later. Mr. ——— also stressed that the average craftsman took pride in his work, but workers on this job were disgusted because of the many shortcuts and "skimping" by sub-contractors.

[Name deleted], a pipe-fitter foreman who worked under David Jennings, also will substantiate Jennings' statements. He cannot materially add to Jennings' statements, but completely endorses them.

[Name deleted], nurse at the new Federal building in charge of the first aid station, can offer many instances of injuries and sloppy safety procedures. She herself was injured on the job, has not worked for a year, and currently is suing the general contractors.

[Name deleted], GSA safety man on the project until last February 1967, has saved memoranda and copies of his reports to GSA regarding faulty construction and hazardous working conditions, but will release them only under subpoena. Verbally he has affirmed just about all of Jennings' allegations, but says "there is a lot more" he could tell.

Hon. Robert Sweeney, attorney and former Member of Congress, has filed a $500,000 suit against the contractors for injuries received by Ray Sullivan, a structural iron-worker when a concrete block wall, 12 feet high, collapsed and fell on him. Sweeney says he will produce evidence that the architect on the project told the general contractors that the wall was defective but the warning was totally disregarded.

[Names deleted], both GSA maintenance men, are reported to have important supporting information, but both are reluctant to talk with Minshall office staff for fear of job reprisals.

CHRONOLOGY OF NEW FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, CLEVELAND, OHIO

JUNE 1962

Final plans for building announced by GSA. To be 32 stories, 1.45 million square feet floor space, parking for 300 cars, 25 elevators and two escalators to basement cafeteria with 1,000-person capacity. Provide office facilities for some 24 Federal agencies now scattered in 27 locations and employing about 5,000 persons. Will take 30 months to build; construction to start in summer of 1963. Plans developed by Dalton, Dalton Associates; Schafer, Flynn & Associates; Outcult, Guenther, Rode, Toguchi & Bonebrake. Site cost $1,270,000.

DECEMBER 7, 1963

Congress votes $37.86 million for building. Approved by the President December 19, 1963.

JANUARY 16, 1964

GSA called for bids, then extended deadline to February 20, then to March 5. No explanation given for extensions.

MARCH 30, 1964

$31.6 million contract awarded to Huber, Hunt & Nichols and Frank Briscoe Co., Inc. Bid of these two firms was announced as lowest of six and was $6.2 million less than appropriation. *Contract provided for completion in 860 calendar days or mid-summer of 1966.*

APRIL 16, 1964

Briscoe says completion target is Fall of 1966.

AUGUST 12, 1964

H. Vernon Wheelock, GSA project engineer, says project is one week ahead of schedule.

JUNE 10, 1965

Completion date now announced as Labor Day, 1966.

JULY 26, 1965

Wheelock predicts completion date of September 6, 1966.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965

Wheelock says building four months behind schedule, but will be finished by September, 1966.

NOVEMBER 13, 1965

Wheelock says structure to be completed "on time."

NOVEMBER 30, 1965

Cleveland Press reports "at least three months behind schedule," but does not attribute quote.

DECEMBER 8, 1965

Press reports "Briscoe & Co. must complete the building in 860 calendar days or pay $3,000 a day penalty. Work is behind schedule." This is first mention of $3,000 per day penalty.

DECEMBER 20, 1965

Press says work is three months behind schedule and points out Federal government paying about $2 million yearly rental for agencies to be housed in new building. At that rate the $3,000 a day penalty would reimburse the government for only half the funds it spends for rent. $2 million a year is approximately $5,500 a day.

APRIL 13, 1966

Press says editorially: "GSA has been slipshod in riding herd on this project."

JUNE 17, 1966

(Date of visit to Federal Building by Reps. Minshall and Sweeney and conference with GSA officials.) Mr. Minshall indicates he is interested in some sort of watchdog committee to keep tab on what happens to Federal projects after tax money has been allocated. At that time William Keely, president of Briscoe, reported that the building originally was scheduled for completion September 15, 1966, but that now the target date for turning it over to the government is February 15, 1967.

OCTOBER 12, 1966

Tesaura of GSA, Chicago, says the contractors won't have to pay the $3,000 per day penalty, at least for the time being. He said the deadline had been extended five weeks and the new extension passed last Saturday. He was unable to say what the new deadline would be—"have to be determined by Washington." He said the building now was 84% complete.

MARCH, 1967

Mr. Minshall, in Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee session, requests that GSA administrator Lawson B. Knott, Jr., review the numerous allegations and pay a personal inspection visit to Cleveland. Knott agrees to do this, but does not, and without prior notification to the Minshall office, sent deputies out over a weekend to inspect the building.

POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States has become increasingly involved in controlling the world's burgeoning population. This commitment, however, will fall pathetically short of its mark if we merely respond with assistance for existing programs. Unfortunately, countries most in need of help seem to be least prepared culturally to attack the problem. Future aid efforts must, therefore, concentrate on creating within the less developed countries an internal will to control their own population.

I would call attention to an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post on Wednesday, April 12, 1967, elaborating on this point, which follows:

POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

Bold changes in policy often come most effectively when they come most quietly. At some point, however, if policy is to be translated into performance, it becomes necessary to shove, or even shout. The evolution in this country's acceptance of a global role in promoting population control is a striking case in point. The final step in the policy-making process was almost casual. "I guess it won't be too long before we're asked to do it," AID Administrator William Gaud told a congressional committee, in response to a question about whether this country would actually make available contraceptive devices or the means to produce them, if asked to do so. "My inclination is that we should."

Since the United States has been doing just about everything to promote population control here or there around the world, short of furnishing or financing the devices themselves, this may not seem a very large step. Except for the pill, which is costly to produce, money is not the object in any case; the so-called inter-uterine device, for example, costs only a few pennies to produce.

By contrast with official attitudes only a few years ago, however, Mr. Gaud's off-hand disclosure and the remarkably mild congressional reaction to it, represent a giant stride. The Kennedy Administration took a first step in committing the United States to research on the subject, and to public dissemination of the results. President Johnson turned a crucial corner in his 1965 State of the Union message, by pledging "to seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources." Innocuous as this sounded, it was the result of months of bureaucratic tugging and hauling and it served as a badly-needed catalyst to aid officials here and technicians in the field who were eager to move ahead but chary of getting out in front of the political leadership. As a result, "family planning" programs, to help establish clinics and spread educational material, have been established by American aid missions in some 20 countries.

But as with other aspects of this problem, not much happens without a certain mutuality of interest, a degree of reciprocity. The United States has correctly avoided coercion; its help is available only on demand. And for all the obvious reasons, demand in most parts of the world, and most noticeably in Latin America, where the Church exerts a powerful restraining influence, has been slack. So AID has found ways to spend only a trifling $8.6 million in the current fiscal year for its population programs—half of it in India alone. Because foreign interest and activity is inadequate to the needs, so is the availability of American aid. Too often, the responsibility in AID missions is somebody's added chore, simply because local interest does not justify the sending of trained technicians.

This built-in inertia may be ended simply by dint of educational programs; the examples of South Korea, or India, or Nationalist China, to name three countries where impressive local programs are under way, may prove contagious. But it may not be enough to await overtures from those countries which should be the most concerned. It is estimated that at present population growth rates, the world population of 3 billion—the product of eons—will double in 35 years, and double again 35 years later. If the United States is to make its economic aid programs meaningful, there will have to be some limit to the human dimension of the problem. This week's meeting in Chile of the International Planned Parenthood Federation is a heartening token of world-wide concern, and a proper forum for the sort of shoving and shouting that may be needed to translate policy into performance to meet one of the great challenges of our time.

FINO COMPLETES URBAN LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing six urban service bills as the last part of my three-part 1967 urban legislative package. The six bills I am introducing today would provide Federal assistance to localities for first, street lighting; second, rat control; third, sanitation and garbage collection; fourth, community health inspection centers; fifth, fire-control and fire-hazard prevention; and sixth, public safety.

I am inserting in today's RECORD my press releases on each of my three groupings of urban legislation: First, urban services, April 17, 1967; second, housing, April 4, 1967; and third, transportation, April 12, 1967.

The press releases follow:

FINO INTRODUCES 1967 URBAN SERVICES LEGISLATION, DERIDES INADEQUACY OF L.B.J. PROPOSALS

(Press release of Congressman PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, Washington, D.C., Apr. 17, 1967)

Congressman Paul A. Fino, Dean of the New York Republican House delegation, today introduced the last group of bills in his three part 1967 urban legislative package; bills to provide federal aid for local sanitation, garbage collection, public safety, street lighting, fire control and fire prevention efforts in blighted neighborhoods. Mr. Fino also introduced Johnson's much touted 1967 housing legislation known as "The Rat Bill", and derided the Administration for meeting the challenge of the Urban Future with a paltry rodent control bill, terming it Johnson's "Mouse That Roared".

The House Banking and Currency Committee's Housing Subcommittee is scheduled to begin hearings tomorrow on the Administration housing bill, at which time HUD Secretary Weaver is expected to testify on rat control and other Administration objectives, as well as on the many urban legislative proposals introduced by Mr. Fino.

Mr. Fino's "urban services" bills are as follows:

1. To authorize the HUD Secretary to provide financial assistance for the control of rodents in urban areas. (The Administration "Rat" bill).

2. To authorize the HUD Secretary to provide financial assistance for public safety programs in blighted urban areas. (A new bill).

3. To authorize the HUD Secretary to provide financial assistance for sanitation and garbage collection programs in blighted urban areas. (A new bill.)

4. To authorize the HUD Secretary to provide financial assistance for fire control and fire hazard elimination programs in blighted urban neighborhoods. (A new bill).

5. To amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to authorize financial assistance for the provision of street lighting facilities in aid of the prevention or reduction of crime. (Introduced also by several Congressmen and Senators in this Congress and the 89th Congress).

6. To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for Community Health Protection centers for the detection of disease (Preventicare). (Introduced in the 89th Congress by Mr. Fino and others).

In introducing this legislation, Mr. Fino said:

"The lead title of this year's omnibus housing bill is labeled 'rat control'. What an extraordinary change from last year's mammoth omnibus bill which sought to legislate paradise for the slums in one stroke! Perhaps the Administration's enthusiasm has been dampened by the disenchantment of the slums with the 'demonstration cities' program.

"As a recent *New York Times* article said, slum dwellers are beginning to fathom that the 'demonstration cities' program is nothing but a payroll for planners. According to the *Times*, one interviewee announced that: 'We're beginning to feel like laboratory animals. We've been surveyed and studied to death. You don't have to draw any more maps. There are maps downtown that say we're supposed to get six garbage collections a week, but you don't see those cats out there.'

"This pinpoints a very real shortcoming of the demonstration cities program, which is nothing but a payroll for planners and a mechanism for exerting federal control over local, urban, social, residential and educational patterns. The crisis of our cities calls for simple, honest action, not the ivory tower solutions of left-wing planners. Will the Administration produce these solutions? No, they will not. The Administration will not endorse my bill to take the federal tax breaks away from slum properties, even though this approach has been endorsed by leading architects and redevelopment directors like Edward Logue, nor do I expect that they will endorse my bills to provide federal assistance to slum programs for fire prevention, garbage collection, public safety and street lighting—after all, these do not create jobs for planners. The Administration is only introducing a rat control bill because last year, one such rat almost bit Hubert Humphrey—that rat was truly a 'Mouse That Roared' and so is the Administration rat bill.

"Let me briefly sketch my six bills. The first would provide federal aid for rat extermination programs, like the Administration bill, but the needs of the slums do not end with rat control. What about the rotten grapefruit in the streets, the dangerous, unlit alleys, the tubercular cellars, the garbage-strewn apartment halls? Don't we need programs to cope with these evils? And what about fire hazards and fire stations? Don't we need fewer of the former and more of the latter in blighted neighborhoods? My second bill would provide federal grants for public safety programs; my third for sanitation and garbage collection programs; my fourth for fire hazard elimination and fire control programs; my fifth for street lighting facilities; and my sixth for community health inspection centers (preventicare) facilities. None of these programs require planners—planners are the bane of the slums, which need help and not endless studies. My bills offer that help."

FINO INTRODUCES 1967 HOUSING LEGISLATION

(Press release of Congressman PAUL A. FINO, Republican of New York, Apr. 4, 1967)

Congressman Paul A. Fino, Dean of the New York Republican House delegation, and a senior member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, today introduced a package of legislative proposals relating to housing and urban development.

The four Fino bills are as follows:

1. To provide for a Bank for Urban Rehabilitation and Development within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which bank would (a) insure loans (above existing ceilings) of up to $50 million for FHA multi-family housing projects (rehabilitation, as well as other FHA 221 programs) *and* insure loans for mass transit programs for which grants could be made under the Mass Transportation Act; (b) make direct loans of up to $10 million for rehabilitation of housing in urban areas of extreme socio-economic tension; and (c) guarantee municipal bond issues to finance such projects regarding which loans could be made or insured under the Bank's other programs. Public agencies and corporations, as well as private persons, would be eligible for Bank loans and insurance. (Mr. Fino introduced this bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 17997.)

2. To amend the National Housing Act to provide for more careful administration by FHA of its multi-family housing programs by (a) prohibiting FHA from extending or modifying mortgages in default unless income from the insured project is held in trust; (b) requiring contractors furnishing materials or services to multi-family housing projects to certify the cost before FHA can insure; and (c) prohibit FHA from insuring multi-family projects unless there is a binding agreement that the Comptroller General may have access to the books. (Senators Ervin and McClellan have introduced this bill in the 90th Congress as S. 1249.)

3. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax incentives for the rehabilitation of rental housing for low-income families by allowing a five-year depreciation write-off of the cost of rehabilitating housing, with a 20% bonus in the first year. (Senator Javits has introduced this bill in the 90th Congress as S. 1199 and Congressman Button has introduced it as H.R. 7328.)

4. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to deny capital gains tax treatment to unimproved real estate, to limit the deduction for real estate taxes paid on unimproved land, and to eliminate the deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multi-family housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition. (Mr. Fino introduced this bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 14995.)

In introducing his four bills, Congressman Fino said:

"During the last few years, I have been privileged to be among the leaders of the fight against the Administration's bureaucratic, wasteful and socially-scheming 'rent subsidy' and 'demonstration cities' programs. I regret the Department of Housing and Urban Development has, in the words of *Barron's Financial Weekly*, used the nation's urban crisis as an excuse to get the social planning 'camel into the tent'—i.e., enact housing legislation designed to achieve social upheaval.

"As this Administration knows full well, the cities need federal help, but not federal control. This Administration uses federal aid as a stalking horse for federal control which the federal government intends to exert on behalf of special interest groups. Frankly, I disagree with this whole philosophy. I think that private enterprise offers the real hope for rebuilding our cities. If the federal government will content itself with helping private enterprise to do the job, we will be spared federal control and bureaucratic waste. The achievements of corporations like United States Gypsum and Smith, Kline and French ought to convince the White House to give business the tax and mortgage insurance encouragement necessary to do the job and foreswear the sociopolitical ambitions of the Washington housing bureaucracy.

"With these thoughts in mind, I am today introducing four bills which I think can help to solve the crisis of the cities. First, I am re-introducing my 1966 bill to establish a 'Bank for Urban Rehabilitation and Development' within the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Bank would insure loans for rehabilitation and other multi-family project housing activities undertaken by private

persons and public agencies up to $50 million, going beyond the limit of some existing federal programs. The Bank could also insure local mass transit project loans up to $50 million providing the projects meet existing requirements for a mass transit program grant. Additionally, the Bank would be empowered to make rather than merely insure loans for housing rehabilitation in areas of socio-economic crisis. Lastly, the Bank would be empowered to guarantee municipal bond issues for purposes for which it could make or insure loans. I believe that the Bank for Urban Rehabilitation and Development could be just what business needs to get going in the field of housing rehabilitation. I think my proposed Bank would provide a great alternative to the power-hungry 'demonstration cities' program and unnecessarily cumbersome 'home ownership' plans.

"Secondly, I am introducing a bill which Senators Ervin and McClellan have authored to impose new and stricter standards on FHA's sloppy administration of multi-family housing projects. The administrative incompetence of FHA is so noticeable that *Reader's Digest* entitled a recent exposé 'The Stench at FHA'. As a Housing Subcommittee Member, I know that *Reader's Digest* is correct. If we impose tougher standards on FHA, perhaps some of the money they spend will go to provide housing and not bank accounts for windfallers.

"My third bill has already been introduced by Senator Javits and Representative Button. Simply put, it would encourage housing rehabilitation by setting up a new tax incentive scheme whereby builders could write off rehabilitation costs over a five year period, besides getting a 20% bonus deduction in the first year. While I am completely in favor of the general idea of tax help for rehabilitation efforts, I recognize that there are several approaches which can be followed.

"My fourth bill is similar to one I introduced last year, based on suggestions in several labor and architectural journals that our present tax treatment of land transactions encourages both land speculation and long-term idling of valuable land, which affects land prices and thus housing prices. Besides denying capital gains tax treatment to unimproved real estate, my bill would also strike at the profits of slum lords by denying federal income tax deductions for real estate taxes and depreciation on multi-family housing which is not maintained in a safe and sanitary condition. My proposal would make it uneconomic for slumlords to operate their slum properties. A dearth of profits will be a far greater blow to slumism than all the 'demonstration cities' programs the Administration can conjure up.

"I hope that the probable late April Housing Subcommittee hearings will give me a chance to discuss these proposals with expert and governmental witnesses."

FINO INTRODUCES 1967 TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

(Press release of Congressman PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, April 12, 1967)

Congressman Paul A. Fino, Dean of the New York Republican House delegation, and a senior member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, today introduced a package of legislation to improve urban transportation and transportation facilities.

The Fino bills are:

1. To amend the Mass Transportation Act to authorize grants under that program to provide the wherewithal for local public agencies to assist local mass transportation company which maintains commuter service, in effect providing federal funds to keep commuter services running. (Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey, introduced this bill in the 89th Congress, and Mr. Fino introduced it as H.R. 12470.)

2. To amend the Mass Transportation Act to increase the funds available to major metropolitan areas and to allow mass transit funds to be used to pay the interest on state or local bonds issued to finance a mass transit program. (Mr. Fino introduced a substantially similar bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 14458.)

3. To amend the Clean Air Act to authorize an investigation and study to determine means of propelling vehicles so as not to contribute to air pollution; and

4. To authorize a program of research, development and demonstration projects for electrically powered vehicles. (Senators Magnuson and Muskie have introduced these bills in the 90th Congress as S. 451 and S. 453.)

5. To establish a program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft. (Chairman Fallon of the Public Works Committee introduced this bill in the 89th Congress as H.R. 990.)

6. To authorize a program of research, development and demonstration projects for hydrofoil watercraft. (A new bill.)

In introducing these bills, Mr. Fino said:

"Improved transportation facilities is a pressing need of the Sixties. Today, I am introducing six bills which I believe could help American transportation to meet the challenges of this and coming decades.

"Three of my bills relate to experimental transportation schemes, i.e., electric-powered cars and hydrofoil watercraft. The Senate has already held hearings on electric-powered cars and seemingly dismissed the idea, but I hope the House will take up the slack. My own State of New York, under the leadership of State Senator Edward Speno of Long Island, has embarked on an electric-car study. I think that electrically-powered cars are a partial answer to the smog problems of our cities because of their lack of fuel consumption and exhaust. Unfortunately, the oil company lobby is at work to block electric-car research.

"In addition to my two electric car research bills, I am introducing a bill to establish a hydrofoil watercraft research program. A few hydrofoil boats are presently plying their way between downtown New York City and some of the commuter suburbs, but hydrofoil watercraft are not yet used widely in the United States, as I believe they could be in light of their success in Europe. Hydrofoil traffic gets heavier each year in the Black Sea, in the Baltic, on the Danube River and in the Mediterranean.

"My fourth bill would also help metropolitan area and other water transportation by establishing a program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft. A program like this could help stimulate the development of a New York City water transportation system and boat marina network centered in maritime and commercial boating areas like City Island in my own congressional district.

"My fifth bill, which I first introduced in 1966, would amend the Mass Transportation Act program to allow mass transit funds to be used by public agencies to subsidize the operating deficits of transportation companies providing commuter services. More than most Americans, commuters pay whopping taxes, few of which dollars are returned to them as federal services. I think that we ought to use federal dollars to subsidize commuter service in the same way federal subsidies and land grants were used to subsidize Western railroads in the last century.

"Finally, my sixth bill would amend the Mass Transportation Act to change the program's ability to help our major metropolitan areas by (1) eliminating the 12½% limitation on the amount of mass transit funds which can go to any one state in favor of a general directive that the Secretary give priority to the needs of America's larger cities; (2) changing the federal contribution to projects aided under the Act to as much as 90%, depending on local tax burdens (the range would be two-thirds to nine-tenths); (3) putting the program on a permanent $200 million a year rather than year-to-year basis; (4) providing that the Secretary may approve grants on a reimbursable basis; and (5) providing that Mass Transportation program funds may be used to underwrite the interest costs of state and local bond issues floated to finance mass transit projects which meet the non-cost requirements of a Mass Transportation Act grant under present law. As restructured by my bill, the Mass Transportation Act would be a greater assist to Governor Rockefeller's bold new metropolitan New York City transportation development scheme."

REASONS FOR NOT FUNDING RENT SUBSIDY AND DEMONSTRATION CITY PROGRAMS

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House some data which I have prepared listing a number of very good reasons why both the rent subsidy and demonstration cities programs should not be funded this year. Both programs are cumbersome, unwanted, unpopular, and unproductive. What more is there to say?

My enclosures follow in two parts:

WHY THE RENT SUBSIDY PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE FUNDED

1. So long as rent subsidy projects are kept out of the unwilling suburbs by the "local option" rider attached by the Appropriations Committee to the past rent subsidy appropriations, few viable project applications will be submitted, because according to material submitted to Congress by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, per unit land and labor costs will prohibit projects from being built in the central cities.

A) This lack of demand for existing rent subsidy contract authority has been confirmed, notwithstanding HUD's protests that it needs more money, by leading editorialists Allen and Scott, writing in the Northern Virginia Sun, Feb. 17, 1967:

"The Great Society's rent supplemental program is turning out to be as productive as a dry creek.

"With a little more than four monthe remaining of this fiscal year, only around $160,000 of the $2 million voted by Congress for rent supplements has actually been allocated by the FHA. That's less than 10%.

"And of the $32 million Congress authorized the FHA to enter into contracts covering other aspects of this controversial program, only about one-third—$10.381 million—has been earmarked for possible projects. . . .

"This is the unpublicized record of the program that President Johnson effusively hailed as the 'most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve American cities' ". . .

B) To twist and finagle within the strict income and cost limitations imposed by

Congress, HUD has put pressure on its appraisers to violate their professional ethics. Last fall, two of the most senior appraisers *resigned* or retired rather than go along with violations of their professional standards. See October 14, 1966 *Congressional Record* insertion of Hon. Del Clawson quoting editorial to this extent from an appraisers association journal.

2. Rent subsidy projects are no longer being built with private funds, but are rather being financed through government purchases of rent subsidy project mortgages out of FNMA's special assistance funds. This action, which violates promises made by Democratic congressional leaders, has put the realtors' groups in opposition to the program.

3. Rent subsidy per unit costs are extremely high—much higher than public housing. In 1965, Ira Robbins of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, told the Housing Subcommittee (House) that the public housing could be provided for a $4,000 a year family of four at $37 per unit per month, while rent subsidy housing would cost $66 for that family. HUD asserted that average rent subsidies would be about $40. HUD now admits that the average is about $75 per month (Washington Star, April 13, 1967). The cost over that of public housing is the premium paid for using privately built housing (with market interest rate mortgages) to achieve economic integration.

4. According to a *New York Times* article of March 18, 1967, Assistant HUD Secretary Taylor said that the Demonstration Cities program will be used to disperse rent subsidy housing into middle-income sections of "demonstration" cities. Metropolitan planning (Title II of 1966 omnibus bill) could be used to spread rent subsidy projects around suburbs notwithstanding Appropriations Committee rider.

WHY THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE FUNDED

1. *Barron's* national business and financial weekly (Nov. 28, 1966): The demonstration cities program is "designed less with an eye on slum clearance or urban renewal than on educational upheaval and social change." (Cong. Record, March 23, 1967.)

2. *United Press International* wire service story of November 30, 1966, describing how HUD planned to disregard Congress' anti-racial balance scheme amendment of October 14: (Congressional Record, March 23.)

"NEW YORK.—Public school educators were told today applications for 'demonstration cities' funds will be returned unprocessed unless their cities combat such social problems as *de facto* segregation to the satisfaction of federal officials. Any proposal which ignores integration or any other social problems would not be in accordance with the 'demonstration cities' bill,' said John Clinton, an aide to Secretary Weaver (Department of Housing and Urban Development). . . .

"The applications must show evidence of consultation of all pertinent agencies with a point of view—including welfare groups and civil rights groups which would be vocal if integration is ignored."

3. Statement of Ralph Taylor, HUD Assistant Secretary for Demonstration Intergovernmental Relations, quoted in *Washington Monitor* of December 15, 1966 (Congressional Record, Mar. 23, 1967, p. 7806):

"From the very beginning of the model cities idea, we in HUD have always assumed that schools would be an integral part of any proposed program for a model neighborhood development."

(Contrast with *Washington Post*) editorial of October 4, 1966: The Demonstration Cities bill has nothing to do with schools.")

4. *New York Times* article of March 18, 1967, describing how the demonstration cities program would be used to 1) force changes in union hiring practices; and 2) disperse public housing and rent subsidy projects throughout middle-income neighborhoods in name of racial balance (Congressional Record, March 22, 1967.)

"As for employment, Mr. Taylor reminded his audience that the regulations governing the program required cities to give 'priority' for jobs created by the expenditure of program funds to 'neighborhood residents possessing the necessary skills.'

"Mr. Taylor's statement here was interpreted as a warning that cities that cannot win agreement from local labor unions not to discriminate in hiring people for construction work will be at a disadvantage in competing funds under the program."

Moving on to the subject of dispersing the population of the ghetto, HUD officials spoke boldly, the gist of their comments being summed up by the March 18 *Times* article as follows:

"Pressed for specifics, Walter G. Farr, the new administrator of the program who serves under Mr. Taylor, said he did not think that the act permitted the government to guarantee the relocation in a white suburban neighborhood of a Negro who wanted to live there.

"But he said that federally-aided housing must be 'open' and that the Administration would definitely give extra points to a city that agreed to disperse federally-aided housing, such as public housing, rent supplement and other low-income housing programs, throughout the city 'in order to avoid perpetuation of the ghetto.'"

5. In an editorial of February 9, 1967, the *Washington Post*, noted that the District of Columbia demonstration cities proposal included a guaranteed annual income proposal, obviously possible within the language of the bill. The *Post* enthused as follows:

"The guaranteed income is precisely the kind of experimental idea that needs to be built into Washington's plans for its model neighborhood program. The program's draftsmen are entirely right in their emphasis upon it. They are showing that the Demonstration Cities Act is already beginning to effect one of its most important purposes, the revival of leadership and imagination in city government."

6. Some prominent national figures are critical of the demonstration cities program. In a February 23, 1967, *New York Times* article, Governor George Romney of Michigan is quoted by Warren Weaver, Jr., as saying that "'drastic change' was needed in the model cities program." Boston Redevelopment Director Edward Logue told a George Washington University audience on April 1, 1967, that the model cities program was needlessly complex. The following excerpts are from the April 2, 1967 *New York Times* (daily Congressional Record, April 13, 1967, p. A1797):

"He told the bureaucrats that the Administration's Model Cities program was needlessly complex. He told the mayors and redevelopers that all their pleading for billions more in federal funds was a waste of time because the Government 'is not about to reduce any existing national priorities or reallocate any national resources to fight slums.'

"'At the rate the executive and legislative branches are spinning off new pilot projects, launched with glowing promises of the wonders they will perform, the average local official is beginning to feel like an air traffic controller.'

"'Increasingly, the local official is forced to turn his attention away from the local scene to palaver with a bewildering variety of Feds who are at home with all the rhetoric, but inexperienced and uninterested in practical local applications.'"

7. Disillusionment has already set in among the poor regarding the Demonstration Cities program—the poor feel that all it provides is a gravy-train for middle-class planners' employment aspirations. One slumworker was quoted by the *New York Times* in an April 2, 1967 story:

"'We're beginning to feel like laboratory animals,' said a young man with a full, reddish beard. 'We've been surveyed and studied to death. You don't have to draw any more maps. There are maps downtown that say we're supposed to get six garbage collections a week, but you don't see those cats out there.'"

8. Disillusionment has also set in within the ranks of city administrators and legislators. Under the leadership of New York City Comptroller Mario Procaccino, a bipartisan and overwhelming majority of the New York City Council on April 11, 1967, voted to slash New York City's "demonstration cities" program by 40%. The vote was 28 for cutting the program, 8 against. An April 12, 1967 *New York Times* story which capsules the actions of the Council appears on p. A1798 of the April 13, 1967, daily *Congressional Record*.

9. *In summation:* 1) the Demonstration Cities program never received more than 178 votes in the House of Representatives (the Administration had to wait until opponents had gone home to campaign); 2) the House amendment to prohibit HUD from insisting on school racial balance schemes is being ignored, according to the statements of HUD's own officials; 3) the Demonstration Cities is receiving increasing critical attention from urban leaders like Edward Logue and George Romney; 4) the Demonstration Cities program is susceptible of use as a vehicle for guaranteed income, and forced housing, and union-coercing programs; 5) the slum poor are turning against the Demonstration Cities program because it primarily helps (and employs) the ivory-tower planners; 6) and local legislative bodies like the New York Council have turned against the Demonstration Cities program. For these reasons, the Demonstration Cities program should be abandoned in favor of a less cumbersome and less social-planning-oriented program.

MORAL EDUCATION

Mr. STANTON. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 an editorial in the Washington Star entitled "Moral Education" refers to an earlier article from the same paper which points up the necessity of concentrating on instilling moral principles in the classroom. In our present era, this is an issue which needs further study. As the Star editorial points out:

There are other countries, as Irvine points out, where certain rules of conduct are drilled into the heads of youngsters from the day they enter school. Such rules, for example, as obey your parents, obey the law, be polite to your elders, come to school clean, wellgroomed and neatly dressed.

More and more information must be disseminated on this subject, and the Washington Star is to be commended for bringing it to public attention. Here is the editorial "Moral Education":

MORAL EDUCATION

With the advent of the war on poverty, American public schools have assumed steadily increasing responsibilities for the physical

and economic well-being of deprived children. Is it not clear by now that a heavier responsibility for the moral training of all our young people should also be added to the list?

Contributing writer Reed J. Irvine, in an article published by The Star last Sunday, asked and answered this question with a resounding yes. Irvine makes the indisputable point that antisocial behavior and the breakdown of discipline and moral standards so prevalent among young people today are not taking a turn for the better in this period of social upheaval. They are worsening. No other social institution seems able to reverse this trend. And that being the case, he asks, why not assign a more positive role of moral training to public schools which are "in a position to exercise their influence over virtually every child in the community five days a week, nine months a year?"

Why not, indeed? The idea is not novel. There are other countries, as Irvine points out, where certain rules of conduct are drilled into the heads of youngsters from the day they enter school. Such rules, for example, as obey your parents, obey the law, be polite to your elders, come to school clean, well-groomed and neatly dressed.

The idea in this country seems to be that schools are the wrong places for this sort of thing, that such training should come from the home, the church—or somewhere else. But what of those homes which have nothing to offer by way of example or advice, where there is seldom even communication between parent and child? It may be too much to expect schools to overcome the character damages suffered in the worst slum environments. The point is that the school may be the last hope, however, for such children ever to be told the difference between right and wrong, or the way they are expected by society to act.

Nor is this a problem, by any means, of the ghetto alone. The statistics on juvenile delinquency and, more pointedly than that, the instances of rudeness and undisciplined behavior that are evident in any well-to-do neighborhood day after day show the real dimensions of the problem.

The surprising thing is that our schools seem so doggedly determined today to avoid any place in the formal curriculum for this entirely logical sort of training. No question of teaching religion or political ideology is involved. Why, in a period of unparalleled probing for answers to antisocial conduct, are we in this country so skittish about this single possibility?

If society does not care enough to tell children how to act, is it really surprise that many of them seem not to know?

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL HELD CAPTIVE IN VIETNAM

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, because the North Vietnamese have continued to disregard completely the principles of the Geneva Convention of 1949 in their treatment of imprisoned military personnel, I am introducing a resolution concerning the treatment of U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam. In doing so, I join with others of my colleagues who have introduced similar resolutions.

The actions of the North Vietnamese when dealing with Americans is opposed to the concept of international law and ethical behavior, and can only add to the problems of finding lasting peace in Vietnam. I hope that these resolutions will help to make it clear to the North Vietnamese that we strongly oppose the trial, punishment, or execution of American captives.

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT C. WOOD

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Robert C. Wood, addressed Massachusetts Gov. John A. Volpe's Conference on Community Development in Boston.

He cited the gains we have made in dealing with our critical and complex urban problems and noted how many problems we have still to solve, particularly in the area of training competent city planning personnel. I include Mr. Wood's speech in the body of the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT C. WOOD

I am glad to join the Governor's Conference on Community Development for the second successive year—and for several special reasons. That we should be together again demonstrates some durability on my part—as HUD moves well into its second year—and considerable endurance in the field of luncheon speakers on yours.

I miss very much my old associations with you in Massachusetts—although enough of you journey often enough to Washington chasing your grants-in-aid applications to keep me from feeling lonely.

There are more important reasons for wanting to return. First, I feel the need to exchange views on the urban situation with those on the firing line; and second, I'd like to share with you our estimate of where the nation stands now on its community development programs compared to where it stood a year ago.

My simple themes are these:

That we have moved in a year, from the challenges of establishing modern urban aid programs to the challenges of putting them to work and producing meaningful results.

That, in this new phase of action, all of us at every level of government have new responsibilities of organization, management and execution.

That we will succeed in our endeavors to the degree that we realize our mutual obligations and responsibilities. In urban America of 1967, no one government, no one agency, no one individual goes it alone.

A year ago when I spoke with you, we were just beginning a new level of Federal effort to build and rebuild the urban areas of this Nation. I spoke of the Rent Supplements program and its problems of getting funded. Model Cities, Metropolitan Incentive Grants, and New Communities Aid were then proposals of the President that had not even been considered by the Congress.

Indeed, some experts announced that the new programs were "dead" even before the legislative hearings.

They said the Administration was foolish to try to update our urban strategy. They said we would be better off just requesting more money for old programs—even though such requests produced only yawns in the halls of Congress.

Those new proposals, once written off so prematurely, are now the law of the land and open for business.

We are doing business, moreover, at a new stand.

HUD is not HHFA simonized. It is a substantially different organization directed through new management practices, operated by means of new allocations of functions carried on by a new field structure. Some 5,000 HUD personnel are now either in new positions, new units, or new locations as a result of organizational changes. New budgets, new reporting systems, new review procedures are now in operation.

That is all background for my themes of today. In 1966, the big news was enactment of Model Cities, Metropolitan Development and New Communities legislation. In 1967, the big news is action.

The cities and towns of Massachusetts have expressed great interest in Model Cities. The Commonwealth heads all States in the number of cities planning to apply. I am glad that Senator Kennedy made possible the Worcester Conference on Model Cities last Monday, and that our Regional Office could provide technical assistance and—I hope—warm moral support.

We are receiving more proposals daily from potential Model Cities across the country and we expect to be making the first planning grants within sixty days from the initial $11 million authorized last year.

In the fiscal 1968 budget, we are asking the Congress for the full $412 million authorized—$400 million to carry the first Model Cities into the execution stages, and $12 million to begin a second generation of Model Cities. This program is not a competition, as some have said, among our cities, or among the poor of our cities. To see it thus is a gross burlesque of the endeavor. Rather the Model Cities program is a sustained effort to move to new and higher levels of Federal urban investment, and to new and improved levels of performance. As cities qualify, they will move forward to increasing participation in the program.

President Johnson has put his full commitment and enthusiasm behind this effort. We have just concluded our first week of appropriation hearings where the interest and enthusiasm of Congressman Boland has been an enormous aid. We look forward to the testimony of John Collins on our behalf as a distinguished national leader in urban affairs. And, this program has never been a partisan one. Congressmen Morse and Conte lent important support to the passage of last year's urban legislation.

The same drive for funds to support action on our new programs applies to Metropolitan Incentive Grants and the New Communities program.

All in all in our current requests to the Congress, we are seeking $3.2 billion compared to the $2 billion received last year. If the Congress responds favorably, we can increase significantly the impact of every major program in the Department.

We hear often from those who lament the inadequacy of Federal financial urban contributions. I think we can differ on how much is really adequate but we cannot really differ over whether or not the national contribution has been substantial and has been growing rapidly. It has, and we can show it.

In 1961, Federal financial commitments affecting urban areas totaled $17 billion. Between 1961 and 1964 they increased each year by 7.8 percent. By 1966, Federal commitments stood at $29 and a half billion. That means an annual increase from 1964

to 1966 of 17.7 percent. Our estimate for 1967 is $30.8 billion and for 1968 it is still higher at $33.8 billion.

So the national commitment, including HUD and other Federal agencies that help urban populations in many ways, has been rising twice as fast as the Gross National Product, and two-and-a-half times as fast as total Federal spending.

These figures are not a reason for complacency. They should not be interpreted to mean this Administration believes we are doing enough to solve urban problems. Clearly we have to do more and that is why we are seeking the new obligational authority for the Model Cities and other programs.

Yet simply agitating for more resources is not enough. As we seek greater and greater public investments, we must recognize the increasing public and Congressional insistence that we produce a product for the price we ask. As budgets grow, we must show results in urban development.

Let me make this point clear. The Vietnam war is not the only restraint on urban investment, nor is space, nor is foreign aid. These are great national missions. We will not abandon them. We will succeed in each of them. But these commitments do not rob the urban purse. Even if we include Vietnam costs, the traditional administrative budget, as a percent of Gross National Product, is at 17 percent—nor more than it was in 1955. And the public debt, as a percent of Gross National Product, has been steadily decreasing—from 134 percent in 1946 to an expected 41 percent at the end of fiscal 1968. We can afford what we can wisely spend.

The real issue of urban development today is not just spending—but prudent, effective and human spending. Our principal challenge is not money but competence. Our real need is for every level of government to improve its capabilities, revise its procedures, upgrade its manpower, increase its sophistication and accept the necessity to work together to secure results. Our concern must be the viability of the federal system in a time of stress and strain.

That is why we have put so much effort in revamping HUD's organization this year.

That is why we welcome the new efforts of State governments to rethink their role in community development—efforts such as the proposals to reform Massachusetts state agencies just put forward by Governor Volpe.

That is why the Model Cities Program places such emphasis on the need for many levels of government to pull together, and for private enterprise, quasi-public agencies, charitable and non-profit institutions to come together in an interdependent and democratic pattern.

It is heartening to see so many states, cities, towns, and counties facing up to the challenge of administration and execution, exploring ways to work together, concentrating on tangible solutions of complex problems. These governments avoid the error of continuing to promise more—and produce less.

In contrast, it is sometimes disturbing to see that there are still those in responsible positions in urban affairs who assert that there are simple, easy, tidy solutions to the subtle, complex, and revolutionary processes of change in urban society.

These spokesmen would have you believe that mere strokes of the pen, decisions of the President, reforms by the United States Treasury would solve our urban dilemma. They insist they can take care of their own city if only the Federal bureaucrats or the Congress—or the taxpayers—would send the cash and then get out of the way.

Their favorite theme to Federal officials is this: Just give us the money and throw out the rules: more dough, less advice.

Now this kind of fiscal fantasy has a lot of appeal. Every Federal agency head has probably had daydreams of a world of full appropriations and no General Accounting Office, no departmental legal office, and no Congressional investigation.

In the current spate of tax-sharing and so-called "unconditional grant" proposals (both in and out of Congress) there resides a similar hope that direct, simple, and perhaps painless ways can be found to solve the very real financial problems of State and local governments. These proposals, however, raise more questions than they settle—and they quite properly will call forth a good deal of national study and debate.

For example, there is the question as to what governmental body or what level of government should be the recipient of Federal tax largesse. Quite understandably, the governors are rather interested in seeing it go directly to the States; the mayors are convinced that it should go to the cities; anti-poverty and urban renewal agencies prefer dealing directly—as at present—with federal agencies; school boards are inclined to favor direct aid channeled to school districts. And so it goes.

To attempt to turn back Federal taxes by formula to municipalities presents great practical problems as well as serious policy questions.

To separate financial and program responsibilities—to tax at one level of government and spend at another—is fraught with dangerous consequences.

There are obvious problems of how you get the money where the need is, and how you ensure that it is not spent frivolously. These questions are quite properly part of the Federal responsibility when it comes to the disbursement of national tax resources. The "go it alone" posture of certain city officials is the counterpart of national isolationism—just as appealing and just as impossible in the modern world.

For the time being, I would like to return from fiscal unrealities to deal with management realities.

And here, I suggest, we all have problems. Take the field of urban renewal, for example: Currently, the preparation of local plans for urban projects takes an average of 25 months. Project execution (not counting construction) has taken an average of another five years for those projects completed to date. But many more are still unfinished. One-half of urban renewal projects started in 1950, the first year of the program, have not yet been completed.

Recently we have had to suspend Federal renewal assistance in Cleveland because of the inability of the city to move forward. Holding that progress on the city's urban renewal projects was "generally unsatisfactory", Secretary Weaver refused to consider an enlarged application for one project and withdrew a $10.4 million fund reservation on another project that has been in planning since the middle of 1961.

Recently, we suspended open space and other metropolitan development programs in Montgomery County, Maryland, when for a time it was uncertain that a genuine planning process was in operation as required by law.

We will continue to examine performance records in our assistance programs to see how we can reduce the time now required to move from planning to execution. For in a period when needs for our programs are mounting, we can ill afford to set aside large sums of Federal money, year after year, without seeing measurable progress. Such carelessness with scarce resources would be the greatest waste of all.

Meantime, we will move forward to improve operational capability in urban programs as a national responsibility. The Committee on Appropriations is now considering our request for 1½ million for continuing the urban fellowships program (of which the first 93 awards have just been made) for initiating the new program of grants to States for urban information and technical assistance services to small communities; and for getting underway the grant program for training public technical and professional employees in the community development field.

These programs will help to meet the critical shortage of trained personnel in the urban field. In 1964, the American Society of Planning Officials found over 500 unfilled positions for urban planners, and predicted the creation of 11,000 to 11,500 *new* planning positions in the following five years, as the planning requirements in many programs became more demanding. The need for pre-service and in-service training for public employees has likewise increased dramatically, as developing technology and rapid urban growth place new demands upon them.

There is also a need for national resources to go into a research and development program that no community and no state could undertake. That is why we are asking Congress for the funds for research to move toward a basic foundation in urban knowledge that can be used in communities.

There is a need for national resources to experiment with and demonstrate new and innovative solutions to urban problems that no community could undertake on its own. That is why we are asking local governments to move ahead on the Model Cities and other demonstration programs.

So the new thrust and the new reality of urban affairs requires, not an escape into the world of a municipal Big Rock Candy Mountain where the budget is unlimited, taxes non-existent, and voters inactive. Nor do they permit a retreat to the old bread and butter politics of the past, when the city existed for selfish exploitation by its managers, public and private. Instead, urban realism requires the recognition of complexity, the development of new capabilities, and for all of us in this interdependent system a reliance on mutual respect and a spirit of cooperation.

Those of us in the service of the city, whether local, state, or national, can ill afford these days our private disputes. Back-biting, gossip and intrigue ill become us. We have too much to learn, too much to do. We know that modern American cities will not be built by the innocent, or the ignorant, or the arrogant.

The stakes in the urban game are high—they involve four-fifths of the next generation.

They involve the places in which nearly all people will live, and work, and play, their community designs, their opportunities for the good life.

Our urban tomorrow will not be built by whim or impulse, but by reason, knowledge, humility and cooperation.

A WORLD OF NUCLEAR POWERS?

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in February the School of International Affairs at Columbia University and the American Assembly sponsored the first graduate student assembly which was held at Arden House in Harriman, N.Y. Topic for the assembly was the question of nuclear proliferation and the students, who represented Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, and Tufts Universities, prepared a report entitled "A World of Nuclear Powers?"

In my judgment, such an assembly is an excellent exercise for the students in analysis, negotiation, and draftsmanship that will serve them in the future as international relations specialists. I understand that another assembly is to be held next year and I hope that this will become an annual event.

I include in the body of the RECORD the report of the assembly and the list of participants:

A WORLD OF NUCLEAR POWER?

PREFACE

On February 23, 1967, sixty graduate students from four major universities gathered at Arden House, Harriman, New York, to discuss the complex problem of nuclear proliferation. Officially titled *A World of Nuclear Powers?*, the Graduate Student Assembly was sponsored by the School of International Affairs of Columbia University and by the American Assembly. The delegates were from the School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University, the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs of Princeton University, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy of Tufts University, and the School of International Affairs of Columbia University. This Assembly represented a departure from previous conferences held under the auspices of the American Assembly in that the participants were exclusively graduate students.

The participants, divided into permanent discussion groups, wrestled for three days with the complexities and nuances of the problem of nuclear proliferation. Professor William T. R. Fox, Professor Warner R. Schilling, Mr. Christopher Wright, and Colonel Thomas E. Lamb, USAF, all of Columbia University, attended the discussions as resource persons. On the fourth day, in plenary session, the participants approved the statement of findings and recommendations contained herein.

The participants were honored by formal addresses by Ambassador Sverker C. Aström, Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations, and by Mr. Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Assembly was organized and directed entirely by students working under the auspices of the Society of the School of International Affairs, the student organization of the School. They were advised by Dr. William C. Olson, Associate Dean of the School of International Affairs, and by Mr. Clifford C. Nelson, President of the American Assembly.

The background material for the Assembly included *A World of Nuclear Powers?*, edited by Alastair Buchan (Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966), and *On Nuclear Proliferation*, by Robert L. Rothstein (One of a Series of Occasional Papers, 1966, available through the School of International Affairs, Columbia University).

The views contained in the Final Report of the Graduate Student Assembly are those of the participants and not necessarily of the sponsoring institutions.

PETER W. SHEATS,
Director, Graduate Student Assembly.
ANDREW W. CORDIER,
Dean, Faculty of International Affairs, Columbia University.

FINAL REPORT OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSEMBLY

(At the close of their discussions the participants in the Graduate Student Assembly reviewed as a group the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it is not the practice of The American Assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

We face today, in nuclear proliferation, a possibility of frustrating uncertainty. A satisfactory assessment of its implications would require a degree of foresight which few among us are willing to claim. Yet not to attempt an evaluation of the contingent hazards involved in nuclear proliferation would be to avoid our responsibility as students of international affairs to treat seriously a matter of potentially grave consequence to human survival. It is our intent here to evaluate the problems generally associated with the spread of nuclear weapons, and to propose some modest recommendations to deal with the problem of proliferation.

Reasons for proliferation

While not accepting without further examination the assertion that nuclear proliferation is in itself a factor of instability, our first concern is with the probability of nuclear weapons being acquired by countries presently without them. In spite of the fact that a timely combination of motive and capacity is needed for the development of nuclear weapons in any given case, there seems to be a strong likelihood over time that proliferation may prove unavoidable.

In discussing the principal motives for proliferation, it is essential to stress their diversity. While the most frequently mentioned motives can be summarized as security and prestige, it would be a major error to believe that these factors operate in a uniform manner in every case. Security may involve either offensive or defensive priorities, and may exist as a problem both within and without alliance systems. It is most likely to be dominant where a specific external threat exists, and where guarantees by one of the superpowers are not offered, or are not credible. Credibility of guarantees offered is not only the most crucial but also the most difficult element in leading the non-nuclear powers to accept a nonproliferation treaty. Prestige is likely to be a somewhat less important element, but it is a common factor and may be dominant in some decisions.

Other reasons for proliferation may include a desire for autonomy or for technological gains. Autonomy would have an appeal to traditional armed neutrals such as Sweden and Switzerland. Hope for technological gain is based on the argument that nuclear weapons research promotes industrial development. These motives are not overwhelming, but their rationale may be attractive where security or prestige is a dominant factor. Although an automatic "bandwagon" response that will breed global proliferation is not certain, once a given nation in a region does acquire nuclear weapons there is increased pressure on other nations within the region and perhaps the world to acquire such weapons. We believe, however, that nations will make their decisions individually, and primarily in terms of their regional context.

Reasons for restraint

Among reasons for restraint in the pursuit of nuclear weapons, guarantees and pressures from the two superpowers are most significant. The economic cost of entering into a nuclear arms race is also a considerable disincentive, especially where a nation faces the problems of economic development. A third major restraint may prove to be the general diplomatic and military pressures which will be focused upon states seeking a military nuclear capacity. A fourth restraint, in such cases as Japan and India, may be a public sentiment that the acquisition of nuclear weapons would result in a loss rather than in a gain in prestige and influence. A fifth restraint is that certain states may indeed consider the acquisition of nuclear weapons as harmful to their security interests. We believe further that the difficulty of calculating the actual effects of the acquisition of nuclear weapons on a nation's position is in itself a force restraining a nation from opting for nuclear weapons.

There is little reason to expect that nuclear technology, in the form of information, components, or technical skills, will be a significant bottleneck in the achievement of simple nuclear weapons by present civil nuclear powers. For these countries, the decisive factor is their political will. The development of sophisticated systems, however, may be impractical without external assistance. Easily exploited uranium deposits are in limited supply, but it would require only one uncontrolled source of uranium to undermine attempts to limit the diffusion of fissile material. In general, even among nations presently without nuclear technology, the relative costs of developing nuclear weapons are constantly decreasing over time.

We believe that the technological factors operating against proliferation are weak. These restraints will, over time, prove almost inoperative at least for simple weapons systems.

Effects of proliferation

The immediate effects of individual cases of proliferation will depend upon the context in which they occur. The most dangerous situation would be an effort undertaken because of exacerbated local conflict. In this context, a major threat of violence would occur during the time between the discovery of intent and the acquisition of nuclear weapons. While proliferation which increases regional tensions may raise pressures for superpower involvement in regional stabilization, the superpowers will probably not intervene militarily in a nuclear conflict initiated by a country claiming their protection. Such a non-support option is necessary if the superpowers are to avoid the threat of continuous "nuclear blackmail." Once two regional powers have nuclear weapons it is conceivable that a regional situation of mutual deterrence will develop.

If proliferation occurs, threats to both local and world stability are considered most likely to develop in the Middle East, South Asia and Central Europe. Although the destabilizing effects of proliferation would be greater in Central Europe, the possibility of proliferation occurring there is considerably less than in the other two areas.

We feel that proliferation entails greater risks than those inherent in efforts to prevent it.

We believe that certain conditions must be realized if proliferation is to be prevented. We believe that the kinds of arrangements involved in a general non-proliferation treaty are the most likely to provide the basis for useful and effective agreement. We feel it is possible to achieve a treaty which will meet the conditions discussed below.

We recommend that a non-proliferation treaty in itself not be considered as the ultimate solution to arms control. As such we advocate that the United States and other countries continue to search for additional arms control and disarmament measures. The achievement of a non-proliferation treaty should not lead to complacency among those who sign it.

Conditions for a general nonproliferation treaty

Detailed conditions for an effective, durable, and comprehensive non-proliferation treaty are too controversial for a broad consensus by the participants of this conference. What consensus we have reached emphasizes the importance of a coordinated approach by the United States and the Soviet Union to the problem of guarantees and safeguards. Furthermore, cooperation by the superpowers will be ineffective unless the non-nuclear and civil nuclear powers exercise equal good faith in the practice of non-acquisition.

The problem of dissemination focuses pri-

marily on West Germany, and upon a fear by the Soviet Union that a projected European Community will somehow give West Germany a measure of control over nuclear weapons without the protection afforded by that country's total subordination to a fully integrated successor state. We recommend that the United States and the Soviet Union reach a compromise which leaves in abeyance the question of a supra-national European force and which provides for a later review if and when the problem becomes more imminent.

An agreement on the question of safeguards is also essential. We recommend that strong provisions for safeguards be included in a non-proliferation treaty.

The basic condition to satisfy the non-nuclear powers would be that some effective alternative provision for their security be provided. With regard to guarantees, there are problems of both credibility and acceptability. It is doubtful that India would accept a guarantee by only one of the two superpowers because of her traditional political non-alignment. On the other hand, the superpowers are unlikely to increase their present formal commitments. We recommend that some system of tacit agreement be arranged outside of a formal treaty, in which vital interests rather than explicit guarantees are expressed.

The problem of assessing credibility in the case of guarantees is too complex for resolution here. It is doubtful that in the long-run guarantees will be credible unless at least tacitly coordinated in instances where the superpowers have an over-riding mutual interest. But even tacit agreements may not satisfy the desire for a credible guarantee on behalf of non-nuclear or near-nuclear small powers, nor are tacit agreements likely to satisfy the desire of these countries for increased regional status or autonomy through the possession of nuclear weapons. This then represents a major weakness in a non-proliferation treaty approach.

Other conditions likely to be emphasized by countries without nuclear weapons are that the treaty be considered a prelude to further steps toward arms control and disarmament, and that their own access to civil nuclear progress be kept open. In addition, although in principle a treaty of indefinite duration will be necessary, there must be included a withdrawal clause to leave open a legitimate option in case of future security threats.

Other agreements

Agreements other than a broad non-proliferation treaty seem to hold little promise as substitutes for a general treaty, but because of the magnitude of the problems involved, we consider that any nuclear agreement which establishes a mood of international cooperation, however limited, is worth the effort to pursue. The realities of international politics may necessitate limited approaches to non-proliferation.

Effective agreements on a comprehensive test ban, the withdrawal of nuclear weapons, and limitations on the production of fissile material may need assent as general as that needed for a non-proliferation treaty itself. In spite of their value to the Soviet-American detente, the agreements will not in themselves prevent proliferation but they may provide additional disincentives to developing nuclear weapons.

It is possible that the non-nuclear and civil nuclear powers can act independently of the powers with nuclear weapons, in concert or as individuals, to prevent proliferation. However, they would necessarily face the same problems which are involved in a general non-proliferation agreement, and would still be without the conditions which they presently demand from the owners of nuclear weapons.

The most likely area for the establishment of a nuclear free zone is Latin America, but even here agreement is blocked by both regional difficulties and the reluctance of major nuclear powers to cooperate on Latin American terms. The same is true in other areas. We recommend, however, that the nuclear powers support efforts by the non-nuclear countries to establish nuclear free zones in their respective areas.

In the event that a non-proliferation treaty cannot be attained or proves ineffective, and if proliferation subsequently occurs which creates serious regional imbalances, it is recommended that possible alternative approaches to the overriding goal of regional stabilization be considered. Such approaches include strengthened commitments and guarantees the possibility of assistance in nuclear development, or even the provision of nuclear weapons in certain cases.

Without deciding among the various approaches possible in the event of destabilizing proliferation, the conference notes them and recommends their consideration and study under the above conditions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we feel it important to state that the prospect of nuclear proliferation is only one of many problems complicating international relations. In perspective, nuclear weapons must be viewed as both a cause and an effect of world tension. The achievement of a non-proliferation treaty will have lasting success only if it is followed by a continued sense of movement toward further disarmament and arms control measures. It is therefore highly important for those nations desiring to prevent proliferation that in addition to a direct approach to arms agreements, they exhibit a willingness and a capability to ease their hostility in other areas of competition. A significant increase in hostilities would undermine all efforts to avoid proliferation. Only a genuinely cooperative multilateral effort will succeed.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSEMBLY

Director: Peter W. Sheats, Columbia.
Assistant director: Ilona E. Tauck, Columbia.
Report editor: Edwin A. Wiggers, Jr., Columbia.
Discussion leaders: Douglas F. Garthoff, Johns Hopkins; Henry W. H. Lum, Columbia; George H. Shenk, Columbia.
Rapporteurs: Robert J. Gruszka, Columbia; Christopher W. Beal, Fletcher; Richard Baker, Princeton.
Howard E. Arbesman, Columbia.
Paul E. Beard, Columbia.
Capt. John C. Buchanan, U.S. Army, Fletcher.
Sheila Buckley, Johns Hopkins.
Jane D. Colvin, Columbia.
Stephen Conn, Columbia.
Michael E. Costello, Fletcher.
Christopher N. Darlington, Columbia.
Helen A. Dimos, Columbia.
Kendall Dudley, Columbia.
John C. Farrell, Columbia.
John Forbes, Princeton.
Mary E. Fowler, Columbia.
James Gardner, Princeton.
Miriam H. Girard, Columbia.
Daniel E. Griset, Fletcher.
Peter Hakim, Princeton.
James A. Hightower, Columbia.
Donald J. Huse, Johns Hopkins.
Onyeonoro S. Kamanu, Fletcher (Nigeria).
Malcolm G. Koch, Fletcher.
Stephen D. Krasner, Columbia.
V. Mavin Kurve, Princeton (India).
Andrew J. Leddy, Jr., Fletcher.
Roger Lourie, Columbia.
James McCallum, Princeton.
John McDiarmid, Jr., Columbia.
Julia Maher, Columbia.
Skirmante Makaitis, Columbia.
Arfan Malas, Columbia (Lebanon).
Thomas E. Markey, Columbia.
Loren Beth Meyer, Columbia.
Willard Mitchell, Princeton.
Stefan Nadzo, Columbia.
Byron A. Nichols, Johns Hopkins.
Björn Norrbom, Columbia (Sweden).
Jutta K. Parsons, Fletcher.
Charles R. Planck, Johns Hopkins.
John C. Pollock, Johns Hopkins.
John H. Quitter, Columbia.
Brian W. Rapp, Johns Hopkins.
Susan B. Rifkin, Columbia.
Donald H. Scharfe, Johns Hopkins.
Charles E. Scheidt, Columbia.
Larry S. Schmidt, Johns Hopkins.
Hartmut Schumann, Fletcher (West Germany).
Stanley R. Sloan, Columbia.
Asa P. Smith, Columbia.
Shigemitsu Sugisaki, Columbia (Japan).
Lt. Comdr. Harold J. Sutphen, U.S. Navy, Fletcher.
Marilyn Z. Wellons, Columbia.
Radford C. West, Columbia.
Barbara Wheeler, Columbia.
Darnell M. Whitt, Johns Hopkins.
John Yochelson, Princeton.

COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT UNIONS AND UNRECOGNIZED GROUPS

Mr. STANTON. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a resolution to create in the House of Representatives a Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups. The interests of these groups vary considerably, and organization for an effective continuing presentation of their interests to Congress and the executive because of their generally small size and heterogeneous nature is especially difficult. These groups, by and large, have no representative in Washington assuring that their voices are heard. Nor is there any congressional or executive body specifically attuned to meeting their problems. A House committee would offer them an opportunity to have their interests weighed with those of other important segments of our society to a degree commensurate with their role. Further, a House committee could become the basis from which Congress could explore and act upon the needs of independent unions and similar groups in much the same manner as our House and Senate Select Committees on Small Business have explored and acted upon the special problems of small business.

When I introduced this bill in the last Congress I commented in greater detail upon the need for a permanent House committee to operate in this area. Those remarks follow. They appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 1, pages 616–617.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best definitions of a small business is one that does not have a Washington representative. Implicit in this definition is the importance to any group in our country, with the ever-increasing role being played by the Federal Government, of having a voice in Washington, a way in which its views on the matters

affecting it can be drawn to the attention of America's policymakers.

There are various channels through which these interest groups can make their feelings known. A common way is through the employment of lobbyists and Washington attorneys knowledgeable in the ways of the Congress and the regulatory agencies. The agencies and departments themselves often act to give a forum to representatives of interest groups in the consideration of matters within their special province.

Similarly, the work of congressional committees in areas of their jurisdiction help to give a voice to the needs and opinions of the groups whose interests are touched by the legislation the committee studies. The Select Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate are excellent examples of this, and go along well with the definition of small business which I noted earlier.

I have today reintroduced a proposal to create in the House of Representatives a Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups. The purpose of this proposal is to offer to these organizations a chance to have their interests weighed in with those of the other segments of our society. Just as small business before the advent of the House and Senate select committees, these groups have no representatives in Washington assuring that their voices are heard, nor is there any congressional or executve body specifically attuned to meeting their problems.

In many ways these groups can be found parallel to small business. They are generally small, struggling in a competitive world to find a place and often provide an organizational context for a new idea. The idea may be good, perhaps even great, yet without a fair chance of survival in a competitive world, it might be lost. One element of survival in the United States is assuring that full consideration be given the interests of the group involved. With the many voices clamoring to be heard in the process of making public policy, it is too easy to overlook one which does not have an adequate sounding board on the Washington scene. This committee, which I suggest, would offer the type of sounding board which would permit the interests of these groups to be given the recognition they deserve.

An example of this is found in the labor field. Concern is properly given the AFL–CIO as the largest representative of organized labor in our country. Similarly the large independent unions, an example being the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, gain recognition. Yet, some 2.7 million workers are joined in small, independent unions whose voices are seldom heard in deliberations of the Congress or policies of the executive departments and agencies. Beyond this number are many other workers, not organized into unions as such but represented to some extent by a formal grouping. It is to give a forum to these groups that I offer the proposal for the Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups.

As I mentioned before, I introduced this legislation in the last Congress. I also had the occasion to comment further on the situation in some remarks on the floor of the House under the title "The Case for the Independent Unions" which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 4, pages 4329–4330. Under unanimous consent, I include those remarks in the RECORD at this point:

"THE CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

"Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have shown a proper concern in our society for the problem of small business, recognizing that small business is the lifeblood of our economic endeavor and that big business which is also beneficial, started as small business. However for some reason or other we have not shown a similar concern for the counterpart of small business, the small or independent unions.

"The AFL–CIO represents approximately 15 million workers out of our work force of around 70 million. Probably 27 million workers are members of unaffiliated independent unions. The voice and point of view of the independent unions is little heard in the councils of the great Government far away in Washington. Indeed, the Department of Labor is oversolicitous of big labor whose voice is heard in all its corridors. There are many areas where big labor is the opponent of independent unions, just as big business in some areas is in opposition to small business. It is important that the voice of independent labor be heard, particularly when it expresses a point of view contrary to that of big labor.

"Part of the difficulty is that the story of the independent union labor movement has not been told widely enough. I was particularly happy, therefore, to see in the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1963, an article entitled 'The Case for the Independent Unions' which tells part of the story, and refers to a recent book written by Prof. John J. Collins telling the story. I am placing this material in the RECORD because this story needs to be broadcast throughout our land and certainly needs to be known in the Congress."

I also wish to again call to my colleagues attention House Resolution 137 which I reintroduced in this Congress to create a House Committee on Independent Unions and unrecognized labor groups to particularly look after and give a forum to the problems of independent unions and nonunion workers. The remarks I made at the time of introducing this legislation appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 527.

"CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

"(By Walter Hamshar)

"Since 1945 the Nation's maritime industry has been wracked by 38 major seamen's strikes. During the same 19-year period, a sizable group of American-flag tankers has never been held up by a work stoppage because their licensed officers and unlicensed crewmen are members of independent unions.

"John J. Collins, a professor of history at Fordham University, who has been the adviser to those unions since 1938, tells the story of independent unions in 'Never Off Pay,' a book published last week by the Fordham University Press.

"The title of the book is the keynote of Mr. Collins' many arguments in favor of independent unions in an industry which only lately has won for itself the title of 'Strike-Strangled Merchant Marine.'

"Independent unions, meaning organizations which are not industrywide affiliates of the AFL–CIO are in a better position to bargain for their members, Mr. Collins argues.

" 'Each [union] has the right to, and does, negotiate agreements which to them seem most suitable to their type of operation,' he said. 'This control at the local level and the ability to tailormake an agreement is one of the reasons why an independent union confined to the employees of one company or one plant is so often preferred by those employees to the large affiliated union.'

"Officers of small independent unions are more receptive to ideas from their members and usually, through their own experience, are familiar with the peculiar problems of the membership. This is not true of large unions, Mr. Collins contends, where the leadership is too frequently influenced by political motives rather than the needs of members. Thus, in independent unions there are no propaganda buildups by power-hungry officers; no strikes called to strengthen the leaders' political power; no theatrics of marathon bargaining, and no feuds which result in costly work stoppages without gains to the members.

" 'In their use of commonsense, the independent tanker associations have never sought to push for an economic gain which, if achieved, would have become a pyrrhic victory,' he stated. 'Perhaps it is this quality of commonsense that can be exercised so widely in a nonpolitical atmosphere that has enabled these associations to have had such unique success.'

"While Mr. Collins attributes the success of the independence among crewmen to commonsense collective bargaining which has produced high pay and working conditions without work stoppages, he does not highlight two other factors which have also contributed to the independent union's prosperity.

"First, there was the willingness of the big oil companies to negotiate agreements which gave the independent unions better contracts than those of the large affiliated organizations. Mr. Collins relates that these agreements were negotiated. But the generosity of the companies is implied, not described.

"The second factor is that the big unions have created the climate under which the independents exist. The reader cannot help but get the impression that cordial relations between companies and independent unions are actually the result of the existence of larger affiliated labor organizations poised to organize dissatisfied tanker crewmen. It is to the advantage of the companies to encourage independents, Mr. Collins said. As long as the powerful, big unions stand in the offing, they will continue to prefer the independents.

"But there never were grounds for the charges so frequently made by the big unions that the independents were company organizations. These charges have been thoroughly investigated on several occasions by the National Labor Relations Board and found to be without foundation.

"The independent unions cover officers and unlicensed seamen in the fleets of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the Socony Vacuum Fleet Co., Tidewater, and the officers of Texaco and Cities Service.

"These companies, as well as their crewmen, have benefitted from the contracts with independent unions. The advantages go beyond the avoidance of the periodic strikes which have plagued relations between maritime management and unions.

"One important benefit enjoyed by the oil companies is that they are not required to hire their ship personnel through union hiring halls. This requirement by the big unions has given them a powerful weapon in securing the loyalty and obedience of their members.

"A second benefit is that the welfare and pension plans of the independents are confined to company personnel. This has encouraged continuity of service within the companies. It also has encouraged a company loyalty rather than a loyalty to unions contrasted to the psychological impact on the seamen in large unions who get their welfare or pension payments from the NMU or SIU plans.

"Mr. Collins' book shows that these two factors, never opposed by the independents, have done much to promote cordial relations between management and labor. So cordial have these relations been that the National Maritime Union, the Seafarers International Union, or any of the large ship officers unions have been unable to make any headway in organizing within the membership of the independents."

CHANGING VIEWS ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. STANTON. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in its Monthly Economic Letter for April 1967, the First National City Bank, New York, has called attention to the Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee and what it terms the committee's "defection from the 'new economics' banner."

The bank's letter notes that the policy rift between the Johnson administration and the Joint Economic Committee reflects more than merely a difference of opinion about the economic outlook. More basically, the difference concerns the ability of the administration to "finely tune" the economy, primarily by changes in Federal expenditures and tax rates.

In its annual hearings on the President's Economic Report this year, the committee heard a large number of economists question the ability of Government policymakers to engage in push-button economic policy. The committee was told repeatedly that Government policies of the past have tended to be destabilizing. There was a large body of opinion which downgraded the importance of fiscal policy as a determinant of economic activity and expressed increasing confidence in the influence of monetary factors.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the First National City Bank's article, "Changing Views on Economic Policy," from its April 1967 Monthly Economic Letter.

CHANGING VIEWS ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The sudden restoration of the investment tax credit and the moves toward easier money would seem to indicate a recognition by the Administration and the monetary authorities that the business situation called for a switch in economic policies. But, in urging restoration of the tax credit, Administration officials last month insisted that the need for this action was not related to any weakening in the overall economy and that the proposed 6 per cent surtax would still be needed by next July 1.

A contrary view, however, was presented on March 17 by the Congressional Joint Economic Committee in its report on the President's *Economic Report*. In an unusual "statement of agreement," both the majority and minority members of the Committee warned that the Administration's "optimistic midyear forecast may not eventuate, in which case a tax increase would be warranted." The Committee went on to call for a reduction in nondefense expenditures, which would reduce "the case for a tax increase even if the economy's expansion is restored during the second half of the year." The Democratic majority specified a cut of at least $5-6 billion in nondefense expenditures for fiscal 1968.

DEFECTION FROM THE "NEW ECONOMICS"

The policy rift between the Administration and the Joint Economic Committee (JEC) reflects something more than a difference of opinion about the business outlook. The Administration's current policies are based on a belief in "fine tuning" the economy, primarily by changes in Federal expenditures and tax rates. The "fine tuning" idea, in turn, is the latest manifestation of the "new economics" philosophy, with its stress on fiscal policy changes as the prime method for managing the economy.

The JEC, on the other hand, adopted its latest policy stand after lengthy exposure to sharply differing views on stabilization policies from a group of economic experts testifying on the President's Economic Report in February. What the Committee discovered is that a growing number of economists have come to downgrade the importance of fiscal policy as a determinant of economic activity. Instead, economists are increasingly impressed with the influence of monetary factors in shaping the course of the economy. The JEC's latest policy stance on fiscal and monetary policies, therefore, substantially reflects the shifting weight of economic opinion.

Thus, while the Council of Economic Advisers has continued to emphasize fiscal policy, the JEC this year has stressed a steady increase in the money supply as being vital for "restoration of economic growth and avoidance of a recession." The JEC's majority report stated:

"The committee urges that the monetary authorities adopt the policy of moderate and relatively steady increases in the money supply, avoiding the disruptive effects of wide swings in the rate of increase or decrease."

In a minority report, Republican members called for increasing the money supply at a rate of 2 to 4 per cent a year, compared with a 3 to 5 per cent range recommended by the majority report. The accompanying chart shows the erratic behavior of the money supply over recent months.

The JEC's current policy stance represents a major reversal since last year. At that time, the Committee called for immediate enactment of a tax increase on a standby basis (to be triggered by a joint resolution) and prompt suspension of the investment tax credit. It then strongly supported the idea of an active fiscal policy, with particular emphasis on raising and lowering taxes. In view of this history as well as its special responsibility for advising Congress on economic policies under the Employment Act of 1946, the Committee's defection from the "new economics" banner is a matter of more than passing importance.

CONTRASTING VIEWS ON "FINE TUNING"

The differences between the "new economics" doctrine and opposing views were effectively revealed by expert testimony at the Committee hearings. A leading exponent of "fine tuning" was Professor Walter W. Heller of Minnesota, who initiated the "new economics" era in 1961 as chief economic adviser in the Kennedy-Johnson Administration:

"Quick and fine tuning of economic policy must be the order of the year in which we expect first an ebb and then a flow in the tides of economic advance, all the while operating near full employment, with continued cost-push inflation. In this context, the case for a midyear effective date for the proposed 6 per cent temporary surtax is clear."

In line with his "fine tuning" stand, Mr. Heller maintained that the surtax should be increased or decreased in size and postponed or dropped completely depending on economic conditions. He went on to call for "push-button tax increases or decreases activated by the President and subject to congressional veto."

But many economists have come to reject the economic thinking behind "fine tuning," which assumes that the private economy is highly unstable and subject to manic-depressive behavior unless constantly corrected by Government action. While recognizing that the "new economics" has represented an advance in fiscal-policy thinking insofar as it is based on the concept of a "high-employment surplus," these observers have become highly critical of its basic assumptions about the economy.

In the first place, they reject the view that the economy is so unstable as to require constant "fine tuning" through fiscal and monetary policy. Among the critics of this view before the JEC was Professor Paul McCracken of Michigan, former economic adviser in the Eisenhower Administration, who pointed out that "a far larger part of our problem of economic instability has come from erratic and inappropriate fiscal and monetary policy than we may like to admit."

While the news media have widely acclaimed the "new economics" for its role in maintaining economic expansion, Mr. McCracken and other witnesses submitted considerable evidence indicating that fiscal policy actions had been poorly timed in recent years. Moreover, far from exerting an exquisite and unfailing control over economic activity, fiscal policy was shown to be less effective than monetary policy. The "new economics" school, on the other hand, have usually regarded monetary policy as no more than a handmaiden to fiscal policy.

Professor John Culbertson of Wisconsin downgraded the role of fiscal policy in the recent expansion period in the following words:

"The recovery from that [1960–61] recession occurred despite the fact that fiscal policy remained unusually restrictive. Fiscal policy moved to a less restrictive position in 1962, which will be recalled as the year when the economy developed an increasingly slack position. Despite the condition of the economy, fiscal policy moved back to an unusually restrictive position in 1963. But despite *this*, the economy in early 1963 began the upsurge in total demand that finally brought back full employment."

He pointed out that fiscal policy became unusually expansive only after mid-1965 when full employment had been substantially achieved, and then became even more expansive in late 1966 and early 1967. Despite the most expansive fiscal policy of modern experience, he went on, the economy over the past year "has been transformed from extreme expansion to the brink of recession."

Advocates of an active fiscal policy argue that its effectiveness has been hampered by slowness in congressional decision-making. They maintain that policies could be improved by adopting "push-button" taxes legislated in advance and activated by the President as needed. The chief difficulty, however, is that an appropriate fiscal policy requires a high degree of accuracy in economic forecasting and an early recognition that action is needed.

In late 1965 and early 1966, the Administration failed to recognize the intensity of the boom then under way and underestimated the amount of restraint needed. And when it finally acted to suspend the investment tax credit last September, the capital spending boom had already crested, as the current and subsequent surveys confirmed. It has now acted to restore the credit at a time when the business slowdown may weaken capital spending to the point where the credit may be insufficient to bring a real revival.

EMPHASIS ON MONETARY FACTORS

Many economists have also been critical about the timing of monetary policy changes. At the same time, belief in the key influence of monetary policy has been growing. Among the witnesses upholding this view was Beryl Sprinkel, Vice President of the Harris Trust and Savings Bank, who presented the following appraisal:

"Although fiscal policy received most of the plaudits for the 1961–65 economic expansion, it should be noted that economic performance can be better explained by trends in monetary growth. Despite the fact that the 1964 tax [cut] lagged the initial proposal over 1½ years, the economy continued to record favorable growth records in response to an expansive monetary policy following the 1962 slowup. Furthermore, there was no demonstrable acceleration in the economy subsequent to the tax cut."

"Rather than looking on monetary-fiscal policies as substitutes, the evidence suggests they are more nearly complements with monetary policy providing the major spending motive force while the tax system establishes the structural incentives to encourage production, employment, savings, investment, and growth."

Many economists also attribute the recent business slowdown to the abrupt change in money supply behavior from an excessive rate of expansion to an actual contraction in the spring of 1966. As Mr. Culbertson pointed out:

"Money growth from the spring of 1965 through the spring of 1966 was by far the most rapid during any period of prosperity in recent times. . . . Finally, with characteristic abruptness, the rate of growth of the money supply changed again in the spring of 1966, now becoming sharply restrictive by involving a net decline in the money supply, compared with an average earlier performance of 3 or 4 percent a year growth.

"Evidently, this sharp departure in monetary policy can be interpreted as the factor causing the choking off of expansion since last summer."

The recent experience, therefore, provides added evidence of the crucial role played by money supply behavior. Economists in recent years have accumulated a great deal of evidence confirming the importance of monetary factors in the economy. The revival of interest in monetary behavior as evidenced by the JEC hearings, is largely attributable to the researches of Professor Milton Friedman of Chicago, whose monumental study (with Anna Schwartz), *A Monetary History of the United States, 1867–1960,* has had a wide-ranging impact on economic thinking.

NEW ROLE FOR FISCAL POLICY

The accumulating evidence on the key role of monetary factors in the economy obviously has important implications for fiscal policy. For if monetary policy largely determines the course of economic activity, this reduces the need for an active fiscal policy, particularly one that would require Congress to hand over much of its power over taxation to the Executive branch.

The JEC's call for a $5–6 billion cut in fiscal 1968 expenditures and its rejection of any early action on the tax surcharge conforms with the new views that are emerging among economists. As Mr. McCracken pointed out, "a fairly wide range of budget positions" may be consistent with a given level of GNP. But the budget remains important because the size of the budget deficit (including sales of financial assets) "has a powerful effect on capital markets and the level of interest rates." Mr. McCracken, therefore, suggested a new division of labor between monetary and fiscal policy:

"We now see it as the task of monetary policy to set the growth path for the domestic economy, and it is the task of fiscal policy to achieve the money and capital market conditions that will validate this course."

Many people who favor a tax increase to narrow the prospective 1968 budget deficit apparently are unaware of the accelerated growth of nondefense outlays, which has been partly hidden by offsetting sales of Federal financial assets. But as the accompanying chart shows, nondefense spending is climbing much faster than defense outlays.

The presumed success of the "new economics," particularly as exemplified by the 1964 tax cuts, is often regarded as setting a precedent for a flexible fiscal policy, whereby Federal spending and tax rates would be continuously adjusted to economic conditions. But Congress's intent in lowering tax rates at that time was to stimulate the economy by improving incentives and equity. Indeed, the preamble of the Revenue Act of 1964 specifically called for "all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

Because the Joint Economic Committee has a special responsibility for economic stabilization, its current policy stand against "push-button" taxes and excessive tax changes is a welcome development. A similiar posture had already been taken by Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over initiating tax legislation. In a speech delivered last February, Mr. Mills said:

"We must not let ourselves be put into the position of raising or lowering the hemlines of taxation from season to season merely to make the merchandise more salable."

It is increasingly obvious that the 6 per cent surtax proposal is not only ill-timed and inappropriate under present conditions, but it represents a psychological barrier to business confidence. Instead, sound fiscal policy requires a slowing in the explosive growth of Federal spending. Pruning $5–6 billion from proposed expenditures, as suggested by the Joint Economic Committee, would put the economy in better shape to resume healthy growth.

Meanwhile, easier money should be our main instrument for stimulating a further advance in business. Our recent experience, however, suggests that a steadier monetary policy—one that avoids excessive swings up and down—is a vital necessity if the economy is to maintain noninflationary growth. In easing money now, therefore, care should be taken to stay within the safe speed limits for monetary expansion.

THREE FEDERAL BUDGET CONCEPTS: WHICH IS "BEST"?

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's budget has become the subject of increasing comment and criticism to the point where the President, himself, has appointed a committee on budget reform for the purpose of restoring the integrity of the world's most important financial document.

On February 16, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 3573—an article from the Journal of Accountancy of November 1966, by Maurice H. Stans, entitled "The Federal Budget Needs Reform." Mr. Stans, a former Budget Director, has been a leading proponent of budget reform. His articles and speeches on the subject have been most compelling in presenting the case for reform fairly in the context of professional accounting considerations.

One of his many well-taken arguments has been that the use of three budgets is misleading and confusing, and that the Federal sector of the National Income and Products Accounts "budget" is not a budget at all, but a tool for economic analysis.

The President this year referred to the National Income Accounts "budget" as the "most appropriate measure of the overall economic impact of the Federal budget." Many economists appear to concur with the President in his selection of the NIA "budget" as the one which should be emphasized.

Therefore, it is highly significant when one of the Nation's leading economists presents a balanced analysis of the characteristics and uses of the three budgets, and draws the conclusions which necessarily follow from such a careful consideration.

Prof. Raymond J. Saulnier, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has done this in his M. L. Seidman Memorial Town Hall lecture at Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn., on March 3 of this year. The title of the lecture was: "Three Federal Concepts: Which Is 'Best'?"

Dr. Saulnier analyses the question in terms of the need for each budget, the uses to which it is put, and its capabilities. I think it would be fair to summarize his points as follows:

First. The NIA "budget" is not a budget but a tool for economic analysis, and by no means a perfect tool even for that more limited purpose: it does not measure cash flows, it does not show the extensive lending operations of the Government, it does not adequately measure the deficit—or surplus—it gives no hint of the impact of Federal Government operations on the financial markets, and the timelag between the availability of the kind of information it supplies and actual events is so long as to limit further its usefulness.

Second. The existence of three budgets provides an opportunity, even an invitation, to an administration to choose which "budget" concept it will emphasize on political criteria rather than set standards relevant to public and private needs.

Third. The National Income Accounts "budget" is interesting and useful, but the administrative budget, and the cash budget are essential to the operation of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President has appointed a very fine and competent group of people to his committee on budget reform. I have the utmost confidence in them. I would like to note, however, that the committee does not include Dr. Saulnier, nor Mr. Stans. I believe this to be a most distressing oversight. Here are two individuals who are not only among the most highly qualified to render invaluable service to the Government and to the people in this cause, but who have already on their own initiative, made substantial contributions toward improving the budget.

At the very least, we here in the Congress, and those who have been named to the President's Committee To Reform the Budget, have an obligation to study their recommendations carefully. As noted above, I have already inserted Mr. Stans' article in the RECORD so that it will be available to all for reference.

Mr. Speaker, this time, it is a pleasure and privilege to insert in the RECORD this further valuable analysis by the distinguished Professor Saulnier, "Three Federal Budget Concepts: Which Is 'Best'?"

THREE FEDERAL BUDGET CONCEPTS: WHICH IS "BEST"?

(The M. L. Seidman Memorial Town Hall Lecture, sponsored by Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn., March 3, 1967, by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City)

My subject tonight is the federal budget but what I shall be talking about is not whether it makes any difference how the

budget comes out in the end, whether there is a deficit or a surplus, but how the deficit or the surplus, as the case may be, is calculated. To put it differently, the subject is federal budget accounting.

Such a subject would in any case be appropriate for a lecture memorializing a distinguished public accountant, but for a number of reasons it is also a topical one. First, a budget that is deeply and consistently in deficit on any recognized and respected method of accounting is bound to become a conversation-piece. And the federal budget is deeply in deficit and has been for six full fiscal years. It is now in its seventh deficit year; and there are additional deficits ahead, even under the most optimistic assumptions concerning economic developments. And because we have been running large deficits during prosperity, the deficits that would emerge if the economy were to turn into recession would be enormous.

Second, it is a good rule that when some aspect of the economy gets out of kilter, so to speak, debate tends to center on the statistics that bear on the problem. That rule has not failed in the present case. What has attracted particular attention is that there are three different sets of figures on the budget and that each tells a different story. On one basis of calculation we have had deficits of only $4.8 billion in the past six full fiscal years; on a second basis, we have had nearly $23 billion; and on a third, we have in this period had a deficiency of receipts below expenditures of just over $30 billion.

Third, it did not go unnoticed that the administration's recent choice of the budget concept which, in its opinion, is the best measure of the federal government's economic impact happens to be the concept that shows the smallest deficit.

Finally, the subject is topical also because the President has indicated he will appoint a bipartisan group to study federal budget accounting practices and make recommendations for improved methods of presenting the figures.

In what I have to say tonight I shall (1) attempt to explain the several budget concepts; (2) discuss their relative merits for measuring the federal government's impact on the economy; and (3) make suggestions for presenting federal budget accounts.

THE SEVERAL BUDGET CONCEPTS

There are three budget concepts that warrant particular attention. I will in a moment speak about a fourth, one that seems recently to have been lost in the shuffle, but there are only three that figure in the current dialogue. These are: (i) the administrative budget (the budget most familiar in public discussion); (ii) the cash consolidated statement (better known as the cash budget); and (iii) the so-called NIA budget. Since the last is not a budget at all, I will not refer to it as such, but rather by its technical name: the "federal sector of the national income and product accounts."

The fourth budget concept, to which I just alluded, must be referred to in the past tense, since it has apparently been abandoned for official use. I refer to the "full employment surplus concept," or what came to be known as the "high-employment budget." It was prominently set forth in the January 1962 Economic Report and in the 1965 Report was praised as "a useful measure of the impact of the federal budget on economic activity." There was not a word about it, however, in the last two Economic Reports. On the contrary, the administration has now turned to the Federal sector of the national income and product accounts as its preferred method of measuring federal impact on the economy.

I have no wish to comment more than parenthetically on the mysterious disappearance of the "full employment surplus concept." But I am constrained to say that if it was dropped because it is giving wrong signals now as to what fiscal policy ought to be, or gave wrong signals in the past, then the public deserves an explanation of what is officially thought to be wrong with this previously much-admired concept. It never seemed to me to be a good one, and I have publicly presented my objections to it, but it was, after all, the intellectual foundation of fiscal policy in recent years. Moreover, and this is a point on which I concede a certain personal interest, it was used extensively by officers of government since 1960 to disparage the fiscal policies of the nineteen-fifties. Remembering this, some explanation is called for if the concept is now being cast aside as somehow seriously deficient. At least, it deserves an obituary notice.

HOW THEY DIFFER

Let me turn now to a description of the three federal budget concepts still in circulation and competing for attention. How do they differ, one from another?

There are a good many differences, but they fall mainly into two general groups. The first has to do with coverage, that is, with the extent to which the concepts include federal fiscal transactions within their scope. The second has to do with the basis on which the several concepts register the occurrence of transactions, which we may refer to as the criterion of timing.

In coverage

On the coverage question, let me note at once that no one of the concepts covers all federal fiscal transactions. In each case there is a certain amount of offsetting of receipts against expenditures with the result that substantial areas of government spending are never visible in the budget. Business-type activities of the federal government, such as the Post Office and TVA, are reported this way. And, as we will see later, federal lending operations are reported on a net basis. However, except for the handling of lending programs, on which I will comment in a moment, we can ignore for present purposes those limitations of coverage in respect of which the several budget concepts are the same; all that concerns us here are the ways in which the coverage of the three budget concepts is significantly different.

Briefly, the important differences of coverage are that the administrative budget excludes trust fund operations, whereas the cash budget and the federal sector of the national income accounts include them, and that (subject to a qualification I will explain in a moment) both the administrative budget and the cash budget cover transactions of federal lending programs, whereas the federal sector of the national income accounts does not. Thus, the most complete set of accounts is the cash budget; it includes trust fund operations absent in the administrative budget, and lending transactions absent in the national income accounts. If there is merit in breadth of coverage—and I believe there is—the blue ribbon, on this score, goes to the cash budget.

In timing

Let us now look at the three concepts from the point of view of their timing of transactions. Conceptually, two bases are used: transactions are recorded on a *current* basis, that is, as they actually occur, or on an *accrual* basis, that is, as rights to receive income, or liability to pay taxes or make other payments are incurred.

It would be convenient if we could say that the three budget concepts are consistent, each within itself, in following either a current or an accrual form of accounting but this is apparently not strictly the case. Broadly speaking, however, we may say that the cash and the administrative budgets are on a current basis and that the federal sector of the national income accounts is on an accrual basis. Thus, the administrative and cash budgets register spending as it occurs—with the interesting but not very significant difference that the former registers spending as checks are drawn while the latter registers it as checks pass through clearance—whereas the national income accounts record spending for equipment and supplies at time of delivery, regardless of when money to pay for them is actually disbursed. On the income side, the administrative and cash budgets record revenues as they are actually received, though again with the minor difference between writing and clearing checks, whereas the national income accounts register receipts from corporate income taxes not as companies actually pay them but as their liability to pay taxes accrues.

So much for the major differences among the three concepts. What I have had to say here, plus other points of lesser importance, are set forth clearly in the January 1967 budget document.

THEIR USES AND RELATIVE MERITS

What are we to say now as to the relative merits of these three budget concepts for measuring the impact of federal fiscal transactions on the economy?

The administration has recently stated that it is the federal sector of the national income accounts that is "best" in this connection, but I am sure you will recognize that "best" in this context must be a relative matter. There is no absolute best. A particular budget concept can be "best" only in the sense that in a particular use it serves better than any other. If there were only one use to which budget concepts are put, we could expect a definitive answer to the question: which concept is best? But there is a variety of uses and not *a priori* reason to say that any one concept is "best" in connection with all of them.

For the Congress

Consider first the use to which Congress puts the various budgets. Obviously, Congress must be interested in all three concepts, but it has a particular interest in the administrative budget. It is this set of accounts—and no other set—that deals specifically and exclusively with fiscal transactions for which Congress has a unique operating responsibility. If you examine the appendix to the budget document you will find that transactions are organized into two categories, those involving "federal funds" and those involving "trust funds." Federal funds are those which, as the budget document puts it, "are owned by the federal government." Their hallmark is that they are funds in respect of which Congress stands in a kind of proprietary position, a position that involves both discretionary authority and special responsibility.

With respect to "trust funds" on the other hand, Congress stands in a position of trustee or fiduciary. These include social security and unemployment insurance trust funds, the highway trust fund, funds of several federally-sponsored enterprises, of which FDIC is an example, and funds left with the federal government in a kind of "suspense" category or as a deposit. Responsibility of the Congress for trust funds is essentially different from responsibility of the Congress for federally-owned funds; accordingly, separate accounting of the two is necessary.

For the Congress, the administrative budget—which records transactions in federal funds—is not only a meaningful but an indispensable set of accounts. It has been correctly described in the budget document as "the focal point for management and decision-making with respect to [those] government activities financed by the government's own funds." Ultimately to consolidate administrative budget and trust fund transactions in a single accounting statement (as in the cash consolidated statement) does not in any way interfere with the carrying out by Congress of its responsibilities for the two separate types of funds. Indeed, the cash consolidated statement pro-

vides Congress with much valuable information. The point is that, with the responsibilities of Congress defined as they are, it needs an administrative budget and it needs separate trust fund accounts. The much maligned administrative budget has obvious deficiencies for measuring the impact of federal fiscal transactions on the economy; all the same, it is an indispensable accounting concept for the Congress.

For the Treasury

The Treasury has two major operating responsibilities that determine what it needs by way of budget accounts. These are its responsibilities for the public debt and for the cash balance of the federal government. Changes in the amount of public debt outstanding are affected by changes in government cash balances and by financing transactions of government enterprises, but they are determined primarily by transactions in federally-owned funds, as reflected in the administrative budget. Changes in the government's public financing requirements, on the other hand, are affected not only by transactions in federally-owned funds but by transactions in trust funds, as well. Accordingly, from a purely functional point of view, the administrative budget is indispensable to the Treasury for its management of cash and total public debt and the cash budget is indispensable to it for the conduct of public debt-financing operations. If the Treasury had no administrative budget or no cash budget, it would have to invent both all over again, and would have to do so promptly.

The federal sector of the national income accounts, on the other hand, is another matter. The Secretary of the Treasury uses these data in certain broad analyses, but if they were all he had to guide him in the performance of his duties as chief financial officer of the federal government he could be swamped with cash; more serious, he could see his checks returned marked "no funds" and not have the slightest forewarning of these embarrassments. Nor would he have the least idea of the kind of debt-financing problem he was up against. In short, for the Treasury, the national income accounts are interesting but the administrative budget and the cash budget are indispensable.

For the monetary authorities and financial analysts

Consider next the needs of those who must evaluate the impact of federal fiscal transactions on the capital markets. These are questions of paramount interest to the nation's monetary authorities—the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System—and to scores of businessmen and financial analysts.

The first point that should be clear is that the federal sector of the national income accounts is of little direct use in making financial analyses. Because they exclude government lending operations they give an incomplete measure of the amount of funds the federal government is injecting into the economy, and an incomplete measure of what government is demanding from the capital markets. For such measures, one has to turn to the cash consolidated statement. And even this statement, with its extensive coverage of financial transactions, is still not broad enough to measure the federal government's full financial impact on the economy. This deficiency results from the way the cash consolidated statement handles the sale of financial assets by the federal government. Let me explain.

Because it is a banker nowadays on a very large scale—far larger than is commonly understood—the federal government holds large amounts of financial assets. In fiscal 1966, for example, it entered into new direct loan commitments amounting to $7.2 billion, entirely apart from the $24.3 billion of privately advanced loans which it committed itself to insure or guarantee, and its holdings of loans amounted to $33 billion at the end of that fiscal period. Recently, however, it has been selling loans from among these holdings, not in small amounts, as was done in the 1950's, but in very large amounts. Thus, in fiscal 1966 it sold nearly $3 billion; it proposes to sell another $4 billion in fiscal 1967; and budget plans for fiscal 1968 call for sales of $5.3 billion.

In the 1950's, loans were sold in order to get the federal government out of the banking business but that is obviously not the purpose of recent sales since (except to a minor extent) loans are not turned over to the buyer but are held in a special trust fund and continue to be serviced by the federal government. What is sold is a security called a "participation certificate" or PC, which has been ruled by the Attorney General as being backed by the "full faith and credit of the United States."

The effect of these sales on the budget is to make spending and the deficit seem less than they really are. Because the sale of financial assets is treated as a loan repayment, and because loan repayments are netted against loan disbursements in reporting expenditures, net budget expenditures for lending agencies and, therefore, net expenditures for the administrative and cash budgets are less, dollar for dollar, than they would otherwise be. And because recorded expenditures are less, the recorded deficit is less. Thus, as a result of financial asset sales, the federal government appears to be spending less than it is actually spending and its budget deficit appears to be less than it actually is. The federal sector of the national income accounts is, of course, entirely innocent of this effect because it excludes lending transactions altogether.

Because PC sales are as much a security flotation as the issuance of conventional federal debt, if we want to measure capital requirements of the federal government we have to add their sales to the deficit recorded in the cash budget. Similarly, to get a meaningful measure of the change in federal debt, we must add outstanding participation certificates to the amount of outstanding conventional debt.

The budget concept that best measures the extent to which federal fiscal operations affect capital markets is neither the administrative budget nor the cash budget, and certainly not the federal sector of the national income accounts; it is the cash budget adjusted for financial asset sales.

For policymakers and economists

Finally, we come to the task of evaluating the impact of federal fiscal operations on the economy as a whole. It is this task—wider than the task of evaluating the impact on credit markets—that is faced by the economic forecaster; it is a major preoccupation, also, of federal policymakers.

Because what happens to capital markets is a major consideration in determining what will happen to the economy, and because it is the cash budget adjusted for financial asset sales that reveals this impact, we may begin by saying that a critical part of the task of evaluating the federal government's impact on the economy as a whole must be satisfied by the cash budget adjusted for financial asset sales. Not only does this measure government financing requirements, but it gives some clue as to whether their satisfaction will involve recourse to the commercial banking system, and thus whether it will affect the money supply. We may differ in the importance we attach to changes in the money supply, but there can be no quarrel with the proposition that, if we don't know how government operations are affecting the money supply, we are without a major part of an explanation of how it is affecting the economy generally. And I emphasize again that, in supplying information to this end, the federal sector of the national income accounts gives no help at all. What information we have comes from the cash budget adjusted for financial asset sales.

Last summer was an object lesson in what we need to know if we are to understand how the federal government affects the economy. A near-crisis was brought on by a sudden turn to tightness in monetary policy concurrently with massive and untimely sales of participation certificates. As a register of these near-calamitous events, the federal sector of the national income accounts is a complete blank! It is a remarkable thing that in a world where there is so much preoccupation with interest rates and with tight money and easy money, the budget concept officially labeled as "best" in revealing the impact of federal operations on the economy should tell us nothing *directly* about the forces affecting interest rates, credit markets, or the money supply. Trying to understand the impact of federal fiscal operations on the economy solely by the use of national income accounts is like trying to understand the impact of consumer spending on the economy without knowing what is happening to consumer credit. It is impossible.

What the national income accounts do for us, and it is an undeniably useful service, is to measure the direct impact of federal operations in national income and production. Important as this is, however, it does not justify labeling that set of accounts "best" for measuring the government's impact on the economy. This much is clear: if all we knew about the impact of the federal government on the economy was what we could learn from the federal sector of the national income accounts, we would promptly have to reinvent the cash budget. And when we had reinvented the cash budget we would have to learn how to adjust it for sales of financial assets.

THE MERITS OF ACCRUAL VERSUS CURRENT ACCOUNTING

Let me touch briefly on another point frequently mentioned as a particular merit of the national income accounts, namely, that they measure federal financial transactions on an accrual rather than on a current basis.

There is a good deal to be said for accrual accounting in evaluating the impact of the federal government on the economy; but it is debatable whether, from an economic point of view it is the "best" basis of accounting. For example, consider the handling of government revenues. Do taxes have more impact on a corporate taxpayer when he makes the cash payment or when he accrues his tax liability? The use of cash to pay taxes affects corporate liquidity; the accrual of taxes does not. Accrued tax liabilities, on the other hand, affect corporate income and profits, whereas disbursement of cash to pay taxes does not. Which is more important, the impact on liquidity or the impact on income? No analyst can afford to be interested in one to the exclusion of the other. To say that the national income accounts are "best" because they are put together on an accrual basis is not at all a conclusive argument.

On the same point, consider the merits of accrual *versus* current accounting in recording federal expenditures. Is it more useful to know when federal spending actually takes place, that is, when checks are drawn or cashed, or to know when the goods for which these payments are made or delivered? My answer to that question is that the analyst must be interested in knowing when the payments are made and when the goods are delivered. One should be eclectic in these things; one needs all the information available. Information on the flow of cash comes from the cash budget; information on the flow of goods comes from the national products accounts. Nothing could be more fruitless than an attempt to show that one type

of information is more important or somehow better than the other.

UP-TO-DATENESS

This discussion can be concluded by pointing out that of the three budget concepts the federal sector of the national income accounts must get the lowest rating when judged by the time-lag between the information it supplies and actual events. The administrative budget is available on a monthly basis. The same is true of the cash budget. The national income accounts are available only quarterly, and even at that, with a considerable time-lag. Thus, if you were to look tonight (March 3, 1967) for the most up-to-date information available in the federal sector of the national income accounts you would find some information through December 1966; but for the budget deficit or surplus you would find data only through September of last year. We may sometime have monthly data on national income and product accounts, and the sooner the better, but as things stand these estimates have the weakness of lagging very much behind events.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) President Johnson's plan to appoint a bipartisan commission to review methods of presenting federal budget information and make suggestions for improvement comes at a time when such a review is greatly needed. What the commission should strive for in federal budget accounting is precisely what we insist on in corporate financial accounting: full disclosure; methods of presentation that avoid misunderstanding; accounts that adequately serve the needs of the principal users of budget materials.

(2) There being no one way of presenting federal fiscal information that meets the needs of all users equally well, and as fully as we should strive to meet them, we should continue the present method, which is to present all three accounts. However, when we speak about "budget deficit" or "budget surplus" we should speak of what is shown in the cash consolidated statement. Gaps in coverage seriously impair the usefulness of the administrative budget for such purposes, though it is an indispensable tool in the management of funds for which Congress has special responsibility. The federal sector of the national income and product accounts, though useful in showing the relation between federal activities and changes in national income and production, is open to the same objection. It will help public discourse if the latter is referred to as an "analysis" rather than as a "budget."

(3) Even the cash consolidated statement is inadequate in one of the leading uses to which federal fiscal information is put: to measure the amount of the federal government's current and prospective demands on the capital markets. To correct this inadequacy, the budget document should include a special analysis of the capital market requirements of the federal government and related agencies. It would set forth actual results and projections for:

a) change in public debt arising from transactions in federally-owned funds, changes in cash balances and financing transactions by government enterprises;

b) extent to which federal debt financing is accomplished through absorption of securities by federal trust funds;

c) extent to which federal expenditures are financed by seigniorage and sales of financial assets, in particular sales of participation certificates;

d) financing by federal agencies that is additive to direct federal financing.

(4) It would be enormously helpful, also, if the federal government were to institute the practice of making quarterly projections of federal expenditures, federal budget receipts and the federal government's capital market requirements. As things stand, information on such matters is more extensive and reliable for the private economy than for the federal government.

(5) In the interest of full disclosure and public understanding, the budget document, through appropriate footnotes or memorandum accounts, should clarify and give prominence to unusual transactions and circumstances affecting the budget. This would include large sales of financial assets, especially participation certificates; unusual gains from seigniorage; and nonrecurring gains or losses of revenue, such as result from changes in methods of tax collection or the management of funds and lending programs. The rule should be the same as that applied to corporate financial accounting: a realistic presentation of budget results that will make it possible to draw meaningful comparisons between operations in adjoining fiscal years and over longer periods of time.

It must be conceded that we have been operating of late in a kind of fiscal fog. This is not only unbecoming but downright dangerous. I hope the suggestions made in these remarks will help lift that fog and extend the range of financial and economic visibility.

AN ANSWER FROM MR. SHRIVER

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, for over 18 months I have been attempting, without much success, to get certain vital information from the Office of Economic Opportunity and its Director, Mr. R. Sargent Shriver. I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of letters and one telegram to illustrate how difficult it is to elicit even a reply from Mr. Shriver.

The opening letter is dated January 12, 1967, to which no reply was received. On March 2, 1967, I again wrote to Mr. Shriver. A third letter was sent on April 6, 1967. I waited until April 13, 1967, at which time I sent a telegram to Mr. Shriver which contained this phrase:

Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators, House Education and Labor Committee, will be at your office, nine a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence four-week investigation at OEO headquarters.

The telegram, at last, galvanized Mr. Shriver into an answer, which is also included, dated April 14, 1967. I am also including my reply to Mr. Shriver of April 17, 1967.

I believe a careful reading of the letters and telegram illustrates a serious administrative defect in the operations of OEO. As I wrote in my letter of April 17, 1967:

A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12 (1967), concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to reasonable inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency.

Mr. Speaker, It would appear to me that OEO already has enough problems without compounding them by refusing to answer a reasonable request from a Member of Congress.

As Members of Congress know, I am not out to eliminate the poverty programs. With my colleague, Mr. GOODELL, I have worked hard to prepare a substitute for the administration's war on poverty, called the opportunity crusade. The opportunity crusade would transfer the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act from OEO to existing agencies and would provide for the involvement of States and private industry in an effort to make meaningful studies toward eliminating poverty.

The purpose of many contacts with OEO is to make the faltering war on poverty a successful opportunity crusade.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my colleagues will take note of this exchange of letters, and Mr. Shriver's belated reply. To vote intelligently we must have more facts. I hope Mr. Shriver and his associates will in the future be more cooperative when a Member of Congress makes a reasonable request for information.

The letters and telegram follow:

JANUARY 12, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The December 20, 1966, issue of the Omaha, Nebraska, *World Herald* carried an article captioned "GOCA Given Bonus Offer—Job Corps Prospects Worth $25 Each." The Director of the Greater Omaha Community Action agency reported he had been asked to participate in a "bonus" program to attract more male youths into the Job Corps. He said the Community Action agency would receive $25 for each youth it recruited and sent to the State Employment Service where screening and testing is done. GOCA reportedly would be paid whether or not the youth entered the Corps.

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Kenneth E. Shearer, Director, Greater Omaha Community Action, confirmed the above and stated this bonus program had been set up in many states because of "some difficulties in recruiting youngsters."

On January 10, 1967, Mr. Don Thomasson, Regional Director of OEO, Kansas City, Missouri, advised a staff investigator of the House Education and Labor Committee that the above program was conceived early in December and all Regional Offices of OEO had been encouraged to participate.

Perhaps you will recall that during the Senate debate of the 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, there was some criticism of OEO for paying amounts up to $80 to the United States Employment Service and private organizations for recruiting Job Corps prospects. The 1965 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, Section 103(e) provided "that the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the corps."

It seems to me that a plan to reimburse another anti-poverty agency for recruiting or referring Job Corps prospects is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Economic Opportunity Act as amended. Further, I would expect that the recruitment and counseling of prospects for Job Corps would receive high priority in community action programs and that these activities are provided for in funds granted community action agencies for conduct and administration.

I would appreciate your comments regarding the above matter.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 2, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: The Sunday, December 11, 1966, issue of the *San Francisco* (California) *Examiner* carried a front-page story exposing fiscal irregularities in the operation of the Economic Opportunity Council (EOC), San Francisco's Community Action Agency. The Examiner's story was based on an Office of Economic Opportunity audit report released by the Western Regional Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Concerning the release of the OEO audit report, the Regional OEO Director said it was a public document open to inspection by anyone.

I was somewhat surprised to learn that OEO considers audit reports public documents. During the past eighteen months, there has been considerable publicity resulting from alleged improper expenditures of War on Poverty funds. To my knowledge, neither the Congress nor the public have been given the results of audits of programs where scandals have occurred and in most instances have not learned of the ultimate disposition of these matters.

I know you are aware of my deep interest in anti-poverty legislation and the development of anti-poverty programs across the country. In order that the Congress can be apprised of the results of official OEO audits of programs having alleged fiscal difficulties, please forward to me OEO audit reports regarding the following matters:

1) Interim and final audit reports concerning Haryou-Act during the 1965–1966 period;

2) Interim and final audit reports concerning EYOA, the Los Angeles Community Action Agency, audited early in 1966. (You will recall that during the 1966 War on Poverty hearings, the Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee ordered that these reports be submitted for the record. The record does not include the Los Angeles audit reports.)

3) Interim and final audit reports concerning the ABCD, Boston's Community Action Agency, which was involved in difficulties late in 1965 and early 1966;

4) Interim and final audit reports regarding CDGM, Mississippi's Head Start sponsor, much of which has been publicized;

5) Audit reports concerning EOC, San Francisco's Community Action Agency, which were released to the press in December, 1966;

6) Audit reports reflecting the results of an investigation in Newark, New Jersey, which culminated in the conviction of Phillip Thigpen, an NYC administrator, and his assistant;

7) Inspection reports regarding the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs which received widespread publicity late in 1965;

8) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Atterbury, Indiana, Job Corps Center prior to change of sponsor in 1966;

9) Audit and inspection reports of the Camp Breckinridge, Ky., Job Corps Center prior to the change of sponsor in 1966;

10) Audit reports concerning the Cleveland Action for Youth program where, prior to September, 1966, $1,632 admittedly was paid to a fictitious employee;

11) Audit reports regarding Cleveland's (Ohio) Neighborhood Youth Corps where in September, 1966, alleged payroll padding scandals were exposed;

12) Audit reports of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) antipoverty programs. It was reported in July, 1966, that U.S. Representative Sam Gibbons had requested OEO to make a "top-to-bottom" re-examination of the Suncoast poverty war; and

13) Any audit or inspection reports of the Mingo, West Virginia, County Community Action Agency.

An early reply to the above request will be appreciated very much.

With every best wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 6, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: I am told that on the Easter Sunday "Meet the Press" program you stated you would welcome a long, hard look at the antipoverty program by the Congress. I find this invitation most interesting and particularly appropriate at this time. I am hopeful that in the near future the House Education and Labor Committee will be considering anti-poverty legislation. It is my feeling that the Committee would find most useful data that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been gathering for the past year. I have noted that several million dollars have been spent by the OEO to study and evaluate a variety of its programs.

It would be appreciated if you will agree to make OEO records available to staff investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee at the OEO Headquarters during the period April 17–May 12, 1967. I would like your assurance that investigators will be permitted access to personnel and administrative records, Inspector General's reports of OEO investigations, all fiscal records including OEO audit reports, all OEO contracts and memoranda and reports concerning studies and evaluations of War on Poverty programs. It is likely that copies of selected data will be requested for review by the Committee. Further, it would be most helpful if you would make members of your staff available, their schedules permitting, for interviews.

I would appreciate an early reply in order that the necessary arrangements can be made.

With every best wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE.

R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, OEO,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference my letter April 6, 1967. Unless you advise me to the contrary, staff investigators, House Education and Labor Committee will be at your office, 9 a.m., Monday, April 17, 1967, to commence 4-week investigation at OEO headquarters.

Regards,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Your telegram of April 13 and your letter of April 6 have been the subject of a discussion between myself and the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Chairman Perkins indicated that he would shortly inform me of his Committee's desires with respect to the handling of this year's poverty bill.

I assured the Chairman that I would welcome a long hard look at the anti-poverty programs by his Committee, that this agency was fully prepared to comply with any appropriate requests for information from his Committee, and that we were ready to cooperate in every possible way to facilitate the deliberations of his Committee.

I am prepared to answer any questions that you or any other Member of Congress may have with respect to this agency's operations. Members of my staff are prepared at any time, their schedules permitting, to answer any questions you or any other Member of Congress may wish to present to them.

I don't think that my attitude with respect to Congressional examination of Economic Opportunity Act programs differs significantly from those of the heads of other agencies in connection with their requests for funds and legislation. I am, therefore, somewhat surprised that what I have said on this point should give rise to the suggestion that your staff should be permitted to range at will through the files and records of this agency—a request that, so far as I know, is completely unprecedented.

The files of this agency, like those of others, contain a variety of material that bears on internal decision-making processes, upon the private affairs of many thousands of individuals, and upon possible or alleged but as yet undetermined violations of law or regulations on the part of specific individuals and organizations. I am certain you will recognize that much of this material is traditionally protected and not of the nature that any agency head could be expected to make available on the terms you suggest.

Apart from questions of law or basic propriety, I would also point out that what you suggest would most certainly interfere with operations of this agency at the busiest time of the year. It would also most certainly interfere with the grant process and inhibit our own efforts to prepare and assemble our justification materials for the Congress in an orderly and efficient manner.

The evaluation reports of OEO programs, as we have previously indicated, are available at any time. They are voluminous and we have them in a special library that is open to the public and certainly would be available to any of your staff who would like to review them. They may contact Dr. Levine (Government Code 128–6021) and they will be permitted access to the reports.

In response to your letter of March 2 with respect to certain audit reports, neither this agency nor any other in the Federal Government considers such reports automatically public documents. The fact that one report was issued prematurely is not a justification for considering all such reports public information.

The report of the auditors is but one step in an over-all auditing process that may involve a good many internal staff communications of the kind that are not normally available even in litigation with an agency. An audit report, moreover, may well lead to or become a part of an administrative or court proceeding. It is clear that premature release of this kind of document can be wholly subversive of the purpose for which those documents are prepared. Obviously the Federal interest could not be protected by the disclosure of every potential claim, charge, or action while it is under discussion. Public disclosure would, in fact, jeopardize in many instances the Federal case if the matter eventually results in a formal proceeding or a criminal prosecution.

Most of the audits on which you requested reports have not as yet been brought to final resolution. The audit report of the 1965 summer program of Haryou, for instance, was completed early this year. It was followed by a response on the part of the grantee which resolved some of the problems. That response has been reviewed by lawyers, accountants, and program people who have made recommendations to the regional director. He is now consulting further with Haryou on the basis of the recommendations made by the reviewing staff. Should his determinations be accepted by Haryou, a final order bringing the matter to a conclusion will be prepared. If not, Haryou will be entitled to an administrative or judicial hearing.

There follows a status report on the other matters on which you requested information.

1. EYOA (The Los Angeles Community Action Agency)—The audit report has been completed and a response has been made by the grantee. This response is being evaluated and no final determinations have been made.

2. ABCD (Boston's Community Action Agency)—A series of audits have been completed. The grantee has responded and the process is moving forward. One or two elements are being evaluated by the Justice Department.

3. CDGM—1965 Summer Head Start Program—Audit process has been completed. A substantial amount of money was recovered. A report on this matter will be provided to you shortly. An interim audit by Ernst and Ernst of the 1966 CDGM Head Start Program is being evaluated as a basis for final audit by OEO staff.

4. EOC (San Francisco's Community Action Agency)—The report was completed. The response of the grantee is now being evaluated.

5. Your requests relating to the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs of ABCD in Boston, and Newark, New Jersey, the Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland Action for Youth, and the Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps, I have referred to Jack Howard who will respond to your inquiry.

6. The audits of Camp Atterbury and Camp Breckenridge Job Corps Centers are now in process. When they are completed, the Contracting Officer will make his decisions and a close-out voucher will be submitted.

7. The audits of the Suncoast Progress (Florida) are being wound up. Information disclosed by the auditors has already resulted in the conviction of one individual for the misappropriation of funds.

8. Mingo County (West Virginia)—An audit is underway.

I stand ready, of course, to answer any specific question you may have with respect to any grant or contract made by this agency. I am also prepared to provide you with the final determination of the audit process as each is completed.

The General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has automatic access to the reports of our auditors and continuously scrutinizes our auditing process. If you have genuine doubts as to how this agency is handling the audits of its programs, you might want to request GAO for an evaluation of our efforts either generally or with respect to particular matters. People at the GAO are experienced and competent to carry out such work. Their experience and objectivity would preclude the misinterpretation and confusion that might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally.

As for the reports of our Office of Inspection, they are not and never have been public information. These reports are prepared for investigatory purposes and for law enforcement. They are internal communications directed to me as Director of this agency, most frequently at my specific request, giving advisory interpretations of specific fact situations. They almost invariably contain information given in confidence and material which if publicly disclosed would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. By their very nature, they must be protected for public disclosure if they are to serve the purpose for which they are intended.

Your vigilant concern for the problems local anti-poverty programs have met in the past is well known to all of us. I believe that most of these problems, now more than a year behind us, have been resolved. I sincerely trust that as our new legislation goes forward you will be as vigilant in maintaining the OEO programs which have proven so vital to the continued progress of America's poor.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

APRIL 17, 1967.

Mr. R. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Thank you for your letter of April 14, 1967. I was pleased to note the communication did not reflect the hostility which was conveyed by Saturday morning's *Washington Post's* account of it. I read the *Post's* article first.

As the time for the House Education and Labor Committee's hearings on the anti-poverty program rapidly approaches, I am most anxious to see that valid, objective data bearing upon the progress, or lack of it, of War on Poverty programs is presented properly to the Committee. Perhaps you will recall that a substantial part of the testimony at last year's hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act was provided by representatives of Federal agencies. My efforts to have sixty-seven witnesses called were ignored. It was my feeling that these individuals, a cross section of proponents and dissidents and all knowledgeable regarding specific aspects of the War on Poverty, could have furnished information of value for the legislative deliberations of the Committee.

Misappropriation and diversion of anti-poverty funds are of vital concern to the Congress and the taxpayers. We in the Congress have been rather patient, I think, waiting for reliable reports of fiscal scandals that broke in the news media eighteen months ago. If disposition of the audits I requested on March 2nd isn't available for this year's hearings, when will it be? Why is it that the Comptroller of the City of New York can release his report on the Haryou situation and the Congress must remain in the dark concerning OEO's findings in this matter?

At last year's hearings you will recall a discussion of the Los Angeles Community Action Agency's audit by the OEO. At that time the Chairman ordered this report be placed in the record and it was not done. Now, one year later, you tell me no final determinations have been made. Are there no administrative devices to expedite these important matters?

Your reasons for denying Congressional examinations of OEO audit reports and reports of your Office of Inspection appear to be substantial; however, I'm not convinced the reasons take precedence over the need for the Congress to know their contents.

Why was OEO's audit report of San Francisco's Community Action Agency released to the press in December, 1966, and what basis did your Regional Director have for stating the audit report was a public document open to inspection by anyone? It seems to me there may have been a compelling reason to release the San Francisco report, if your attitude regarding audit reports was the same then as it is now.

You suggest I might want to request the General Accounting Office to evaluate the handling of OEO audits. I reject this suggestion since it would constitute duplication of the process that your auditors have performed. At this point I have no quarrel with your auditing procedures. It is the findings of the audits that would be of interest to the Congress, the House Education and Labor Committee, and the general public.

I would take exception to your feeling that "misinterpretation and confusion might result from superficial scrutiny by inexperienced personnel of material in audit reports generally" by Congressional staff investigators. I can assure you that the minority investigators of the House Education and Labor Committee are experienced, competent and thorough and would be capable of a completely objective review of your agency's records.

What did you mean when you said on the March 26th, nationally televised, "Meet the Press" program when you stated, "We would welcome, as I've said many times, a close scrutiny of all parts of the War against Poverty?" It is my view that any close scrutiny of the War on Poverty must include an examination of the OEO Headquarters' operations, the very heart of the problems that plague anti-poverty efforts.

Naturally, I would prefer that any investigation of OEO Headquarters or examination of OEO records be scheduled with your approval and cooperation. If at some future date I still feel the need of Congress to be apprised of the results of OEO audits and inspection reports, I intend to explore the possibilities of examining OEO records under the provisions of legislation enacted by the Congress last year (Public Law 89-487, Public Information, Availability).

A review of our correspondence reflects that it takes an average of from four to six weeks to receive a reply from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am still waiting for a reply to my inquiry of January 12, concerning bonus payments for recruitment of Job Corps enrollees. I find replies to responsible inquiries of the Office of Economic Opportunity are delayed for a longer period than in any other government agency. When irate taxpayers and responsible representatives of the news media request information from me concerning anti-poverty programs, I do not expect they should be kept waiting for periods of months for answers to their inquiries. Any steps you can take to expedite responses will be greatly appreciated. I might add this view is shared by a large number of my colleagues.

Your invitation to my staff to review evaluation reports of OEO programs at your library is appreciated. I would appreciate it if you will forward the following reports to me so that I might look them over in my office prior to this year's anti-poverty hearings:

Two reports prepared by the Louis Harris Associates concerning surveys of Job Corps graduates and dropouts.

The evaluation report of neighborhood centers prepared by Kirschner Associates of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Report of the study made by Dr. Max Wolff, Senior Research Sociologist for the Center of Urban Education at the University of New York City, on the Head Start program.

410-page report prepared by the Human Sciences Research, Inc., McLean, Virginia, resulting from a study of six Indian reservations.

310-page report on the jobs for the poor in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and Rochester, prepared by the National Committee on Employment of Youth under contract to OEO.

Report on Camp Atterbury prepared by Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., in late 1965.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PROCRASTINATES ON POWELL CASE; PERMITS JUSTICE TO FALTER AND TORMENTS CONGRESS

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 3 months since serious allegations of misappropriation of Federal funds by ADAM CLAYTON POWELL were made public—and said charges certainly must have come to the attention of the then Acting Attorney General.

More than 2 months have elapsed since Mr. POWELL was accused of conduct constituting misappropriation of Federal funds and fraud by a select committee of the House of Representatives. The evidentiary material and transcript of testimony, all uncontroverted, were transmitted to the Attorney General for appropriate action on February 24, 1967.

More than 5 weeks ago, on March 14, approximately 150 Members of the House of Representatives wrote to the Attorney General respectfully urging him to inquire into the findings of the select committee "with due diligence and dispatch."

The only reply was a letter from an Assistant Attorney General, dated March 20, 1967, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] promising that the Justice Department "will give this matter thorough and expeditious attention and will take whatever action is deemed appropriate."

Inasmuch as the entire membership of the House of Representatives was being embarrassed by the alleged misconduct of Mr. POWELL, and tormented by the delay of the Justice Department, and because I believed that both he and the American public are entitled to a prompt determination of the serious allegations of unlawful conduct against him, I was offended and alarmed by the failure of the Attorney General to answer responsively the inquiries of more than a third of the Members of this House.

Mr. Powell should not be kept on tenterhooks. If he is not guilty of any crime, the accusations should be allayed and his innocence should be judicially decided.

To permit charges of malfeasance to go unresolved—one way or the other—is grossly unfair, and unconscionably damaging to the character and reputation of the person against whom they are made.

As has been stated many times, justice delayed is justice denied. Every accused person and the public are entitled to swift justice.

Our Constitution stipulates that the determination of whether or not certain conduct is unlawful should be made by the courts—not by the Congress. Breaches of law should be prosecuted by the Justice Department—not by the Congress. Fines, when warranted, should be imposed by the courts—not by the Congress.

Ordinarily, one of the coequal branches of the Federal Government should not encroach upon the jurisdiction of another. But the Powell case involves all three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial.

Regrettably, the House of Representatives is being forced to consider action which raises questions of jurisdiction—principally because the Justice Department is not now discharging its clear responsibility.

With these thoughts in mind, I wrote to the Attorney General as follows:

APRIL 7, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: More than three months have passed since serious charges of embezzlement and fraud by Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, were made public. More than six weeks have elapsed since the Select Committee of Congress turned its files which substantiated some of these charges over to your office. More than 23 days have elapsed since approximately 150 Members of the Congress called upon you to investigate the charges, study the record, and take the appropriate action—either to clear Mr. Powell of the accusations or to indict him so that "even justice is more than a shibboleth." We have had no reply.

The highest law enforcement officers of the United States should not wink at undenied charges of protracted embezzlement of United States taxpayers' funds. If justice in this country is to be respected, it must be swift and certain—for all; special exemptions for friends or allies should not be tolerated.

The Congress is being embarrassed and tormented by unresolved accusations that are primarily within your responsibility. If Mr. Powell is not guilty of any federal crime, he was entitled to an early absolution. If a a reasonable question remains, he and the nation are entitled to an early determination by a court.

The evidence is available now. No further investigation appears necessary for a determination of the present charges. Postponement of action by your department can only result in the loss of witnesses and evidence. No law enforcement officer should prejudice a case by delay or postponement.

May I please have a status report of that portion of the Powell matter within your jurisdiction as of the day your office receives this letter.

May I pleased be informed when you plan to take some definitive action? If further postponement of the Powell case is indicated, may I please have a brief statement of your reasons for such delay.

May I also please have a statement explaining why the accusations against Mr. Powell should be treated differently from charges of embezzlement against other persons.

A prompt reply will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. Congressman.

Like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] I was sent a routine, unresponsive letter from an Assistant Attorney General—the full text of which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, April 11, 1967.

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of April 7, 1967, concerning the report of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate the qualifications and activities of Adam Clayton Powell. We received that report by letter dated February 24, 1967, and we acknowledged its receipt in a letter dated March 3, 1967.

You are also undoubtedly aware of our response to Congressman Devine and approximately 150 members of the Congress. We responded to the letter of March 14, 1967, in a letter dated March 20, 1967. You will find a copy of that response reprinted in the March 21, 1967 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7389.

The alleged misuse of public funds by Mr. Powell is under investigation by this Department. You may be assured that the results of that investigation, when completed, will be given full and expeditious consideration to determine whether there have been prosecutable federal violations and appropriate action will be taken.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

We can only conclude that the Attorney General intends to avoid this case, to ignore the accusations, to postpone any indictment, to refuse to prosecute Mr. Powell, and to disregard the reasonable inquiries of House Members.

Procrastination by law-enforcement officials can result in loss of witnesses and other evidence, and seriously prejudice a sound case.

The general public, the law-abiding citizen, the youth who seek direction, all who are implored by law-enforcement officials to respect the law, surely are disillusioned when the highest law enforcement officer of our Nation refuses to do his duty.

Private correspondence having failed, I now publicly call upon the Attorney General to set aside personal friendships, disengage from political affiliations, rescind all extrajudicial commitments, and treat the Powell case as any other. Special treatment of the Powell case because of race, party politics, religion or personal friendship should not be tolerated.

I simply call upon the Attorney General to do his duty—now.

REPORT ON RHODESIA

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Government of Rhodesia was never given an opportunity to appear before the Security Council so as to give their side of the issue before the compulsory sanctions were voted, I think it is well to put in the RECORD a very excellent report by D. Garner for the Under Secretary, External Services, for the Government of Rhodesia, which I recently received.

He outlines in a very cogent and sensible way the problems which confront that little country in trying to fight for its independence against England and the United States, which countries seem to be determined to wreck the economy of the country and prevent it from getting its independence when all of the other countries of Africa have been granted their independence.

His entire letter follows:

SALISBURY, RHODESIA,
April 11, 1967.

The Honorable J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

DEAR SIR: The State Department has issued a Paper (No. 1/21d–666BT) which gives the official U.S. attitude towards Rhodesia.

This paper starts by stating that the United States accepts the British Government's position that Rhodesia is a British Colony.

It omits, however, to mention that Rhodesia was a self-governing Colony until November, 1965 and had been since 1923 when Southern Rhodesia, as it was then, was given the choice by Britain of either becoming a province of South Africa, which was then a Dominion—a sovereign state and a full member of the League of Nations; or of assuming Responsible Government. Rhodesia

chose the latter by a referendum of the electorate. It is at this stage that it can be claimed that Great Britain renounced any responsibility for Rhodesia by virtue of giving her this choice, which could have led to her joining South Africa.

Since then Rhodesia has governed herself with no interference from Britain so far as her internal affairs were concerned for over 40 years.

She has had her own Army, Air Force, Police and Civil Service, administered and paid for by the Rhodesian people and responsible to the Rhodesian Parliament.

The Queen's representative here at the time of the Declaration of Independence, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, was bound by the Constitution to take the advice of the Queen's Rhodesian Ministers on all matters concerning Rhodesia's internal affairs.

Rhodesia was not, therefore, a Crown Colony under the control of the Colonial office and never has been. She has been in a position similar to that held by the Dominions—Canada, Australia and New Zealand and South Africa up to the date of the Statute of Westminster and, indeed, this position was tacitly accepted generally in the Commonwealth by the Rhodesian Prime Minister being invited to and attending Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences for many years up till 1953, when Rhodesia joined the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

From then on, up until the dissolution of the Federation by Britain's unilateral decision in 1963, Rhodesia was represented at the Prime Ministers' Conference by the Prime Minister of the Federal Government. Indeed, for the first few years, the same individual, Sir Godfrey Huggins (now Lord Malvern) who had attended previously as Rhodesia's Prime Minister, still attended these Conferences as Prime Minister of the Federation.

During the period of the Federation's existence, consideration was being given to modifying Southern Rhodesia's Constitution and a Constitutional Conference was held in Salisbury in 1961 under the Chairmanship of Mr. Duncan Sandys at that time Secretary for Commonwealth Relations.

At this Conference it was agreed that the "Reserved Clauses" in the 1923 Constitution—never in fact used by Great Britain—would be done away with, except for a few formal matters.

The Rhodesian electorate was asked to vote in a Referendum in July 1961 either for or against the proposed Constitution as set out in two White Papers—Command Papers 1399 and 1400—printed and issued by Her Majesty's Stationery office in London.

The introduction to Command Paper 1399 contained the following paragraph:

"The proposed new Constitution, which is based on the conclusions of the Conference, will reproduce many of the provisions of the existing Constitution. It will eliminate *all* the reserved powers at present vested in the Government of the United Kingdom, save for certain matters set out in Paragraph 50."

Paragraph 50 reads as follows:—

"Under the new proposals Southern Rhodesia will be free to make any amendments to any section of the Constitution without reference to the United Kingdom with the exception of amendments which would affect:—

"(a) The position of the Sovereign and the Governor;

"(b) The right of the United Kingdom Government to safeguard the position regarding—

"(i) International obligations;

"(ii) Undertakings given by the Government of Southern Rhodesia in respect of loans, under the Colonial Stock Acts."

It is understandable, therefore, that the Rhodesian electorate assumed they were voting for a Constitution which gave them complete Independence, except for a few trifles, and voted accordingly.

But when the Bill introducing the new 1961 Constitution was before the British House of Commons on November 8th, 1961—*some months after the Referendum had taken place*—it was stated by the then Under Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations:

"My Right Honourable friend (Mr. Duncan Sandys) proposes to advise Her Majesty to grant by Order in Council under the Bill, once enacted, a Constitution which will follow the White Papers in every detail. It will include a few minor points for which provision has to be made, which were not mentioned in the White Papers, since these of necessity were expressed in layman's language."

One of these few *minor* points not mentioned in the White Papers was the inclusion of Section III in the new Constitution.

Section III reads: "Full power and authority is hereby reserved to Her Majesty by Order in Council to amend, add to or revoke the provisions of Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 29, 32, 42 and this Section and any Order in Council made by virtue of this section may vary or revoke any previous Order so made."

An almost identical provision, Section 61, existed in Rhodesia's 1923 Constitution so, in other words, we were back to "square one" again with a vengeance!

It is difficult to think of a more flagrant deception perpetrated against an electorate in modern times and it is inconceivable that the Rhodesian electorate would have voted for the new Constitution if they had known that Section III was to be included.

When the Federation was broken up at the end of 1963 Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland were promised Independence and were, in fact, granted it on October 24th and July, 1964 respectively.

But the British Government would not grant independence to Rhodesia in spite of the fact that, unlike the other two territories, she had had Responsible Government for over 40 years and in spite of the fact that the leader of the British delegation, Mr. R. A. Butler, a senior Minister of the Crown made a categorical promise to the Rhodesian Prime Minister at the Victoria Falls Conference in July, 1963; that, if Rhodesia cooperated in the winding up of the Federation, the British Government would immediately deal with our Independence. The matter to be concluded not later than the granting of Independence to the other members of the Federation. However, this promise, like so many others, was not kept.

Nevertheless the Rhodesian Government continued to pursue negotiations for Independence under the 1961 Constitution throughout 1964 and, later in that year, decided to demonstrate that this desire for Independence was supported by the majority of the Rhodesian people of all races.

Accordingly a referendum was held on November 5th at which overwhelming support was given by the electorate to the claim for Independence under the 1961 Constitution.

But the great majority of the black population could not qualify for the vote, so it was decided to use the traditional African method of obtaining the views of the people by holding an Indaba or Conference of all the Chiefs and Headmen. This was done in October, 1964. This traditional procedure has always been accepted as a valid method by the British Government in the past and was in fact last used before this in 1947.

Proof of this was provided while the 1961 Constitution was being negotiated when the British Government of the day insisted on the Southern Rhodesia Government enacting legislation to provide for the formal establishment of a Council of Chiefs and also Provincial Assemblies of Chiefs *to give expression to African opinion in the Tribal Trust Lands.* The relevant legislation was duly enacted in Act No. 58 of 1961 and is cited as the "Council of Chiefs and Provincial Assemblies Act."

This Act not only defines the Tribal Trust Lands, but also repeats the Constitutional definition of "tribesman" which means *"a person under tribal law and custom is recognised as a member of a community under the control or leadership of a Chief appointed and holding office under law."*

Africans living in the Tribal Areas make up over 67% of the whole indigenous African population. Therefore, when the Chiefs and Headmen decided unanimously, according to their tribal customs and traditions, that they wanted Independence under the 1961 Constitution, it cannot be disputed that the Rhodesian Government had the support of virtually two-thirds of the whole population.

This support was confirmed, incidentally, by the Chiefs when Independence was taken about a year later. It should be noted that though invited, neither the British High Commissioner nor the United States Consul General chose to attend the Indaba and the British Government refused to send any observers. Perhaps they were afraid the decision would go against them!

There can be little doubt that, if the decision of the Indaba had been against Independence, it would have been claimed that the majority of the population did not support Mr. Smith's claim.

The British Government had indicated that, if Mr. Smith could demonstrate that a majority of all the inhabitants desired independence, progress in the negotiations could be made. Indeed, it had been clear for some time that the main difficulty, so far as Britain was concerned, was doubts about whether majority support for independence existed or not.

Other ex-colonial territories in Africa, which were nothing like so advanced economically, or in other ways, as Rhodesia, had been granted independence without hesitation, as soon as there was any evidence that the majority of the people desired it; even though it is extremely doubtful if public opinion was always tested as thoroughly as it had been in Rhodesia.

However, for reasons which, it is now pretty clear, had nothing to do with the merits of Rhodesia's case, the British Government still refused to grant independence.

Negotiations continued for about another year, until it become quite clear that Independence could not be negotiated with Britain on reasonable terms, but only under conditions which were not acceptable to the majority of Rhodesian people of all races. Accordingly Independence was declared on November 11th, 1965 and a new Constitution, the 1965 Constitution, was introduced which was in all respects a replica of the 1961 Constitution except for certain minor changes necessary to make it applicable to a Sovereign State.

Clauses referring to such matters as franchise laws, human rights, etc., were identical with those in the 1961 Constitution.

The State Department paper states that this was done by the "Smith Regime," but fails to point out that Mr. Smith's Government was the legally elected Government of Rhodesia—elected originally late in 1962 and confirmed in office with an increased majority in May, 1965 and had the support, as has been shown above, of some two-thirds of the total population of all races.

This Government was and is, therefore, governing with the consent of the governed and made the transition to independence peacefully—without any bloodshed at all in fact, which the State Department claims is just what United States' policy toward Southern Rhodesia is aimed at.

This policy is stated to be grounded on five principles:—

1) *Self-determination for all African Countries.*

If a two-thirds majority of the inhabitants is in favour of independence is this not clear

evidence that this principle has been met and applies in the case of Rhodesia?

2) *Encouragement of the solution of African problems by Africans.*

Surely it can be claimed that Mr. Smith and his Government, many of whom were born in Africa, are indeed Africans, just as the American Government comprises Americans.

On this basis, the solution arrived at by the Rhodesian Government should receive encouragement and not the reverse.

3) *Support of improved standards of living through trade and aid.*

America's support of sanctions against Rhodesia would appear to be in exact opposition to this principle.

In spite of sanctions, however, Rhodesia is endeavouring to continue improvement of standards of living of all her peoples, already higher than those existing in most, if not all, of the Independent black African States north of the Zambezi.

4) *Discouragement of arms build-up beyond the needs of internal security or legitimate self-defence.*

Rhodesia has no aggressive designs against any of her neighbours, is enjoying complete internal peace and tranquility (another proof, incidentally, that her present government is governing with the consent of the governed) and is certainly not engaged in any arms build-up.

5) *Encouragement of other free-world countries to recognize their continuing responsibilities towards Africa.*

This principle does not apply to Rhodesia; but presumably to European or other countries engaged in trade with or development of Africa. Rhodesia would welcome any assistance in this respect, provided there were no "strings" attached.

This paper goes on to refer to "a political solution acceptable only to the minority in Rhodesia and prejudicial to the interests and rights of the vast majority of the population!"

As has been indicated above this is a complete travesty of the true situation here and it is most surprising that the United States' Department displays such abysmal ignorance of the actual conditions existing in Rhodesia.

It might well help if U.S. Government representatives accepted Chief Sigola's invitation to come here to see for themselves, as indeed did a fact-finding mission of the American African Affairs Association whose report appears to have been ignored by the State Department.

The above is also applicable to Ambassador Goldberg's remarks in the U.N. Security Council, both on November 12th, 1965 as referred to in this paper and, more recently, which show how ignorant he also is of the true state of affairs here.

This paper also refers to the additional measures taken by the United States with regard to Southern Rhodesia, No. 4 of which states:—*"All American private travel to Southern Rhodesia was discouraged."*

This is perhaps of some significance, as it would appear to be an attempt to prevent the American public from finding out the truth for themselves!

It can hardly be on the grounds of personal safety, as Rhodesia is one of the most peaceful countries in the world, as has been testified to by the hundreds of American citizens who have visited this country, in spite of this discouragement, since Independence.

Later in this paper the statement is made "at present there is no direct Communist threat to Southern Rhodesia."

Is the State Department not aware that Communist armed and trained guerrillas have, from camps established in Zambia and Tanzania (both members of the British Commonwealth) been infiltrating across Rhodesia's borders and attempting to commit various crimes such as murder, arson, cattle-maiming, etc., ever since and indeed before Independence?

The fact that they have been singularly unsuccessful is beside the point; except that it is just another proof that the present Government is governing with the consent of the governed. But for the active assistance of the local population in reporting the location and movement of these terrorists, it is obvious—at least to anyone with any knowledge of guerrilla warfare—that the Rhodesian security forces, who are numbered in hundreds rather than thousands, could not possibly have "contained" this infiltration coming across a frontier some 400 miles long, mostly consisting of very wild country.

Finally it is not disputed that our Declaration of Independence was, strictly speaking, illegal, just as any rebellion is illegal, as was the American Declaration of Independence, until it is successful!

On moral grounds, however, it would seem that Rhodesia had just as good a case, if not a better one, in 1965 than America did in 1776.

This paper points out that Independent Rhodesia has not yet been recognised by any other country. Nevertheless it has peacefully maintained its independence in spite of all the efforts of Britain and other countries, including the United States of America, to suppress it for over a year now.

The State Department is reminded that Great Britain didn't acknowledge American Independence until some nine years after the Declaration.

It is rather early days, therefore, for Americans to describe the Rhodesian Government as "an illegal regime which has temporarily usurped power" or "this white minority regime in a desperate and what will certainly prove to be a futile gesture" . . . as this paper does.

While appreciating the present respect for legality existing in the United States of America, it is most surprising that she has chosen to take such a very narrow view about Rhodesia's declaration, in view of the circumstances of her own birth as a Nation!

One can only hope that it is due to the almost complete ignorance shown by American officialism, of the true facts of the case.

Sincerely,

D. GARNER,
(For Under Secretary, External Services).

P.S.—Since writing the above it has occurred to me that this may not be the letter which you wish to insert in the "Congressional Record" (vide your letter of the 17th March to Mrs. Christman of Ohio). If not, then you must be referring to my letter of the 13th February (a copy of which is attached).

It may also interest you to learn that at a Press Conference of the Secretary General of the United Nations held on the 10th June, 1967 (Press Release SG/SM/637), Dr. E. von Hofmannsthal, Schweizer. Handelszeitung: posed the following question:—

To come back to your answer on sanctions. As it is a basic rule of law that *nobody can be sentenced without being heard,* and as the Security Council has refused to hear Rhodesia because it is not an independent State, does that not lead to the compelling conclusion in law and logic: (a) that sanctions can only be imposed on independent States; (b) that sanctions imposed on an entity which cannot be heard and defend itself are *illegal and void?"*

The *Secretary-General:* "As you know, I am not a jurist or a constitutional lawyer. As the Secretary-General I have to comply with the decisions of the principal organs of the United Nations. The Security Council in its wisdom has adopted a resolution—a historic resolution. Whether it is legal *or illegal* is not my business to argue. I have to comply with the decision of the Security Council. Therefore, I am proceeding on the lines I indicated earlier."

Where do we go from here?

I shall endeavor to pass relevant information to you as often as possible. I realise that you are an extremely busy person so please do not worry about acknowledgement.

Assuring you of our warm and sincere appreciation of your support,

Best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

DOUGLAS GARNER.

P.P.S.—By all means use the whole or any portion of either of the texts of these letters.

SALISBURY, RHODESIA,
February 13, 1967.

Mrs. H. E. CHRISTMAN,
Rocky River, Ohio,
United States of America.

DEAR MRS. CHRISTMAN: Our mutual and very good friend, Bob Bartlett of Puerto Rico, has kindly advised me of your reaction to my recent letter regarding the "Carnegia Blueprint" and also the United Nations Participation Act, Section 5 (a) and (b) (which, incidentally, are one and the same as U.S. Public No. 264). By all means, photostat as many copies as you wish.

It is rather ironic that Selected Mandatory Sanctions have been imposed on our country under Articles 39 and 41 of the U.N. Charter. Ironic because Article 4, can only be applied if Article 39 has been complied with and it reads:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, and shall make recommendation or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain and restore *international* peace and security" (my capitals and underlining).

U Thant, discussing Communist China and North Vietnam, recently stated, "Of course, my attitude regarding Security Council involvement is guided by one single consideration: If the Security Council has to take any action on any dispute, the first prerequisite is that it must be in a position to hear both sides of the question; this is a must."

Strange, is it not, that Rhodesia's side of the case has not been heard. Indeed, Mr. Duncan Sandys pointed out to the House of Commons the imposition of sanctions on Rhodesia is based on a lie. Also, Lord Coleraine said (House of Lords, Monday, 7th February) that if a state is arraigned and accused, the first principle of justice is that it should be heard in its own defence. "Rhodesia made application for that and the application was not even answered. What kind of justice is the Security Council dishing out?", he asked. It would appear that U Thant's "one single consideration" is only applicable to the Communists.

I was interested to learn from Bob that you were involved with him in the pro-Katanga movement in Cleveland some years ago. Interested because of my involvement in the exodus of thousands of Belgians. In July, 1960, I was in charge of a camp set up in Salisbury to accommodate, feed and generally help these poor fleeing people. As a matter of interest, we had over 300 Americans (mainly missionaries of the Church of Christ) through our hands at that time.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

D. GARNER,
(For Under Secretary, External Services).

THE TARIFF WALLS ARE TUMBLING DOWN

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America, Inc. of Covington, Ky., has prepared a paper entitled "The Tariff Walls Are Tumbling Down."

Mr. Wimmer is the public relations director for the National Federation of Independent Business and his conclusions may well be taken as opinions derived from the various polls taken by the National Federation of Independent Business. His article follows:

THE TARIFF WALLS ARE TUMBLING DOWN

(By Ed Wimmer)

"Our tariff structure should be reformed to reflect wage differentials between the various nations with whom we compete and trade. If this is not done, it will serve only to place our own industries at an unfair disadvantage, and it will retard the advance of wages in other countries.

"I am also led to believe that the Department of State is not adequately situated or equipped to deal with this problem. . . . Our entire goal must be to encourage fairly competitive trade—the only trade that is healthy trade (domestic or international)."—JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Member of Congress (1964).

U.S. TARIFF POLICES STRENGTHEN OTHER NATIONS—WEAKEN THE UNITED STATES

Between now and June 30, when our present Tariff Act expires, the Congress of the United States will either seal the doom of thousands of American factories and destroy millions of jobs, or adopt a sane tariff policy that will strengthen our industries, increase job opportunities, and offer foreign traders the only trade privilege to which they are entitled: an opportunity to compete with our industries on a fair trade basis.

In other words, what Congress now faces is a task of taking tariff regulation out of international politics and putting it into economics (where it should have been lodged at the beginning), and, at the same time, deprive any bureau, agency or even the President of the power to raise or lower tariff walls to benefit the economy of a foreign nation by weakening the American economy.

Congressman Harley Staggers (W.Va.) supported this view when he said: "American companies and workers should not be penalized because our government wants to make friends with foreign countries."

A ONE-WAY STREET

Senator Russell Long (La.) spoke in the same tone when he told his colleagues: "We must be zealous in our concern for the welfare of American workers and their employers—as we are for those who live in distant lands. We as a people, and especially the Congress, must be farsighted enough to strengthen the American system by wise adoption of laws calculated to foster American strength and economic growth, rather than submissively accepting policies whose chief contribution is strengthening other nations at our expense."

CHEAPER TO DESTROY AMERICA

Free traders say that Long and Staggers are not making sense. They say if we let down the bars against foreign trade, Americans will be better off because they will be able to "buy foreign goods for less money and therefore have more money to spend on other things." They support the view of Dr. Harry Johnson, formerly of Chicago University, and now with the London School of Economics, who says:

"By dropping tariff walls (especially against the poorer nations), America will be reducing the need for direct foreign aid." He adds:

"We should abandon any insistence that foreign nations drop their trade barriers against us. . . . America should also stop insisting that foreign nations spend their foreign aid dollars in the U.S., and we should start phasing out cotton textile arrangements to help adjust to the shock of imports."

PAY THE BANKRUPTS—TRAIN THE JOBLESS

What Dr. Johnson is saying, and what top officials in the Administration are advocating, is actually a policy of compensating factory owners who are put out of business with cheap imports, and pay their jobless employees a guaranteed wage until they have been retrained for other work. Some argue that liquidation of entire industries may be necessary to carry out a "free trade" program, and they refer to the clause in the present Tariff Act providing that government shall make payments to firms "seriously injured by imports"—if the owner is able to prove that his demise was due to concessions in tariff agreements—and "not to his inability to compete efficiently."

Such wanton destruction of investments and jobs would make the so-called protection clause in the Tariff Act a total fraud, because it could not cover more than a fraction of total losses.

A TEXTILE APPALACHIA

Consider the billions, for example, that would be required to compensate companies put out of business in the textile industry alone, and the cost of retraining countless thousands of workers who would lose their jobs; the communities that would be ruined if free trade in textiles and related products should become a reality.

Alabama textile mills, apparel and man made fibre industries, employ 37 percent of all manufacturing workers in the state. Alabama has 129 textile mills, all of which are now threatened by our present tariff policy.

South Carolina receives 27 per cent of all its corporate income tax from the textile industries—which pays 64 per cent of all local property taxes. No textile factory or textile job in South Carolina is safe under the present tariff policy. Congressman W. J. Dorn, of this up-and-coming state, declares:

"There is no depression worse than a depression during a time of inflation and high prices, when a person in a community is unemployed, or dependent on some form of dole. This is the danger we face in my state where 2 out of 3 jobs in manufacturing are in the textile and related industries, representing 58 per cent of all industry wages. We dare not risk the destruction of our factories and a loss of jobs at a time when our costs of government are so high, and when every job counts for so much."

Congressman Charles Jonas (N.C.):

"There are 279,000 workers in North Carolina employed in spinning and weaving. You will find large companies such as Monsanto, du Pont, Beaunt, Hercules, Celanese, Fibre Industries, American Enka, and Uniroyal Mills, modern and efficient but with no chance whatsoever to compete with the wages and tax rates of their foreign competitors."

Mr. Jonas is convinced that North Carolina now faces a crisis.

In Hendersonville, N.C., Harriot, Henderson Cotton Mills officials have asked merchants to write their Congressmen urging more tariff protection. Pilot Mills Co., Raleigh, N.C., stated:

"We have been in the textile business since 1905, but have never seen a time, even in the '30's, when the industry was any sicker and as much hurt by imports as now. We lost money in 1966 for the first time, and it is becoming worse."

THREATENED AREA WIDENS

Tennessee reports 30 per cent of all manufacturing jobs are in the textile industry. Chattanooga area reports 16,500 textile jobs. In several Tennessee counties (with an Appalachia label) 3 out of 4 jobs are in textiles. Kentucky shows one Congressional District with 20 plants and 400 workers threatened by the imports. . . . Rhode Island, 26,000 textile jobs, and in the New England area, where 700 factories were struck down by imports, with a loss of over 300,000 jobs, there are still 200,000 people directly employed in the textile industry. In Fall River, Massachusetts, 70 per cent of all workers are employed in textiles and related businesses, yet, U.S. negotiators in Geneva continue to advocate up to 50 per cent reduction in present tariffs on all these products.

WE BUILT THEM UP

According to authoritative sources, we literally gave foreign countries "$6,200,000,000 worth of textile machinery," which free traders now suggest we turn against our own factories and workers—despite the fact that 59 countries, beneficiaries of our pot of gold philosophy, won't let a pound of our textiles cross their borders. Congressman Tom Bevill (Ala.) has reminded them that when this industry was founded in America, there was no Marshall Plan. No Office of Economic Opportunity; no handouts of any kind. He noted that in Danville, Virginia, the Dan River Mills employs 10,000 people in a city of 50,000, with a payroll of $45,000,000; yet, with one stroke of the President's pen, it could become a "Ghost Town" or a "Dole Center".

LOWERING THE BOOM ON TILE

If any reader of this discourse doubts what is going on in this country, I refer them to the case of National Tile & Manufacturing Co., Anderson, Indiana, where 525 employees lost their jobs, and a 77-year-old business was put up for sale, or merger, at a distressed price.

Japanese and other foreign tile hit the tile industry like a tornado. Tariff cuts on tile were made in 1951 and following years, and between 1952 and 1963, Japanese tile sold in the U.S. went from 2,700,000 square feet to 54 million, and in a few years, National's sales were cut in half—along with those of other American companies.

THE COMMISSION HEARS AN APPEAL

National took its case to the Tariff Commission in 1964, and was represented by able Horace de Podwin, New York Consultant to the Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the U.S., seeking the assistance Congress promised in the Trade Expansion Act of 1963. In a closely split decision, the Commission lived up to its almost unbroken chain of refusals to act. Two of the Commissioners, however, Dan H. Fenn and Joseph Talbot, vehemently declared that National had met all the tests of the law, and was entitled to compensation, but the majority said no. National closed October 1966.

AID AFTER DEATH

After the turndown, Richard Alexander, president of National, was heard to remark that he had been told that under the Tariff Laws "you have to die first before help is forthcoming, and after that it doesn't matter."

Until the Japanese decided to flood the nation with floor and wall tile made by workers receiving under 30 cents an hour, and by companies whose taxes and other overhead was less than half the costs of American companies, 77-year-old National was successfully marketing its products.

Congressman Wright Patman (Texas):

"I have great interest in the tile industry which is made up of many small manufacturers scattered across the country. Many are closing their doors, and we must not allow this to happen."

JAPANESE BUSINESSMEN SAY THEORY WON'T WORK FOR JAPAN

In contrast to the irrational Don Quixote approach to the tariff issue by our American representative, Mr. Yosomatsu Natsubara, Chairman of the Hilachi Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., a heavy producer of home appliances and heavy electrical equipment, declared: "Chaos would reign in Japan if

U.S. industries are allowed to enter our country unhampered by tariffs."

Mr. Natsubara added that "smaller businesses (now being written off by the countless thousands in the U.S.) would suffer seriously, and we would thus bring on many social and labor problems."

Ken Okubo, president of the giant Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, also predicted "chaos," and Tsuenji Matsuda said "Japan's distribution system will be plunged into serious confusion by an invasion of American capital and goods, or if unlimited American production and investment in Japan by American corporations should be permitted."

Japanese businessmen and bankers want "more time," and it may be certain that they and the Japanese government will fight anything that endangers their trade position. They will sell wherever they can, whether it is Red China, the Soviet Union, or Cuba, and at prices our domestic companies will be unable to meet.

U.S. WISHY-WASHY TRADE POLICY

As a result of our wishy-washy lose-our-shirts, fear-of-retaliation, hold-our-"friends"-at-any-price, foreign trade policy, we are destroying our industrial centers sewing machines, office machines, household appliances, radio and transistor business, photographic equipment; glass, gloves, china, watches, silver, tractors, dresses, shirts, shoes, plastics, tile, wallboard, plumbing supplies, steel, textiles, U. S. flags—you name it, and the internationalists who think in terms of "America last" want to speed up the process—whether they know it or not.

PEARL HARBOR AND TODAY

To prove this statement, ask them if they can deny that we gave, or otherwise supplied, Japan with all its high test gasoline, most of its scrap iron, nearly all of its copters and war materials dumped on China in the '30's, and if the bombing of Pearl Harbor would have been possible if we had not supplied them with 800,000,000 gallons of Zero (Japanese fighter plane) fuel as late as 1940—after the Roosevelt embargo had gone into effect.

You should then show the billion dollar figures on what it cost us to rebuild Japanese industries and to restore their prosperity, and how they (the free traders) are now insisting that we turn this mammoth production facility (a would-be Frankenstein) loose in our markets—just as we are being urged to turn loose the American paid for industries and know-how of Europe—all consequences or risks be damned.

NOT OPPOSED TO FAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

At this point I want to say that no responsible person is anti-Japanese, anti-British, German, or anti-any other race or country. I personally want every nation to make good, in the free enterprise way if possible, but I know it cannot be done under a domestic-international-discount-house-dog-eat-dog, unmoral, uncurbed, uncontrolled marketing system, as advocated by the free traders and uninformed anti-fair traders wherever or whoever they are.

What we must do in this country (and we have to do it quickly), is to sponsor an all-out program of opening up every possible opportunity for the next generation to start and run things, whether it is farms, factories, banks, stores, or the professions, and we must make this program work so well that present monopolistic corporations and other power centers can be broken up and the formation of new ones made impossible, and we cannot accomplish this goal unless our market place is governed by the same rules of fair play that govern the baseball diamond, the football field or a hockey match.

If such ends are out of our reach, then we ought to embrace the whole socialistic-monopolistic package of Utopian nonsense, and get the explosion over with so we can dust off the Declaration of Independence and start all over again.

STEEL STAGGERS INTO STALEMATE

Before we pursue and further justify the validity of this line of thought, we suggest a close look at the faltering steel industry, and why it is faltering under a barrage of foreign competition.

America was once the biggest exporter of steel in the world. Now we are the biggest importers, and one-third of the steel that we ship across our shores is given away by our government.

Once there were 32 steel producing nations in the world, and these figures held until 1950, when our giveaway program of steel expansion in "under-developed" countries such as Germany and Japan helped to raise the number to around 70. (Reports indicate that upward of 200 foreign steel plants received our aid.)

By 1965, steel production in all markets shot up from a 1950 figure of 207,000,000 tons to 500,000,000 tons, with imports up 1,000 per cent and U.S. exports down 75 per cent.

Japan went from scratch to 11,000,000 tons in 1966, and 50 per cent of it arrived in the U.S. delivered up to 40 per cent below U.S. costs of production. Japanese tariff rates double those of U.S. Like the U.S., Japan has a steel problem: no place to dump its huge production except in the United States. Producers speak in desperate terms. U.S. internationalists say we must not discourage their steel designs on faltering Uncle . . . despite his wage differentials and fringe benefit arrangements that will not be approached by any foreign producer in either this or the next decade.

(Union leaders in most cases ignore these facts. They come up with new demands that cannot be honored without great new strides in automation that cost them more jobs, and they struck the steel industry at a time when imports were being speeded up, costing workers 70,000 jobs, and the government an enormous tax loss. Here we find government silent—until called upon to help the unions get their way, and this is NOT an "anti-union" observation; it is based on the record.)

TARIFFS, CARTELS AND RUIN

The same philosophy exists in Germany, Italy, Britain, Yugoslavia, Russia, Hong Kong, India, Portugal, Canada—wherever you look, and that is why West Germany (which we financed until they became our toughest competitor) put a $43-ton-tariff on carbon plates. Italy and France soak us up to $47 more per ton on carbon plates than we charge them, and worse than all of this, is the fact that American corporations have entered these countries and are building up huge cartels in every part of the world—including our own 50 states.

Foreign corporation officials look at the invasion of American capital and take-over, and speak bitterly of out-merging us in order to compete with us, creating the exact condition that existed in Germany and Britain prior to World War II. . . . In an editorial, Fortune Magazine listed 850 "corporate raids" which Fortune said was "sometimes for size alone"—the opinion being that "anti-Americanism is building up at a dangerous pace."

MIGHTY IBM TAKES OVER

Amid these cries of "economic subjugation" and "corporate colonialism" now hitting France, Italy, Britain, Germany, Canada and other nations, we witness IBM moving its production of computers, et cetera, to foreign countries, and IBM is now selling 9 out of 10 computers sold in the whole world. Better than 30 per cent of cars sold in Europe are made by American firms IN Europe. . . . Fifty per cent of British car sales are by American owned manufacturers in Britain. Chrysler sits on top of Roots Motors and Simca in France. U.S. concerns control 70 per cent of Europe's washing machine sales; 30 per cent of tire sales, and 35 per cent of the tractors. In France we sell 50 per cent of the refrigerators, and 40 per cent of the tractors.

Seven hundred of our biggest (out of 1,000) firms in U.S. have subsidiaries abroad, and they are expanding. We are flooding their retail markets with supermarkets, trading stamps and gimmicks. The discount houses and big chains in our country have gone abroad to knock out countless thousands of small foreign business—just as they have in this country with cutthroat competition, but they were stalled in Japan by opposition from the government—generated by Japan's smaller retailers.

EUROPEAN LABOR LEADER SPEAKS UP

A visiting labor leader from Europe intimated we must be mad. He asked:

"Do you think your American enterprises that own so many of our facilities are going to let your plants ship into our markets when it is easier to take exhorbitant profits from a foreign country where workers can be exploited? . . . Furthermore, the average worker in my country cannot buy our cheap products, let alone your high cost exports."

Then our friendly adviser added:

"There are plenty of rich people in our country who can create any productive facility they want to, but they hide their money and use your money."

S. T. Williams, President of Scoville Manufacturing Co., Scoville, Mass., put it shockingly true when he said (in 1960):

"The way to win in progress and world markets, is to lose a war with the United States."

STEEL MEN TALK—ONE ACTS

President Blough of United States Steel Corporation, advised Congress to "examine our whole international trade arrangements." What he should have suggested was a scrapping of the "arrangements." Board Chairman Edmund F. Martin, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, went a little further than Mr. Blough. He told the American Steel and Iron Institute that "business has lost its good image." He advised everybody to "start selling the profit incentive," and he asked the government and the people to face up to the tariff menace—if we "want to keep a strong steel industry in the United States." I liked his admonition to businessmen to "quit resting on their past accomplishments, for to rest is to rust."

Ninety per cent of the business and professional community has "rested and rusted" over the major sicknesses within the free enterprise system, and that is why the public sector of the nation has been swamping the private sector, and there is nothing that will speed up the process faster than low tariff walls in these critical times.

The one company that acted was Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, whose president, William J. Stephens, told a Cincinnati audience:

"With all our responsibilities abroad, our responsibilities to ourselves have increased ten-fold."

He revealed that Jones & Laughlin has spent millions of extra dollars for supplies and new plant equipment, insisting that everything be American made. This great company closed a 113-year-old nail manufacturing plant because "foreign nails were so cheap that competition was impossible."

Free traders accuse the steel industry of being "behind the times," but it spent $13 billion in the last few years to "keep ahead of the times." Renewal of the 7 per cent investment allowance fought for by our organization will start a new spurt in plant and equipment spending, but what good will the spurt do if imports keep flowing in at prices far below domestic costs?

APPALACHIA UNLIMITED

Washington sources say the Appalachian range of unemployment, ignorance, poverty, disease, and lack of economic opportunity stretches from New York to Alabama, and covers about 180,000 square miles. The poverty budget (total) now calls for an expenditure of $25 billion—up 16 per cent in a few months. The so-called Appalachian "poverty belt" runs along a 50-mile peripheral where more than a million textile-apparel jobs are threatened by low tariffs.

UNHOLY ALLIANCES—UNHOLY OUTLOOK

Add to this unholy outlook the figures showing apparel industry profits at the bottom of 20 leading industries, with textile profits down to 17th place. Fifty per cent of wool products sold in the U.S. are imports. Fifty per cent of worsted cloth, knit apparel and wool shirts are imports. All textile imports exceeded exports in 1966 by $800,000,000, only $600,000,000 below total U.S. payment deficits; and estimate of job and plant losses from 1950 to 1960 represented 334,000 workers and 676 plants closed, creating a tax loss to this government of unimaginable size.

Georgia textile plants employ 100,000 people, with a payroll of $400,000,000. In one Congressional District there are 100 plants, nearly all independently owned; 65,000 jobs also are provided by Georgia apparel industry.

South Carolina textile wages average $2.04 per hour. South Carolina textile companies paid 27 per cent of state corporate income taxes and 64 per cent of local property taxes. Wages in Hong Kong and Japan, where we buy millions upon millions of shirts, blouses, skirts, underwear, suits—have wage scales below "30¢ per hour." Both countries sell to Communist China. Communist China is opening huge discount department stores in Hong Kong. So, if Hong Kong workers get their pay from us and they buy from Mao's Department Stores, what kind of foreign aid should we call it?

WE'RE WONDERFUL—UNTIL WE GO BROKE

Yes, good old Uncle Sam's nieces and nephews bought 69,000,000 shirts and 53,000,000 blouses from Japan and Hong Kong in 1966. Only a few European countries will buy them at any price. Portugal, Germany, Italy and Spain sold us 16,000,000 gallons of wine in 1966 without paying a tariff, but we cannot sell them a gallon at any price.

The rug business in now 50 per cent imports and jobs are down 60 per cent. Japanese rug workers get 27¢ per hour; Belgians, 37¢. Their equipment is new and subsidized, and with little money spent on research. Imports up from 303,000 square yards in 1940 to 6,800,000 square yards in 1965.

AN ECONOMIC GRAVEYARD

Wall tile, imports up nearly 3,000 per cent. Plywood from Japan, up from one per cent of U.S. market in 1951 to 60 per cent of U.S. market in 1965. Italy sewed strips of braid on cloth to escape U.S. tariff regulations. Uncle acted. Then they shipped through the Virgin Islands where cloth was treated to "escape tariffs." One Italian drug company put a "spy" in an American laboratory; stole formulas costing $30,000,000 to develop, and sold the medicine to our Defense Department at bargain prices. America pays for the research; foreigners reap the rewards and take over our markets.

Imports of machine tools from Japan are up 300 per cent in less than two years. Russian machine tool industry promises to outstrip our own—at least in price. Russia is building 625 ships to go out over the world, while we put 14 on the waters. Russia has educated nearly 12,000,000 young people in several languages, and if we wait until they start their capitalistic export campaigns, our kids are going to be swamped. Experts talk of the demise of our merchant fleet—due to union policies, high cost of operation, taxes and inability to compete in any kind of traffic.

FARMERS ALSO VICTIMS

Look back and recall the huge quantities of dairy products and poultry we sold or gave to foreign nations—until they could produce their own. Our farmers have been dumping milk at the same time cheese and other dairy products were being dumped on us from abroad. Our yellow corn entering Germany carried a tariff of $1.15 per bushel, but France sold yellow corn to Germany (where we spent billions) against a tariff of 23¢ a bushel. Says the National Wool Growers Association:

"We are seriously alarmed. We cannot hide our disappointment at the failure of the government to institute reasonable limitations on imports. If textiles go, we go."

Yes, the cattlemen are worried too, but their bellows aren't loud enough to be heard. Meat packers view with concern the nearly 100 per cent increase in some meat imports over 1965, and our leather tariffs are below those of any other country.

Stop and consider that since 1950 we reduced dairy herds by 1,000,000. Our cattle population is little above what it was in 1920. Turkey farmers are getting out because the price-cutters sell turkeys on holidays cheaper than they can raise them, which is the same kind of competition we are getting from abroad—that puts farmers, factories, stores, and the young people of America between two gigantic forces: discounting at home and discounting by foreigners.

The Congress and the Administration, professing to favor "fair play"—talks of morals and economic freedom as basic to political freedom—does little for either.

A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

The principal aim of this broadside attack on low tariff walls and their control by people who think in terms of "foreign trade as foreign aid," is not an attack on expansion of foreign trade. We must engage in all efforts to create the greatest possible exchange of goods and services between nations, but when we furnish other nations with our research, our tax dollars, our skills, machinery—everything we can offer—and when the production of those nations is subsidized by national governments, by low wages, low taxes and low shipping costs, we have no choice but to protect ourselves or let this nation hit the bottom of the "Have Nots."

Our loss of over 85 per cent of the motorcycle business is an example of what can happen to tile, tractors, shirts—anything—as our industries go down to low tariff drain. There isn't a nation on earth that thinks as we do; not even the untrained, uneducated leaders of the new independent nations would entertain such idiotic trade policies as giving away markets in which they were self-sufficient.

A WORD TO SWEDISH AND JAPANESE CONVENTIONERS

Ever since the U.S. inaugurated the "give them the money to build factories so they can invade our markets" policy, I have contended that other nations can be sold the "fair wages, fair prices, fair profits" idea, and I still believe it.

At a convention in Chicago I examined the tremendous improvements in Japanese products and later asked the Japanese businessmen assembled if they were now good enough salesmen and had good enough merchandise to compete on a market where tariffs are regulated according to wage scales and other costs of competing countries. My admonition was, that if unfair foreign trade destroys our markets, their markets will be weakened to an equal if not greater degree.

At the close of the meeting, the wife of a Japanese businessman said: "Mr. Wimmer, why doesn't your government talk to us like this?"

In Miami, the head of a big Swedish company praised the "fair trade" approach and said: "We are not afraid to match products with American manufacturers under tariff equalized competition."

In fact, he seemed upset by the suggestion that his company needed to be subsidized to sell its goods.

Whoever heard of typewriter manufacturers fighting it out with foreign typewriter manufacturers, with cut prices? There is no cutthroat competition in this field except from a few chains and discounters, and on only a few models.

ONE WORLD-ISM?

Today, there are more knowledgeable people saying that "free trade is the road to one world-ism." Congressman H. R. Gross (Iowa) has believed this for a long time. Mr. Gross predicts that it will come through "international built-in welfare programs," beginning with business and labor. Hon. John Dent (Pa.) has long called our trade policies "a house built upon the sands." Mr. Dent, a Democrat, says the Congress should regulate tariffs; not the internationalists. Mr. Gross says the power to destroy American businesses by lowering tariffs is a power no man in America should possess.

OIL MOVES THE WORLD

"One world-ism" or not, the destiny of goods and services does determine the destiny of a nation. It determines standards of living. It determines whether freedom of opportunity shall exist or disappear. Goods and their destinies determine the outcome of wars.

In the case of oil, no nation can move without it today, and its flow may change governments overnight. In the case of oil, we need import-export controls to encourage development of our own resources, but what can independent exporters do in this country, if prices, taxes, wages and tariffs are not in balance?

What chance does the independent oil company—the "wildcatter"—have in any market—domestic or foreign—where the giants that operate in all oil producing companies are in constant "private" negotiations with governments that leave the independent out in the cold?

OPPOSITION TO TARIFFS SINCERE

Patriotic Americans; sincere, honest Americans (in and out of government) believe the free trade theory will work to the ultimate advantage of all peoples—no matter how many businesses and jobs are lost in its early stages, but all of them, I think, are overlooking the fact that under the free enterprise profit incentive system the United States led in major medical discoveries; development of the automobile and aircraft industries; led the world in steel, electricity, textiles, television, nuclear energy, electronics, movies, farm implements, and most other fields.

It was the profit incentive, as Robert A. Stranahan, Jr., president of Champion Spark Plug Co., emphasizes, that turned basements, attics, small shops, barns and bedrooms into "idea laboratories" from which flowed a stream of products and better ways of doing things—that made America the envy of the world.

Failure to protect this area from being undermined by low wage, low taxed, subsidized products from abroad; failure to solve the monopoly threat; to allow the big chains, big unions and big debts to swamp the system, could only bring harm to the whole world. This is why we cannot permit the free traders (or any other force) to barter away a single business or seriously weaken a single industry.

UNITED STATES ONLY "PATSY"

Somehow or other, the free traders must be made to realize that every country but the United States is jealously guarding its own industries from outside competition, except where vital needs cannot be satisfied by

these industries. They have taken the position we should take: no lasting progress can come from reaching an export goal by liquidating home businesses with cheap imports—whether it is watches, glass, paint, tires, textiles or garden seeds.

MOST DANGEROUS TIME IN HISTORY

Congress is thoroughly aroused over this issue, and well it should be. We are going down the monopoly-socialism road faster than Britain. We are in a war that will cost us three to five hundred billion dollars before its aftereffects are paid for, and our obligations and taxes are so great on other fronts that any failure to revive, stimulate, breathe independence, hope and morality into our economic system, could pull the whole world down.

Those of us who speak for small business in this country. Who speak for big business that is not monopoly business. Who are willing to examine any issue regardless of personal opinion, believe that the United States is not only the principal base from which economic freedom and political liberty must be fought, but we believe also that there is still great leadership in this nation that can help and inspire all other nations—if it can be fully enlightened and activated.

It is becoming more and more evident, however, that whether we are dealing in tariffs, antitrust laws, urban renewal or anything else, we must look at their moral aspects and act accordingly.

When the government wastes money, it is violating natural moral laws. When giant business swallows up small business or drives it out with cutthroat competition, or by enjoying its present special privileged buying, et cetera, there is a violation of moral laws, and this extends into labor, inflationary pressures or to a case of government letting any enterprise die from unprotective foreign trade regulations.

NOT AN ISSUE

As a final conclusion in this matter of tariff regulation, I would guess that during the 35 months the 53 nations have wrangled over tariff reduction or elimination proposals, the existence of a moral responsibility to establish a fair trade exchange of goods and services, received little consideration; yet, here is the crux of the whole problem.

William Roth, U.S. Ambassador to the trade talks, told a Senate Finance Committee (for example), that he would "walk out" of the negotiations if they failed to produce a "balanced package" of tariff cuts on both "industrial and farm products." I am certain that Mr. Roth was ready with plenty of concessions to "balance out his package"—at the expense of American industry. In 35 months he might have simply stated that we will allow any foreign competitor to come into our high living standards market on a fair trade basis—maintaining tariff walls only where the competitor is being subsidized by his government, and operating on wage scales and tax rates that make it impossible for Americans to compete.

By dropping our tariffs below the fair competition level, we are doing no different than letting foreign producers set up shop over here—bring in their low paid workers and cheap raw materials, pay none of our fringe benefits, and only the tax they paid at home.

Collapse of the "Kennedy Round" negotiations may mean a wave of international protection-ism, but this would be less dangerous than bartering away our independence and industries in an attempt to appease nations ready to "bury us" should it be to their advantage.

German negotiators gave clarity to the position we ought to be taking, when they argued that any renunciation of the principles of "free and fair international trade" would impair the standard of living and create unfavorable thinking in "all countries." This view knocks the "favored nation clause" which says any government granting a concession to one of its favored trading partners, must grant it to all of them—which may be likened to a manufacturer who has A&P and a dozen others on his favored list to which he grants the same discounts, but not to the customers he doesn't favor.

Individuals, families, nations—are captives of the law of self-preservation. It is the law of the animal kingdom, and no other rule of life will preserve our Heritage, our Constitution, our industries, jobs and hopes; the future of our children's children.

That is why Congress cannot let the anti-protectionists sell their scheme of a Utopia of Free Trade, because such a Utopia will never exist. If Sweden wants to sell sewing machines in the U.S., then Sweden should simply pay the difference between Swedish labor, taxes and material costs, in a tariff, or pay the difference to their workers and stockholders. We are not going to sell other nations unless they sell us, and vice versa, but instead of contributing to low wages of foreign workers by buying what they produce, and then taking conscienceless profits from their sweat and deprivation, let's pursue a policy that raises their standard of living.

One might well wonder what would happen if this Congress issued a credo telling the low wage manufacturers: get your wages up and we'll give you an open market. Come in with a price that is at least close to what American companies have to charge, and that is all the protection we will give them. *Chemicals coming into the U.S. are not assessed on their actual price, but on the selling price of American-made chemicals.*

Foreign producers want this pricing system changed. They want to come in with much lower prices, but they wouldn't stand for the U.S. subsidizing our chemical companies so they could undercut them on their home grounds. British manufacturers say they should be able to sell on our markets cheaper than we can operate, but they are accusing the British government of abandoning them because they can't meet competition from Portugal.

It all adds up to one thing, and that is, we must recognize that trade jealousies are too great and too numerous for any "trade zones"—"favorite nation zones"—"gold bloc nations"—"reciprocal trade groups"—"common market participants"—or any other group to honor agreements that are to their disadvantage no matter how many advantages are involved. All nations, however, can enforce anti-dumping barriers, and they can let competition come in on a basis that offers the home boys enough competition to keep them on their toes, but putting them on their backs is another matter.

Too many tariff negotiators, I am afraid, are too anxious to play the role of big brother—at a time when "Big, Big Brother" is bent over from more debts and taxes than all other nations combined; with most people living in glass houses of government-fed "prosperity" that becomes hungrier by the hour.

In answer to critics of our position, I would say that no knowledgeable person advocates closing the tariff reduction door to all low priced imports. There are myriads of things made by gifted people in every land which will never be produced (except artificially) by Americans. . . . All these talents should be encouraged, and the peoples of other lands should welcome goods from the U.S. not produced in their own nations, or sold at prices harmful to their lives.

A recent agreement (or "Common Market" area) was created in automotive products between the U.S. and Canada, which is an example of how people with similar earnings can trade profitably with each other, and this example should be repeated and explored.

As a parting thought, I would admonish all Americans—especially the business and professional class—to weigh the other fellow's welfare with their own, because no one classification of business—one party—one group—can win or hold their freedom, alone.

When C. Wilson Harder founded the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., in 1943, it was to forward this conviction now accepted by 233,000 members representing every kind of business and profession in the United States.

* * * * *

"In my belief, the Constitution is somewhat like the Bible. If you read it long enough you will find the answers to a lot of problems that look very complex. . . .

"The Constitution of the United States says very clearly that it is the responsibility of the Congress to regulate commerce, and when Congress recaptures this authority which it has delegated to others, we will find solutions."—BASIL L. WHITENER, Member of Congress.

UNREALISTIC, ARBITRARY ADMINISTRATION OF BEAUTIFICATION ACT JEOPARDIZES PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1967, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Mr. Alan S. Boyd, now the Secretary of Transportation, transmitted to the Congress the 1967 highway beautification program report, printed as Senate Document No. 6, 90th Congress. With a price tag over 10 years of $1.8 billion for plan "A" and $2.9 billion for plan "B."

This 1967 report was transmitted to the Congress pursuant to the requirements of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, Public Law 89–285. I think the requirement of the 1965 act that the Secretary of Commerce had to make such a report to the Congress was one of the wisest provisions of the 1965 act.

The report contains an estimate of the costs of the Highway Beautification Act—as viewed by the administration—and a report on "comprehensive studies" of the economic impact of the program. One of the most controversial sections of the report is part II thereof—the draft standards, criteria, rules and regulations formulated by the administration for the control of outdoor advertising.

These draft standards have been the center of great controversy, principally because they are unrealistic and unworkable.

The draft standards, as submitted to the Congress, appear to be unacceptable to the Committee on Public Works, which has legislative jurisdiction over the highway beautification program. Our concern is evidenced by the fact that the Subcommittee on Roads of the committee has been holding open hearings on all aspects of the highway beautification program since April 5, 1967. It now appears that because of their great importance and because of the substantial concern over the draft standards these hearings will probably continue through the first week of May.

This concern has been expressed to

the committee from all sections of the Nation and by almost all people who are involved in the program—government leaders, businessmen, labor union officials, civic groups, professional associations, and so forth. Testimony before the subcommittee, to date, has well brought out the shortcomings of this program, a program that appears to be almost totally unsusceptible to any effective administration.

From information obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, I have compiled three very informative tables on various aspects of the highway beautification program. I think these tables well indicate why the American motoring public is greatly concerned over the draft standards and their anticipated detrimental effects on the convenience of the traveling public.

In essence, these tables indicate that as of October 22, 1965, the date of enactment of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the total number of off-premise advertising signs along the Interstate and Federal-aid primary highway systems and subject to the law and the standards, was 1,100,020. The provisions of the 1965 act apply, for the purposes of controlling outdoor advertising, only to the Interstate and Primary Systems, and they are applicable to off-premise advertising control. Of these 1,100,020 signs, a fantastically large number of 1,016,792 of these signs would be removed, if the draft standards are forced upon the States and if they are thereafter carried out in accordance with the current plans of the administration and all signs in the area subject to control in rural areas would have to be removed, some 839,361 in number.

Mr. Speaker, this would leave only 83,228 signs remaining on the 268,898 miles on the Interstate and Federal-aid primary systems, the systems to which the Highway Beautification Act applies. This leaves only approximately one sign for every 3.2 miles on that mileage, possibly causing great inconvenience to the traveling public of our Nation.

The removal of these signs would probably result in the bankruptcy of many outdoor advertising businesses. It would thereby result in the discharge of thousands of those who work in this important industry, from the company supervisory personnel to the sign painters, decorators, paperhangers, and construction crews. It would result in great inconvenience to the traveling public who must depend upon outdoor advertising signs along the Nation's principal highways for instructions and information which will not be included on any directional or informational signs erected by the governments along the highways, supposedly to aid the motorists in finding gas, food, and lodging. It will result in the closing of countless business establishments from tourist attractions to tourist services—such as restaurants, motels, privately developed recreation areas, private lodges, et cetera—who must depend, to a very great extent on their outdoor advertising. It will thereby result in the loss of tens of thousands of jobs for the people employed in such establishments. The program will result in excessive costs to the Federal and State Governments at a time when we should be expending greater sums of money on highway construction.

We shall try to revise the legislation to do an effective job of beautification without causing undue hardship and if the administration's attitude had been reasonable in carrying out the 1965 act, we would not have this controversy before us.

TABLE I—SIGN INVENTORY

The first table that I am putting into the RECORD today—table I—shows the number of off-premise advertising signs along the Interstate and Federal-aid primary highway systems as of October 22, 1965. This sign inventory shows the number of signs controlled by the administration's proposed standards for commercial and industrial areas and other areas on both the Interstate System and the Federal-aid primary highway system. It also shows the number of signs not controlled by the proposed standards, a very small percentage of the total number of signs on the Interstate and primary systems. Figures for this table were supplied by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads.

Table I follows:

TABLE I.—*Number of off-premise advertising signs along the interstate and Federal-aid primary highway systems, Oct. 22, 1965*

State	Signs controlled by administration's proposed standards									Not controlled by proposed standards		Grand total
	Interstate System			Other Federal-aid primary highways			Total					
	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Toll roads	On highway right-of-way	
Alabama	113	582	695	6,044	15,650	21,694	6,157	16,232	22,389		485	22,874
Alaska				47	62	109	47	62	109		561	670
Arizona	402	2,577	2,979	2,142	5,995	8,137	2,544	8,572	11,116		517	11,633
Arkansas	336	567	903	5,155	14,056	19,211	5,491	14,623	20,114		3,078	23,192
California	2,156	1,667	3,823	7,471	9,676	17,147	9,627	11,343	20,970		158	21,128
Colorado	340	2,060	2,400	2,941	10,164	13,105	3,281	12,224	15,505		465	15,970
Connecticut	433	66	499	2,260	962	3,222	2,693	1,028	3,721	64	611	4,396
Delaware	84	13	97	970	1,879	2,849	1,054	1,892	2,946	11	588	3,545
Florida	519	1,054	1,573	15,731	11,604	27,335	16,250	12,658	28,908	64	1,253	30,225
Georgia	254	1,116	1,370	7,480	28,685	36,165	7,734	29,801	37,535	2	5,482	43,019
Hawaii	1	1	2	13	16	29	14	17	31		20	51
Idaho	125	1,043	1,168	2,122	7,316	9,438	2,247	8,359	10,606		240	10,846
Illinois	446	3,572	4,018	13,141	46,589	59,730	13,587	50,161	63,748	115	2,699	66,562
Indiana	88	855	943	6,930	24,019	30,949	7,018	24,874	31,892	118	7,508	39,518
Iowa	112	249	361	7,821	90,496	98,317	7,933	90,745	98,678	13	13,499	112,190
Kansas	151	815	966	5,256	29,693	34,949	5,407	30,508	35,915	226	16,653	52,794
Kentucky	124	11	135	4,634	13,678	18,312	4,758	13,689	18,447	15	4,625	23,087
Louisiana	149	478	627	3,552	11,567	15,119	3,701	12,045	15,746		1,611	17,357
Maine	18	158	176	1,650	2,678	4,328	1,668	2,836	4,504	1	5	4,510
Maryland	46	139	185	2,307	3,889	6,196	2,353	4,028	6,381	56	1,075	7,512
Massachusetts	294	82	376	3,838	1,287	5,125	4,132	1,369	5,501	29	833	6,363
Michigan	994	3,305	4,299	7,802	20,733	28,535	8,796	24,038	32,834		4,201	37,035
Minnesota	99	694	793	5,591	35,581	41,172	5,690	36,275	41,965		3,030	44,995
Mississippi	122	669	791	2,875	12,099	14,974	2,997	12,768	15,765		1,337	17,102
Missouri	675	5,003	5,678	8,568	41,347	49,915	9,243	46,350	55,593		1,154	56,747
Montana	31	2,762	2,793	1,447	11,697	13,144	1,478	14,459	15,937		1,863	17,800
Nebraska	32	343	375	2,960	29,973	32,933	2,992	30,316	33,308		730	34,038
Nevada	351	927	1,278	1,339	1,831	3,170	1,690	2,758	4,448		766	5,214
New Hampshire	44	146	190	1,134	2,400	3,534	1,178	2,546	3,724	38	1,458	5,220
New Jersey	84	9	93	9,376	901	10,277	9,460	910	10,370	43	1,286	11,699
New Mexico	790	2,807	3,597	2,271	6,064	8,335	3,061	8,871	11,932		527	12,459
New York	270	316	586	10,508	23,923	34,431	10,778	24,239	35,017	25	6,214	41,256
North Carolina	270	1,668	1,938	4,769	14,884	19,653	5,039	16,552	21,591		4,779	26,370
North Dakota	54	905	959	1,451	7,815	9,266	1,505	8,720	10,225		1,156	11,381
Ohio	305	512	817	6,212	29,283	35,495	6,517	29,795	36,312	19	2,041	38,372
Oklahoma	233	1,470	1,703	3,758	24,557	28,315	3,991	26,027	30,018	1	5,313	35,332
Oregon	351	1,658	2,009	4,858	6,134	10,992	5,209	7,792	13,001		559	13,560
Pennsylvania	1,105	1,292	2,397	10,103	25,223	35,326	11,208	26,515	37,723	55	6,412	44,190
Rhode Island	101	4	105	750	87	837	851	91	942		85	1,027
South Carolina	76	792	868	6,676	18,055	24,731	6,752	18,847	25,599		4,091	29,690
South Dakota	287	2,218	2,505	3,599	19,888	23,487	3,886	22,106	25,992		2,205	28,197
Tennessee	231	490	721	6,690	16,075	22,765	6,921	16,565	23,486		816	24,302
Texas	2,551	8,591	11,142	14,543	37,269	51,812	17,094	45,860	62,954		2,408	65,362
Utah	337	1,501	1,838	1,467	5,632	7,099	1,804	7,133	8,937		28	8,965
Vermont	1	21	22	385	2,518	2,903	386	2,539	2,925		141	3,066
Virginia	127	265	392	8,268	10,731	18,999	8,395	10,996	19,391	86	53	19,530
Washington	224	881	1,105	2,949	5,378	8,327	3,173	6,259	9,432		1,321	10,753
West Virginia		12	12	1,938	4,560	6,498	1,938	4,572	6,510	24	1,524	8,058

TABLE I.—*Number of off-premise advertising signs along the interstat e and Federal-aid primary highway systems, Oct. 22, 1965*—Con.

State	Signs controlled by administration's proposed standards									Not controlled by proposed standards		Grand total
	Interstate System			Other Federal-aid primary highways			Total					
	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Toll roads	On highway right-of-way	
Wisconsin	80	339	419	9,992	29,140	39,132	10,072	29,479	39,551	13	3,921	43,485
Wyoming	151	1,715	1,866	670	7,185	7,855	821	8,900	9,721		840	10,561
District of Columbia	2	1	3	36	16	52	38	17	55		28	83
Puerto Rico											4,352	4,352
Total	16,169	58,421	74,590	244,490	780,940	1,025,430	260,659	839,361	1,100,020	1,018	126,605	1,227,643

Source: Bureau of Public Roads.

TABLE II—SIGNS TO BE REMOVED

Mr. Speaker, table II shows the number of off-premise advertising signs existing on October 22, 1965, along the Interstate and Federal-aid primary high way systems which would be removed under the administration's proposed standards in commercial and industrial areas and other areas on the Interstate and primary systems. This excludes signs along toll roads, signs on the right-of-way, and signs under construction.

On the Interstate System there were 12,274 off-premise advertising signs in commercial and industrial areas and 58,421 such signs in other areas on the Interstate System as of October 22, 1965, or a total of 70,695 off-premise advertising signs, to be removed under the administration's proposed standards.

On the Federal-aid primary system there were 165,157 off-premise advertising signs in commercial and industrial areas and 780,940 such signs in other areas on the Federal-aid primary system on October 22, 1965, for a total of 946,097 off-premise outdoor advertising signs, to be removed under the administration's proposed standards. The administration, therefore, proposes to remove 1,016,792 off-premise advertising signs existing on the Interstate and Federal-aid primary systems on October 22, 1965.

Table II, showing the breakdown State by State, follows:

TABLE II.—*Number of off-premise advertising signs existing on Oct. 22, 1965, along interstate and Federal-aid primary highway systems which would be removed under administration's proposed standards* [1]

State	Interstate System			Other Federal-aid primary highways			Grand total	State	Interstate System			Other Federal-aid primary highways			Grand total
	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total			Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	Commercial and industrial areas	Other areas	Total	
Alabama	105	582	687	3,717	15,650	19,367	20,054	New Hampshire	43	146	189	965	2,400	3,365	3,554
Alaska	0	0	0	36	62	98	98	New Jersey	51	9	60	5,747	901	6,648	6,708
Arizona	201	2,577	2,778	1,427	5,995	7,422	10,200	New Mexico	362	2,807	3,169	1,181	6,064	7,245	10,414
Arkansas	305	567	872	3,304	14,056	17,360	18,232	New York	216	316	532	8,102	23,923	32,025	32,557
California	1,462	1,667	3,129	4,423	9,676	14,099	17,228	North Carolina	243	1,668	1,911	3,920	14,884	18,804	20,715
Colorado	304	2,060	2,364	1,700	10,164	11,864	14,228	North Dakota	27	905	932	569	7,815	8,384	9,316
Connecticut	393	66	459	1,623	962	2,585	3,044	Ohio	285	512	797	4,789	29,283	34,072	34,869
Delaware	81	13	94	821	1,879	2,700	2,794	Oklahoma	159	1,470	1,629	2,762	24,557	27,319	28,948
Florida	389	1,054	1,443	10,225	11,604	21,829	23,272	Oregon	234	1,658	1,892	3,595	6,134	9,729	11,621
Georgia	239	1,116	1,355	5,917	28,685	34,602	35,957	Pennsylvania	759	1,292	2,051	8,042	25,223	33,265	35,316
Hawaii	0	1	1	10	16	26	27	Rhode Island	84	4	88	475	87	562	650
Idaho	71	1,043	1,114	1,199	7,316	8,515	9,629	South Carolina	76	792	868	3,839	18,055	21,894	22,762
Illinois	372	3,572	3,944	10,040	46,589	56,629	60,573	South Dakota	232	2,218	2,450	2,768	19,888	22,656	25,106
Indiana	75	855	930	5,198	24,019	29,217	30,147	Tennessee	154	490	644	2,863	16,075	18,938	19,582
Iowa	104	249	353	3,605	90,496	94,101	94,454	Texas	2,327	8,591	10,918	8,319	37,269	45,588	56,506
Kansas	136	815	951	3,269	29,693	32,962	33,913	Utah	295	1,501	1,796	1,027	5,632	6,659	8,455
Kentucky	120	11	131	4,013	13,678	17,691	17,822	Vermont	0	21	21	314	2,518	2,832	2,853
Louisiana	114	478	592	1,421	11,567	12,988	13,580	Virginia	76	265	341	4,911	10,731	15,642	15,983
Maine	16	158	174	1,099	2,678	3,777	3,951	Washington	127	881	1,008	2,070	5,378	7,448	8,456
Maryland	32	139	171	1,306	3,889	5,195	5,366	West Virginia	0	12	12	1,762	4,560	6,322	6,334
Massachusetts	207	82	289	2,318	1,287	3,605	3,894	Wisconsin	70	339	409	8,893	29,140	38,033	38,442
Michigan	738	3,305	4,043	5,937	20,733	26,670	30,713	Wyoming	91	1,715	1,806	526	7,185	7,711	9,517
Minnesota	85	694	779	3,310	35,581	38,892	39,670	District of Columbia	0	1	1	13	16	29	30
Mississippi	106	669	775	2,234	12,099	14,333	15,108	Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	396	5,003	5,399	5,912	41,347	47,259	52,658								
Montana	29	2,762	2,791	1,175	11,697	12,872	15,663	Total	12,274	58,421	70,695	165,157	780,940	946,097	1,016,792
Nebraska	26	343	369	1,752	29,973	31,725	32,094								
Nevada	257	927	1,184	714	1,831	2,545	3,729								

[1] Excludes signs along toll roads, signs on the right-of-way, and signs under construction.

Source: Bureau of Public Roads.

TABLE III—ESTIMATED COSTS OF REMOVING OFF-PREMISE ADVERTISING SIGNS

Mr. Speaker, table III shows the estimated costs of removing off-premise advertising signs existing on October 22, 1965, along the Interstate and Federal-aid primary highway systems to comply with the administration's proposed standards. This chart shows the total miles on controlled Federal-aid systems, signs inventoried, signs to be removed—which include all off-premise signs outside of commercial and industrial areas—signs to remain—these signs are in commercial and industrial areas only—and the administration's estimated costs of sign removal. These figures exclude signs along toll roads, signs on the right-of-way, and signs under construction.

Table III shows that of the 1,100,020 signs inventoried on the Interstate and Federal-aid primary systems some 1,016,792 will be removed, leaving only 83,228 signs along the entire 268,898 miles on the controlled Federal-aid systems. The administration's estimate of the costs of removing these signs is $558,610,000, which many, if not most, people who have worked in this field feel is much too low and too unrealistic of the actual expenses that will most probably be incurred in the removal and processes of removal of these 1 million plus signs. This, according to the administration's estimate, will be $549 per sign.

TABLE III.—*Estimated costs of removing off-premise advertising signs existing on Oct. 22, 1965, along interstate and Federal-aid primary highways system to comply with administration's proposed standards* [1]

State	Total miles on controlled Federal-aid systems			Signs inventoried, total	Signs to be removed [2]			Signs to remain [3]			Administration's estimated costs of sign removal	
	Interstate	Other primary	Total		Interstate	Other primary	Total	Interstate	Other primary	Total	Total	Average per sign
Alabama	874	5,738	6,612	22,389	687	19,367	20,054	8	2,327	2,335	$9,994,000	$498
Alaska	0	3,285	3,285	109	0	98	98	0	11	11	26,000	266
Arizona	1,167	2,283	3,450	11,116	2,778	7,422	10,200	201	715	916	14,480,000	1,420
Arkansas	520	3,592	4,112	20,114	872	17,360	18,232	31	1,851	1,882	7,702,000	428
California	2,165	7,548	9,713	20,970	3,129	14,099	17,228	694	3,048	3,742	45,454,000	2,638
Colorado	946	3,622	4,568	15,505	2,364	11,864	14,228	36	1,241	1,277	10,728,000	754
Connecticut	296	987	1,283	3,721	459	2,585	3,044	40	637	677	2,584,000	849
Delaware	41	619	660	2,946	94	2,700	2,794	3	149	152	1,818,000	651
Florida	1,151	4,325	5,476	28,908	1,443	21,829	23,272	130	5,506	5,636	38,348,000	1,691
Georgia	1,105	7,961	9,066	37,535	1,355	34,602	35,957	15	1,563	1,578	16,294,000	453
Hawaii	49	463	512	31	1	26	27	1	3	4	3,000	111
Idaho	609	2,682	3,291	10,606	1,114	8,515	9,629	54	923	977	7,564,000	786
Illinois	1,632	9,826	11,458	63,748	3,944	56,629	60,573	74	3,101	3,175	33,685,000	556
Indiana	1,116	4,937	6,053	31,892	930	29,217	30,147	13	1,732	1,745	9,222,000	306
Iowa	709	9,387	10,096	98,678	353	94,101	94,454	8	4,216	4,224	19,073,000	202
Kansas	799	6,947	7,746	35,915	951	32,962	33,913	15	1,987	2,002	11,295,000	333
Kentucky	733	3,849	4,582	18,447	131	17,691	17,882	4	621	625	4,887,000	274
Louisiana	667	2,641	3,308	15,746	592	12,988	13,580	35	2,131	2,166	6,313,000	465
Maine	312	1,657	1,969	4,504	174	3,777	3,951	2	551	553	2,901,000	734
Maryland	355	2,122	2,477	6,381	171	5,195	5,366	14	1,001	1,015	1,370,000	255
Massachusetts	456	1,908	2,364	5,501	289	3,605	3,894	87	1,520	1,607	4,914,000	1,262
Michigan	1,082	5,957	7,039	32,834	4,043	26,670	30,713	256	1,865	2,121	23,156,000	754
Minnesota	901	7,623	8,524	41,965	779	38,891	39,670	14	2,281	2,295	12,092,000	305
Mississippi	678	5,188	5,866	15,765	775	14,333	15,108	16	641	657	10,328,000	684
Missouri	1,120	7,769	8,889	55,593	5,399	47,259	52,658	279	2,656	2,935	30,747,000	584
Montana	1,177	5,297	6,474	15,937	2,791	12,872	15,663	2	272	274	4,455,000	284
Nebraska	478	5,427	5,905	33,308	369	31,725	32,094	6	1,208	1,214	8,516,000	265
Nevada	535	1,752	2,287	4,448	1,184	2,545	3,729	94	625	719	5,493,000	1,473
New Hampshire	214	1,042	1,256	3,724	189	3,365	3,554	1	169	170	1,629,000	458
New Jersey	373	1,816	2,189	10,370	60	6,648	6,708	33	3,629	3,662	3,769,000	562
New Mexico	1,003	3,093	4,096	11,932	3,169	7,245	10,414	428	1,090	1,518	6,884,000	661
New York	1,234	11,485	12,719	35,017	532	32,025	32,557	54	2,406	2,460	12,489,000	384
North Carolina	769	3,991	4,760	21,591	1,911	18,804	20,715	27	849	876	16,244,000	784
North Dakota	571	4,089	4,660	10,225	932	8,384	9,316	27	882	909	4,534,000	487
Ohio	1,526	6,618	8,144	36,312	797	34,072	34,869	20	1,423	1,443	17,224,000	494
Oklahoma	796	7,332	8,128	30,018	1,629	27,319	28,948	74	996	1,070	17,171,000	593
Oregon	731	3,343	4,074	13,001	1,892	9,729	11,621	117	1,263	1,380	9,369,000	806
Pennsylvania	1,585	6,914	8,499	37,723	2,051	33,265	35,316	346	2,061	2,407	13,519,000	383
Rhode Island	71	371	442	942	88	562	650	17	275	292	984,000	1,514
South Carolina	679	4,616	5,295	25,599	868	21,894	22,762	0	2,837	2,837	7,359,000	323
South Dakota	679	5,341	6,020	25,992	2,450	22,656	25,106	55	831	886	6,621,000	264
Tennessee	1,049	5,723	6,772	23,486	644	18,938	19,582	77	3,827	3,904	10,030,000	512
Texas	3,024	14,566	17,590	62,954	10,918	45,588	56,506	224	6,224	6,448	30,177,000	534
Utah	934	1,433	2,367	8,937	1,796	6,659	8,455	42	440	482	10,222,000	1,209
Vermont	320	1,355	1,675	2,925	21	2,832	2,853	1	71	72	697,000	244
Virginia	1,059	4,637	5,696	19,391	341	15,642	15,983	51	3,357	3,408	19,225,000	1,203
Washington	725	3,234	3,959	9,432	1,008	7,448	8,456	97	879	976	6,608,000	781
West Virginia	516	1,966	2,482	6,510	12	6,322	6,334	0	176	176	4,854,000	766
Wisconsin	459	5,906	6,365	39,551	409	38,033	38,442	10	1,099	1,109	12,834,000	334
Wyoming	912	3,029	3,941	9,721	1,806	7,711	9,517	60	144	204	2,664,000	280
District of Columbia	29	138	167	55	1	29	30	2	23	25	63,000	2,100
Puerto Rico	0	537	537	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	[4] 40,931	227,967	268,898	1,100,020	70,695	946,097	1,016,792	3,895	79,333	83,228	558,610,000	549

[1] Excludes signs along toll roads, signs on the right-of-way, and signs under construction.
[2] Includes all off-premise signs outside of commercial and industrial areas.
[3] These signs are in commercial and industrial areas only.
[4] The 69-mile difference between the full authorization of 41,000 miles and the 40,931 miles reported here includes routes for which the final locations have not yet been determined.

CALL FOR A REALISTIC BILL

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Committee on Public Works, on which I have the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member, will be able to works its own free will in the formulation of legislation to make the highway beautification program a workable and realistic one.

I think we all want beautification. But there is much difference of opinion between the Congress and the administration on what constitutes a workable and realistic program. Fortunately, many Democrats and Republicans alike on the committee are working toward a workable program. There has been very encouraging bipartisan support of efforts to make the program a workable one. I am sure that this cooperation will continue.

In 1965 the Committee on Public Works was well on its way toward reporting a good highway beautification bill when the administration stepped in—injecting strong partisan issues and making committee members reach strong points of disagreement—thereby resulting in the unworkable and highly criticized program which we have enacted and are struggling with today.

If the Committee on Public Works can work its will, without pressure from the administration, we will have a good bill, one which I think the Nation will readily accept. If the administration steps in again, then we will have the same old problems all over again and still not have a workable beautification program. I hope that this will not happen.

THE WASHINGTON STAR LOOKS AT THE MERITS

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of the true issue in current Republican proposals for changes in the administration's war on poverty program appears on the editorial page of the Washington Star for today, April 17.

The Star editorial very effectively identifies the basic weakness in the GOP's widely advertised opportunity crusade—and that is the loss of coordination which is sure to follow fragmentation of existing programs, under the GOP plan.

While frankly admitting the vulnerability of OEO's past performance "on a number of points," the Star acknowledges that the administration is moving to meet these criticisms and urges "full consideration" of the proposed administration amendments.

The Star editorial, entitled "Shriver's Survival," follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1967]

SHRIVER'S SURVIVAL

While there are a good many other aspects, the crux of the fight now shaping up between the administration and House Republicans over the poverty program is clearly and simply the survival of Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity as an independent agency.

Scattered demands for Shriver's resignation were heard in the last session of Con-

gress, along with attempts to shift various elements of the OEO program to other agencies. The opposition strategy did not fully coalesce, however, until last week, when GOP members of the House Education Committee disclosed the details of a proposed "Opportunity Crusade" which would "completely dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity under Sargent Shriver, eliminating or redirecting existing programs." The issue could hardly be stated in plainer terms than that.

Actually, the Republicans' 11-point alternative by no means abandons the goals of the present anti-poverty war. Indeed, most of these programs, modified drastically in some instances and very little in others, are retained. Its estimated cost for the next year, moreover, is a substantial $1.7 billion, just $300 million below the administration's pending request. The authors of the GOP plan seek to disperse the control of these recast programs to other federal agencies, however, primarily Health, Education and Welfare, with the contention that this dispersal plus a fuller participation by local governmental and private sources would add some $400 million to the anti-poverty pool.

We trust there will be no inclination by Congress as a whole to take these claims at face value. The OEO's past performance is vulnerable to criticism on a number of points, much of which is the result of initiating programs on too broad a scale with too little advance thought and preparation. The fact is, however, that the administration is finally showing signs of responding to these complaints. Its own voluminous package of amendments would tighten program control in a variety of ways and it deserves Congress' full consideration.

There may be merit in the specifics of a number of the GOP proposals, which might profitably be incorporated in program revisions. But coordination of these efforts is also essential. And it hardly seems that the best way to achieve coordination is to fragment this vast array of programs among existing bureaucracies which are having great difficulty administering the complexity of federal responsibilities they already have.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. WAGGONNER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Public Works who have chosen to review the unworkable advertising standards set by the Department of Transportation having to do with the highway beautification bill. I accept this responsibility as a Member of Congress and I believe that the other Members do as well, because there is a vast difference between congressional intent and the criteria which have been established by the Department to administer this act. The gentleman from Florida has made a significant statement. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] has led this fight.

Beyond this, however, I would like to add just one other remark. This might seem just a little strange coming from me, because I have been about as critical of the U.S. Supreme Court as has any man. However, I would like to congratulate that group today upon turning down the request of Cassius Clay to have further delayed his entrance by draft into the U.S. Army. I have mixed emotions, however, about him going into the Army. I would rather have him go to a rock pile and spend the rest of his life there for in my opinion he is not worthy of wearing the uniform of an American soldier. It is a crying shame and disgrace that this same Court has rendered decision after decision which has had the effect of encouraging such sad spectacles as was the case in New York and San Francisco Saturday when our Vietnam critics told the Communists once again they were on their side and do not support the United States and their fellow Americans. The Supreme Court bears more responsibility for this than anyone.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the report of the President's Crime Commission and the recent FBI figures on last year's increase in crime underline the swelling problems of our law enforcement officials. A nationwide increase of 11 percent in 1966 is evidence enough that crime today is a terribly destructive force in our body politic—and the threat of its potential is no less real.

In America we prize our freedom and are comforted by the liberties we have—to speak, to move about, to worship as we wish. But if the criminal element in our society denies us the freedom to enjoy these things in which we take so much pride, of what value are they? Already, thousands hesitate to walk our streets and enjoy our parks and our great cities after dark for fear of what may happen to them. Our citizens, quite simply, are no longer secure or relatively free from danger.

And let us not think that this problem affects only the urban dweller. The increase of crime between 1965 and 1966 in suburbia was 13 percent. Our small cities between 10,000 and 50,000 experienced a 12-percent increase. For those under 10,000 the increase was even greater—14 percent. Even rural areas report a 7-percent increase.

There are many aspects of this problem. We must investigate its causes, look for far-reaching remedies, and inspire public responsibility for what is going on.

But one conclusion seems inescapable to me: any meaningful attack on this problem must focus on concerted attention on the law enforcement process. Our system of criminal justice was not established in a spirit of vindictiveness, with a desire to avenge wrongs done. It has, rather, a dual purpose. It seeks to reform and, therefore, to make possible, the return to society of the perpetrator of crimes. Just as importantly, our law enforcement system has the responsibility to assure would-be criminals that violations of the law are to be met with swift and sure punishment commensurate with the crime. If our streets are to be safe, those who would make them dangerous must be removed from them until they understand that society will not tolerate criminal infringements on its members.

To accomplish this task, our law enforcement agencies must have tools with which to work. Better training, scientific research, increased financial support—these are all important. But our officials must also have the legal authorization to do the job which we, the public, vest in them. As some traditional methods of police work have been restricted by recent court decisions other tools and methods must be developed. These must carefully guard the rights of all citizens—those suspected of crimes as well as the law abiding.

It is with this special need in mind that I have given much thought to the laws under which our law enforcement officials operate. I believe that several changes can be made which do not endanger the constitutional rights of anyone but, at the same time, will give officials needed tools in the apprehension and prosecution of criminals. It is with this in mind that I introduce four bills for the consideration of the Congress today.

I. APPEAL OF MOTIONS TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

The first of the bills I introduce today involves the problem of motions to suppress evidence collected by our law enforcement officials.

No one condones unreasonable and illegal searches. Just exactly what is an unreasonable and illegal search is not always clear, however.

The law provides that the accused may move to suppress evidence that he feels has been wrongfully acquired. He may appeal conviction if he believes that illegal evidence has been used against him.

This privilege is not open to the prosecution. As a result, different standards apply in different courts in the country. One judge may suppress on quite different grounds than other. Contradictory judgments are not unusual.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the other body, after studying this problem in the 85th Congress, stated that the authorization of the Government to appeal motions to suppress evidence was badly needed. This authority has been given to the Government under section 1404 of title 18 of the United States Code for narcotics cases. The subcommittee concluded that this authority should not be restricted to narcotics cases. The various courts in this country are entitled to appellate guidance in "admittedly difficult field of search and seizure," concluded the subcommittee. "If they cannot obtain such guidance, the result will be an increasingly chaotic condition, with some judges in a single district consistently adhering to one view of the law, and others to another, incompatible view."

The Supreme Court in the 1957 case of *Carroll* v. *U.S.*, 267 U.S. 132 (1957), declared that a grant of such authority is a proper legislative function of Congress. The Justice Department and the Judicial Conference of the United States have in recent years recommended similar action.

I propose that Congress grant such authority to the Government. However, I believe certain safeguards are necessary. To make sure that such appeal does not bring about unnecessary delay, such appeals must be made within 30 days. Also, to avoid frivolous appeals the attorney who seeks the appeal must certify that the evidence suppressed in the pretrial motion represents a substantial proof in his case against the accused.

Recent support for this general idea came in the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Commission concludes on page 140 that:

> Congress and the States should enact statutes giving the prosecution the right to appeal from the grant of all pretrial motions to suppress evidence or confessions.

The Commission points out that under present circumstances, when law enforcement officers are faced with overly-restrictive or conflicting rulings they have but two courses of action—both undesirable. They can, for example, abandon a form of search which is considered quite proper by many judges, or they can continue their search, hoping that in future cases a trial judge will sustain it, and a defendant, by objecting and appealing will give the higher court an opportunity to form an authoritative and clarifying ruling. The first choice may cause the denial of the use of legitimate police methods simply because an appellate test cannot be gained, while the second places the officers in the position of flaunting court rulings.

To correct this unfortunate situation is the purpose of the bill I introduce today.

II. FEDERAL "NO-KNOCK" STATUTE

My second bill applies specifically to the area of search and seizure.

Organized crime is today a flourishing business. It affects every one of us—whether as the innocent victims who are shrewdly and professionally exploited each year or as the citizens who annually foot the bill for improved training and new scientific research methods for our law enforcement officials. It is evident that changing situations and tactics demand continuous revision of the procedures used to combat this ever-increasing problem of crime.

This is where my "no-knock" bill comes in—in the form of an additional tool available to our law enforcement officials in the investigation and prosecution of criminals. I propose to grant to our law enforcement officials the authority they need to meet the skillful methods devised by organized crime today.

Of particular concern is the flourishing gambling and narcotics traffic. Here are two highly professional criminal areas of operation where evidence is of extreme importance for convictions. This evidence under present laws can be easily disposed of at the time of a search by officers. Court records are full of cases in which incriminating evidence is thrown out of windows, poured down drains or flushed down toilets when an officer executing a warrant makes the statutory announcement of his presence prior to entry. Another example is that of gambling slips which can be produced on "flash" paper that goes up in smoke in a few seconds at the touch of a match.

Warrants to search for "the fruits and instrumentalities" of these crimes are regularly granted. But due to its peculiar nature evidence of gambling and narcotics is easily disposed of and often lost forever as incriminating evidence.

Clearly there is a need in these cases for our law enforcement officials to be able to enter a place to be searched without delay and without announcement. The delay which now results from the requirement of an announcement of the official's presence allows the criminals to destroy the evidence, thereby frustrating the purposes of a legitimate search.

My bill would, therefore, grant authority to officials to enter premises to be searched without announcement or identification if there is strong reason to believe that the evidence to be seized would be destroyed. This approach has already been enacted into law in the State of New York, and I feel it essential that Federal officers share this authority.

III. AUTHORITY TO INSPECT AUTOMOBILE SERIAL NUMBERS

Stolen motor vehicles pose another problem in the area of search and seizure. Recent FBI statistics show automobile thefts to be one of the largest criminal problems in our country. In 1965 there were 486,000 auto thefts—a 5-percent increase over 1964. Now we learn that this figure increased by another 12 percent during the year just past.

No doubt a high percentage of these automobile thefts are committed by young people for "joyriding purposes." Still, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover declares that auto theft for resale is one of America's major rackets. Only about one out of four auto theft cases is solved, so exact statistics are not obtainable; but some authorities estimate that 50 percent of the thefts are by professionals.

Car owners can significantly solve the joyriding problem by taking various preventive measures, but deterring professional car-theft rings requires much more.

Especially careful police work in apprehension and prosecution of offenders is a necessity. It is for this reason that I propose a simple increase in the inspection power of law-enforcement officials.

Federal officials now can inspect many items in interstate commerce including motorboats, ferryboats, hazardous chemicals, foodstuffs, and so forth. My bill would allow an inspection by law-enforcement officers of the serial numbers of the body or motor of a motor vehicle for the purpose of determining whether or not it is stolen. This power would not be dependent upon an arrest, or a search warrant, but would simply be an inspection made by an officer who had a reasonable suspicion that the vehicle was being transported in violation of the law. An altered identification number, or a number that did not correspond to registration papers, or that was known to be that of a stolen vehicle would easily establish whether or not a theft had occurred.

If officers can inspect for the great number of purposes they do now, it would seem only logical that they have extended to them this simple power under the commerce clause of our Constitution. The precedents are established, and the need is clear. I would hope that this bill would receive favorable attention by the Members of this Congress.

IV. ADDITIONAL GROUNDS OF SEARCH AND SEIZURE

A particular problem that faces law-enforcement officers and which is often unknown to many citizens, is the inability of officers to search for anything other than fruits, instrumentalities, or contraband of a crime. This deficiency in our methods of criminals procedure is the subject of my fourth bill.

The United States Code limits reasonable searches to the categories I have just mentioned. So under present interpretations of law, it appears that blood-stained clothing, body fluids, hair fibers, and other things that are considered "mere evidence" are not objects of legitimate search.

The Supreme Court has spoken in somewhat equivocal manner in this area. It promulgated in 1921 the so-called "Gouled Rules," which says that items that are merely evidential are not proper objects of a search warrant. The Court in later cases has expanded this rule to include searches made incident to a lawful arrest. However, the Court has not applied the "rule" in cases other than those involving personal papers and documents.

Lower Federal courts and State courts have not acted on this consistently. In the absence of statutory and more definite case law, the cases involving this question have been numerous and conflicting. Recent cases include *Morrison* v. *U.S.* 262 F. 2d 449 (D.C.C.R. 1958), in which a handkerchief which bore evidence of the crime was excluded as improper evidence; and *U.S.* v. *Linsy* 226 F. Supp. 759 E.D. Wis. (1964), in which keys which linked the defendant to an alcohol violation were also excluded. Some State courts have held the opposite. In fact, a Maryland case is before the Supreme Court at this moment in which some clothing is at issue.

Taking cognizance of this problem, the Illinois Legislature of which I was a member, in 1963 passed legislation to make possible searches for any evidence of a crime. The bill I introduce today is patterned after the Illinois law and is based on the sound research and consideration of that legislature.

What my bill does, in brief, is to enable judges or commissioners empowered to issue search warrants to consider as grounds for these warrants any property that may constitute evidence of the offense for which the warrant is requested.

The courts have long held that law officers need no warrant to make a search of a person or his premises if the search is incident to a lawful arrest. My bill, therefore, adds to this power the authority to discover and seize property that may constitute evidence of an offense when the search is thus made incident to arrest.

Obviously, and rightfully, the Constitution of the United States does not permit "fishing expeditions" by police offi-

cers so that they may enter our homes and look about for anything they might wish to use against us. On the other hand, it seems absurd to deny officers the right to seize the evidence they find of the very crime for which they have the probable cause to arrest or for which they have a legitimate warrant.

It is my hope, that if passed into law, this bill will clarify the existing situation with respect to search and seizure and will give Federal authorities this significant tool in the investigation and prosecution of crime.

The dispensing of criminal justice is always a difficult and arduous task. The rights of all citizens—innocent and guilty—who are accused of crime must be protected. But these rights must be balanced with the rights of the law-abiding citizens to also be secure in their persons and property. Changing situations and changing tactics of criminals demand that criminal procedure also be revised from time to time. It is my belief that the changes I have proposed take nothing away from the rights guaranteed us all by our Constitution, but that they do offer significant new tools to those who protect us in the prosecution of their work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. I cannot help but observe, first of all, that the gentleman is to be congratulated for bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives one of the Nation's most pressing and most severe problems.

Second, I would like to congratulate the gentleman, and I understand a group of experts, for the vast amount of work they have done in presenting to us concrete and specific proposals to help curb and rectify crime in the streets.

We certainly appreciate also the gentleman taking the time here on the floor of the House today to give us the benefit of all of the work that has been done.

Mr. RAILSBACK. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for his very kind words.

NATIONAL GRANGE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of National Grange Week—April 16–22—which not only recognizes this Nation's oldest farm organization, but also honors the National Grange's centennial this year.

I take great pride in saluting this fine organization because its acknowledged father, Oliver Hudson Kelley, chose to settle in my district on a homestead near Elk River, Minn., and because the first State Grange was organized in Minnesota on February 23, 1869.

The times cried for an organized farmers movement in 1867, when Kelley conceived the Grange. It was a troublesome period of reconstruction following the Civil War: Abraham Lincoln was gone, and Andrew Johnson was trying to cope with serious political, social, and economic crises.

In the decade following the War Between the States, farmers felt they were not advancing as rapidly as others. While farmers in the northeastern part of the country were profiting from dairying, market gardening, hay, potatoes, and fruit, other parts of the Nation were less fortunate.

The South was left by the war in a state of complete exhaustion, and agriculture was among the hardest hit; farms had been completely destroyed and often the owners had been killed in battle; but most of all, the total change in the industrial system made a return to normal farming conditions extremely slow.

Meanwhile, the great prairie States of the upper Mississippi Valley, from Ohio to Kansas and Nebraska—producers of wheat and corn—were the center of agricultural discontent. It was here that the protective movement among the farmers manifested itself most vigorously.

The move westward of the wheat industry was leaving these States with disillusioned farmers who were facing depreciation in land values and were finding it necessary to turn to stockraising and dairy farming.

Burdened with debt, they blamed the bankers, railroads, Congress, tariff, and monopolies for many of their troubles. While some of their grievances had been caused by their own shortcomings, many of their grievances were well founded.

Their grievance against the railroads was twofold. In the first place, many unsuspecting farmers lost every penny as they were victimized by unscrupulous brokers who sold them stock in new rail lines. Secondly, railroad rates, management, and service were uncontrolled and discrimination was practiced in fixing prices The Granger laws, pushed by State granges in 1873, curbed the railroads and led to further regulation of monopolies through such measures as the Interstate Commerce Act of 1867 and the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890.

Farmers in 1867 also felt that as a class, they lacked adequate representation in the Government. The 43d Congress—1873–75—for instance, included 61 percent lawyers, 16 percent businessmen, and only 7 percent farmers; at the same time, the 1870 census showed that 47 percent of the working public was still engaged in farming, while commerce and manufacturing could only claim 31 percent.

Usually ignorant of market conditions and of the laws of supply and demand, and with no facilities for storing their crops, farmers often were forced into selling their products in a glutted market. They received small returns for their hard, careful work. The wrath of the farmers was also directed against commission merchants, through whom they were forced to dispose of their crops at quite unremunerative prices.

For example, a story printed in the Proceedings of the Illinois Grange in 1875 told of a farmer carrying a load of grain to market and returning with a pair of shoes for his boy—the sole purchase which he was able to make from the proceeds of the sale for his grain.

Among farmers there was general poverty and widespread indebtedness, as represented by the growing burden of mortgages—often at excessive rates of interest. Loan agents infested the West; sometimes interest on loans ran as high as 15 or 20 percent.

Following the war, various conditions brought about substantial decreases in the prices farmers received. Their decreasing income and increasing costs led to serious personal situations.

These then, were the conditions which led to the organization and early building of the Grange. As Prof. Solon Justus Buck, of the University of Illinois, put it in his book, "The Granger Movement," which was originally published in 1913:

> An agricultural organization, including a great part of the farmers of the nation, would be able to demand fairer treatment from the railway corporations and to enforce it with the help of the state; it could use its immense influence to secure more favorable legislation on such matters as the tariff, currency and taxation; by means of a widespread local organization it could gather and disseminate useful information concerning the crops and the markets; in general, it could foster a beneficial spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance among its members. In this way alone can a satisfactory explanation be found for the widespread and phenomenal movement for organization which appeared among the farmers in the decade of the seventies.

Into this situation plunged Kelley. Born in 1826 in Boston, he moved early in his life to his Sherburne County farm. By 1866 he had served briefly as a member of the small staff of the newly created Department of Agriculture, when he was authorized by Isaac Newton, first Commissioner of Agriculture, to make a survey of farm conditions in the South following the Civil War.

It was while so engaged that Kelley conceived of the idea that a fraternal organization—composed of farmers from all sections of the country—would help to heal the scars caused by war, as well as to improve the economic and social position of the farm population.

On his return to Washington, Kelley discussed his plans with some of his friends in and out of government, and enlisted their support. Among these were William Saunders, Superintendent of Propagating Gardens in the Agriculture Department and later first National Master of the Grange, J. R. Thompson, William Ireland, Rev. A. B. Grosh, Rev. John Trimble, and F. M. McDowell.

These seven men—after framing a ritual and constitution—met in Saunders' office—currently the site of the portion of the Washington Mall that faces the Agriculture Department—December 4, 1867, and formally organized the National Grange.

Resigning his position with the Department, Kelley left Washington on April 3, 1868, to establish the new organization throughout the rural districts. On April 16 he instituted Fredonia Grange No. 1 in western New York, which is still flourishing.

The industry and perseverance of Kelley and his associates gradually made

itself felt and granges began to spring up in the Middle West. Before the end of 1872, more than a thousand granges—distributed among more than half of the States in the Union—had been organized. Kelley moved to Washington and in the parlor of his Georgetown home, on January 8, 1873, the National Grange had its first representative meeting, with 27 delegates from 11 States.

From that date on the Grange movement spread across the country like the proverbial prairie fire, and the long-cherished hopes of the founders for a great national organization of farmers—banded together for the protection and advancement of agriculture and holding fast to the best American traditions—came to full fruition on a scale that amazed the entire Nation.

Today, the National Grange has more than 620,000 members in 7,000 local granges; nearly 5,000 of these units have their own grange halls, which also are used by their communities for civic functions.

The Grange in 100 years has helped modify the capitalistic system to meet yesterday's problems and supports it to meet today's challenges. The Grange is motivated by the ethical ideas of brotherhood, neighborliness, integrity and human concern based on our religious heritage—the very foundation that has made America great.

The Grange today is filling a tremendous need in rural communities. It is one of the few organizations where men, women, and young people—family groups—come together for social purposes, for economic discussions and for the formulation of public policies that affect the entire family and every person within the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that such a vital organization had its roots in my district. I commend the National Grange during National Grange Week for its contribution to the development of the United States and wish it every success in its next century of service.

NATIONAL GRANGE MASTER HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, no citation of National Grange Week, April 16–22, would be complete without mentioning the outstanding leadership with which this 100-year-old farm organization has flourished under its current national master, Herschel D. Newsom.

I consider it an honor that Mr. Newsom's hometown is Columbus, Ind., which is in my district. As a matter of fact, Mr. Newsom, who is the Grange's 16th national master, is part of the fifth generation of a distinguished Columbus family of farmers.

Mr. Newsom has given the Grange dynamic leadership and enjoys an international reputation in agriculture. Mr. Newsom has personally directed the National Grange's leadership in international agricultural organizations.

Mr. Newsom is an active member of the President's Advisory Committee on Trade Negotiations to the Kennedy round of the current GATT discussions in Geneva, and he has played an important role in formulating policies among the member nations.

For 3 years—1963–66—Mr. Newsom was president of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, a federation of farm organizations from five continents, founded in London in 1946 at the instigation and with the guidance of the National Grange.

His concern in the stake of international agriculture has earned him the chairmanship of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, membership on the U.S. Food for Peace Council, a trusteeship of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, a directorship of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A., charter membership in the Advisory Council of the International Movement for Atlantic Union, Inc., and membership in the Inter-American Economic Policy Committee on Canadian-American Relations, and Advisory Committee on Latin-American Relations.

Mr. Newsom has contributed importantly to much of this country's domestic agricultural, legislative program during the last 17 years.

Mr. Newsom is a member of the Transportation Council of the Department of Commerce and the Joint Council on Economic Education, and holds additional Presidential appointments to the President's Commission on the Employment of the Handicapped and the President's Rural Safety Council; he also has been appointed to the Citizen's Commission on International Cooperation and has held similar appointments under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

Mr. Newsom represents the third generation in his family that has taken an active part in Grange affairs. In 1960 he received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Indiana University, from which he graduated in 1926 with an A.B. in chemistry.

Herschel Newsom exemplifies the ability, drive, religious, and practical attributes of his 15 predecessors as national master. He is an inspired, active, and farsighted administrator, another example of the excellence which has characterized the Grange for 100 years.

THE GRANGE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, with the country currently embroiled in international controversies, I think that it is appropriate during this week and year that we contemplate the leadership that the National Grange has taken in forging worldwide cooperation in common endeavors involving agricultural affairs.

This week, of course, is National Grange Week, and this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Grange. The Grange was celebrating its 50th birthday in the early 1900's when the farm organization became increasingly active in world affairs. This participation grew to the point where its leaders became—and are—an important influence in today's widespread effort to spread the best agricultural know-how possible to developing nations, and to utilize every possible means to reduce the starvation that overcomes millions of people.

Today's established international position of the Grange, and the worldwide recognition of the organization and its leaders came about because of the initiative, straight thinking, and practical approaches that have characterized Grange involvement in world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that half the people of the world daily go to bed hungry. For many years the Grange has supported—vigorously—programs aimed at providing adequate diets to more and more people.

Grange historian Charles M. Gardner explains that a Grange member, David Lubin, of California, gave the Grange international program a boost when he suggested the creation of an International Institute of Agriculture. It was his idea that a permanent agency be set up in which nations from all over the globe would be represented; and which would have established headquarters, be financed internationally and devote its energies largely to research. King Victor Emmanuel III, of Italy, became very interested in this project and in 1905 the proposed agency was set up in permanent quarters at Rome, eventually becoming an international spokesman for agriculture with more than 60 different nations represented.

This first attempt at international collaboration united the nations in a program for improved farm conditions and started the effort for greater unity among agricultural groups and people. Far-reaching results came from this start, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

From the very beginning, the Grange was involved in all of these developments. Grange national masters have served on Presidential factfinding missions since 1926 and have brought back to the United States a wealth of information and a broader understanding of world agricultural problems.

It was during the 1940's, however, that the greatest advances were made in world agricultural organization, both among governments and among farmers' own organizations. Through the efforts of National Master Albert S. Goss, the 40-year-old International Institute of Agriculture in 1945 was recognized for its outstanding contributions and consolidated with the new Government-oriented Food and Agriculture Organization.

Soon afterwards, nongovernmental farm organizations from seven countries met in Quebec to consider the creation of an independent federation of farm organizations to bring the farmers of the world together to meet world food problems, and to protect the interests of producers. Goss was a key figure in this and succeeding meetings, from which was organized the 31-nation International Federation of Agricultural Producers. Goss played a major role in shaping and building the new organization.

The history of Grange leadership in the international sphere culminated in the election of present National Master Herschel D. Newsom to the presidency of the IFAP for 3 consecutive years—1963 to 1966. The foresight and humane qualities of the National Grange are magnificently expressed by National

Master Newsom in his comments on May 3, 1966, to the IFAP on its 20th anniversary:

Twenty years ago—as today—farm leaders believed that farming could only be prosperous when farmers joined together to understand and tackle their problems of production and marketing. Twenty years ago—as today—farm leaders realized that an ever-improving productivity was the master key to progress.

And this is the place to remind those who might tend to overlook it, that few—if any—countries have seen the improvement in agricultural productivity matched by comparable performance by the other sectors of the economy. Nor have there been any more illustrations of general economic advance without agricultural progress having preceded such industrial or economic development.

* * * * *

Twenty years ago—as today—farm leaders recognized agriculture's responsibility to consumers. As we went along we came to realize how deep was the community of interest between primary producers the world over and how fruitful were our continuing consultations among farmers' representatives.

* * * * *

In rich and poor countries alike, primary producers have to limit or regulate speculation—of which the prime victims are always those at the base of the economic structure; that is to say, the farmers themselves. We as farmers in our respective countries, therefore, must promote formulae of economic and trade organizations which create a basis for the stability necessary to harmonious progress.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural that, with the interest of the Grange in feeding the hungry people of the world that it should also become active in many related problems that involve peace and war, liberalization of trade restrictions between nations, and stability of domestic markets. Grange positions on these and other problems are constantly reviewed through the machinery of the Grange, which encourages members to "have their say on what Grange policies should be."

And so, Mr. Speaker, to return to my opening remark, it is well to keep in mind during National Grange Week, and the centennial year of the Grange, the historic leadership of the Grange in the field of international agricultural affairs.

GRANGE COMMUNITY PROGRESS PROGRAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the National Grange, which we are commemorating during National Grange Week, coincides with the 20th year of the community progress program, which is operated under the joint auspicies of the Grange and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation.

The mounting problems of our mushrooming population and urban congestion and decay will hasten suburban expansion into rural areas, relocation of more and more industrial plants in outlying districts, and reveal other symptoms of national growth which all add up to a greater challenge for local leadership to instigate development action at the community level.

Rural community and suburban self-improvement programs have constituted a basic part of the Grange philosophy since the inception of the farm organization 100 years ago.

I am proud that the chairman of this magnificient program is a resident in my district—William J. Brake—who resides in Haslett, Mich., which is headquarters for his activities both as head of the community progress program and as national lecturer of the Grange.

Originally the local Granges carried out projects under the annual community service program. The new 2-year community progress program stresses leadership with the Grange as a motivator and coordinator, rather than the sole doer.

Incentive for the communities to participate in the Grange-Sears program are cash prizes, with the top award $10,000. All award money must be reinvested promptly in further community progress. Some 4,500 entries were submitted in the first biennial contest during 1963–65.

The first-prize winner in 1965 was the Grange in Spencer, N.Y. The town was suffering from urban blight—highlighted by an eight-acre swamp in the center of town—when the Grange and the local chamber of commerce initiated 14 projects that reversed the decaying trend and culminated in the conversion of the swamp into a beautiful lake.

From this example, Mr. Speaker, we can see what local initiative can do when organized behind a common goal. It is self-help projects such as the one in Spencer which will save rural America from further blight, poverty and ghost towns.

Together, the Grange and the Sears Foundation have spawned 100,000 projects that utilized millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of volunteers dedicated to improving rural and suburban communities throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Grange on its 100th birthday during this, National Grange Week.

THE GRANGE—PIONEER IN EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1867 the legal status of women was about the same as that of the then recently freed slaves. In the same year seven farsighted men organized the National Grange with the unheard-of stipulation that women members would have representation equal to their male counterparts.

The founders, in this way, created a unique family organization, the first in history to give women a high place in its operations and an equal share of the most exalted positions of the Grange with their "brothers." The Grange structure from the very beginning has given women responsibilities commensurate with their abilities and privileges.

As a matter of fact, it was a woman who probably saved the Grange from collapsing within its first year. It was May 1, 1868, less than a year after the Grange was founded by a seven-man group headed by Oliver H. Kelley, that Kelley returned to his farm home at Elk River, Minn., from 6 weeks on the road of fruitless organizational efforts.

Kelley was weary, hungry and had little to show for his pioneering efforts except for the organization of Grange No. 1 in Fredonia, N.Y. He even had to borrow railroad fare from Masonic friends at Madison, Wis., to make the last leg home. He was so dejected that he probably was ready to give up his drive to organize the Grange when his wife, Temperance Lane Kelley, came to his rescue.

Unknown to her husband, Mrs. Kelley had received a $500 legacy from a distant relative. She had carefully saved this sum, in spite of the harassing situation surrounding their impoverished homestead, where almost everything was badly needed. After hearing her husband's story she gave him the $500, along with sympathetic, but challenging words of encouragement. She urged him to try again—to continue his inspired organizational efforts.

Without this financial and inspirational aid, the discouraged Kelley might never have resumed his crusade to start the Grange, and it is unlikely that any of the other founders would have been able to have done so.

Even before Mrs. Kelley's support, another woman had already made a key contribution to the Grange. Miss Caroline Hall, Kelley's niece and later his assistant, told her uncle:

Your organization will never be permanent if you leave the women out.

Kelley took her advice—which turned out to be prophetic. The spectacular action of the founders in giving women full equality and a vote placed the Grange in another leadership role. It was the first American association of any kind—not only the first farm organization—to work for equality and justice for women.

Early conventions of the Grange went on record for women's suffrage, and Grange support and influence contributed greatly to bringing about equal suffrage for women in the United States.

It was not until 1920—53 years after the Grange had established the principle of equality—that the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, forbidding the States from making sex a qualification for voting, was ratified.

Today the Grange has a wide program for women that currently is under the direction of Mrs. Alta Peck, of Litchfield, Conn.

The role of the American woman in society today has changed greatly since the founding days of the Grange. In 1867 plenty of work was found for the weaker sex. Besides homemaking functions in connection with Grange hall activities, Grange women demonstrated their abilities as lecturers, officers and committee chairmen. They took the leadership in community and youth activities that have characterized the Grange in all of its 100 years.

Since 1911, home economics has been a major activity within the Grange, and the National Home Economics Committee, working with subordinate granges, has contributed tremendously to the building of the National Grange into a stronger force throughout rural America. The committee assists the Grange in lectures, its community service program, and its activities associated with educa-

tional authorities in towns, counties, and States.

In addition to the various programs and contests conducted by the women of the Grange, overseas assistance projects also receive aid from these dedicated women in such countries as the Philippines, Cambodia, Greece, and Latin American nations.

Mr. Speaker, the unselfish work of the women of the Grange within their organization and for the general welfare is deserving of the highest commendation in this, National Grange Week, and the 100th year of the National Grange.

GRANGE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, an integral part of the National Grange since its inception 100 years ago has been the youth of our country. As National Grange Master Herschel D. Newsom stated this week, which is National Grange Week:

> Young members must be encouraged and inspired along the way to develop all of their talents for service and leadership in the high principles of the Grange for building a better America—and a happier, more peaceful world.

Mr. Newsom ties this philosophy to that of the Grange when he points out:

> Those goals can be achieved only as we develop the acceptance of responsibility and dedication to purpose for which the Grange was originally organized, and toward which Grange leadership must now rededicate our 100-year-old farm organization.

Persons 14 and over have been admitted to full membership in the Grange since its founding in 1867. Nine years later, Junior Granges—originally called Juvenile Granges—were created. Junior Granges elect their own officers and conduct their own rituals. Members may continue as active Junior Grangers until they are 16.

Junior Granges are aimed at building good citizens. They teach appreciation of our country, understanding of others, and the responsibility that goes with freedom. They also guide members through the good life, which includes sincere faith, love of the out of doors and a definite place for fun and happiness. Latent abilities are developed in all areas.

Among major Junior Grange activities are summer camps, group discussions, nature studies, first aid instruction, bus tours and participation in National Grange competitions, involving such activities as art, photography, and sewing—according to age groups.

An unusual JG activity is known as the Greek team project, under which Junior Grange members help finance the construction of a girl's school in Kytheria, Greece. The Greek team is composed of Mr. and Mr. George Koksma, Dutch missionaries serving under the aegis of the World Council of Churches, who are directing the school construction.

Although the Grange since its birth has sought to stress youth activities in subordinate units, there was no concerted nationwide approach until 1934. In that year, youth committees were organized in all State, Pomona—district—and subordinate—community—Granges.

Youth activities continued to expand after 1934, and in 1949, a full-time staff member was designated director of youth activities. I am proud that the current director is a constituent of mine—Edwin C. Hadlock, of Hammond, N.Y. Mrs. James W. Ingwersen, of Le Roy, Kans., is junior superintendent.

In 1951 the National Grange youth leadership training fund was established through donations from the 7,000 local Granges—members and nonmembers—to provide incentives and opportunities for young people to discover and develop potential leadership qualities. Under this program was developed the National Grange interstate exchange and international travel scholarships.

Another offshoot of the leadership training program was the popular practice—initiated in 1960—of selecting State and National Grange princes and princesses of the year among older teenagers. In 1961 the young married couple of the year contest was set up.

Another commendable youth feature of the Grange is the youth traffic safety service contest inaugurated in 1963 as an annual feature. It replaced the traffic safety essay contest, which had been in operation since 1927 under the joint sponsorship of the Grange and the automotive safety foundation.

Mr. Speaker, the Grange is performing an outstanding service to the country by preparing many of our young people for the burdens of citizenship and leadership thrust upon them when they become adults. I look forward during this special week to an even more dynamic youth program under the Grange, as it moves into its second century.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE GRANGE

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this special salute today on the occasion of the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the National Grange during National Grange Week for 100 years of service to this Nation would not be complete without a roll call of major agriculture legislation achieved with Grange assistance.

Many of our laws taken for granted today were either sponsored or supported by the Grange, not just laws benefiting farmers and rural Americans, but all Americans. Look around you, observe your community. Much of the legislation that developed our 20th-century mode of living was enacted with the active aid of the Grange.

The Grange has helped build highways, schools, churches, recreation and health facilities, libraries, cooperatives, electric and telephone lines, youth organizations. It has not been the sole organization behind these progressive acts, but it has been a bulwark in securing their passage.

In the early days, shortly after its creation in 1867, the Grange fought vigorously for measures which lifted farmers and rural Americans out of their doldrums and into the mainstream of American society.

Its sustained campaign to break the stranglehold the railroads had on this country during the 1870's led to the basic American tradition that the Government had the right to control monopolies, on behalf of the American people. These antimonopoly laws have become known in history as the Granger Laws, and led to such fundamental acts as the Interstate Commerce and Sherman Antitrust Acts.

Following are some of the other achievements of the Grange over the past 100 years in the field of legislation:

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, cited by Agriculture Secretary Freeman as incorporating longstanding Grange policies.

The concept of parity, or equality of income, initiated by the Grange, for both the farmer and the entire rural American economy.

Led the fight that gave cabinet status to the Department of Agriculture.

Developed the original Farm Credit Act and played a major role in giving the farmer control and ownership of its administration.

Laid the groundwork for the creation of farm cooperatives and strongly supported their continued development.

Sponsored legislation which created the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural telephone system.

Was the dominant force in bringing social security to farmers and other self-employed rural Americans.

Played a paramount role in the formation of the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

Helped pass legislation establishing our current system of interstate highways.

Fostered creation of the Agriculture Department's Extension Service and Vocational Agriculture program.

Initiated legislation which removed the Federal tax on fuel for on-the-farm use—saving farmers some $100 million a year.

Won its fight to preserve trip leasing privileges in agricultural trucking—saving rural people $200 million annually.

Was solely responsible for initiation of rural free delivery and our parcel post system.

Secured initial action establishing our system of agriculture experiment stations.

Championed the Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, and the crop insurance, upstream small waterways, school lunch and milk, rural area development, food-for-peace programs.

From these examples, Mr. Speaker, we can see that the National Grange over the last 100 years not only has been instrumental in obtaining milestone agricultural legislation, but also laws affecting all Americans.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Grange during its special week and on this special day, which honors this outstanding farm organization with a commemorative stamp, for its dedicated service to all Americans.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE MAGAZINE

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this salute to the National Grange during National Grange Week with a few comments about the renewed publication of Grange this year.

After a 4-year absence, the National Grange magazine has returned bigger and better than ever before. Originally a weekly and later a monthly periodical, the National Grange magazine has been published for 60 of the farm organization's 100 years, prior to its reestablishment in this, the centennial year of the Grange.

The new publication will appear quarterly this year—its pilot issue was distributed last December and its initial, full-scale edition last month—and will become a monthly next year.

Distribution is 500,000 dues-paid copies. The magazine appears in full color on slick paper and its editorial content is probably the most provocative of any publication of its kind.

The pilot issue of the magazine was highlighted by a proposal by National Master Herschel D. Newsom that included three steps which could be taken by the United States and other countries to help eradicate the staggering food problem in the world.

The initial issue last month contained a wealth of excellent material, including a call by Newsom to suspend the extension of new construction of government facilities in major cities until studies have been made to determine which of these planned projects could just as easily be set up in small towns.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the managing editor of Grange—Ray J. Taylor—is a constituent of mine who had distinguished himself before joining the Grange as general manager of the Northern Virginia Sun in Arlington and later as executive editor of the Washington World in the Nation's Capital.

I welcome the appearance of this bright new addition to the Nation's press and wish it every success in the ensuing years.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, while we are celebrating National Grange Week between April 16 and April 22, I believe it would be appropriate to look ahead to another date this year—December 4—which will mark the 100th anniversary of the National Grange.

It was on this day 100 years ago in a small office of the newly created Department of Agriculture on the site of what is now the Mall that seven farsighted men grouped themselves around the plain wooden table of William Saunders—superintendent of propagating gardens for the Department—and founded the Nation's first farm organization.

Now, 100 years later, the Grange will be convening at Syracuse, N.Y.—which I am fortunate to represent in Congress—to set in motion plans for its second century of service to our country and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Grange has neither contented itself to rest on its laurels, nor to fix its programs on the problems of a bygone era. Instead, the National Grange is looking to the future. Today, more than ever before, the Grange is marshaling the necessary forces in the country to revitalize a rapidly declining rural America.

The Grange, today, is placing the full impact of its massive prestige behind an effort to unite all common friends in a fight on rural poverty. No one can stand aside in this fight. The urban resident has as much involved as the rural. The first step of the Grange timetable is to halt the increasing migration into the cities in an effort to lessen the already over-congested cities of our Nation. Such a reversal can only come about if there are adequate incentives to keep the farmer and smalltown citizen where he is. And the Grange is seeking the creation of projects that will "keep them down on the farm" and in the small towns.

As a first step, the Grange has proposed the revolutionary but thoroughly feasible suggestion that some of the new buildings which are being planned by the various executive departments and agencies be placed in heartland communities. Many of our cities simply cannot handle more construction. And the time has passed when the Federal Government has to be totally concentrated in the National Capital.

As a matter of fact, the speedy development of modern technology, mass communication and transportation systems is making such centralization obsolete. In the very near future it will be easy for Government officials to communicate with each other by picture phone, obtain complex data through computerized touch phones, and meet face to face through ever speedier modes of transportation.

Furthermore, the decentralization of Government agencies into sparsely populated areas will give these economically depleted sections of the country the economic base they so badly need to encourage similar action by industry, and thus provide the jobs and social requirements absolutely necessary for the survival of rural America—not to mention urban America.

At the same time, the reversed migration of urban professionals into inviting rural areas will also alleviate the overcrowding in our cities, which are doomed to the ominous prospect of figuring out what to do with twice as many people early in the 21st century.

Additionally, these new rural residents not only will bolster the composite population of the areas, but they will bring living representation of the National Government to people whose conception of the Federal Government in some cases is of a far-removed monolith that neither cares nor works for their behalf.

These are the kinds of proposals which will be scrutinized at the upcoming centennial celebration when the National Grange convenes its annual convention November 13–22 in Syracuse.

While having a history of vast accomplishments behind it, the Grange will concentrate its efforts in Syracuse through prominent speakers and through introspective seminars on solving America's rural dilemma in the coming years.

I will have more to say about Grange plans in the ensuing months, but I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to take the occasion of National Grange Week to alert the other Members of Congress to the discussions and exhibits being planned for the November centennial convention in Syracuse.

LET US KILL ONCE AND FOR ALL THE COSTLY AND UNNECESSARY EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will recall that I have been one of those who have been most outspoken in opposition to the proposal by the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Stewart, that we ought to expand and extend the west front of the Capitol, the beautiful and historic front that faces down the Mall toward the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial; that we ought to extend it by 4½ acres, put in a couple of restaurants, movie theaters, and entirely alter the sole remaining portion of the original Capitol Building constructed here originally in 1800.

I have been relatively quiet on this subject this year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of some of the opposition generated in this body and in the other body, and with the formation of a National Committee To Save the U.S. Capitol. I think it was interesting that the Architect decided at the last moment last year not to ask for funds to undertake this project. And there has been some delay in our knowing just what his action was going to be this year. For that reason, I have been, so far, rather quiet on this subject.

But several events have taken place in the last couple of weeks that I think make it timely to bring this subject again to the attention of this House, to the Congress, and beyond us to the American people, who are going to have to foot the bill for any such $34 million boondoggle project up here on Capitol Hill. In fact, if the experience with the Rayburn Building is any basis for judgment, it will prove to be a lot more costly than $34 million.

The first item that I want to bring to the attention of this House is an item that appeared in Roll Call newspaper, dated April 13, announcing that the Capitol Architect, Mr. J. George Stewart, has indicated that he is, after all, not going to ask for any funds to undertake this $34 million project to deface and destroy the only remaining part of the most historic building in our country; he is not going to ask for any money on that project this year.

I do not know whether this is any official document, Roll Call newspaper, but certainly this is interesting news. If it is true, then certainly this is a partial victory for restraint and sanity here on Capitol Hill, and it is certainly very clear, too, that the public opposition to the ridiculous west front project that has been building up over the past 3 years is finally beginning to have a telling effect on the Capitol Architect.

Mr. Stewart pulled in his horns last year, as I have already indicated, on this project after we got our National Committee To Save the U.S. Capitol going with substantial support from both Houses of this Congress and when, as a result of that activity, we were able to put a little national publicity spotlight onto just how harmful and costly this whole scheme would be.

Members may recall that Parade, Sunday newspapers supplement, last September ran an article on this subject, and I might say that the favorable response from that article around the country has been overwhelming.

So apparently this reaction is beginning to be felt. But Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that relying on Mr. Stewart's off-again on-again moods is really going to be good enough for us here. The time has come now for the elected Members of this Congress to assert their own leadership and their own responsibility in what is certainly one of the most vital matters to come before the House—the future of this U.S. Capitol Building. It is time for us, in my judgment, to blow the whistle finally and emphatically on Mr. Stewart's grandiose scheme and tell him in words of one syllable—or less, if possible—that he is not going to get away with devastating and destroying the most historic building in the United States today.

It is time for us to act positively and decisively, rather than for us to try to keep on, year after year, sitting around here with our fingers crossed and holding our breath until we find out what Mr. Stewart's whim for the current fiscal year might happen to be. After all, who is running this body, the Congress or one of our hired hands?

Let us hope that this report is true, Mr. Speaker. But even if the Capitol Architect does not plan to come before the Appropriations Committee to request fiscal year 1968 funds for getting started on this $34 million job, do not by any means think he has given up the hope, or that he has abandoned the project. Because there is plenty of evidence that activities for propagandizing this project—and for trying to sandbag the Members of the House and the Senate into thinking it is all over but the shouting—is still going on.

I commented during the period that Congress was in recess that over in Statuary Hall, in that historic shrine, the former Hall of the House of Representatives of this Congress of the United States, the Architect of the Capitol has himself enshrined in stone and glass and metal, with a structure that rivals the impressive tomb of Napoleon in the Invalides in Paris, a $20,000 model of his proposed extension project. That's right in the center of Statuary Hall. As a matter of fact, he did not miss by very many feet covering entirely the historic spot in that Statuary Hall, marked by a metal plaque, where President John Quincy Adams sat for 20 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, after he was no longer President of the United States, and where one day, more than 100 years ago, he collapsed and was carried off the floor to die.

This is a rather remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, because Congress never authorized that model to be placed there. We never voted on it. As far as I am aware, this is the first time any such model has ever sat in that historic spot. We have had models before, around here. We had a model of the Rayburn Office Building. The design had been officially approved, the building had been authorized, its construction was underway. And so we had a model of it sitting in the rotunda of the Cannon Office Building, so that people could see what the thing going up across the street would eventually look like. We had models around of the proposed extension of the east front of the Capitol, which also started out at a relatively small cost, but which ended up at a much inflated cost. That design, too, had been approved and construction of the front was going on. But the model was still located downstairs in the crypt of the Capitol, down on the first floor, and not up in one of the historic Chambers.

Yet here is a proposal, still without any formal support from this Congress—as a matter of fact, which the Congress specifically last year directed the Architect not to proceed on. Yet here it is, occupying a position as though it had some sort of special enshrined and sainted significance.

I picked up the National Geographic magazine for April when it arrived at home the other day, and opened it to an article appearing there, entitled, I believe, "Flowering Washington." It was devoted mainly to a project which has been considered downtown for some time, but for which Congress has not yet appropriated the funds, a revision of the northern side of Pennsylvania Avenue and generally an improvement of downtown Washington.

But I was amazed when I saw the pictures that had been included in this article, to realize that the Capitol Building which appeared in the models which proposed to show what a restored Pennsylvania Avenue would look like was the J. George Stewart version of the U.S. Capitol, not the real one. So they have put this version in their own photographs, without any approval by the Congress for the Stewart change, and apparently without any attempt to determine what Congress and the elected Members are going to do about the Stewart proposal.

By doing this the National Geographic Society is directly and improperly contributing to the Stewart propaganda campaign. In view of this uncalled for exercise in subtle propaganda on the part of a magazine which is supposed to have some concern for education and certainly for historic landmarks—and I do not know of any landmark more important than this Capitol Building—perhaps it is a darned good thing that the Internal Revenue Service over the past weekend withdrew the tax exempt status of the National Geographic magazine.

How has the Geographic arrogated to itself the job of telling the world what is going to happen to the Capitol, even before the elected Representatives in this body and in the other body have an opportunity to vote on it? Are they a part of the Stewart propaganda machinery too that is seeking to accomplish by subliminal means what it cannot so far—and I do not think it is ever going to be able to do—accomplish officially and openly? Or has the Geographic been an unwitting victim of the Stewart propaganda machinery itself, fooled by the model of his Capitol project he put in the middle of Statuary Hall when Congress was in recess? Did they fall for that one too, perhaps?

Well, let us get the Stewart model out of the Capitol and let us get it out of the National Geographic magazine. Let us get it back where it belongs, in the Capitol Architect's own office, and back on the very back burner at that.

One further point, Mr. Speaker: The other day the American Institute of Architects made public a study by a task force of distinguished architects operating under instructions of the American Institute of Architects, devoted on this very topic, the present status of the west front of the U.S. Capitol. I am going to ask permission at the end of my remarks to include the full text of this study in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe it will be of interest to every Member of Congress and certainly to the general public at large.

Mr. Stewart has suggested that you cannot repair the west front; that the only way to fix it is to extend it by 4½ acres and spend $34 million to put a couple of movie theaters and Howard Johnsons out there. I think it is reassuring to us who are interested in economy as well as architecture to know that the American Institute of Architects has said that the west front can be repaired. Their report demonstrates this fact. The architectural experts, having examined the building very carefully, found that Mr. Stewart's claim that the building was in imminent danger of collapse and might be slipping down Capitol Hill at any moment if some jet airliner bound for National Airport should veer just a little bit too close to us was complete nonsense. We can stay here for a few more centuries, they found, without too much difficulty—if we can survive the other perils we face.

They said that any structural damage which exists on the west front—and incidentally they noted a fact that I have pointed out on this floor many times; namely, that much of the damage cited to us in justifying this boondoggle project is what occurred because not a single thing has been done to keep the west front in repair since 1961—they said any structural damage can be repaired by modern techniques. We can even duplicate the stone used in the original Capitol.

The report of the American Institute of Architects clearly demonstrates that Mr. Stewart's study of 3 years ago of what was needed to keep the west front from falling down was really no study at all but only a set of fallacious arguments dug up to support a preordained conclusion. As a matter of fact—and I have pointed this out before too—the Stewart study never bothered to go into what would be needed to repair the west front instead of destroying it. This is because Mr. Stewart already had made up his mind about turning it into a super Howard Johnson.

Senator MONRONEY over in the other body tried gallantly last summer to force Mr. Stewart to do a thorough engineering analysis or to have it done for him, as to what would be needed simply to repair the west front and how much this repair would cost in contrast to his own $34 million extension proposal. Once

again, though, the wily Capitol Architect slipped through the trap. Now we have a prestigious and professionally sound group on record to the effect that this job can be done in fact. I think we ought to put our attention to the first job and find out just what does need to be done and how cheaply we can get it done. Let us give the heave ho once and for all to the Howard Johnson nightmare on Capitol Hill.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, just one or two of the conclusions from this report, because I think they point out how inadequate a job the Capitol Architect has done in trying to lure us into spending this kind of money. The task force of the American Institute of Architects was appointed in September 1966. It was "instructed" to study the engineering reports and the extension plans, meet with and review the arguments of the architects for the project, and inspect the Capitol from attic to basement." The instruction from the president of the AIA were as follows:

If this committee finds that restoration is impractical or too expensive or that in the opinion of the task force the proposed plans have validity, I think we are big enough to change our position. I hope, therefore, that you will agree to serve on this committee.

Well, they did not change their position. In a preliminary note the report says this. I think we would all subscribe to this.

The Institute believes that Capitol Hill is the single most important land development in our nation. We also believe that history will hold the architectural profession accountable for the development of the Capitol and of Capitol Hill. Therefore, in the findings and recommendations of the American Institute of Architects which follow we have attempted to be objective and constructive.

Let me just read some of these findings. First of all:

The west front of the Capitol is in a serious state of disrepair. Numerous cracks are in evidence on the exterior of the building. Some window lintels and keystones have cracked and slipped. Several of the architrave stones have sagged. The foundations at some points are not far enough below finished grade to escape frost damage. However, none of the defects appear to indicate the danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is impractical.

In fact, the comment goes on to point out, and again I am quoting:

No visible effort has been made recently to fill these cracks nor at least to deter the penetration of moisture.

Imagine 6 years of failure even to keep the moisture out; which any reasonably competent manager or superintendent or janitor of a building ought to be able to do—

Had this been done as the cracks appeared, it is likely that the disgraceful exterior due to scaling paint could have been avoided.

Mr. Speaker, I think this further comment is also of interest:

There is no direct evidence that lateral thrust in the present West Front has caused problems. The Capitol Architect's staff engineer reports that the building is not out of plumb. Thus while the Capitol is experiencing some vertical settlement it is not slipping down the hill. In short, none of the above mentioned defects appears to indicate that danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is not practicable. Furthermore, since lateral thrust is not presenting major structural problems, doubt is cast on the need for a buttress, although this is one of the arguments made by those who favor an extension.

So it now appears that that big wooden structure outside that was so ostensibly erected a year or so ago, the big buttresses out there holding up the columns and all the rest, are really after all just another bit of the subliminal propaganda campaign to which we have been subjected by the Capitol Architect to appropriate $34 million we do not need to spend.

Mr. Speaker, here is the second conclusion of the AIA report:

The recommendation to extend the West Front of the Capitol, to provide Members of Congress and visitors with additional space and facilities, was made without first conducting an adequate survey to illustrate the use of present space and the need for additional space, according to recent testimony by a Member of Congress. If modern facilities and office space are critical necessities, should a 19th century building be reshaped to meet 20th century needs?

The third conclusion is as follows:

The American Institute of Architects recommends that the West Front of the Capitol be restored and that Congress establish a permanent policy prohibiting any further major alteration to the Capitol other than that absolutely necessary for structural and safety reasons.

I might also quote their further comment, here, since we are concerned with finances—

No estimate has been made by the Capitol Architect to determine the cost of restoring the West Wall in its present location on the grounds that restoration was not the best solution and there were too many unknowns to arrive at a reasonable estimate. The American Institute of Architects does not know what the cost of restoration would be. However, it is unlikely that the cost of restoration would approach the total cost of extension.

And then finally they conclude—

The American Institute of Architects recommends that the West Front of the Capitol be restored and that Congress establish a permanent policy prohibiting any further major alteration to the Capitol other than that absolutely necessary for structural and safety reasons.

And they add a couple of other observations which I think the House will find interesting:

The more aged, eroded condition of the stone of the West Front should be considered honorable evidence of its survival as one of the earliest of our major public buildings.

After all, the British tried to burn the Capitol down and they were not successful. Are we going to let the Architect of the Capitol tear it down and cover it up now?

It is a condition that does not detract from the beauty of the building when viewed from a distance, and it is one which adds considerably to its interest and historic significance when examined close-at-hand.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the language should be stronger. I think it would be a tragedy and a crime to cover up the remaining portion of the original Capitol.

And then let me quote the final sentence of the report:

We strongly urge that the greatest symbol of our country be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is one other quote in this report I would like to read if the distinguished present occupant of the chair will forgive me for prolonging this discussion.

It is a quotation from President Johnson:

Among the most cherished of the nation's treasures are the monuments of its past. Each contributes to the historic texture of society. We look back with reverence to lasting reminders of a vital past. We look forward with confidence to achievements which will enhance our future with accomplishments to match our monumental past. In every part of the country citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The government must also do its share to assist the local efforts.

Mr. Speaker, we have right here in this Capitol a historic landmark unmatched in America. Certainly we in the Congress ought to do our part, and I think we can do our part, by saying flatly and finally now that we do not want to let the Capitol Architect get away with his grandiose plans for destroying and defacing the U.S. Capitol, the single most important historic landmark in America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose in the days ahead and at the appropriate time to introduce legislation and appear before the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to get funds appropriated so that we can finally get a full-scale engineering study done of just what repairs are needed to correct the damage which has been allowed to take place in recent years on some of the west front stones, the sole remaining original portion of our U.S. Capitol Building.

I also want to call the attention of my colleagues to a very penetrating article that appeared in the New York Times magazine section yesterday on April 16, written by Robert Sherrill, entitled "Architect, Spare Our Capitol."

This is, I think, a very comprehensive and very fair survey of what the situation here is. I believe the Members ought to take advantage of the opportunity to read this article so that perhaps if they may be inclined to "go along with the Architect" rather than "rock the boat," they may realize that there are some other important factors involved.

The plain fact of the matter is that with all the emphasis today on eliminating unnecessary Government spending, and on ethics in the Congress, the very last thing we need up here on Capitol Hill right now is to leave any possible doubt in the minds of any American voter or taxpayer whether this Congress still plans to go ahead with another grandiose $34 million mausoleum to ourselves once the present flurry has blown over, and the appropriate, unobtrusive moment has arrived. We know darned well that we should not build this thing, and we ought to tell Mr. Stewart and the rest of the world that very plainly and forthrightly right now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous con-

sent to include with my remarks three items. First of all, the news item from Roll Call from April 13; secondly, the report on the conditions of the west front of the Capitol submitted by the American Institute of Architects; and, thirdly, the article from the New York Times magazine section of April 16 by Mr. Robert Sherrill entitled "Architect, Spare Our Capitol."

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

[From Roll Call, Apr. 13, 1967]

WEST FRONT PROJECT DELAYED THIS YEAR

Opponents of the west front extension project appeared to have won a postponement, as the Capitol Architect's office this week indicated it would not request funds at upcoming House Appropriations Committee hearings.

Funds for the $34 million project are not included in the Legislative Branch budget for the new fiscal year, although the five member Commission on the Extension of the Capitol approved the preliminary plans last year.

Appropriations hearings on the legislative budget are expected to begin this month, but preliminary plans for the extension will not be submitted for funding, unless requested, the Architect's office reported.

Committee members, however, are expected to closely question the Architect, particularly after last week's release of a study by a committee of the American Institute of Architects opposing an extension.

The AIA committee recommended removing all exterior paint and replacing stones that are structurally unsound with the same sandstone material as that of the original wall.

The Architect's Office maintains that the old sandstone walls are in danger of collapsing and recommends construction of an extension faced with marble that would add 4.5 acres of floor space.

AIA President Charles M. Nes, Jr., in a preface to the committee's report, called on Congress to establish a permanent policy prohibiting any further major alteration "other than that absolutely necessary for structural and safety reasons."

Nes also said that the restoration job would be difficult but if the decision were made to restore the Capitol, "our building technology is certainly adequate to meet the challenge."

The AIA committee report gave no cost estimate for the project, but indicated it would probably be less than that of an extension. Supporters of the extension project contend the cost of a restoration job might be as much, or more, than that of an extension.

A REPORT ON CONDITIONS OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

"In every part of the country, citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The government must also do its share to assist the local efforts." President Johnson, 1966.

I. INTRODUCTION

In September 1966, when it became apparent that the 89th Congress would not appropriate funds for the proposed extension of the West Front, AIA President Charles Nes appointed a five-member Task Force of outstanding and highly respected architects to restudy the conditions of the West Front and the Institute's position with regard to the Capitol extension. Those selected to serve on the Task Force were: Samuel E. Homsey FAIA of Wilmington, Delaware; Francis D. Lethbridge FAIA and John W. Stenhouse AIA, both of Washington, D.C.; Louis Rossetti FAIA of Detroit, Michigan; and Norman Fletcher FAIA of Boston, Massachusetts.

The Task Force was instructed to study the engineering reports and the extension plans, meet with and review the arguments of the architects for the project, and inspect the Capitol from attic to basement.

The Task Force was to be completely objective in making this study and was to arrive at its own recommendations, without regard to any statements previously made by the Institute. Indeed, in a letter inviting Norman Fletcher FAIA, to become a Task Force member, Charles Nes wrote:

"If this committee finds that restoration is impractical or too expensive or that in the opinion of the Task Force the proposed plans have validity, I think we are big enough to change our position. I hope, therefore, you will agree to serve on this committee."

On November 16 and 17 the Task Force met in Washington, having previously studied the Thompson and Lichtner engineering report and related material, individually. Task Force members visited the Capitol on November 16, when they heard the project analyzed by the architects for the extension project, and were taken on a tour of the Capitol building. On the following day they continued their study of the facts. Throughout its review, the Task Force was advised by a prominent and experienced structural engineer. Their report to the AIA Board of Directors is included herewith as an Appendix.

The Institute believes that Capitol Hill is the single most important land development in our Nation. We also believe that history will hold the architectural profession accountable for development of the Capitol and of Capitol Hill. Therefore, in the findings and recommendations of the American Institute of Architects which follow, we have attempted to be objective and constructive.

II. CONDITIONS OF THE WEST FRONT

The West Front of the Capitol is in a state of disrepair. Numerous cracks are in evidence on the exterior of the building. Some window lintels and keystones have cracked and slipped. Several of the architrave stones have sagged. The foundations, at some points, are not far enough below the finish grade to escape frost damage. However, none of the defects appears to indicate that danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is impracticable.

Sandstone

There is some professional opinion that the sandstone facing used on the West Front was inferior to begin with and its deterioration when exposed to the weather was predictable. Though this stone is obviously inferior to some other stones for exterior use, the same can be said of marble. In the Old Patent Office, for example, there is no serious deterioration of the sandstone facing of the first wing. Yet the adjoining wings of marble are badly deteriorated. The example is pertinent since the facing for the Capitol's West Front and the Old Patent Office building come from the same sandstone quarry. This suggests that the condition of the sandstone on the West Front may be partly due to causes other than the quality of the stone.

Cracks

Several of the architrave stones of the portico are definitely sagging and have been shored. Some window lintels and keystones have both cracked and slipped. The foundations, although below the finish grade, are subject to frost damage at several points. The basement wall of the center part of the SW corner in the court has also been shored. When the grade was lowered in this court the foundations thus exposed were veneered and it is this unbonded stone covering that has come loose from its back-up and required shoring. No cracks are in evidence on the interior but this is explained by the fact that constant repairs have kept pace with the cracks. The explanation given by the Assistant Architect of the Capitol that visible exterior cracks are due to settlement and expansion of the wall appears reasonable. However, no visible effort has been made recently to fill these cracks in order at least to deter the penetration of moisture. Had this been done as the cracks appeared it is likely that the disgraceful appearance of the exterior surface due to scaling paint could have been avoided.

Vertical settlement—Lateral thrust

There is no direct evidence that lateral thrust in the present West Front has caused problems. The Capitol Architect's staff engineer reports that the building is not out of plumb. Thus while the Capitol is experiencing some vertical settlement it is not slipping down the hill.

In short, none of the above mentioned defects appears to indicate that danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is not practicable. Furthermore, since lateral thrust is not presenting major structural problems, doubt is cast on the need for a buttress, although this is one of the arguments made by those who favor an extension.

III. SPACE REQUIREMENTS

The recommendation to extend the West Front of the Capitol, to provide Members of Congress and visitors with additional space and facilities, was made without first conducting an adequate survey to illustrate the use of present space and the need for additional space, according to recent testimony by a Member of Congress. If modern facilities and office space are critical necessities, should a 19th century building be reshaped to meet the 20th century needs?

Space survey

One argument made by those who recommend a 4.5 acre extension to the Capitol is that such an extension will provide much needed office space and added facilities for visitors. But, according to recent testimony by a Member of Congress, no accurate survey has been conducted to predict Capitol space needs.

Apparently, the only space survey which has been made was done in 1957 when various occupants were asked: "What additional space do you anticipate needing within the next 25 years?" The findings, based upon the wishes of selected occupants, was that "139,000 additional square feet of useable space are needed to fulfill the needs of the Capitol for the present and for 25 years in the future." Subsequent events have proved the 1957 survey unreliable. This is emphasized by the fact that over 200,000 square feet would be added by the combined East and West Front extensions—61,000 more square feet of space than the Capitol Architect's survey found would be necessary to satisfy Congress' needs in the Capitol building until 1982.

A survey of Capitol space needs should also be made to determine what functions are now being carried on in the building which could be accomplished elsewhere just as effectively. It is quite possible that some of the functions now housed in the Capitol building could be moved to other new or existing buildings with no loss of efficiency.

If a space survey had been made and the need for more generous accommodations clearly documented, the Congress would then be faced with the question: Can present facilities be remodeled or must new space be constructed? Certainly, if one is to provide the most up-to-date and advanced, flexible, functional and handsome space, one would not normally start with the restricting envelope of a building conceived a century-and-a-half ago.

That a survey of immediate and long-term space needs is a valuable and recognized first

step in planning any new construction has been consistently recognized by both Congress and the Executive Branch. For example, in 1961 the President directed that a survey of Federal office space be made to eliminate disorderly, inefficient and wasteful utilization of space. The report of the President's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Federal Office Space has been the bench mark for constructing new Federal facilities since that time.

The functions of the Capitol

Floor consideration of legislation and the work closely related thereto are the principal activities which must be carried on in the Capitol. We question whether it is necessary or prudent to try to accommodate in the Capitol constantly growing activities not directly related to the work of Senate and House Chambers.

There is obviously a limit to the amount of space which can be added to the Capitol if it is to retain any resemblance to its original form—or even to the present building. Congress will presumably decide at some point not to make any more additions to the Capitol. We believe the Congress should make that decision now while the one remaining original wall can be saved as visible evidence of our heritage.

IV. RESTORATION: AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK?

The West Front of the Capitol can be restored and its structural weaknesses corrected. Admittedly, it will be a job requiring skill and patience. But if the decision to restore the Capitol is made, our building technology is certainly adequate to meet the challenge. Restoration would be, however, a costly undertaking and would entail some inconvenience.

Restoration techniques

The walls and foundations of the West Front of the Capitol are structurally inferior when tested by today's standards. However, retention and repair of the existing walls is not infeasible. No authority, including the Architect of the Capitol, contends that restoration is impossible. It would, of course, be a delicate and time consuming proposition. But our technology is up to the task.

Restoration work done on historic buildings in Europe indicates that walls and columns which have deteriorated have been reinforced effectively by a system of drilling diagonal holes through the masonry, inserting reinforcing rods, and forcing grout under pressure into the holes. Another successful technique called "needling" involves the use of temporary steel beams to take the load off parts of the wall while other areas of the wall are being repaired. Similar or even more innovative methods could be applied to the West Front.

Inconvenience

If restoration is undertaken, Congressional leaders with offices located on the West Front would have to move and this certainly would be an inconvenience. But this inconvenience would occur even if the West Front were extended.

Cost

No estimate has been made by the Capitol Architect to determine the cost of restoring the West Wall in its present location on the grounds that restoration was not the best solution and there were too many unknowns to arrive at a reasonable estimate. The American Institute of Architects does not know what the cost of restoration would be. However, it is unlikely that the cost of restoration would approach the total cost of extension. Furthermore, since no recent survey has been made to determine the space needs of Congress and no master plan has been developed for the Capitol Hill area, it is our opinion that extension of the West Front may prove much more costly, due to misdirected effort, than the immediate value of dollars spent on the extension project.

V. ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING ON CAPITOL HILL

We move from crisis to crisis under present procedures for approval and construction of Capitol Hill buildings. Unlike other parts of the Capitol City, neither the Fine Arts Commission nor the National Capitol Planning Commission has authority over Capitol Hill architecture and development. A Congressional inquiry in 1965 brought out the fact that there had been no planning for Hill development during the past eight years. And today, no long-range master plan exists to guide development of Capitol grounds and contiguous areas.

Master planning

Construction on Capitol Hill seems inextricably steeped in controversy. Much of the blame for this situation can be attributed to Congress which, apparently through indifference, has allowed procedures to develop which are not in the best interest of the Capitol Hil area.

For example, most universities, towns and cities of consequence have recognized the benefit of a master plan. And Congress has insisted that comprehensive master planning be accomplished before Federal funds are granted for interstate highways, model cities and other development programs. Yet no such plan exists for Capitol Hill.

"Why," one Congressman recently asked "should this 131 acres known as Capitol Hill be excluded and denied the benefits of comprehensive master planning which Congress in its wisdom . . . felt was an indispensable condition to their spending a dime of Federal funds to help any city?" Why indeed!

Congress owes it to the people of the United States to have orderly plan for the development of the Capitol grounds and contiguous areas. The cost of creating an excellent plan would be far less than the amount which will be spent unnecessarily without one.

A Commission on Architecture and Planning

The 89th Congress considered legislation to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning. The Commission, to be composed of highly experienced professionals, would supervise the implementation of a master plan and would pass on the design of buildings on Capitol Hill. We believe the legislation has a great deal of merit. Accordingly, we strongly urge that the many members who introduced the legislation in the 89th Congress reintroduce the Commission on Architecture and Planning bill and press for its enactment.

Congress called for the establishment of a Fine Arts Commission and National Capitol Planning Commission to assure the orderly and artistic development of the Capitol City. The Capitol grounds are a part of the city and should no longer be excluded from the accepted process of examination and review. Indeed, Capitol Hill is so important as to merit its own review body.

VI. CONCLUSION: RESTORE THE WEST FRONT

The American Institute of Architects recommends that the West Front of the Capitol be restored and that Congress establish a permanent policy prohibiting any further major alteration to the Capitol other than that absolutely necessary for structural and safety reasons.

No evidence has been produced that would make impracticable the restoration of the West Wall in its present form. The encrustations of paint should be taken off and only those parts of the original facade that are dangerously damaged or deteriorated should be removed to be replaced with the same material as that of the original walls. The more aged, eroded condition of the stone of the West Front should be considered honorable evidence of its survival as one of the earliest of our major public buildings. It is a condition that does not detract from the beauty of the building when viewed from a distance, and it is one which adds considerably to its interest and historic significance when examined close-at-hand.

The American Institute of Architects believes it would be a mistake to cover up the last remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol. We strongly urge that the greatest symbol of our country be preserved.

VII. APPENDIX: AIA TASK FORCE REPORT

Statement of the findings of the AIA Task Force on the West Front of the Capitol

The members of the AIA Task Force on the West Front of the U.S. Capitol met in Washington November 16th and 17th, 1966. They were Messrs. F. D. Lethbridge, Norman Fletcher, J. Stenhouse, L. Rossetti, architects; C. Hansen, engineer; Samuel E. Homsey, Chairman; T. R. Hollenbach and P. Hutchinson, AIA Staff.

The Task Force met in the morning of November 16, having previously studied the engineering reports individually. Carl Hansen, prominent structural engineer, discussed the reports and helped analyze the various structural problems. The afternoon of November 16th was spent at the Capitol building with Mr. Campioli, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and the associated architects for the extension of the Capitol project, together with certain of their engineers.

The presentation of the engineering reports by the associated architects for the extension is based largely on the theory of lateral bracing against lateral thrust of the brick arches, although there was no direct evidence that lateral thrust in the present west front was causing problems. There was evidence to show that cracks were due to vertical settlement. Even if the present facade is covered by an extension, it would appear that new underpinning of the present foundations will be necessary.

Several of the architrave stones of the portico by inspection indicated a definite sag and were shored up. Some window lintels and keystones had both cracked and slipped. The foundations at some points were reported to be well below the finish grade and at others unacceptably close. The basement wall of the center part at the SW corner in the court had also been shored. It was explained that when the grade was lowered in this court the foundations thus exposed were veneered and it was this unbounded stone covering that had come loose from its backup and required shoring. No cracks were in evidence on the interior, but this was explained by the fact that constant repairs kept pace with their occurrence. The explanation that visible exterior cracks were due to movement of the wall by settlement and expansion appeared reasonable; however, no visible effort had been made recently to fill these cracks in approved fashion in order to at least deter the penetration of moisture. Had this been done, it is possible that the disgraceful appearance of the exterior surface due to scaling paint might have been ameliorated.

After a study of drawings of building sections and on-site observations, none of the defects appear to indicate that danger of collapse is imminent or that correction is not practicable though it might be time consuming and relatively expensive.

It would seem, however, improbable that the cost of preservation would approach the total cost of extension. Some more research could be done by the AIA on the probable range of cost for the restoration. This could be done by getting opinions from contractors in this country, experienced European contractors who have been dealing with this kind of construction—for example, Fondedile S.P.A. in Rome. Techniques used in Europe for restoring facades include one called "needling," in which steel beams are placed

through the wall at intervals for scaffolding, while certain portions of the building are worked on. There is also a possibility of using temporary tie rod techniques on the inside to hold the wall in place while the outside surface is worked on. Restoration work done on historic buildings in Europe indicates that walls and columns have been reinforced effectively by a system of drilling diagonal holes, inserting reinforcing rods and forcing in grout under pressure. This method seems very promising as one of a number of techniques which can almost certainly be used to preserve the West Front with no major change in its appearance. Foundation underpinning is well within the range of familiar techniques in this country.

The inconvenience factor has been strongly developed by the associated architects. If the extension is built, the Congressional leaders using the offices on the west side will be inconvenienced at least part of the time as the building is joined on through construction, and all of the time because of lack of natural light. It is true that if a project for preservation of the present west front is carried forward, then the Congressional leaders in that area would have to move elsewhere during that time, and this certainly would be an inconvenience. However, if extra space, such as is now proposed by an extension, is an absolute necessity, separate quarters could be planned as a Phase I development of a total program, and they could move into the new quarters after it was finished, occasioning no inconvenience except for moving. In this version, Phase II would be restoring the west facade after additional space was built. In all parts of the world we see scaffolds and other protective measures used for preservation of historic monuments; they are there for years at a time. They are worth the effort and patience. They remind us of the dimension of time. We cannot go back and rebuild the past.

At a hearing before the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol in 1965 some opinion was expressed that the sandstone facing used was quite inferior for use when exposed to the weather and unless painted would go to pieces. Though this stone is obviously inferior to some other stones for exterior use, so is marble. The difference is relative. The same quarry from which came the facing for the Capitol furnished the facing for the first wing of the old Patent Office. There is no serious deterioration of that surface, however, the adjoining wings of marble are badly deteriorated. There is good reason to feel that inferior construction methods—penetration of the weather to the inner core of the exterior walls and sealing of the surface with paint—contributed considerably more to deterioration than the facing material itself.

The Task Force supports a program of preservation in the purest sense of the word. First of all, every bit of exterior paint should be carefully removed and the original stone exposed. Only those stones that are structurally unsound should be replaced and these stones should be replaced with the same material as that of the original walls.

It is not felt that a restoration of the West Front for "cosmetic" reasons is either necessary or desirable. The more aged eroded condition of the stones of the West Front should be considered honorable evidence of its survival as one of the earliest of our major public buildings. It is a condition that does not detract from the beauty of the building when viewed from a distance, and is one that adds considerably to its interest and historic significance when examined close at hand. After removal of the existing layers of paint and replacement of damaged stones, it will then be possible to determine whether the wall should remain exposed or should for aesthetic or protective reasons receive a coating that will not entrap moisture as before, i.e. will allow the stone to breathe.

It has been stated in support of an extension that no restoration of the existing building would be permanent. Very little is permanent, not even the proposed extension. Constant maintenance is the only safeguard against failure of any construction—just as constant vigilance is essential to the preservation of our form of government.

Were the primary objective one of preservation rather than additional space, our technology, wealth, and will would be adequate to meet the challenge.

If the extension is carried out, the work of important early American architects and landscape architects would be lost forever—namely, Thornton, Latrobe, Bulfinch, and Olmstead. The work of these significant American architects would seem important to keep in a world in which we are losing many of our original resources in buildings and nature. It seems all the more essential to hold on to this last remaining, important symbol embodied in our Capitol. Should we not follow the example of such attempts at restoration as the Adler-Sullivan Auditorium Building in Chicago and the effort given to restoring New York City Hall recently? Certainly now is the time when Americans are becoming conscious of their heritage in building and in nature.

Now is the time when Americans may be developing the self-confidence to solve their functional problems in an aggressive, growing, and modern approach, still keeping their historic monuments inviolate. These people have a right to be heard. The landmark under discussion is number one on the list—the Capitol of the United States. If this landmark is not worth the effort to save—what is?

The whole problem of the extension points to the necessity for master planning on Capitol Hill. In this connection, it would seem an underground development for the east plaza side of the Capitol should be explored for the possible use of multi-level parking and visitor's facilities. The whole idea for visitors' facilities incorporating cafeteria, specialized auditoria with advanced audio-visual techniques, the use of free and flexible areas and orientation would be part of the overall program. Certainly this type of new 20th century facility can best be solved in structures and materials less inhibited by the classic framework. The matter of additional office space may be subject to some debate as to its critical necessity, but if one is to provide the most up-to-date and advanced, flexible, functional, handsome office space, one would not start with the restricting envelope of a building conceived a century and a half ago. The one advantage of proximity of offices to legislative chambers could be answered by well-designed motorized connections.

The Task Force recommends preservation, but would put a strong plea for a master plan, providing for office space, visitors' facilities and parking, all with possibilities for expansion. It would seem then that the AIA's position, if the Board follows the recommendation of the Task Force, would be very much in concert with the President's program for natural beauty, which would include preservation, and also that of the many governors' councils on the same subject. We are already identified with this movement and are not alone in defending this position. Moreover, there are hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people who are shocked at the prospect of extending the west front of the Capitol and who would support preservation. The fact that the east front has been more or less successfully added to should argue more strongly for the preservation of the west front as the only remaining historic facade of the Capitol.

President Johnson has said:

"Among the most cherished of a nation's treasures are the monuments of its past. Each contributes to the historic texture of society. We look back with reverence to lasting reminders of a vital past. We look forward with confidence to achievements which will enhance our future with accomplishments to match our monumental past. In every part of the country citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The Government must also do its share to assist the local efforts."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1967]

ARCHITECT, SPARE OUR CAPITOL

(By Robert Sherrill)

During the last years he was in the United States Senate, Paul Douglas of Illinois would periodically arise in that chamber which has heard so many fruitless pleas and add one of his own:

"Architect, spare our Capitol,
Touch not another stone.
In youth it sheltered our Republic,
O please, let it alone."

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart gave no sign then of being moved by doggerel sentiments, nor is he any more impressed today by the increasingly loud appeals to keep his hands off the Capitol, voiced by a chorus that includes the American Institute of Architects, the President's Fine Arts Commission and several prestigious antiquary societies. New York Congressman Samuel S. Stratton has even set up a corporation which has about 25 U.S. Senators and 30 members of the House as cochairmen, called the Committee for the Preservation of the Capitol.

What makes Stewart's critics feel rather desperate is that there is not much left to preserve. If they fail this time, they fail forever. The exterior stones that by 1829 contained the basic Capitol—which was added to but never altered substantially until the coming of Stewart—will all be hidden or discarded. The sandstone that Benjamin Latrobe used to build the original House and Senate wings in the first decade of the 19th century, and which Charles Bulfinch used to construct the central portico in the eighteen-twenties, will be swallowed by Stewart marble. Changed, too, will be some of the design which in 1793 won for Dr. William Thornton a prize of $500, a city lot and President Washington's commendation. And even some of Frederick Law Olmsted's terraces and steps, built between 1884 and 1892, will be displaced.

The Capitol Architect's goal remains what it has been for a dozen years—to spruce up the old central section with new stone—and the only thing that stands between him and completion of the job is $34-million, which Stewart, who has many good friends on the Congressional money committees, considers no hurdle at all.

Six years ago, Stewart obliterated the east front of the original Capitol, pushed it out 33 feet, and replaced it with a shiny new marble front. Now the old man—76, slightly stooped, with precarious eyesight and even more precarious temper—sits impatiently puffing on his pipe in his basement offices, architectural plans ready, waiting only for the lawmakers upstairs to give the budgetary go-ahead that will send his demolition and construction crews to work on the west front. That is all that is left of the original Capitol's facade, a mass which George Washington praised for "grandeur, simplicity, and beauty"; in its place will go some new marble, carved and erected along lines which Stewart and House Speaker John McCormack and Vice President Hubert Humphrey, as well as most of the Congressional leadership, insist will be grander, if not quite so simple.

The original wings will be pushed forward 88 feet and the central section 44 feet, increasing the size of the Capitol by 4.5 acres or 25 per cent. In constructing the new east front, Stewart had duplicated the old design faithfully in every detail, but he doesn't intend to be bound by tradition on the west. He will add a couple of new columns, top them with a pediment (there is none now),

cut off eight feet of the 48-foot-wide Olmsted steps, put in flat windows where now they are arcade, and arcade windows where now they are flat. It will be, as nothing else on Capitol Hill, pure Stewart. And that is one of the things which bothers his critics.

The expanded west front will include several dozen offices (most of which will be taken over by the most powerful Congressmen,) a couple of movie auditoriums, 41 toilets, two private dining rooms and two large cafeterias (300 to 400 seats in each) with a great view of the mall. Some unhappy Congressmen predict that it will be "a giant Howard Johnson." But Stewart insists to the contrary that "there are many members of Congress who are dedicated to the proposition that this opportunity [to eat while looking at the Washington Monument] should no longer be denied the millions who visit the Capitol each year."

Just why he and his followers feel that these eateries will catch on is not clear, since other Stewart-supervised cafeterias on Capitol Hill went in the red $500,000 last year for lack of customers. In any event, the quarrel over whether one has an inalienable right to have a scenic bowl of bean soup in the Capitol seems destined to be a central issue, which, though it may seem strangely trivial, is welcomed by both sides as a commonplace handle to hang on to and steady themselves in an otherwise high-flown debate. From the one side come accusations, from men such as Representative Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, that Stewart proposes to feed Congress "by the somewhat excessive process of tearing down its historic house." He is joined by Pennsylvania's Senator Joseph Clark, who likens Stewart's cafeteria proposals to "putting imitation-Colonial hot-dog stands in Independence Hall." In rebuttal is heard the judgment of men such as Humphrey—who once proposed turning the Olmsted terraces into sidewalk cafes—that the Capitol, after all, is "not a monument but a place to work and eat in."

If Stewart succeeds, as he probably will, in laying his mark upon the west front, it will be a notable cap to a stormy career. The eighth Capitol Architect since the office was established, he has spent much more (a total of about $200-million) and built much more (the new Senate Office Bulding, the Rayburn House Office Building, the expanded east front of the Capitol, two underground Congressional garages, an underground trolley for what the Senate chaplain dedicated as "chariots of democracy," and various renovations to other House and Senate office buildings) than any of his predecessors. And in doing so he has been criticized more than all the other Capitol Architects put together.

He has been criticized for design (stairways that lead nowhere), for decorations (flying horses with cornucopias for tails), for mechanical Rube Goldbergisms (hot and cold air blowing into offices at the same time) and for extravagance (he said the new Senate Office Building would cost $20-million and it cost $30-million; he said the Rayburn building would cost $63-millilion and it cost $98.2-million, making it the most expensive office building in the world).

No major project supervised by Stewart since he was appointed to the lifetime post by President Eisenhower in 1954 has escaped ridicule and outraged criticism. Unhappiness reached newsworthy levels on the completion of the new Senate Office Building in 1958, a building whose workaday kinks (wheezing loudspeakers, clock hands too heavy to move, inoperable elevators) after a decade of slapstick operation are still being straightened out. Unhappiness turned to fury when he tore down the Capitol's east front in 1961. By the time he finished the Rayburn Building in 1964 he was, for many Federal architecture aficionados, considered Public Enemy No. 1.

Senator Stephen Young's description of the Rayburn building as "quite possibly the worst building costing the most money in the history of the construction of public buildings anywhere in the world," would not get much argument even from persons who otherwise defend Stewart. It is a building whose style was described by one newspaper writer as a mixture of "middle Mussolini, early Rameses, and late Nieman-Marcus" and by another as "having all the grace of a dockside warehouse." Criticism finally became so nasty that Stewart, whose most impenetrable defense is customary silence, was stung to complain, "From the way some people talk, you'd think we hire our architectural help in the Bowery."

So long as he stuck to putting up new buildings, Stewart risked abuse only for esthetic judgment, but when he began fiddling with the Capitol—sacred to most Americans despite its cracks and chips and sagging stones—he was quickly damned for sacrilege.

It is a natural reaction. No building in America can raise such passions. It certainly is, as historian Allan Nevins said, "the best-loved and most revered building in America." When the French-born Pierre Charles L'Enfant laid out Washington, he looked upon Jenkins Hill as "a pedestal waiting for a monument," and the Capitol that was finally erected there took on at once not the aura of a monument only but of a temple—"the first temple dedicated to the sovereignty of the people," as Thomas Jefferson hailed it.

Of course, occasionally Congressmen who wanted more room suggested that the original Capitol be enlarged eastward or westward, but after President Fillmore squelched that suggestion in 1851, not again was the east-west inflation seriously considered until the coming of Stewart. A dozen times it was brought up and a dozen times rejected.

Power formidable enough to work change came only when Stewart teamed up with Sam Rayburn. No previous Capitol Architect had anything like Stewart's power, possibly because no other architect was smart enough to realize that the machinery of a democracy is not itself democratic. The 131 acres that make up Capitol Hill is a little kingdom of its own and the men who run it are, while operating within its boundaries, virtually a royal household, desiring the luxuries and services and perquisites of royalty. The Capitol Architect willing to see them in that light, and serve them in that way, would be rewarded with all the unpublicized powers of a medieval major-domo. And Stewart turned out to be that man, to Rayburn's great satisfaction.

A dropout from the University of Delaware, where he played half-back on the football team, Stewart in 1910 went to work in his father's engineering firm, Stewart & Donohue, which at one time was the largest heavy construction company south of Philadelphia. Later he went into landscape construction and is probably best remembered in Delaware for his work on the gardens of the du Pont estate, Nemours. Pottering about in state politics, he was appointed to the Delaware Athletic Commission, and then in 1934, at the age of 44, he was sent to the U.S. House of Representatives on the Republican ticket for one term.

He retired from business in 1944 and began to hanker to return to Washington. Three years later he made it as a member of the staff of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, and though he was bumped from that in 1951 he had already made the right connections on the Republican National Committee, which he served briefly as head of its speakers bureau. By this time, however, he had decided that his future lay not in prompting partisan politics but in tending to the happiness of the Capitol Hill court.

In 1954, when Stewart was 64, a few members of the court decided that he could tend best as Capitol Architect. Joseph Martin, then Republican House leader, recalls approaching Eisenhower with the suggestion: "I took the recommendation to the President, all right. I knew Stewart. He had been in Congress, you know, and he was in the construction business. But it wasn't just my recommendation, it was a general Republican recommendation. Several people thought he would be good for the job." Eisenhower appointed him to the $27,000-a-year post.

Not everybody was overjoyed at the appointment. In the strife-filled years that followed, Stewart's enemies were never to stop mentioning one noticeable defect in his background: He is not an architect. He has neither a degree, nor training, nor experience as an architect (or at least had none until he got this job). Looking back on Stewart's appointment, columnist Joseph Alsop put down Eisenhower's action as "almost as whimsical as the Emperor Caligula's famous nomination of his favorite horse to the Roman consulship; and it has produced far more practical results, all of them perfectly godawful."

Pursuing the trail of Stewart's career through The Congressional Record, one finds others calling him "dangerous," "mad," "the most expensive, most wasteful, most incompetent architect whom we possibly could engage," "the best living example of the tragic waste and shortcomings of Socialism," and likening him to the British vandals who fired the Capitol in 1814. Wolf von Eckardt, The Washington Post's unmincing critic, sees Stewart as the living symbol of the "bungling megalomania of Congress" who heaps "pompous blocks of marble upon marble without plan, reason or design." (Stewart's staff describes von Eckardt, in turn, as "that crackpot.")

It is probably fair to say, however, that much of this bitterness comes from the fact that no matter how vigorously these opponents protest, Stewart remains unruffled and victorious, swaddled in the warm assurance that among the men who really run Capital Hill he is looked upon as a stout-hearted and uncomplaining soldier in the necessarily dirty fight to keep government, and the house of government, flexible. As one reporter sized up the situation, "Getting rid of the Capitol Architect is a little like disposing of Daddy Warbucks."

Vice President Humphrey, for example, defers to Stewart in all things architectural. But it is from the House side that he has had his firmest support. House Minority Leader Gerald Ford feels Stewart is, if anything, too cautious and conservative in his expansion plans. House Speaker McCormack describes him as "a dear, dedicated soul." In his first meeting with President Kennedy after the inauguration, Speaker Rayburn's opening remark was: "Now, Mr. President, I want you to keep on George Stewart. He's a good man, and I want him to stay on the job."

Rayburn got an office building partly as a result of that friendship. McCormack may do as well; Stewart has already prepared plans for a new House office building to be named for him. One of the architectural firms that has profited most from Capitol Hill work during the last decade is headed by Dallas friends of Rayburn. The main consulting engineering firm used by Stewart in developing his Capitol plans has headquarters in McCormack's home state. Other friendships are evident. Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge helped block an effort to prevent Stewart from letting contracts in 1958; six months later Steward awarded a $2,783,650 contract to the George Marble Company of Atlanta.

That's really, as things go now, what being Capitol Architect means. The title is misleading. The Congressional leadership expects the Capitol Architect to be less an architect than a butler. He is responsible for supervising the cleaning and maintenance of the buildings on Capitol Hill, the paying of utility bills, the contracting for repairs

and new construction, the supervising of charwomen and elevator operators.

And, in fact, Stewart does not do the designing of his buildings himself. His office has a chief architect, Mario Campioli, and two subordinate architects, but it is freely admitted that they do only minor day-to-day adjustments—adding a room, refurbishing an office—around Capitol Hill. All major jobs are given to outside consultants, and since 1956 most of the big Capitol jobs have been given to the same group of consultants, Roscoe DeWitt and Fred L. Hardison (now deceased) of Dallas, Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford (also deceased) of Atlanta, Alfred E. Poor and Albert H. Swanke of New York City, and John F. Harbeson of Philadelphia.

With a budget of $500,000 a year, Stewart is, above all, a dispenser of favors. Does some seniority-girdled Congressman need a special room, a hideaway in the Capitol catacombs? Stewart will find one. And if he cannot find one, he will construct one by knocking out a wall here, throwing up a wall there. At a nod from the leadership, toilets become libraries, closets become breakfast nooks. Does the air-conditioner blow down some influential ancient's neck? Repairmen will work through the night to correct the flow.

Shortly after the new Senate Office Building was finished, some of the more powerful of its inhabitants complained that they weren't getting fast enough elevator service; Stewart spent $600,000 to install two more special elevators for them. Then they complained that the special custom-styled tile which had been installed at a cost of $100,000 was hard on their secretaries' heels; Stewart covered the tile with carpeting, though more than a hundred walnut and metal doors had to be sawed and ground down an inch and a half to clear the new cover.

Always sensible of the fact that when Congressmen speak of practicalities, they do not necessarily mean to be *that* practical, Stewart showed his genius in the Rayburn Office Building. The excuse for building it was the need for more office space, yet when he was through with it, less than 20 percent of the gross floor space was given over to offices. The rest went for swimming pools and gyms and barber shops and steam baths and dining rooms and enough garage capacity for 1,600 cars. Already some powerful Congressmen are complaining about needing more office space.

Above all, Stewart serves the leadership with the kind of secrecy that Rayburn, thinking back to his boyhood days on a Texas farm, once described as "as beautiful as a morning glory closing for the night." What the bald bachelor from Bonham, wanted from Stewart, he got, and he got it in the style he wanted. That included secrecy. "When I came here," Stewart recalls, "Speaker Rayburn said to me, 'Boy, you came here to work, not to talk.' "

That has been Stewart's philosophy ever since. Reporters get next to nothing from him ("If you asked me whether the American flag was going to fly over the west front after it is finished, I still wouldn't have any comment") but nonestablishment Congressmen and the American Institute of Architects, his special foe, get even less. When the A.I.A. asked to inspect the plans for altering the east front, Stewart said the plans "do not belong to the public" and "are not for publication," and he declared firmly that only the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, headed at the time by Rayburn, could authorize release of the plans. He turned down the A.I.A. again when it asked to see plans for expanding the west front. In fact, for months after the plans had been completed Stewart would show them to nobody in Congress but the members of the Commission for Extension of the Capitol (McCormack, Humphrey, Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen and House Minority Leader Gerald Ford) and members of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Some Congressmen complained at being expected to vote appropriations for a job they knew nothing about. Stewart, smiling wanly at such hopeless rebellion, reminded them, "That's the way things are done up here."

"The way things are done" was illustrated nowhere better than in the maneuver by which Congress gave five members the power to meet secretly and make all decisions with regard to the future of the Capitol. It happened in 1955, the year after Stewart became Capitol Architect. Rayburn slipped into the Appropriations Act a section setting up a commission for renovating the central portion of the building. Whether or not Congress knew it, the seemingly bland legislation gave the commission carte blanche powers. No hearings and no debate were held on the expansion in either house. All the planning was being done behind locked doors by the special commission.

By 1958 they were ready to strike. Ray Roberts, who took Rayburn's seat in Congress after the old Texan's death and had been his confidant for years, recalls that victorious moment with metaphor-mixing excitement: "Suddenly the cat was out of Pandora's box!" Many politicians, lay patriots, newspaper editors and architects were furious to discover that the east front, without any public discussion, was about to be remade, but as Roberts puts it proudly: "It was pretty much a case of locking the barn after the foxy old devil [Rayburn] was out."

The east front had been an oddity that the nation had grown proud of. The great cast-iron dome literally stuck out over the edge of the building about 15 feet on that side and seemed to rest on the portico. The dome appeared to pour over the edge and down the columns. But as the years went by most Americans adjusted to the view and then got to like it. Joseph Hudnut, retired professor of architecture and dean of the Harvard School of Design, argued that the east front should be left alone because "history has harmonized a thousand imperfections in the Capitol."

Rayburn did not see it that way. He considered the east front cramped, ugly, deteriorating and unsafe. He wanted more offices and more restaurants, so out came the east front by 33 feet.

The ghost of Rayburn is still directing the debate on the west front. In 1958 Rayburn had promised publicly, "We aren't going to touch the west front," but that is not what he and Stewart and the others agreed on in private conference. So now Stewart is using Rayburn's old east-front arguments to pry loose the west front, too: Once again the words are ugly, unsafe and cramped.

That part of the Capitol *is*, on the surface, unsightly. Not since Kennedy's inauguration has the west front been painted, although Stewart admits it should be painted every four years. Much of the paint is now gone; what remains is flaking away in great scabs. Stones between the columns and the columns themselves are propped up with splitting, unpainted, crudely hewn timbers.

But perhaps the best clue to what is happening to the west front can be had by taking a late-evening walk along the terraces. Unless tourists are around, it is very quiet here; almost rustic. Thousands of birds chirping. As you listen to the birds— starlings—you realize all of a sudden that this is not a peaceful scene: Those are the sounds of a guerrilla war against the west front. Nowhere else do the eaves of the Capitol shelter starlings. Elsewhere the eaves are protected, and very successfully, by anti-starling wiring. But not on the west front. It has been abandoned to the birds and their droppings. For the nastier the front looks, the less opposition is expected to its dismantling.

The west front is also, as Stewart claims, in rickety condition. Even his enemies agree to that. A 30-pound piece of cornice popped off a couple of years ago; Stewart has it prominently displayed in an outer office as a prize piece of evidence. Surface cracks, some of them dating from the burning of the Capitol in 1814, run the height of the building's face. Window capstones have dropped a couple of inches. Stewart warns earnestly that any good jar, even a nearby plane crash, could bring the whole front tumbling down. One of his engineering consultants told a Congressional committee last year that the front had better be replaced "next week—and I'm not kidding."

But among many professional architects there is doubt that the front is as dangerously weak as Stewart and his advisers say. Within the past month a special study group of the A.I.A. reported to Congress that, despite its deterioration, the west front can and should be saved in its present form. This group, made up of five architects and a structural engineer, urged Congress not to be frightened by some of the things said about the Capitol, which may be settling slightly but "is not slipping downhill." Without accusing Stewart, the group nonetheless suggested that in future planning on Capitol Hill he should be assisted by a commission of "highly experienced professionals."

Before he tore down the east side Stewart made the same dire predictions of imminent disaster, and pointed to pieces of the cornice held on with wire. Yet D. W. Kessler, former chief of the National Bureau of Standards' Building Stones Section, said that while some of the Capitol stones are not of the best quality, most are in good condition. Test borings to a depth of a foot, he said, showed no appreciable weathering of the stone back of the first half-inch. Scale it down with pneumatic tools and the "stone would be practically as good as new."

Stewart did not take Kessler's advice; nor has he called on the Bureau of Standards to test the stones on the west front.

Stewart is a no-holds-barred battler. When he got tired of hearing the A.I.A.'s leaders say they felt the west front could and should be repaired with just some new stones, some grout and some hidden braces, Stewart recruited a friendlier organization, the Society of American Registered Architects, which has about one-tenth of the membership of the A.I.A., and it promptly passed a resolution not only supporting Stewart's position but accusing the A.I.A. of an irresponsible hatchet job on him. He who hits Stewart can expect a clout in return, from some direction.

In this fight, as in all others to curb or withdraw the powers of the Capitol Architect, Stewart has shown amazing survivability. Angry Senators have tried to abolish his job altogether, and failed. They have tried to replace him with a registered architect, and failed. Last year an effort was made to banish him at least from one job, supervising the construction of the new Library of Congress annex; this passed the Senate, but the House, intimidated by Speaker McCormack, forced a compromise requiring Stewart to consult with an A.I.A. panel of advisers before he went ahead with the annex. Stewart ignored the order. He signed his contracts with some of the same architects he has been using for a decade and made his preliminary plans without so much as sending a postcard to the A.I.A. and he got away with it. For years Stewart resisted all demands for a public accounting of his expenditures. Finally, in 1964, stung by increasing criticism of the soaring costs of the Rayburn building, Congress authorized the General Accounting Office to audit his books. For some reason, the G.A.O. needed more than two years to do it, but finally the study was released; it was uncritical of the more than 55 per cent estimate error.

The masterful way in which Stewart copes with those challenges he does not just ignore once prompted his old baiter, Douglas, to remark almost admiringly, "Make no mistake about it, the Architect is a very determined man and somewhere, somehow, he has a tremendous amount of influence. He may not know much about architecture—in fact, he knows very little about architecture—but somehow he seems to have a good deal of backing on Capitol Hill."

It is no mystery. Of the power pyramid, Stewart recognizes the existence of only the one topmost block, and hangs on to it. If he ever falls, it will be because the blocks supporting that one are removed. And this is what his enemies are now proposing to do, with a great upheaval.

William Walton, chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts, recently expressed the hope for "a national uprising of citizens, saying, 'You cannot vandalize our Capitol.'" Similarly, Congressman Stratton pins all his organizational hopes on arousing the public to a bubbling rage: "If the voters back home speak out loud and clear against this wasteful and unnecessary mayhem of the principal shrine of American democracy, they can keep Congress from letting it happen."

The odds in this fight are fascinating; it took only one man, Rayburn, to set up the machinery for alterations, and it took only three votes on a secret commission in 1966 to set it on its final motion; four Congressmen. How many millions of voters will Stratton need to reverse their actions? If there is to be an answer, it must come fast. Stewart already has the power. He needs only the money. And nothing is easier to get on Capitol Hill than that.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BILL TO INCREASE AMOUNT UNDER GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR SERVICEMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill which will increase substantially the amount of life insurance available for servicemen under the Government life insurance program. During the last session of Congress, we enacted a bill designed to provide protection for service personnel, but we limited coverage to a maximum of $10,000. This sum is inadequate to meet today's needs.

The loss of loved ones on the battlefield can never be compensated for through an insurance policy. However, I believe it is important that we help ease the financial burden placed on the surviving family. The present maximum coverage of $10,000 is too restrictive a policy. It should be raised to a maximum of $30,000.

In 1917, the first program of Government life insurance was established for those serving in the Armed Forces. The maximum then allowed was the same as today, $10,000. However, as we all are aware, times have changed. The growth of our national economy and the subsequent increase in wages and cost of living have made it evident that our families must be better protected today against the sudden loss of loved ones in battle.

President Johnson, in his January 31 message to Congress, called for enactment of this basic legislation. My bill differs from the President's in one important way. It provides coverage to all servicemen regardless of rank. The administration's bill would scale coverage above the minimum of $12,000 on the basis of pay level. I believe a sounder principle would be to allow all servicemen regardless of rank the prerogative of deciding the extent of personal coverage.

Often those individuals with a lower income have greater need for insurance coverage than those who are at the high end of the wage scales.

I believe such a proposal, which extends the amount of coverage and introduces a maximum of flexibility in deciding how much a person can carry, will not only protect the loved ones but will serve as a positive incentive for the career motivated person.

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL CIVIL SERVANT WEEK

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a resolution proclaiming a Civil Servant Week. This would provide an opportunity for expressing the gratitude which we, as Congressmen, owe Government employees. Furthermore, it would afford us the occasion to call to the attention of all Americans the importance of the work being done by the public servants.

The civil service, which replaced the spoils system, adopted a nonpartisan, professional standard not only in the selection of employees, but in all its work. We seldom stop to reflect on the significance of this standard for the operation of our Government and the preservation of our democracy.

This standard guarantees that the bureaucracy of this Government will assist and serve all elected officials regardless of the view they represent within the range of partisan politics. This is important, for it enables us to develop and to express sound but varied positions on issues discussed within the committees and on the floor of Congress. This service is essential for the maintaining of bipartisan politics. How long would our two-party system last if the bureaucracy supplied information only to Members who adhered to the administration's point of view?

It is the responsibility of the Federal employees to maintain the degree of flexibility necessary to enable them to provide information for all views as an issue is being debated in Congress. Yet once a program has been enacted into law, the service works with unswerving loyalty, dedication, and efficiency to implement it. This tradition of service reflects the highest ideals of democracy and, at the same time, helps insure the efficient working of democracy throughout this country.

A well-known historian, H. G. Wells, said, well over a quarter of a century ago, that the "time may come when history, grown more penetrating, will have more to tell about the clerks and less about the conquerors." Unfortunately that time in history has not yet arrived. The spotlight of publicity focuses the attention of the public on a few key figures, while the vast cast of Federal employees, whose work supports and sustains these stars, remain behind the scenes.

The injustice of this is compounded by the fact that Members of Congress, who are in a position both to appreciate and to benefit from this help, make so little effort to inform the public of the work done by the civil servants. We are responsible in part, for allowing the myth to develop in this country that the civil service is the refuge of mediocre men. This myth is both false and damaging.

It is not true that the elected officials rely primarily on Government employees to perform only the picayune and routine jobs. Today, we turn to the Federal employees to supply us with the most highly complex and intricate information on subjects ranging from water pollution to space programs, from civil rights to foreign affairs. More importantly, we depend on these people to administer programs in all these areas. As a result, an increasingly large number of Government jobs demand highly educated specialists. Indeed, in the variety and importance of positions available, the Government service in many areas overshadows private industry.

Yet the public continues to refer to civil servants more often in disparaging than in complimentary terms. More disturbing is the fact that the Brookings Institution recently published the results of a nationwide survey which showed, among other things, that the esteem and respect for the opportunities and challenges of Government employment is particularly low among persons at the upper educational and occupational levels. As a result, many of our finest young people in college and graduate school fail even to consider the possibility of working for the Government. These, of course, are the very persons whom the service needs and whom it must attract.

Unless public opinion comes to recognize the opportunities and achievements of Government employees, the civil service will fail to attract the number of trained and qualified people needed to fill the jobs. No Government service can achieve and maintain excellence without public respect. Excellence and honor must move forward side by side; improvement in personnel and performance must be accompanied by meaningful efforts to generate public pride and recognition of accomplishment.

Only with a renewed determination to deal forthrightly and resolutely with the problem of enforcing the prestige of public employment can we expect the civil service to retain and continue to attract the quality of personnel required to keep pace with the Government's growing need for experts.

Designating 1 week to honor civil servants is an important first step. During this week, we, as the elected officials of this Government, could express our respect and gratitude for the caliber and performance of the civil servants. Such recognition would promote public respect for the service, and thereby further strengthen democracy throughout this Nation.

BUSINESSES FORCED TO RELOCATE BY URBAN RENEWAL DESERVE FAIR COMPENSATION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak of grave injustices that can occur when a community undertakes urban renewal projects. One of my constituents, Mrs. Harriet P. Oakes, has brought this situation to my attention.

Mrs. Oakes and her husband John operate a small grocery store in the central Negro district in Miami. Together, Mr. and Mrs. Oakes work a total of 108 hours every week to earn a living. They have invested important years of their lives to insure their economic security. Yet because they do not own either the land or the building where their business is located, they are not eligible for a fair payment of the cost of relocating their business nor can they be sure that a new location will be as profitable or that they will not have to move again.

Under existing law, they are permitted but $500 to help defray the cost of relocating their grocery store. The Housing Act of 1949, as amended, provides a maximum of but $3,000 for relocating businesses, but does not permit payments for lost good will, which can often never be replaced in a new location. Now these people, after years of hard work, must begin again in a new location.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Oakes' and people like them must be sufficiently and fairly compensated for the necessary relocation required by urban renewal projects. Under existing law, those who own land receive adequate compensation for the property used for urban renewal. Residents who are forced to find new places to live also receive adequate compensation. But honest, hard working business people do not receive payment for loss of the source of their livelihood. After urban renewal forces a business to change its location or close its doors forever, many of these self-supporting people never get back on their feet again. As long as urban renewal represents progress for our cities, Mr. Speaker, then there should not be victims of progress such as Mr. and Mrs. John Oakes.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced legislation to remedy this problem. Mr. TYDINGS, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, introduced his own bill, S. 3290, in the 89th Congress, and had hoped this would lessen the hardships of these business people displaced by urban renewal. However, my bill, H.R. 8620, provides that compensation not be limited to businesses earning less than $10,000 a year, and the maximum repayment be fair and equitable. In addition stores, which need not physically move but still lose their business because customers are forced to relocate, should also receive fair compensation.

Mr. Speaker, the urban renewal program in this country was born with the Housing Act of 1949. Yet in the intervening 17 years we have done little for the small businessman who often loses his source of livelihood he spent many years building up. Seventeen years is too long to wait, but certainly waiting any longer is even worse. We must do something for these people and we must do it in this session of the 90th Congress.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XLVII

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, several of the Nation's economists have challenged the assumption by the Department of Defense that the costs of obtaining and maintaining a volunteer military force are prohibitive.

Based on a variety of evidence obtained from a Department of Defense study of military recruitment, Prof. Walter Oi, of the University of Washington, estimates that a starting pay to attract sufficient volunteers for military service should be from $4,000 to $5,000 a year, or about $80 to $100 a week. Professor Oi believes that the total extra payroll costs, after allowing for the savings in turnover and men employed in training, would be around $3 billion to $4 billion a year for an armed force equivalent to 2.7 million men and not more than $8 billion a year for a military force of 3.1 million or 3.2 million.

Prof. Ross Wilhelm, of the University of Michigan, advocates a flat across-the-board pay increase of $240 to $300 a month per man, bringing the total cost of his proposal to more than $9 billion a year. But, Professor Wilhelm maintains that the actual increase in the military budget would be significantly less. He said:

> At present, only about 5 percent of the draftees reenlist for a second tour of duty, while about 20 percent of the volunteers reenlist and more than 90 percent of the regular careerists. Thus tremendous savings could be realized by reducing the turnover.

Professor Wilhelm finds it "distasteful that the richest Nation on earth should use coercion to secure its military personnel when it could obtain all the men it needs by paying adequate salaries."

Prof. Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago, holds that the present draft is economically wasteful because a volunteer force would need fewer recruits while "we now waste manpower by higher turnover, unnecessary training and retraining, and the use of underpaid servicemen for menial tasks."

Mr. Speaker, the Military Establishment has created what my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], has called "an artificial monetary barrier to an all volunteer army at the outset." I believe, however, that economic analysis will show clearly that if the military forces were to pay adequate salaries, they could attract all the personnel they require, without resorting to coercion and without costing $17 or $20 billion.

AGRICULTURE—A NATIONAL, NOT A FARM, PROBLEM

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today sponsoring two bills—the Dairy Parity Act and the Young Farmers Investment Act. The junior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. NELSON, is introducing similar legislation in the other body today also.

The bills seek to deal with the two major problems facing the American farmer—and the beneficiaries of America's food producing capabilities, the American consumer.

Below-parity farm income and the prohibitive costs of entering the farm business are combining to reduce the proportion of economic-sized family farmers in the industry. An article in the Farm Index for April 1967 points this up:

DAIRY FARMS BECOMING FEWER, BIGGER, REPORTING MORE MILK COWS PER FARM

> The pace of the trend to fewer but larger dairy farms quickened between 1959 and 1964.
>
> There were about 1.8 million farms reporting 16.5 million milk cows in 1959. In 1964, 1.1 million farms reported 14.6 million milk cows. In the same period, the average number of cows per farm rose 40 percent.
>
> Farms selling milk and cream dropped at about the same rate, going from 1 million to 650,000.
>
> Larger commercial dairy farms—with gross sales of $10,000 or more—increased during this period, while the number of smaller dairy farms dropped sharply.
>
> Some dairy farmers have gone into other farm enterprises or have found non-farm employment that offered them better economic opportunities.
>
> As demand for beef has continued to rise and demand for farmers has dropped off, some dairy farmers have been attracted to beef production, as it requires many of the same resources as dairy farming.

As one of my constituents said in a letter to me recently:

> The family dairy farmer, a proud, hard-working class of people will soon be history.

It is not just the individual who will be forced out of a vocation that our system of government should provide him the right to continue who suffers, but it is also the consumer who faces the alternatives of a short supply of essential

foodstuffs or a supply controlled and priced by large farm enterprises. The result of either alternative is drastically higher food prices for all of us.

It is this situation that I seek to avoid in sponsoring these two bills today.

DAIRY PARITY ACT

The major reason many dairy farmers are making the irreversible decision to give up the work they chose many years ago is the fact that farm produce continues to return less than full parity. This means the cost of the fertilizers, machinery, and other operating materials cost them proportionately more than they receive for their goods. The difference has to be made up some place—and for many it has come out of depreciation. Instead of using the depreciation allowances to replace equipment and farm buildings, the family farmer has had to live on that portion of the gross income he receives.

The result of this all-too-common practice was most evident in the National Farmers Organization milk strike. These farmers, who first sold off their milk cows to the slaughter houses and then dumped their milk, had come to a hard conclusion:

Either they obtained full parity now for their produce or they would eventually be forced out of business when their depreciated equipment and buildings gave out. It was not an easy choice for people who are devoted to dairy farming—as they must be to spend the time needed to keep a herd of dairy cattle producing efficiently.

It is in this context—a loss of family farmers from dairy farming and a trend toward concentration in the industry—that Congress should take a new look at the present dairy support program.

Recent decisions of the Department of Agriculture to continue price supports at $4 per hundredweight or near 90 percent of parity; to resell Government stocks only at 110 percent of cost; to invoke section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act against dairy imports; and to begin a new round of discussions on the national system of milk marketing orders, are all commendable efforts to improve the lot of the dairy farmer.

Under present law, however, the most these can achieve is a return for the dairy farmer of 90 percent of parity.

The Dairy Parity Act would enable the Secretary to assure a return to the dairy farmer of 100 percent of parity while maintaining consumer prices at competitive levels.

For the purposes of assuring the Nation of adequate milk supplies and improving farm income, the dairy parity program would:

First. Liberalize the criteria used by the Secretary of Agriculture in establishing the price support for milk and butterfat. Under present law, the Secretary is permitted only to take into consideration the price support level that is necessary to assure an adequate supply of milk. The dairy parity program would broaden the criteria to include the need of dairy farmers for a fair return on their labor and investment.

Second. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the price support for manufacturing milk for a full 100 percent of parity from the present legal limit of 90 percent of parity.

Third. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use payments to producers, in addition to purchases, to support the price of manufacturing milk at 100 percent of parity. The payments would be equal to the difference between the current market price and the price support. If the dairy parity program were currently in operation, the payment would be 57 cents, or the difference between the current U.S. market price of $4.07 and the full parity price for manufacturing milk of $4.64.

Fourth. Stimulate the domestic consumption of dairy products by enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to make a downward adjustment of the Commodity Credit Corporation purchase price for butter, cheese, and other dairy products. This in turn would result in lower retail prices for the consumer and increased domestic use of dairy products. The purchase price could be decreased to a level of 75 percent of parity.

Fifth. Allow the minimum prices for fluid—class I—milk marketed through Federal milk marketing orders to reflect the price or value of manufacturing milk plus any payment on manufacturing milk.

Sixth. Result in savings to consumers through lower retail prices and savings to the Federal Government of high storage, processing, and transportation costs on surplus dairy products more than offsetting the cost of the program. Otherwise surplus dairy products would be consumed through domestic channels because of lower retail prices rather than be accumulated by the Federal Government.

The result would be a stabilization of the dairy industry, continued production of dairy products by the Nation's high-efficiency, low-cost dairy farmers—so essential to a national reserve of dairy production to keep liquid milk prices at reasonable levels across the country—and a restored confidence among dairy farmers in the future of the industry.

YOUNG FARMERS INVESTMENT ACT

The second problem is the prohibitive costs of getting started in the dairy business. As the older farmer is retiring or taking a job in town, the young farmers are not coming into the business at a sufficient rate to continue needed levels of production for the future.

The cost of real estate and of equipping an efficient-sized farm is growing at a fantastic rate. The average value of farm real estate increased by over 50 percent from the 1957–59 average by March 1, 1966. The cost of equipping the farm is an even more dramatic example of why young people—otherwise attracted to farm life—are choosing other jobs, other ways of life.

The costs of getting into the business of farming and keeping up with its ever-changing demands must appear almost insurmountable to the young man just getting started in life. Even though he might be able to see his way clear to buy a small farm with some cattle and equipment, the monthly mortgage payment for principal, interest, and taxes on an economic-sized unit, of 30 to 50 head of milk cows, would leave him so little of his milk check that he could not provide adequately for his family, send his children to school, have an occasional vacation, or otherwise enjoy life as he could if he lived in town. As a result, he chooses the job in town, even though he is attracted to life on the farm, seeing things grow, and being his own boss.

The Young Farmers Investment Act would increase the authority and provide more funds for the Farmers Home Administration to make real estate and operating loans to young farmers.

Its principal provisions would require borrowers to repay 50 percent of the loan with interest over a period of time up to 40 years; make the remaining 50 percent of the loan due and payable in a lump sum or "balloon payment" at the end of the 40-year mortgage period; limit the interest rate to 4 percent, the approximate cost of the money to the Government; and authorize annual appropriations of $100 million for the program.

The need to keep young farmers coming into the business is clear. For some Americans, the efficiency of a farm or other business is equated with size. The bigger the operation, the more efficient it is, or so goes the bigness theory that is often misapplied to farm operations—particularly in the dairy industry. The opposite is true in the dairy industry in Wisconsin. The family-sized farm is clearly the most efficient and productive size unit.

Dairying, more than any other type of farm enterprise, involves the highly skilled and careful management of animal husbandry. Not everyone can be a successful dairy farmer because not every one is willing to commit himself and his family to manage or care for a dairy herd. The "contented cow" is an absolute necessity in a successful dairy operation.

Inexperienced help has been known to deviate from the regular milking procedures, skip feedings, and, in general, ruin a dairy herd's production in a few days' time. For this reason, any good dairy farmer is reluctant to have workers other than members of his immediate family care for his herd. For this reason, among many others, the farm family is uniquely suited to dairy farm management.

As further evidence of the nature of the job of herdsmanship, there is the record of improvement in production recorded by four separate groups of young farmers who are participating in adult farm classes at the Appleton-Kimberly-Kaukauna Vocation and Adult Schools in Wisconsin. The following graph demonstrates how individual family-size farms are able to improve their producing capabilities:

	1st year group 18	2d year group 18	3d year group 22	4th or more group 22
Gross farm income	$8,879	$13,360	$19,380	$22,748
Farm expenses	6,093	7,409	10,941	11,559
Net before depreciation	2,786	5,951	8,439	11,189
Net after depreciation	1,163	4,007	6,169	8,267
Increase in net worth	349	1,402	2,767	4,165
Butterfat per cow	359	394	418	458

The Young Farmers Investment Act would recognize the national importance of getting and keeping young farmers in the business.

The lower repayment schedule would enable the young farmer to build equity in his farm through his efforts and through appreciation in land values, while having enough left over out of his milk check to enjoy life and educate his children on a basis similar to that of his city brothers.

Furthermore, the high and rising cost of land—one of the reasons that young people cannot get started in farming now—guarantees the success of the "balloon payment" plan contained in the bill.

With increasing population, pressure on farmland will continue to force land values up and the lump sum farm payment due at the end of the 40 years will be easily refinanced commercially.

Many interests depend on the vitality of the family-farm sized unit. Small towns across America depend on its business for survival. A dispersal of producing capability assures an adequate supply of essential foodstuffs and avoids the disadvantages of economic concentration and control of food production.

These two bills would restore the discouraged and diminishing agriculture industry to a sound and stable element of the Nation's economy.

MUSCLE SHOALS BAND TO REPRESENT UNITED STATES AT EXPO 67

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pride I wish to announce that a high school band from my district has been invited to represent the United States at the opening of Expo 67 in Montreal.

We have always admired the excellence of our high school bands in the Eighth District of Alabama, and this singular recognition of the Muscle Shoals High School band is welcome acknowledgment of that quality by our neighbors to the north.

Other U.S. bands, of course, will perform later during the fair in Canada. However, for Muscle Shoals to be selected as the one band from the United States which, with three Canadian bands, will play for the opening ceremones next week is indeed a great honor.

The officials of Expo 67 went through a detailed evaluation process in selecting the Muscle Shoals High School band to play for the opening date. They evaluated tape recordings, the awards record, and other information in deciding to issue the invitation to the Muscle Shoals band.

I share the pride of the citizens of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in having this honor bestowed upon a very excellent band. The eager young musicians from Muscle Shoals High School will represent the United States at these ceremonies with dignity and an excellent performance. The officials of Expo 67 are to be commended for their recognition of these excellent young musicians.

CAN YOU BELIEVE YOUR EYES?

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on television the news happens in front of you. But is that what really happened? Is it a true picture or only a violent episode? Would it have happened at all if the TV cameras had not been there?

The highly respected American Heritage Publishing Co., publisher of Horizon, has recently printed an article about television coverage of the news which I believe deserves the widest possible distribution and discussion.

The author of the article, Henry Fairlie, is one of England's best-known political commentators. He is the man responsible for the term "Establishment," and he has covered upheavals from Cyprus to Mississippi for newspapers and television. He is now reporting the U.S. scene from Washington. In this article, he has raised some extremely penetrating questions which I hope will become the basis of an extensive dialog in the communications industry.

I am sure that all of us have a profound respect for the impressive contributions that network television news can make toward a better understanding of world and national events by the American viewing public. Mr. Fairlie's disquieting analysis of how this medium reports the news cries out for a reply by those responsible for network television news.

I am submitting this article in the RECORD today because I believe such a dialog will serve the best interest of all parties concerned. I personally find no criticism with the way news is handled by local television reporters who, in my judgment, are experts in the field of journalism and, more important, have a deep understanding of local problems in reporting the news. I am not certain the same can be said of network television news.

Mr. Speaker, this article deserves to be read and discussed by Americans from all walks of life. The article follows:

CAN YOU BELIEVE YOUR EYES?

(By Henry Fairlie)

None of us has ever seen Alexander the Great emerging from his tent. If there had been television in his day and we could look at the tape, would we know him any better, as we think we now know a John F. Kennedy or a Lyndon B. Johnson when we see them, on television news, emerging from a convention?

None of us has ever heard Julius Caesar speak. But if there had been radio in his day and we could listen to the recording, would we know him any better, as we think we know something important about Franklin D. Roosevelt from his fireside chats?

The answer is far from clear. Of all historical evidence, the public presence of voice or of physical appearance is the most revealing but can also be the most misleading. Yet the problem of historical evidence is raised every night on television news, when we are asked to accept what we see and hear as genuine. It is raised especially by the two most important television news programs in the United States: Huntley-Brinkley on NBC, and Walter Cronkite on CBS. Millions of people have to decide not so much whether they can believe what they are told but whether they can believe what they see flickering in front of them.

"The evidence of their own eyes": but that is precisely what is not available to them. What *is* available is the evidence, first, of the camera, making its own selection, dictating its own terms; and it is the evidence, then, of the small screen—still the best description of television—which in turn dictates to the camera. Can television, by its nature, ever tell the truth?

Amid all the pretentiousness of his theorizing, Marshall McLuhan is right to this extent: the medium is the message. Television does not merely create news. That is an old business, practiced for generations by newspapers. Television creates its own events, something even the most imaginative newspaper reporter cannot do. The newspaperman can only create words, and however powerful they may be, words do not *happen* over the breakfast table as television *happens* in a living room. Thomas W. Moore, ABC's president, came very near to the point when he said: "It is difficult to retain one's perspective when, without leaving the security of our living rooms, we become witness to such startling events as the assassination of an assassin, or a war in progress."

It is because television *happens* in this way that people begin to think that the small excerpts from life which they see on the screen in their living rooms are more "real" than the life which they experience around them. There is a vital margin of difference between saying, "Did you see the report in *The New York Times* of the massacres in the Congo?" and saying, "Did you see the massacres in the Congo on television last night?" The first remark implies only that one has seen a report (which may conflict with a report from another source). The second implies that one has seen the event itself. However carefully television is used, it cannot avoid this deception.

It is doubtful whether it is ever easy—sometimes whether it is ever possible—for a newspaper or television reporter to report an event. He can report incidents, and it is the nature of incidents that they can, and do, happen in isolation. But the true meaning of an event depends on all of its known and unknown causes, on all of the known and unknown incidents that contribute to it, and in the process, cease to be isolated, and on all of its known and unknown repercussions. The whole of an incident can easily be described, the whole of an event may escape even the historian.

If this is a difficulty that confronts the newspaper reporter from day to day, it is one that the television reporter can rarely overcome. For the newspaper reporter possesses a flexibility that the television reporter does not have. He has flexibility because he can move without the paraphernalia and encumbrance of a camera or a camera crew. He has flexibility because he can reach where the camera cannot reach: the camera can never go "off the record."

The newspaperman has flexibility, above all, because words are flexible and the length of a story is flexible: the one able to qualify, even in the shortest parenthetical expression; the other capable of imposing its own perspective. But however carefully chosen the words of a television reporter, they can never properly qualify a spectacular picture; and however discriminating the apportionment

of stories in a television program, they are in length too nearly the same.

Incidents are usually in the open; the whole of an event, often obscure and private. Not only is the core of television the public and the spectacular, but there is an important sense in which television has a vested interest in disaster. From the point of view of a good story, both newspapers and television prefer covering a major strike to negotiations which prevent a strike. But it is possible for the newspaper reporter to make negotiations almost as exciting a story as a strike itself; by word of mouth, he can collect a picture of the comings and goings which are the essence of negotiation and, by his words in print, vividly describe them. But what can television do with negotiations? It can only show pictures of people arriving at a building and people leaving it. However, colorful they may be—and the modern business executive is not normally colorful—this does not make exciting viewing.

Violence is the stuff of television, and the question of how to deal with it is the most important one confronting the medium.

To be sure, the same question confronts newspapers, but the impact of violence—whether a boxing match, a riot, or a massacre—is much greater in a moving picture than in a still picture or in descriptive prose. Violence is movement—the raising of an arm, the smashing of it on someone's head—and movement is what television cannot help emphasizing.

In covering violent situations, three distinct characteristics of television conspire to intensify both its special problems and the special temptations to which it is exposed. There is, first, the limitation of time. A lead news story in a paper such as *The New York Times* may take twenty minutes to read; in a popular newspaper or a tabloid, as many as ten. There simply is not this time available in television news. In the reporting of all news, this means concentration to the point of distortion. In the reporting of violence, it means concentration on the violent incident to the exclusion of the whole event.

An outstanding example of such distortion was the police attack on civil rights marchers at the Selma, Alabama, bridge in March, 1965. I was not present myself. But I do not know one reporter who was present, and whose opinion I trust, who does not point out that there was first a prolonged period during which police and demonstrators faced each other, without violence, in an atmosphere of unbearable tension, and who does not agree that the tension had to break in the form of police action.

Television news—except in special features and documentaries—did not, and could not, show this preliminary encounter. Three minutes of film is an extended sequence in a news program, and the time is best filled with action, not inaction. On the other hand, a single phrase in a newspaper story, placed correctly, where it carries weight, can put even an extended description of violence in perspective.

The point of such perspective is not to excuse any eventual police brutality, but to explain it. Without this explanation, whether implicit or explicit, one begins to think that brutality is automatic, that the police will always behave in such a manner; demonstrators begin to think that they can, and should, goad the police; and the police begin to think that, since restraint is so frail anyhow, they may as well give way to exasperation from the start.

There is, secondly, television's tendency to produce self-generating news. The problem arose most notably during the disturbances in Watts; but it has arisen, again and again, whenever there have been similar disturbances in other cities. However spontaneous the original outbreak of violence, an external provocation is added once it has occurred. That provocation is the presence of television cameras in the middle of the trouble spots.

This is especially true on the night after the original outbreak. Then, as dusk gathers, television cameramen and reporters move into the streets looking—literally looking—for trouble, and the crowds begin to play up to them. Their presence is very different from the presence of newspaper reporters, who either roam around, hardly distinguishable, or lounge in bars until they hear that action has broken out somewhere down the block. Television, merely by its presence, helps to create incidents and then itself remains part of the happening. There is no doubt that this participation occurred after the first night in Watts, and that it occurred again last summer in Chicago.

But in order to create on the screen the impression of continuing disturbance, of continuing riots, television needs only one incident. One spectacular incident of violence can occupy a two-minute sequence in a news program just as impressively as a series of incidents. Much of the Watts film is a classic example of this: showing that it needs only one defiant boy and only one hot-headed policeman to suggest that a neighborhood is aflame.

In this connection it seems worth pointing out that a newspaper reporter's dishonesty—or imagination—can be a great deal less dangerous and provocative than a television reporter's. The newspaper reporter, after all, need only create—or exaggerate—a story in his own mind. But the television reporter must create—or exaggerate—it in actuality: he must make it a happening.

Finally, in this matter of violence, there is the size of the screen: the limitations which it imposes, the temptations it offers. At the end of last summer, television news showed some alarming pictures of white men and women in the Chicago suburb of Cicero screaming abuse at some Negro marchers. Their hating faces—a dozen of them, perhaps—filled the screen. They looked as if they were a representative example of a much larger crowd. But anyone who was there knows that these particular whites were only a small part of the crowds in the streets; and that the crowds themselves were only a small part of the total white population of Cicero. To this vital extent, television that night distorted badly.

What all this amounts to is not only that people sitting in their homes begin to think that all police are brutal, that all demonstrators are violent, that all disturbances are riots, that all crowds are aggressive; the fact that they usually go through each day without either meeting or themselves displaying violence becomes less real to them than the violence on the small screen.

Anyone who has appeared regularly on television knows that complete strangers think they have actually met him. They smile or nod at him in the street or across bars; they approach him and shake his hand; they even ask him to drop in when next he is around their way, as if they really believe that he has been in their homes. It is this imaginary "real" presence of television in people's living rooms which is the background to the whole problem. Surely much of the feeling of living in a condition of perpetual crisis, and the agitation arising from it, comes from a sense of being a witness to a world which is more actual than the routine world in which one lives.

Television can create, not only events out of incidents, but movements and people. The television news coverage of the Meredith march across Mississippi, during the couple of days when I accompanied it myself, constantly appalled me. It was near the beginning of the march, when it had barely gotten organized, and when the numbers were few and the individuals composing the numbers were anything but impressive.

All the familiar hazards of television reporting were displayed. A straggling column—it was at the time little more—could be made on the small screen to look like an army. When the cameras were rolling, the marchers pulled themselves together and played the role expected of them. The several civil rights leaders strode in line abreast, at the head of their enthusiastic followers.

The real story of the Meredith march was not this unified demonstration at all, but the fact that it produced the deeply significant clash between different factions of the civil rights movement over "black power." Newspapers felt their way to this story and were, by the end, reporting it fully. It was a story which, for the most part, was taking place in private meetings where the cameras could not reach. But then when television at last caught on to the fact of "black power," it inevitably exaggerated and distorted it. Film is expensive. Getting film ready for a news program is a hurried job. The result is that in reporting any speech the television reporter and cameraman make an automatic, almost involuntary, selection. They wait for the mention of a phrase like "black power," and on go the lights and the film rolls.

But, given the length of the usual sequence in a news program, that is all. The impact is far greater than that of any selection made by newspapers. By constant reiteration on the small screen day after day, the slogan of "black power" was elevated into a movement. It was suddenly there. It had suddenly happened. "Black power" switched the cameras on, and in turn the cameras switched the movement on. It was a classic case of self-generating news.

Stokely Carmichael, of the Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee, could not have emerged so rapidly as a national figure without television. (SNCC is a master at using television.) But he is not the only example of television's ability to create—or destroy—people. No one, I think, questions that Governor Ronald Reagan is the creature of the television cameras, just as previously Actor Ronald Reagan was the creature of the movie cameras. John Morgan, one of the British Broadcasting Corporation's most experienced television reporters, returned from the California gubernatorial campaign last fall, amazed at Reagan's professionalism in the television studio, and the use that he made of it to dictate camera angles and even the moments for close-ups.

Much of the poor impression that President Johnson has often made is the direct result of his comparatively poor television "image." The close-up, especially, can distort in the crudest way and make what is simply unprepossessing actually repellent. In fact, in considering the impact of the close-up, one can notice the vital difference between television and the movies; between what is legitimate in the cinema and illegitimate in a living room.

Movies are intended to be, and are taken to be, larger than life. Sitting in the theatre, one does not imagine that what one is seeing is real. The close-up in the movies, therefore, is a legitimate *and understood* distortion. But a distortion it is. We never do see anyone in real life as close in as the camera can go, except in one position and in one activity; when making love. There is no reason why President Johnson, or any other public figure, should have to pass this private test in public. Moreover, not only does the close-up bring one ridiculously close to a face, it shows it in isolation. It removes the general bearing; it removes the whole man.

Perhaps the most striking demonstration of the power of television to create personalities is one that most people will think also demonstrates its power for good. For a comparatively short time three men seemed to bestride the world: John F. Kennedy, Pope John XXIII, and Nikita Khrushchev. Their impact, all over the world, was quite out of

proportion to the length of time any of them held office. In a few years they had made as great an impression as Queen Victoria had in sixty years. This was the work of television.

Television news is new, and we have not yet got the measure of it. Its hazards are numerous: some of them are inherent in the nature of the medium, and are likely to be permanent. Others are more technical and, with technical advances, may be removed.

Camera crews are costly, and costly to move about; this automatically imposes a preselection of news far more rigorous than it is in a newspaper. Film costs impose a second automatic selection. Time on the screen is expensive, and this imposes a final selection. Again and again, when I have been making news films with a camera crew, I have wanted to utter over the pictures, "It was not like this at all."

However paradoxical it may seem, the only immediate answer to most of the problems of television news lies not in pictures but in words. Given the powerful impact of the pictures, the words covering them must provide the corrective. Most television reporting just describes the pictures, and by doing so, reinforces them. But the object of words in television news should be to distract from the pictures, to say: "It was not quite so. This was not the whole story." Pictures simplify; the object of words should be to supply qualification and complication. Pictures involve; the object of words should be to detach the viewer, to remind him that he is not seeing an event, only an impression of one.

The manner of delivery—especially of the "anchor" men in the studio—is as important as the substance of the words themselves. There is something very professional and very engaging about the television manners of Chet Huntley and David Brinkley and Walter Cronkite. All of them, in dissimilar ways, cultivate a deadpan approach. In Huntley, it is made to suggest a judicial impartiality; in Brinkley, an ironical detachment; in Cronkite, an unfailing common sense. Each of them by his manner reinforces the impact of the pictures over which he is speaking, suggesting that they can be taken at their face value.

Only now and then, when Brinkley's irony is allowed to break loose into that overnourished flicker of a smile, is the value of the pictures ever questioned. The vital role of the television reporter or commentator is to make watching as difficult as reading, to invite the viewer to make comparisons and judgments from his own experience so that he never reacts by assuming that he is seeing actual life.

That television news can do some things remarkably well, especially in full-length features and documentaries, that those involved in making television programs are conscientious and skillful, does not touch the main problem. Television news holds a mirror up to the world in a way that newspapers never can; and the world is beginning to believe that it can recognize itself in it. Life is not made up of dramatic incidents—not even the life of a nation. It is made up of slowly evolving events and processes, which newspapers, by a score of different forms of emphasis, can reasonably attempt to explore from day to day.

But television news jerks from incident to incident. For the real world of patient and familiar arrangements, it substitutes an unreal world of constant activity, and the effect is already apparent in the way in which the world behaves. It is almost impossible these days, to consider any problem or any event except as a crisis; and, by this very way of looking at it, it in fact becomes a crisis.

Television, by its emphasis on movement and activity, by its appetite for incident, has become by far the most potent instrument in creating this over-excited atmosphere, this barely recognizable world. The medium, to this very important extent, has become the message; and the message is perpetual stimulation, perpetual agitation, perpetual change. The world it creates is a world which is never still.

Many of our unnecessary anxieties about the way in which we live, about the fearful things that may happen to us, might be allayed if television news began, now and then, to say: "It has been a dull day. But we have collected some rather interesting pictures for you, of no particular significance." Television news has a deep responsibility to try to be dull, from time to time, and let the world go to sleep.

NATIONAL CAPITAL CHAPTER OF AIR FORCE SERGEANTS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night I was privileged to attend the officer installation of the National Capital chapter of the Air Force Sergeants Association at Bolling Air Force Base. I attended at the invitation of M. Sgt. Estel E. Lipham, the new chapter president, who happens to be from Lineville, Ala., which is my district.

The guest speaker at the installation banquet was my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Chairman MENDEL RIVERS, of the Armed Services Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Chairman RIVERS has lately been the favorite target of newspaper columnists Jack Anderson and Drew Pearson. I did not rise here today to defend the chairman against Anderson and Pearson, because he can take care of himself in that respect.

But I do want to report to you that if there was a popularity contest between these columnists and the chairman with the members of our armed services voting, there would really be no contest. They made Chairman RIVERS an honorary lifetime member of the Air Force Sergeants Association. The sergeants and their wives interrupted his address time and time again with applause. And then the group's national president invited the chairman to address the association's national convention later this year.

It is quite plain to me why the men and women of every rank in our services like, admire, and respect the chairman. He is their representative here in the Congress. He has their interests at heart. It is Chairman MENDEL RIVERS who wants our service men and women to have a standard of living comparable to those of us in civilian life, and it is Chairman RIVERS who wants our fighting men to have the very best facilities and equipment possible so that they can get the job in Vietnam done.

Contrast this, Mr. Speaker, with a question posed by a veteran sergeant who heard the chairman last Thursday night. "What," he asked, "has Drew Pearson done for us lately?"

Chairman RIVERS' speech, I think, outlines some of the problems that face the enlisted men of our services, and some of the possible solutions. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include his entire speech in the RECORD:

President Lipham, Other Officers of the National Chapter, Members of the Air Force Sergeants Association, and ladies:

I am very happy that you asked me to join you tonight, and I am very happy that I have been able to manage my time so I can be here. I think you can appreciate that as Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, I am a very busy man. I get so busy that sometimes I turn a corner in the Rayburn Building and meet myself coming the other way.

I told the Secretary of the Air Force in a hearing just the other day that I was coming here and that this marks the first time I have accepted an invitation to speak to an Air Force enlisted group since I have been chairman. I also told him he might not like what I am going to say—and he might not. But I am going to say it anyhow. I am happy that the first occasion is before a group such as this which represents the *career* enlisted man—a group that is interesting in *serving* the enlisted man, not in *selling* to him.

There are all sorts of groups and individuals who work overtime trying to sell things to the enlisted man. I am interested only in those who work to serve him. I know that yours is still a young organization and I am sure that you must still be experiencing some growing pains. But as long as you remain an organization of professional airmen, run by career non-commissioned officers and working for the welfare and benefits of all your members equally, you can make a worthwhile contribution to the Air Force—and to our national defense. I know that is your purpose and I wish you every success. I can tell you that my Committee will always be interested in listening to your ideas. My Committee is ready to listen to any organization that is trying to make life a little better for military men and their families.

Congress has received many worthwhile suggestions on legislation from your counterpart, the Navy's Fleet Reserve Association.

And I assure you that my door is always open to the representatives of the Air Force Sergeants Association.

I have said a number of times in the past and I intend to continue saying it in the future—I shall continue saying it until it is a reality—the members of the Armed Services are entitled to a standard of living as good as the standard of living they are defending. In this connection, I would like to make a prediction.

I predict that you will get a pay raise this year.

In the past when I made predictions like that, some people laughed. They are not laughing much any more. I have been doing pretty well with my predictions.

I introduced this year's pay bill, H.R. 8197, on April 6th. It provides an average pay increase of 5.6%. I told the Secretary of the Air Force the other day that it would pass so fast it would make his head swim.

To give you a little idea of what the bill does:

For a Master Sergeant, E–7, with 16 years service, it will mean an additional $24 per month.

For a Technical Sergeant, E–6, with 12 years service, it will mean an additional $20 per month.

For a Staff Sergeant, E–5, with 6 years service, it will mean an additional $16 per month.

The bill also provides basic allowance for quarters and dislocation allowance to bachelors on permanent change of station. I am pleased with this aspect of the bill. I have often felt that we have neglected those servicemen who have chosen not to contribute to the population explosion.

The bill will mean a basic allowance for

quarters to E–4s (with 4 years service) and above for the period when in a travel or leave status between permanent duty stations. It will also permit payment of a dislocation allowance to a serviceman without dependents when he is transferred to a permanent station where he is not assigned to government quarters. Present law pays the dislocation allowance only for a member whose dependents make an authorized move. But a man without dependents incurs the same general type of additional expenses when he is not furnished government quarters at a new duty station. The bill will assure that he is treated fairly along with married personnel.

There is one other provision in the pay bill which is especially gratifying for me. As you know, all of the services now have established the position of Senior Non-Commissioned Officer. The Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Airey, was only recently appointed. At my suggestion, the military services are temporarily paying each of these senior men the top proficiency pay of $150 a month. My new pay bill will provide a special rate of basic pay for the Senior Non-Commissioned Officer position of $844.20 per month. This is $150 a month more than the highest enlisted basic pay otherwise provided in the new pay bill.

Having a special rate of pay set permanently in law is further evidence that the Congress recognizes the great importance of this very special individual and through him the great contribution that non-commissioned officers make to the success of our Armed Services.

Now I brought up a few other matters with the Secretary of the Air Force the other day concerning this very special man, the Chief Master Sergeant in the Air Force. And following some correspondence and some questioning of Secretary Brown, I can tell you this. In June, when the Chief Master Sergeant's family arrives, they will have waiting for them here at Bolling the best set of enlisted quarters available. He will have adequate transportation available to him for such travel as he is required to make. He will have adequate office space, stenographers, and an enlisted administrative assistant at the grade of E–7 on his personal staff. And we have gotten it established with Secretary Brown that he will have no problems getting reimbursed for his expenses including entertainment expenses. So he won't have to pinch pennies when he is representing the Non-Commissioned Officers Corps.

Now we have taken care of the Number One Non-Commissioned Officer in the Air Force very well. But that leaves us quite a few others. That brings me to something else that I want to talk about—in fact the thing that I particularly want to talk about tonight.

Because we have a problem in the Air Force.

And it is a very serious problem. It is much more serious in the Air Force than in the other services.

And it can be summed up with one word. And I am sure you all know what that word is: promotions!

I do not know what the answer to the Air Force enlisted promotion problem is but I am here to tell you I have got the questions. And I am here to tell you I am not going to stop asking until we get the problem solved.

In some grades in the Air Force, it takes almost twice as long to be promoted as it does in the Army, or the Navy, or the Marine Corps. I do not understand why this should be so. Are the men in the Army and the Navy twice as smart as the Air Force?

We know that isn't so. Anybody who believes that can turn in his membership card.

Secretary Brown said he thought the Air Force gets the cream of the crop. He said he thought the Air Force enlisted people are better educated, more intelligent, and more ambitious on the average than those of the other services.

Of course, we all tend to favor our own constituencies.

But the Air Force does not need a high percentage of men capable of advanced technical training. And this being true it makes even less sense to have them wait twice as long for promotion.

The average E–4 in the Air Force has 7.8 years of service at the time of promotion to E–5. I am not talking about exceptional cases now. I am talking about the average. By contrast, the average E–4 in the Navy has only 4.6 years at the point of promotion to E–5 and in the Army, the average is only 3.6 years. At the time of promotion to E–6, the average E–5 in the Air Force has more than 12 years service. In the other services the average is around 9 years.

Again, I emphasize that this is only the average.

I get letters daily from members with 10, 12, and 14 years in grade as E–4 and E–5 who have outstanding records but cannot get promoted. I do not get letters like that from the Navy.

I have been especially impressed with the maturity and thoughtfulness of the men who write to me. These are not the goof-offs, the dodo-heads. They are men with families, men who are serious about their careers, who have never had disciplinary problems. They are men who earn efficiency ratings of excellent and outstanding and who earn medals and commendations for their performance. They are men who are proud—proud of their uniform and proud of their service.

Not long ago, I received a letter from an Air Force Staff Sergeant who had 10 years in grade. He was shot down over North Vietnam. He evaded capture for seven hours though wounded and managed to signal to a rescue helicopter in the night with his cigarette lighter. He recovered from his wounds and returned to duty flying additional rescue missions over North Vietnam. He received the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, the Air Force Commendation Medal, and the Air Medal, and his unit received the Presidential Unit Citation. He returned to the United States and in last December's promotion cycle, he was turned down for promotion to an E–6.

When a man with a record like that after 10 years in grade does not get promoted, I think it is time to ask whether there is not something fundamentally wrong with the system.

I have been told that the wait for promotion is longer in the Air Force because the retention in the Air Force is better; but that does not satisfy me.

I am aware, of course, that a higher retention rate makes it more difficult to create promotion vacancies but I will not accept the answer that this reason alone justifies the existence of the problem.

If we say the service that achieves a higher retention rate must have a much lower promotion rate, that is a little like putting a penalty on esprit de corps.

I have also been told that the problem was created in part by the refusal of the Department of Defense to give the Air Force all the non-commissioned officer billets it requires. My Committee is going to look into that allegation and if it is true, we will do something about it. But I have also been told that the Air Force has a higher percentage of its men in the upper enlisted grades than the other services. We, in the Congress, recognize, of course, that the needs of the services differ and the percentage of men in different non-commissioned officer grades will naturally vary, but I want to know why the service which has the highest percentage of non-commissioned officers also has the most serious promotion problem.

I want it clearly understood that I am concerned not just with the wait for promotions, but with the equity with which those promotions are distributed. And I don't wish to imply that I am concerned only about the Air Force. While the problem is more severe in the Air Force there are promotion—and other enlisted problems—in the other services. And we are going to look into those too.

For officers, most of their promotion procedure is written into law and those laws guarantee an officer fair consideration with his contemporaries at set points in his career regardless of where he is stationed. For enlisted men almost all of the promotion procedures are handled by regulations. And promotions seem to vary a great deal from location to location and from command to command.

The processes of the Air Force promotion system are not visible. A man does not know how he was rated by the promotion board. He is not told of his relative standing. He has no examination results with which he can make a comparison. I think we have to do a better job of explaining the system to the men. If the system needs fundamental changes, I think we have to have the courage to change it. But, in any case, I think it is important to Air Force morale to make the system better understood and to reduce its margin for error.

Finally, even beyond the question of promotions themselves, I am concerned about the effect on Air Force personnel and their families if the system is not faithful to its own principles. Our airmen have been told throughout their careers that if they work hard, show loyalty, and dedication and establish good records, they will be rewarded. They have been told that we have a rating system which determines how well they are performing and that those who achieve outstanding ratings will be rewarded with more responsibility and higher pay. They have been told that the rating system means something.

I think we do something terrible to a man's spirit when he achieves success according to the standards of the system but then does not get his reward. We damage not only his faith in the promotion system but his faith in the Air Force and even, to an extent, his faith in himself. I have received letters from long term, intelligent, non-commissioned officers who simply could not believe their promotion folder had ever been considered by a promotion board. Most of them do not ask special intercession in their behalf, they merely ask why. What they want is not influence but understanding. Why did they not get promoted? If a man has excellent or outstanding ratings and commendation medals and letters of praise from his commanders and still does not get promoted, he begins to wonder whether the outstanding ratings and the medals and the praises really mean anything.

I think they really do mean something and I think where their faith has been damaged, it must be made whole again. I think we must have the courage to use our rating systems honestly or to junk them and find something else. I do not think we can afford to run a promotion system in such a way that it damages a man in his dignity or his pride.

Nobody has a right to be promoted but he does have a right to equal consideration with his fellow airmen. He has a right to be told honestly if he is not capable of promotion. He has a right to understand the system he lives by.

I told you in the beginning that I did not have the answers but only the questions. I hope your Association will help us find the answers because we need all the help we can get. I told the Secretary of the Air Force that he ought to appoint a task force to study this problem and if necessary I just might create a task force on my own.

All I can promise you is that we won't stop asking questions until we find satisfactory answers.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN LAUDS CREDIT UNIONS FOR THEIR EXCELLENT RECORD DURING TIGHT-MONEY CRISIS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, addressed the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League, in York, Pa. In his remarks, Chairman PATMAN pointed out that credit unions have weathered the tight-money crisis in our Nation better than any other class of financial institutions.

Not only did credit unions survive the crisis, but they experienced a period of tremendous growth. Chairman PATMAN pointed out in his speech:

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions reports an increase of more than 500 credit unions during the year ending February, 1967, and during the same period more than 1.5 million new credit union members were added. These are impressive totals and clearly show the faith that the American people place in credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman PATMAN's speech is a fitting tribute to the more than 22,000 credit unions in this country. I am enclosing a copy of Chairman PATMAN's speech in my remarks so that Members of this body can become fully aware of the outstanding work that credit unions perform for our Nation.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CREDIT UNION LEAGUE, YORK, PA., APRIL 15, 1967

President McCullough, Officers of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League, Mr. Judge, and League members. After Congressman Annunzio addressed your annual meeting last year in Philadelphia, he spoke so highly of the wonderful reception that he received that I was most appreciative when I received the invitation to address you this year. I am only sorry that I can't spend more time with you because I enjoy so much talking to credit union people. However, due to the press of business in Washington, my stay in your lovely and historic town is all too short.

I would like to take a short period this morning to discuss the state of the art of credit unions and have a few moments to look to the future of the credit union movement.

The United States is slowly coming out of one of the worst tight-money periods in recent history. There was a time when stories concerning monetary matters were buried on the financial pages of our daily newspapers. But lately, the American public has become far more interested in what happens to its dollar and the current tight-money period has whetted the public's appetite for more detailed financial news. Read almost any newspaper in the country for one week and at least once during that 7-day period there will be a story on the front page concerning monetary matters. Unfortunately, most of the stories that have appeared in the past year tell of tight money, high interest rates, and a critical shortage of mortgage funds.

We read of banks and other lending institutions increasing their interest rates to borrowers and severely limiting the amount of funds available for borrowing. During 1966, mortgage credit was at its lowest since the depression years of the 1930s. Residential mortgage loans dropped about $18 billion in 1966 over the previous year and housing starts, which already were running at a rate below the needs of our nation, fell off 20 percent from 1965.

During this period, the commercial banking and the savings and loan industry came to Congress for help in solving the money shortage problem. Other mortgage lenders, fearful that they might be forced out of business, sought assistance from various legislative bodies.

A number of State legislatures were asked to raise the State usury rates so that lenders could extract more interest from borrowers. Governors were requested to call emergency sessions of their State legislatures in order to raise usury rate limitations.

In short, most every financial institution in this country was asking for outside assistance in solving its problems. However, there was one financial institution which, I am happy and proud to say, did not ask for outside assistance and has weathered the financial storm in the finest of styles. I, of course, refer to the credit unions in this nation, which once again demonstrated that they play a major role in the stabilization of our economy.

The Federal Reserve Board, which has never been known for its pro credit union philosophy, had this to say of the role of the nation's credit unions during the tight-money crisis:

"Credit unions continued to improve their position in 1966. They were the only holder group that increased its penetration in every major type of installment credit. Credit unions apparently were not so much affected as other lenders last year by the problem of limited funds . . ."

This quote is not from one of your own publications, whose disinterested view might be questioned, but is from the March 1967 *Federal Reserve Bulletin*. It is the highest type of praise that can be paid to credit unions.

Let no one question the strength, the importance, or the safeness of credit unions, for in the most critical financial period of our nation in the past 30 years, credit unions alone have shown that they can not only withstand such experiences, but actually grow during these adverse times.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions reports an increase of more than 500 credit unions during the year ending February 1967, and during the same period, more than 1.5 million new credit union members were added. These are impressive totals and clearly show the faith that the American people place in credit unions.

Because credit unions have shown that they can prosper during extremely critical periods, it is time that we look to expanding the area of credit union activity. Why should such a responsible group of fianancial institutions be restricted to a narrow channel of opportunities? To this end, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 6156—which would permit Federal credit unions to make long-term loans secured by real estate. The impetus for this legislation was supplied by the Pennsylvania Credit Union League—and I salute you for your foresightedness and your willingness to challenge the future.

There may be a reason in law, but certainly not in logic, why Federal credit unions should not be allowed to make real estate loans. Actually, the law does not preclude real estate loans; but because the Federal Credit Union Act limits loan maturities to five years, it would be impractical to attempt to make a real estate loan on such a short-term basis. H.R. 6156 would allow credit unions to invest up to 25 percent of their assets in real estate loans with maturities of not more than 30 years, in amounts not greater than 80 percent of the appraised value of the real estate.

This legislation was brought about because many credit union members seeking mortgage funds found them unavailable from banks, savings and loans, and other mortgage lenders during the recent tight-money period. At the same time, the credit unions to which these individuals belonged had excess funds which could have been made available in the form of mortgage money had there been a law allowing such a transaction.

Not only would passage of the real estate legislation assist credit union members in obtaining mortgage loans, but it would be a shot in the arm for the sagging building industry. It would provide an instant source of mortgage credit that overnight could start the homebuilding industry back on the road to recovery.

I do not want to suggest that every credit union would immediately go into the mortgage lending business, nor perhaps would some credit unions—because of their size—ever make mortgage loans. But there are a number of credit unions which are in a position—because of surplus funds—to make a significant contribution to the mortgage market. At the end of 1965, there were more than 1,200 credit unions with assets of from $1-to-$2 million; there were 767 credit unions with assets from $2-to-$5 million; and there were nearly 300 credit unions with assets of more than $5 million. The 1966 figures are not yet available, but I am told that there will be an increase in each of the three categories I have listed. Thus, we have more than 2,100 credit unions which, based on their size, could enter the mortgage market. I am certain even those who oppose allowing credit unions to enter the mortgage field would agree that the addition of 2,100 new mortgage outlets would highly stimulate our economy in general, and our building industry in particular. Of course there may be hundreds of other credit unions with assets of less than $1 million that might also go into the mortgage market.

Mortgage lending is a sound business, and even during our most critical tight-money period, less than 5 out of every 1,000 mortgage nonfarm structures were foreclosed, and foreclosure does not mean that the loan was a total loss. If Federal credit unions were allowed to enter the mortgage field, I do not feel that their foreclosure rate would even approach the national average, because of the excellent repayment records that credit union members in general possess.

There are a number of other reasons why Federal credit unions should be allowed to go into the real estate mortgage market. If any of you have purchased a new home recently, I am certain you have run into a little item in the financing called "points." This is money which is paid to the lender at the time the loan is granted, in addition to the interest rate. Actually, points are nothing more than a percentage of the loan. For example, if a $20,000 loan were obtained and the borrower were required to pay 5 points, he would have to pay $400 for the privilege of obtaining the loan, plus the interest rate. Points are considered nothing more than a bribe or under-the-table money. It is a way that lenders get around the usury laws. Although points are always objectionable, they are the most objectionable in periods of tight money since the borrower must pay the maximum legal interest rate, plus points, in order to obtain a loan.

If Federal credit unions were allowed to invest in real estate mortgages, they could not charge points because the Federal Credit Union Act prohibits the payment of any fees above the maximum interest rate specified. No matter how scarce money became, credit unions would not be allowed to charge points. Even if this restriction were not in the law, I know that credit unions would not seek to

extract extra money from the borrower. Many credit unions charge far below the maximum rate allowed by law, even during money-shortage periods, and credit unions also have done a remarkable job in rebating interest to borrowers at the end of the year if the financial condition of the credit union can justify this practice.

I would like to see more credit unions begin the interest rebate practice. It is excellent public relations, and you would be surprised at the selling job it can do on members for repeat loans. The savers in the credit union might be unhappy with an interest rebate program, but you must remember that credit unions are not set up to favor one category of credit union members over another. An attractive saving rate, plus the interest rebate, is not hard to effect; and although there may be some initial mutterings by your savers, a large majority of your members will applaud such an arrangement.

Real estate lenders have long held an unfair advantage over those who do not engage in real estate lending, and it is an advantage that works against the best interest of the borrower.

I am certain that most of you are aware of the boondoggle surrounding the Christmas Club operations of commercial banks. These are promotions that urge bank customers to save their funds for Christmas expenditures with the bank, although the bank in a large majority of cases does not pay interest on these funds. It is a multi-billion-dollar-a-year free bonanza for the banks, but it is only a drop in the bucket compared to another windfall received by banks and other mortgage lenders.

When you obtain a home loan from a mortgage lender, the lending contract normally requires that your monthly payment include not only a principal and interest payment, but also a prorated share of the annual taxes and insurance premium on your house. Thus a mortgage payment of $150 might be broken down in this manner: $75 for principal, $40 for interest, $20 for taxes, and $15 for insurance. The tax and insurance escrow is withheld so that there is always money available to pay for these items at the end of the year. However, these items are paid only once a year, which means that the lender has the use of this money for the entire year but does not pay the borrower one penny for the free use of these funds.

Not all mortgage lenders require these escrows, although a vast majority demand that both items be escrowed and just about every lender requires a tax escrow. I do not dispute the business soundness of the escrow, but these lenders should be required to pay the borrower interest on this money or allow the escrow to be held in a nonwithdrawal, interest-paying savings account which would be tapped once each year by the lender to pay the taxes and insurance.

When you stop to think of the billions of home mortgages outstanding in this country, the amount of free funds available to mortgage lenders because of escrows staggers the imagination.

If credit unions are granted real estate lending authority, I would hope that they would voluntarily pay interest on the escrow amounts so as to set a precedent for other mortgage lenders.

If credit unions are sincerely interested in the real estate lending proposal and the other portions of their 1967 legislative package, they will face a knock-down, drag-out fight with commercial bankers. Banks want to keep credit unions in the financial basement and will use every method and tactic to accomplish this end. A typical example of the tactics bankers use in their battle against credit unions was a highly distorted article appearing in a recent issue of Nation's Business, entitled "Washington Hides Truth-in-Lending." The article is dedicated to the sole proposition of criticizing credit unions in general, and antipoverty credit unions in particular.

The very fact that this article appeared in the publication *Nation's Business* is enough to raise questions concerning its credibility. *Nation's Business* is, of course, the paid voice of the United States Chamber of Commerce, an organization which has never been known to advocate the causes of anyone except big banks and big business.

It must be remembered that one of the recent Presidents of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, who is Chairman of the Board and President of the Bank of Delaware. It was Neilan who traveled around the country making speeches against payments to veterans for such items as education and home mortgages, while at the same time he accepted subsidy payments for the operation of his farm in Wilmington. And it is interesting to note that Mr. Neilan's bank has more than $22 million of Government funds on deposit in his bank, for which the bank pays not a penny in interest. **Mr. Neilan is not opposed** to subsidies, he is only opposed to subsidies which he does not receive. I only make these points to indicate that articles appearing in U.S. Chamber of Commerce publications carry a highly distorted viewpoint. For instance, in the article on credit unions, *Nation's Business* reports that many low-income-area credit unions never have paid a dividend. The article states, "In fact, in 1965, about 70 percent of all Federal credit unions with assets of less than $10,000 paid no dividend."

On the face of it, this is a damaging statement. But when the truth is known, the statement is as hollow as an empty rainbarrel. What the article does not point out is that a large majority of credit unions operating in 1965 with assets of less than $10,000 were newly formed credit unions. In fact, more than half of the credit unions in this category opened their doors during that year. It is not unusual for a credit union in its early formative years not to pay a dividend. In addition, it must be remembered that most credit union members do no join for speculative or profit-making reasons. The article should also mention the number of credit unions that did not pay dividends in their first years, but at the same time did not lose members, but, in fact, gained new members. How many banks would continue to attract customers to their savings department if they did not pay interest? You would see a mass exodus from banks in this category, yet, there was no such pulling-out on the part of credit union members.

This twisting of figures and words by *Nation's Business* reminds me of the story of the great auto race between a Russian and American car. Both countries were firmly convinced that their car was the fastest in the world. So a race was arranged to prove which car was the faster. When the race was run, the American car easily defeated the Russian car. The next day the headline in the Russian newspaper read: "Russians finish second in great auto race, Americans next to last."

Banks do not like credit unions because they feel you are invading their territory. I would argue that it is banks that are invading your territory. For years banks were not interested in the small saver or the small borrower. It was only after credit unions had clearly shown that the small borrower and saver were good business risks that the banks entered the field of consumer banking. However, there is another reason—perhaps more important—why banks want to put credit unions out of business. One of the biggest customers of commercial banking—perhaps the biggest—is the loan and finance company industry. While there are no accurate figures available on the amount of funds which loan and finance companies obtain from commercial banks each year, it has been estimated by some, however, that these companies obtain 70 to 80 percent of their short-term funds from commercial banks. The banks do not ask these loan companies what they do with their money or what rates of interest they charge borrowers or question any of the practices of these companies. The banks ask only one question: Will we be paid on time?

I am certain that many of you are aware of the investigation of Federal Services Finance Corporation conducted in 1965 by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. This was a loan company specializing in servicemen's transactions, which was charging our men in uniform loan rates as high as 60 and 70 percent a year. We also found that this company was taking advantage of the servicemen in a hundred other ways. But what was really shocking was the fact that in 1965 alone, a group of commercial banks across the country extended lines of credit to Federal Services of nearly $32 million. One of the banks making funds available to Federal Services was Puget Sound National Bank of Tacoma, Washington. The Chairman of the Board of that bank was one Reno Odlin, at the time, President of the American Bankers Association. Odlin, like Ed Neilan, felt that this country was perhaps giving our veterans too much assistance. Mr. Odlin chose a strange way to voice his feelings. His bank lent a half million dollars to Federal Service, a company dedicated to the sole proposition of getting as much of the serviceman's pay check as possible.

You can see that banks cannot be your friends and also friends of the small loan industry. You can also see on whose side they would be in a toe-to-toe match. And, unfortunately, it would not be with credit unions.

For years, credit unions have fought for truth-in-lending legislation. For the same number of years, banks and small loan companies have fought against such legislation. The type of truth-in-lending legislation which has been proposed in the past merely requires full disclosure of credit transactions. In short, truth-in-lending requires that the lender tell the truth. This idea is strangely repugnant to the banking industry. They argue that they cannot comply with the provisions of the legislation because of technical difficulties. But, in fact, the bankers are actually saying we cannot comply with the legislation because we cannot tell the truth. Bankers are reluctant to spell out for the lender the interest rate which must be paid. They are hesitant about providing full information so that a rational decision can be made by the borrower. And, at the same time, the banks must oppose truth-in-lending because they are "shills" for their good customers—the loan companies. What's good for the loan companies must be good for the commercial bankers.

Let me state again that I look favorably upon legislation which would enable the borrower to better choose between competing credit offers. At the same time, however, I am not certain that this type of legislation would solve the problems that the consumer faces when he seeks credit or attempts to make a loan. Let's put some meat and potatoes on the truth-in-lending menu, and seek legislation that would go to the root of the problem. I would look with favor on some type of Federal statute that would provide a fair and reasonable limit on interest rates, including those imposed on small loans. Such a law is needed because of the wide variance in small loan laws from state to state. These laws carry interest rates that range as high as 48 percent. In fact, a so-called uniform small loan law which has made the rounds and been adopted in many states recommends a 36 percent limit, a figure which to my way of thinking is nothing more than legalized

larceny. In addition, the rapid rise of mail order borrowing clearly justifies the need for Federal legislation in this area. Servicemen are, perhaps, the biggest losers in the mail order borrowing business, particularly those stationed abroad. The Domestic Finance Subcommittee learned that many small loan companies open offices in states with the highest small loan rates, and then offer loans through the mail. The company is careful to make certain that the contract for the loan is executed in the state bearing the high interest rate, even though the borrower may be situated in a state having a lower rate. Why should a person in one state pay more for money than a person in another? A Federal law would change this, and I am certain would correct many of the abuses which have gone on in the small loan field.

Thus, while I will support truth-in-lending legislation of any type, since I feel it would be a step forward, I would rather see legislation that would prevent the borrower from being bilked, instead of merely requiring the lender to tell the borrower that he is being bilked.

At the same time banks are fighting against truth-in-lending legislation, they are waging an aggressive battle to change laws so that their profits can be increased. Legislatures are being bombarded with demands that the 6 percent usury laws be raised to a much higher level. Unfortunately, state usury laws provide only minimal protection for the borrower, and any attempt to dilute this protection would leave the borrower virtually unprotected from the profit-grasping clutches of the bankers. If state usury laws are raised only 2 percentage points, it will mean that the average homeowner will have to work at least one extra year, simply to pay the interest on his home mortgage. This fact does not bother the bankers. They are only interested in the increased profits it will bring into their treasuries. But it is important to you as members of the credit union movement. You must use all your energy and resources to fight any attempt to increase the usury law in any state.

It would be a grave mistake for credit unions to underestimate the objectives or powers of bankers seeking credit union elimination. This is not a scheme drawn up by some bank lobbyist in order to justify his pay check. The amount of money, the number of people, and the amount of work which the bankers are throwing into this fight should clearly indicate that the bankers mean business. They may tell you they are your friends; but if this is true, why, then, do the banking braintrusts seek the elimination of credit unions? It may be true that the bank in your community is a sincere friend of your credit union, and may endorse privately—if not publicly—the work you have done. But I assure you that this banker will soon be whipped into line by the Washington bully-boys of the American Bankers Association. The bankers want to present a united front on every issue in which they take sides. The bankers do not provide for minority viewpoints in their power struggle.

What, then, will the credit union movement do to protect itself from this unwarranted attack by bankers?

There are several choices open to you. You can ignore the bankers and tell yourselves that the bankers really are your friends, and are only making these attacks on credit unions for publicity purposes. You can rest on your laurels, pointing out that credit unions do such a wonderful job in this country that our interests will be protected by legislators on both the Federal and State levels. You can stand idly by with your hats in your hands and let the bankers steamroll you. All of these courses of action would be tragic mistakes.

There is a course of action that will not only benefit credit unions, but also benefit everyone who strives for more service to the public interest in our financial community. Credit unions have more than 18 million members who belong to more than 22,000 credit unions. Mobilize these members and credit unions and fight the bankers. Stand up to them and tell your story publicly and loudly. Organize letter-writing campaigns to your Congressmen and Senators. Tell them what the bankers are advocating and, at the same time, tell them what your organizations are doing to better life in this country.

Your leaders have outlined a dynamic legislative program. You will not see passage of a single piece of that legislation unless you are willing to work for it. Let your elected representatives know your reasons for needing this legislation. Point out the number of people who are members of your credit unions. Hit them with the facts. Tell them what you want and what you expect. As a group representating more than 18 million people, you are much more highly representative of this nation's needs than are the bankers.

I have often heard it said by Members of Congress that they would like to vote a particular way on a piece of legislation, but because of hundreds of letters from commercial bankers in their District, they had decided to vote in the way suggested by the bankers. If the bankers can accomplish their legislative program with a few hundred letters, let credit unions accomplish their programs with thousands of letters. A highly organized letter-writing campaign can have a great effect on the voting outcome of legislation. I sincerely hope before you leave York this weekend that you discuss the need for better grassroots support among credit unions. Your representatives in Harrisburg, Washington, and Madison do an outstanding job, but there is nothing more effective than a letter or letters from a Member's constituents outlining their views on a particular piece of legislation.

In closing, I would like to quote from a letter I received recently from a man who felt he had been treated unjustly by a bank concerning his auto loan. I feel this paragraph is an acute observation of what has happened to banking in our country. If there are those among you who still maintain that bankers are credit unions' friends, I hope that you will listen closely to this paragraph.

The letterwriter states:

"In a small town where I grew up in the 30s and 40s, the local banker was placed on a level with the local doctors and judges. You could stake your life on his word. Interest was calculated as simple interest. Nowadays, you can put no stock in what your banker tells you and they will skin you just as quick as a loan shark or fly-by-night loan company. . ."

It has been a pleasure for me to be here and I sincerely thank you for the opportunity to speak to you.

A BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our President has now returned from his historic Latin American conference, and while we closely watched him and the events at Punta del Este last week, the time is now before us to analyze the meaning and future significance of this summit meeting. The April 16 Newark Star Ledger contained a perceptive editorial summing up the goals and hopes of Punta del Este, while pointing out also the difficulties that lie ahead. I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

The editorial follows:

A BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL

It would have been relatively easy . . . and popular . . . for President Johnson to have gone to the Latin summit at Punta del Este as the Chief of State bearing impressive pledges of enormous aid to relieve the grinding poverty of Latin America.

This is what is expected of the richest, most powerful nation on earth, the progenitor of the open-handed policy of foreign aid.

But Mr. Johnson astutely realized that the predictable, the expected is not the antidote for Latin America's monumental ailments. A lot more than that will be needed for the economic and social salvation of our hemispheric neighbors.

There will be expanded U.S. aid, of course. But there must be a new spirit, a new mood of determination and purpose created by Latin nations themselves if they are to lift their underdeveloped economies.

And that is what Mr. Johnson sought to create, a feeling of independence among Latin countries, a determination to help themselves and to help each other. This will mean a radical excision of nationalistic jealousies and suspicions, a rapprochement among Latin countries to improve trade and political relations among themselves.

This is not going to be easy; no one expects it to be . . . least of all Latin leaders and President Johnson. But fortunately they have established a consensus, with one lone dissenting voice raised by Ecuador, that U.S. aid by itself, no matter how massive, is not going to accomplish the impressive goals set at the summit meeting.

The sinews for an economic and social renaissance for Latin America have been created by common agreement . . . a common market, the physical foundations for Latin American economic integration through multi-national projects, a substantial increase in Latin trade revenues, the modernization of living conditions for rural populations and the elevation of agricultural productivity and an increase in food production, for the benefit of Latin America and the rest of the world.

These are the goals laid down at Punta del Este; they can be achieved on a long term basis but only with the wholehearted participation of Latin nations in conjunction with expansive U.S. aid. There is really no other alternative, other than revolutionary anarchy.

VISTA ACADEMY AWARD WINNER

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, April 10, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences presented their 39th annual "Academy Awards Presentation." Almost the entire Nation viewed this entertaining and suspenseful evening on television. An Oscar was awarded for the best short subject documentary to a VISTA film entitled "A Year Toward Tomorrow,"

produced for the Office of Economic Opportunity by Mr. Edmond Levy. VISTA stands for Volunteers in Service to America.

I had the privilege of viewing this film earlier in the year, and was deeply impressed by this story of the individual battle of three VISTA volunteers against the inertia bred of generations of poverty. Narrated by Actor Paul Newman, who eagerly donated his services, the film was made on location in the area where these volunteers lived and worked. Completely unrehearsed, it described the frustration, determination, and hope experienced by two girls on a Navajo Indian reservation in Arizona, and a Navy veteran working as a VISTA volunteer in the slums of Atlanta, Ga.

We should all be very proud of VISTA's achievements, not only for the worldwide acclaim their film has received, but for the meaningful, daily contributions these VISTA volunteers, as an arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity, are making in this war against ignorance and despair. We congratulate them all.

THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a commemorative program was held in Newark, N.J. in observance of the 24th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. Leaders of our State and local government were present among the capacity crowd attending this event, sponsored by 50 local and national organizations, to commemorate one of the most atrocious episodes in man's history, and one of the most heroic episodes in the history of the Jewish people.

Perhaps no one will ever understand how the mind of man could become so twisted, his emotions so distorted, that one group of men could commit the atrocities against another group of men which occurred that infamous week. The world learned with horror and disbelief of the barbarious massacre of the Jewish people in the Warsaw ghetto.

Never will the world forget the heartrending resistance of the Jewish people of the Warsaw ghetto. Virtually unarmed, knowing in advance their resistance would fail, a doomed people dared to challenge the Nazi war machine. Faced with certain death, the ghetto inhabitants by choice fought to their last ounce of breath, registering for eternity their outrage against man's capacity for inhumanity.

The Warsaw ghetto uprising was the awe-inspiring response of those remaining Jewish people to the last and most horrible Nazi policy toward the ghetto—liquidation. The ghetto had been established in Warsaw by November 15, 1940, sealing within an area of 100 square city blocks a Jewish population of around 500,000. The ghetto inhabitants were given daily rations equivalent to 184 calories per person. Starvation and disease claimed the lives of thousands.

By the summer of 1942 the second phase of Nazi policy toward the ghetto began. The ghetto inhabitants were informed that they were to be "resettled in the East." Resettlement consisted of deportation to concentration camps equipped with gas chambers. It is estimated that 300,000 of the Warsaw ghetto Jews were deported in this manner or shot for resisting deportation.

From a population of 500,000, the ghetto inhabitants had now been reduced to 40,000. The Nazis decided in early 1943 to begin the third and final phase of their policy toward the Warsaw ghetto—liquidation. On January 18, 1943, the Nazis for the first time were met with armed resistance by the ghetto inhabitants. The element of surprise was on the side of the resisters; the Nazis drew back.

Knowing deportation meant death, knowing the Nazis would be enraged by the first resistance, the ghetto inhabitants feverishly prepared for the inevitable Nazi attack. Their decision was made. They would not be meekly led to death. The indomitable spirit of the Jewish people, despite the tragedy which awaited them, despite their physical weakness resulting from the suffering they had thus far endured, that indomitable spirit soared, enabling them to resist for 8 days the crushing power of Nazi military strength. With limited artillery and ammunition, much of it homemade, some of it supplied by the Polish underground movement, the Jewish people in the Warsaw ghetto unbelievably fought for 8 days against German soldiers armed with artillery, tanks, incendiaries, and bombers.

The Warsaw ghetto was liquidated. But never from the mind of man will be erased the memory of the epic monumentally courageous uprising of the inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto. This indomitable spirit of the Jewish people serves today as an inspiration to all men of good will that the freedom and independence we seek for all mankind may soon be realized.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my questionnaire on the issues which I recently forwarded my constituents continues to bring a number of very interesting comments. Several persons have forwarded letters expanding on their views. One of these recently came from Mr. Weldon Ellis, of Nashville, who expressed his views on the subject of "What Happened to the Monroe Doctrine?"

I would like to have Mr. Ellis' letter printed in the RECORD at this point:

NASHVILLE, TENN.

Re: What happened to the Monroe Doctrine?

Hon. RICHARD FULTON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for offering me the opportunity to express my opinions on several important matters. Some of the questions that were asked have their roots deep in history. For me to try to give you a "yes" or "no" answer to them might be misleading. It would be, to me, like answering "yes" or "no" to "would I rather be red or dead." Fortunately there are other alternatives. I would rather remain what I am, an American who is a firm believer in our form of Democratic Capitalism.

As far as I am concerned, we have followed our present foreign policy for enough years to convince me that it is leading us into atomic war. If that is what this nation really wanted it should continue to ignore the lessons of history and force a showdown with China. Since I feel certain that it does not want war, I think that we should chart a different course. But lets look at history before we do so. Lets look particularly at Asian history, and Russian.

Russian history is full of attacks on her from the west, and of attempts on her part to create protective buffer states. She likes friendly neighbors, just as we do. The account of the battle of Novgorod with the Swedes is most interesting. You can substitute Stalingrad and Germans and the accounts are the same, even to the creation of protective satellites. History does repeat itself.

Russia has been attacked by Sweden, Poland, France, and Germany, from the west. She has defeated all of those invaders. One does not usually fear a defeated opponent. Russia has only been defeated by opponents from the east. The Mongols, under Genghis Khan, overran Russia, and the Japanese defeated her at sea. The Russians would naturally look with more fear toward the east than to the west.

Russia and China make what could be called "natural" enemies. Both are land powers, with large armies. They have adjoining borders. There are disputed territories that both claim. There is a long history of Chinese expansions and China is on the move again. If we leave them alone they will counterbalance each other. But we are the outsider who is interfering in family affairs. Russia and China will have no choice but to close ranks against us if we continue to interfere.

We interfered in Asian affairs when we forced Japan to open her doors and thus to become a modern nation. We had to fight Japan, in WW II, to stop her aggression in Asia. We interfered in China's internal affairs and lost a former friend. Regardless of reason or intent, we again interfered when we intervened in Korea, China entered the war in Korea when we neared her borders. She became unhappy, as we did when Russia neared our borders. Regardless of intent or reason, we are again interfering in Viet Nam. Instead of a friend we now have an enemy in mainland China, an incensed enemy with nuclear power. History shows that we are on a direct collision course with China and perhaps Russia.

Long ago we declared a very sensible, logical, and reasonable, foreign policy, known as the Monroe Doctrine. It was a clear statement of "Keep your hands out of American affairs" and the world understood. Russia enforced her version of the Monroe Doctrine, when she put down the revolt in Hungary. It was brutally done and the world was shocked. But it was understood as an act of self-protection. Russia did not want any unfriendly neighbors, as close as Hungary. We are not happy about Cuba either.

We started to do the same thing in Cuba when we forced Russia to remove her missiles. The respect for the United States rose

in the eyes of the world. We were willing, if necessary, to protect our sovereignty. Unfortunately, we seem to have lost the courage of our convictions. We are tolerating a nearby source of infection that should be eradicated.

Communist Cuba is a cancerous growth that is metastasising and creating more cells throughout Latin America. Bolivian troops are fighting invaders today because of our reluctance to stand behind our stated foreign policy of hands off the Americas. We are spending billions of dollars and asking young Americans to die in fighting Communism in Viet Nam, while we tolerate it under our noses. But that is merely a reflection of our lack of a coherent foreign policy.

We did what could be characterized, with the advantage of hindsight, as a childish thing when we declared a world-wide policy of containment of Communism. We said, in effect, we will let you Communists have some of Asia and a bit of Europe as your playground, while we take the rest of the world. That could be looked on as an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. But it could also be looked upon as the same thing that a child does when he draws a line on the ground and dares another child to step across it. We invited aggression. We dared the Communists to step across that line of containment. No self-respecting nation could refuse such a dare and still face the world. What would we have done if Russia had drawn a similar line around us?

History is full of similar kinds of attempts at repression. Each has represented a resort to force, to try to stop a movement from growing. It is hard enough to do at home and is far worse when its around the world. The effort required increases as the square of the distance. Also, outside pressure is most effective in galvanizing a nation into action. North and South American nations grew out of oppression. The people of Britain united to withstand the attacks of Nazi Germany. Look at repression throughout history and look at what we are trying to do. We are trying to use force to repress Communism throughout the world. The way to defeat Communism is not by using physical force in far parts of the world. The way to do it is by setting an example here in this hemisphere. There is ample opportunity here to show our true strength. We can demonstrate that we are a nation that can be trusted.

President Eisenhower is reputed to have said that we could not afford to let the Vietnamese vote because they would vote for Communism. If that were true, at the time that he was supposed to have said it, it was a clear statement that we did not believe in practicing what we preached. We told the world that we did not believe in the democratic process unless we were sure of winning. Are we a democratic nation? Do we live by our principles? If we do not live up to our agreements, how can we expect others to trust us?

We are letting ourselves be frightened into aggression by the "domino theory" of military successes. The advocates of the domino theory say that if Viet Nam falls, Laos will fall. If Laos falls, then Thailand will fall, and so on, and so on, until finally all of us will be eating chop suey and speaking Chinese. That is the figment of the fearful thinking of some people about China. There is such a thing as being over-extended, as England, France, Holland, Spain, Japan, and Germany have all learned.

If the dominoes did start falling, as predicted, there are other, and much closer nations who would not stand idly by. Pakistan offered to come to the aid of India, in her fight against China. Russia and other nations would be forced to act on their own. Chinese aggression has been stopped in the past, long before these United States of America came into being. Finally, there is the small matter of air and sea power that are happily lacking from China's stock of armaments. No major overseas expansion is possible without both of those.

Russia does not want China to expand. We will miss a golden opportunity if we do not pull out of Viet Nam as soon as feasible and let Russia and China face each other. Let Russia bear the burden and pay the cost of keeping China within its boundaries. She will do it if we let her. She will have no choice because she is China's neighbor. Any move of China toward or around Russia will be suspect.

The admiration of Russia for the West long pre-dates Communism. Over the centuries Russia has become a western oriented nation. The Russians are trying their best to remake themselves in our image. They have learned that theoretical Communism won't work. From what I have read and heard, the people of Russia want peace and prosperity. They revolted against oppression and fought to obtain the right to have their own affluent society. The people of Russia are human, they want bread, not guns. They have the same aspirations for their children that we have for ours. They will demand, and get what they want from their leaders, if we will only step aside and let them.

Now, let's take a look at this beautiful nation that we have inherited, and the affluent society that we have built. We have, in being, the best, the finest, the most foolproof, anti-Communist armor in the world. We have, already installed and in operation, what can truly be called, "Democratic Capitalism." We have created a way of life whereby both private corporate enterprise and public governmental enterprise are owned by the voting public. They are owned by the stockholders and the taxpayers who take the trouble to vote. We have combined, in one system, the best elements of free enterprise and public endeavor. It is, in truth, the finest system in the world. We just do not appreciate it.

We still have a little house cleaning and repair work to do before our anti-Communism system is termite proof. We need to eliminate all forms of pollution: in the air, in the water, and on the ground. We need to eliminate poverty, economic and social. We need to clean out all forms of slums, tear down the man-made forests of utility poles, build schools, hospitals, roads, recreation and reclamation projects, and do whatever else that may be necessary to show what Democratic Capitalism can do when it really gets in high gear.

We no longer need to use force to get others to accept our way of life. We have established working models in Asia and in Europe. The amazing post-war growth of both Japan and West Germany is due primarily to our having cleaned out their outmoded factories and home workshops. We also introduced modern management methods, such as production and quality control. We have two shining examples of what others can do, once they adopt our way of doing things. We can in turn, learn from them.

There is still another side of the coin that needs examining. We are straining our economy by keeping troops around the world. We are killing and being killed, thousands of miles from home. We are not only expending our human and natural resources abroad, we are bringing on inflation and higher taxes here at home. We are paying a high price, in blood and dollars, in a vain attempt to police the world. We are trying to do what no other nation in history has succeeded in doing.

What is worse, we are leaving our nation, our heartland that has to support our troops abroad, exposed to attacks by nuclear missiles. If we could only stop our headlong flight toward destruction, we could: build the necessary anti-missile systems to protect us; add to instead of decreasing our military strength; clean out all forms of pollution and crime; and, at the same time, strengthen our economy. We could gain in many ways by letting others fight their own battles within the confines of their own Monroe Doctrines.

It has been said that fear can bring about that which is feared. We should not let our fear of others lead us into blindly destroying both their way of life and ours. We should stop arming the world for war and start building an even better way of life here at home. We need to strengthen our economic and social armor, as well as our military might.

Sincerely yours,

WELDON ELLIS.

TRENDS MR. SAMPSON SEES

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hobart H. Sampson recently forwarded and had published a letter to the editor of the Nashville Tennessean.

In his letter, Mr. Sampson remarks on a number of trends which he sees in this country and which he views with alarm.

I have unanimous consent to have Mr. Sampson's letter printed in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 1, 1967.

To the EDITOR:

This is my first attempt to write such a letter but in viewing the National, State, and local Government conditions, I have become very much alarmed.

With each daily news release, our Government Taxing Agencies are trying to find new concepts for laying of new taxes on the individual. It will not take many more straws to break the camel's back.

Pacific Gas and Electricity's Edition of Progress in a Statistical Research of all Recorded History states that the average age of the world's great civilizations has been *200 years*. These nations progressed through this sequence;

From Bondage to Spiritual Faith
From Spiritual Faith to Great Courage
From Courage to Liberty
From Liberty to Abundance
From Abundance to Selfishness
From Selfishness to Complacency
From Complacency to Apathy
From Apathy to Dependence
From Dependence back again to Bondage

Note: The italicized is our approximate point in history.

Edward Gibbon in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" gave five basic reasons why that great civilization withered and died. These were:

"The undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home which is the basis for human society."

"Higher and higher taxes; the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the populace."

"The mad craze for pleasure; sports becoming every year more exciting, more brutal, more immoral."

"The building of great armaments when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual responsibility."

"The decay of religion; faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life, losing power to guide the people."

In the light of these facts, does anyone have difficulty concluding that history is repeating itself, and that prophesy is about to be fulfilled?

The personal, National and International

remedy is the Lord Jesus Christ. Nationally and Internationally "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14:34)

"Happy is that people—whose God is the Lord" (Psalm 144:15)

Statistically, as of this forthcoming 4th July, we will have *nine years left* to continue as a *sovereign nation*. This cycle is not inevitable—It depends on you—the individual.

HOBART H. SAMPSON.

OLD HICKORY, TENN.

EAST-WEST TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I issued a news release to the newspapers, radio and television stations in my State that I believe will be of interest to the Members of the House:

WASHINGTON.—Congressman Walter S. Baring today warned Congress to take another look at the proposed East-West trade legislation following a statement by unidentified U.S. officials that the Soviet Union and Communist China have worked out an agreement to speed up Soviet military supplies to North Vietnam across China.

"How can we conscientiously even think of engaging in a trade with Communist countries who are making an all-out effort to speed up supplies to kill American boys in Vietnam," Baring said.

"For reasons best known to themselves, these U.S. officials have declined to be identified by name or agency in the press. But they report that, contrary to any impression left by Soviet allegations, Russian shipments to North Vietnam are moving across China in a steady stream."

A story in today's New York Times quoted the unnamed U.S. officials as stating that the Soviet Union and Communist China had apparently worked out an understanding to speed the flow of Soviet military supplies to Vietnam.

"It is inconceivable to me," Baring said, "that we keep our American military commanders from cutting the enemy supply lines and attacking vital military targets—that we know Russian military supplies are being used against our forces in Vietnam—and yet our government talks about opening new avenues of East-West cooperation."

PROBLEMS OF BLINDNESS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the problems of blindness are so immense that I find it difficult to believe that they can be comprehended by persons possessed of their vision. That blindness is disabling per se needs no proof. The question is, "Are we providing sufficient benefits for the blind?"

Many blind persons cannot qualify for disability benefits under our social security laws due to the lack of sufficient quarters of coverage. Since the possibility of the blind acquiring the necessary quarters is extremely limited, I have introduced H.R. 8445, which would permit blind persons to qualify for disability if they have been credited with six quarters of social security coverage.

The hardships of a life of blindness can, to an extent, be eased by extending the social security law to provide disability benefits to blind persons who cannot now qualify. These unfortunate people do not need pity—they need help that this bill can afford to them. I urge that H.R. 8445 be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to place the text of my bill in the RECORD:

H.R. 8445

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 223(a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual other than an individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in subsection (c)(2)(B)), has not attained the age of 65,".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age 65" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual other than an individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in subsection (c)(2)(B)), the month in which he attains age 65".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and, in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in subsection (c)(2)(B)), as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2)(B))" after "An individual"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence following subparagraph (B)) the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)(B)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than six quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs."

(2) Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) blindness; and, for purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees."

(c)(1) The first sentence of section 216(i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 223(c)(2)(B)."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223(c)(2)(B))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

COLLEGE HOUSING BILL

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to help overcome the critical and growing shortage of college housing. This is a major factor in the financial pressure on our colleges and universities and on the parents of college students.

The college housing loan program, created in 1950, has made an important contribution toward meeting this problem through the financing of some 600,000 housing accommodations over the years. In spite of this, we have not caught up with soaring enrollments, and today we are faced both with a substantial backlog of housing needed now and the prospect that enrollments will rise even more rapidly in the years just ahead.

A recent study published by the Joint Economic Committee cites the need for the expenditure of over $10 billion in the coming decade for college housing. Similarly, a study prepared for the American Council on Education estimates that we will need an additional 1.5 million housing accommodations at institutions of higher learning over the same period. However measured, it is clear that we have a tremendous job to do to fully achieve our educational objectives, not just for the benefit of the students but for the benefit of our entire Nation.

The fact is that the demand for financing for college housing in recent years has far outrun the funds available from the loan program. I know that many of my colleagues have received urgent requests from colleges in their districts since the Department of Housing and Urban Development stopped accepting loan applications in January of last year. That action was taken because the backlog of pending applications had reached $760 million, more than twice the annual increment of new loan funds provided for in existing law. Meanwhile, we have slipped further behind in meeting this vital need.

The bill I have just introduced is designed to supplement the existing loan program and provide the needed housing at a cost within the reach of students and their families without imposing a serious burden on the Federal budget. It would be done through private financing, with the Government providing only that margin of assistance necessary to give colleges the benefit of the same 3-percent

financing available under the existing loan program.

The approach in my bill is very simple: the university would finance the housing by selling serial bonds to private investors at the market rate of interest under a contract previously entered into, HUD would make an annual payment of the difference between the actual debt service—principal and interest—and the debt service at a 3-percent interest rate. Before HUD could enter into any such contract it would have to obtain approval from the Appropriations Committee. The 3-percent direct loan authorization in existing law would remain available to be used in cases where the private market required an inordinately high interest rate, with discretion left to the Secretary to determine the dividing line.

The impact on the Federal budget in any year under the supplemental payment approach would be very small. For example, assuming an average private market interest rate of 5½ percent for public and private universities together, an annual supplement of less than $10 million would achieve the effect of 3-percent interest for $300 million of college housing financing.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill for appropriate reference in the belief that it offers a promising approach to the problem of financing college housing and in the hope that it will stimulate thinking about this serious problem. The Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over the college housing program, will begin 2 weeks of hearings on housing tomorrow and I hope they will give the bill thorough consideration and careful technical review. Certainly the need is there, and I plan to do everything in my power to achieve effective action by this session of the Congress to help our colleges and universities meet their housing problems.

"TIGER" TEAGUE: APOLLO INQUIRY CHIEF

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, there is a wise saying from the past that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country. I hesitate to take exception to this noted saying, but I have the privilege of serving with a distinguished gentleman who has made this saying open to question. This man is OLIN E. TEAGUE, my colleague and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I have the privilege of serving as a member.

When it is among the other Members of Congress, in Washington, in the Nation, or right in his home district in Texas, the qualities of Chairman TEAGUE are known and admired.

A story in the New York Times on Tuesday, April 18, portrayed some of the outstanding attributes of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, but it would take much more than one story to detail the qualities which have made Chairman TEAGUE a leading force in our Nation today. His vitality knows no bounds, and he is well deserving of the nickname of "TIGER" which he has borne since his first days in this body.

"TIGER" TEAGUE'S work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee is so well known that it needs no eulogy. But in the years that I have known him I have found that whether he is serving as a chairman or as a member, he is equally interested and knows all the facts concerning any undertaking which comes his way.

An outstanding example of this is one of his recent significant achievements. "TIGER" TEAGUE had been appointed Vice Chairman of a special Presidential Panel on Veterans' Matters to work in conjunction with a similar group from the Republic of the Philippines. An unsettled group of questions faced the panel relating to veterans of that country who had served with the U.S. forces during World War II. The chairman of the panel became ill, and "TIGER" TEAGUE took over the leadership of the panel. His adroit handling of this highly important assignment, his forthright discussions with our Filipino friends, brought new understanding of a problem of two decades' standing. Because of his leadership and his great abilities not only in internal affairs but in the international realm, there are greater bonds between the United States and one of our principal allies in the Pacific.

Despite the fact that Chairman TEAGUE has become an expert and his opinions highly respected in the fields of veterans' affairs, space exploration and international affairs, the people of his district in Texas know him as a personal friend vitally interested in their problems. His office has an open door at all times, and there is no limit on his time when his constituents and their problems are involved.

It is a privilege and an inspiration to serve with "TIGER." His knowledge and assessment of any question is profound. His judgment is always just and equitable. I am sure that this opinion is shared by all of my colleagues here today.

As a part of the high regard which is expressed by constituents and friends of OLIN TEAGUE and the people of this Nation in general, I would like to commend the following article from the New York Times to every Member of this Congress and to the people of our country:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1967]

APOLLO INQUIRY CHIEF—OLIN EARL TEAGUE

WASHINGTON, April 17.—Nearly every day, a stocky man with graying hair scampers nimbly around the paddle ball court in the House gymnasium. On his left foot he wears a special shoe with a rocker sole because of a missing ankle bone.

MAN IN THE NEWS

Friends say it is typical of Representative Olin Earl Teague, Democrat of Texas, that he refuses to be daunted by the infirmity he suffered when a shell fragment nearly severed his left foot on the Siegfried Line in 1944. He spent two years in military hospitals and came out fighting. He has been fighting ever since. His friends affectionately call him "Tiger" Teague.

He is one of the space effort's strongest champions in Congress, and he now finds himself presiding over a House subcommittee inquiry into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's greatest failure—the fire in which three astronauts died in the Apollo spacecraft last Jan. 27 at Cape Kennedy.

FOUGHT BONUS BILL

The investigation poses a personal dilemma for him. If he is too critical of NASA, Congress might sharply cut back funds for space efforts. If he is too lenient, he leaves himself open to the charge that he is whitewashing the agency.

In some respects, the dilemma is similar to the one he faced when he came to Congress 21 years ago. A political unknown, just out of the hospital, he had won the seat largely because he was a war hero. Fellow veterans in the little cotton towns of northeastern Texas were his strongest supporters.

Yet it was Olin Teague who led the successful fight against a multibillion-dollar veterans' bonus bill in 1949.

The veterans' lobby vowed to "get him" in the next election. But Olin Teague has handily won every election since then, and today he is the principal Congressional policy maker on veterans' legislation.

SPONSORED GI BILL

As chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, he has continued to serve as buffer between Congress and what he considers excessive demands of the veterans' lobby. Grateful colleagues on both sides of the aisle hail him as the man "who's kept the veterans' lobby off our backs."

But while waging a running fight against what he regards as "veterans' give-aways," Mr. Teague has steered through Congress the most far-reaching veterans' legislation since World War II.

He sponsored the Korean G.I. Bill of Rights, the war orphans scholarship program and rate increases for widows and disabled veterans. His emphasis has been on aid to the sick and needy and disabled.

However, he is no Great Society liberal. More often than not, he has voted against the social improvement programs proposed by a fellow Texan, President Johnson. Mr. Teague comes from a largely conservative district, and his voting reflects it.

Born 57 years ago in College Station, Tex., he worked his way through Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College by cleaning out cow barns at night and mowing lawns by day.

After graduation he worked for the post office in his home town and then, in 1940, volunteered for Army service. As commander of the First Battalion, 314th Infantry, 79th Division, he faced artillery fire for 90 straight days of combat before the Battle of the Bulge. He was wounded six times, won 11 decorations and emerged from World War II with the rank of colonel.

One of the most popular members of the House, he frequently invites friends to his Rayburn Building office for steak dinners, which he cooks on a portable electric stove.

Despite his handicap, he is one of the best paddle ball players in the House. He is an avid gardener, specializing in geraniums and azaleas.

He and his wife, the former Freddie Dunman of Fort Worth, have three children: Jack, an Air Force Captain who served with the Special Forces in Vietnam and is now in training as a jet pilot; James, who is with an Agency for International Development mission in Vietnam, and Jill, a student at the University of Texas.

PARKERSBURG'S BERNARD McDONOUGH

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Parkersburg, W. Va., is the home of a very remarkable man, Bernard P. McDonough, a prominent industrialist whose life is a legend. Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the New York Times of Sunday, April 16, concerning Mr. McDonough and his works:

PERSONALITY: MAN WITH A FEELING OF SUCCESS—CUDAHY'S NEW CHIEF BELIEVES IN ACTING ON IMPULSES

(By David Dworsky)

PARKERSBURG, W. VA.—Hatless and coatless despite the chill, overcast afternoon, Bernard Patrick McDonough walked out of his mountainside home and watched a car wind its way up the gravel driveway.

He paused to reassure a large German shepherd named Duke, who had burst into a spasm of barking.

"I'm McDonough," he said to a visitor. "How was your flight? Have you had lunch? Come on, I'll broil a steak."

Mr. McDonough, the new chairman, chief executive officer and controlling stockholder of the nation's seventh largest meat packer, demonstrated ease and familiarity while cooking the meat.

But, he quipped over lunch in a guest cottage that stands beside the main house, it will be an entirely different matter to learn how to profitably slaughter, dress and market meat products.

Late last month, the 63-year-old businessman achieved a financial coup of sorts by acquiring an 18 per cent stock interest in the Cudahy Company from the estate of E. A. Cudahy. The block is by far the biggest held by anyone and gives him effective control.

Mr. McDonough said the sum paid for Cudahy, which rang up sales of $365-million last year, "is my affair," but from several subsequent references to the transactions, it is doubtful that more than $4-million was involved.

The meat packer, however, may be laced with gristle. Cudahy sustained losses in four of the last five years, primarily because of labor problems and inefficient plants. Wall Street sources close to the company expect no immediate reversal as few of the problems that produced the deficits have been substantially eliminated.

The executive detailed no specific plans to rejuvenate Cudahy, other than to clamp down in spending and superfluous administrative expenses.

"It took years for Cudahy to get the way it is," he said, "and it isn't going to turn around overnight. I am going to give the company plenty of attention and we are going to get on the ball."

Mr. McDonough leaned back in a wicker chair, swallowed a forkload of steak, potato and onions, and said, "You've kind of got to have that feeling of success to get started or you don't get started at all.

"Can Cudahy make $6-million before taxes?" he asked rhetorically. "I'm betting a few million dollars to find out."

The telephone in the cottage rang constantly. Mr. McDonough takes calls of a personal nature through a regular telephone, but others through an amplifier that enables him to hear and speak from anywhere in the room.

Asked why he bought Cudahy, Mr. McDonough paused for a long, reflective moment before answering, and said:

"I didn't plan to buy Cudahy. I don't plan to do anything. I'm a horse trader, I'm always buying some thing."

The phone rang again, and Mr. McDonough excused himself with a sigh of weary resignation.

Only by telephone, he explained later, can he keep on top of the 10 or so companies he owns. These interests range from a shovel factory in Parkersburg to a cement and gravel plant in Houston to a tugboat business in New Orleans. He also owns a motel in Arizona and a castle in Ireland.

These holdings make Mr. McDonough one of Parkersburg's most influential citizens, one of its largest employers and probably its wealthiest resident.

Mr. McDonough believes in acting on his impulses. He bought Cudahy after knowing the company and its owners only a short time. He purchased the Casa Blanca Motel in Scottsdale, Ariz., after the former owner "took me into the bar and started buying me doubles."

During a vacation in Ireland in 1963, Mr. McDonough purchased Dromoland, a 1,000-year-old castle near Shannon. He paid about $600,000 for the castle and spent about $1.5-million more in restoring the structure, which now "breaks even" as a luxury hotel.

Again acting on a whim, he purchased the 700-acre plot on which his large, two-story home now stands. The residence has fewer than a dozen rooms, but some are 100 feet long.

Mr. McDonough is probably Parkersburg's leading practicing Irishman. He was born in San Antonio, Tex., but has lived here since he was 16 years old. He has seen much of Europe but now goes only to Ireland, where he owns a home and a hotel, as well as Dromoland.

His grandfather was born in County Galway, and laid track for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad through West Virginia.

Surrounding the outskirts of Parkersburg are factories owned by the O. Ames Company, a division of the McDonough Company and the base on which Mr. McDonough's empire rests.

Ames, a producer of shovels, was founded in 1774, "and is one of the very oldest companies in the United States," according to Mr. McDonough. "We built the shovels that built the railroads," he added.

The company, he noted, turns out three million shovels a year and accounts for nearly half of world shovel production.

Although the Cudahy Company lies 2,185 miles from here, in Phoenix, its new nerve center is Mr. McDonough's three-room office above the Wilmar Cafeteria and Bake Shop.

The stature Mr. McDonough holds in Parkersburg comes into clear focus as his car, a black Cadillac, inches toward his office through the five o'clock traffic of this city's congested Seventh Street.

It is not necessary for him to swing the car off the busy avenue. He stops the car in the middle of the thoroughfare and dashes between cars to the curb. A parking lot attendant who has spotted Mr. McDonough, is already darting out to retrieve the car and drive it off the avenue.

Mr. McDonough is greeted by his secretary with a bulging basket of work and a sheaf of telephone messages. He handles both chores simultaneously, all the while leafing through a copy of The Irish Times of Dublin, which is flown across the Atlantic each day.

Mr. McDonough plays no golf, sails no boats, collects no paintings.

"I work," he said, "I don't think I work very hard, but people tell me I do."

He and his wife, a slim, former West Virginia schoolteacher, who drives a green Cadillac, are frequently in New York, and once saw many Broadway plays.

"They bore me now," he said, "and I walk out the minute I get bored."

Mr. McDonough owns a Twin-Beech aircraft and retains a professional pilot on a full-time basis. He said he was considering buying a used Aero-Commander jet airliner, which had been offered to him for $700,000.

"I can afford it but Cudahy can't," Mr. McDonough said with a grin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

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. STRATTON, for 60 minutes, today; and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. STANTON), for 30 minutes, on April 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) to address the House following legislative business and to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RESNICK, for 1 hour, on April 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. MACHEN.

All Members (at the request of Mr. STANTON, on behalf of Mr. ZWACH), for 5 legislative days, to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in connection with the special order of Mr. ZWACH, today, on the National Grange.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STANTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. WALKER.

Mr. GATHINGS.

SENATE BILLS, CONCURRENT AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, concurrent and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 95. An act for the relief of Capt. Rey D. Baldwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 191. An act for the relief of Eileen Iris Punnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 233. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 324. An act for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 327. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Victor De La Concepcion Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 499. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Zuniga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wil-

son (nee Hiranaka); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 608. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 650. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Anthony J. Corso, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 714. An act to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committees, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 819. An act for the relief of Charles H. Thurston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 965. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act to enable Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 966. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1045. An act for the relief of Alton R. Conner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to establish the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1967 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 18, 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:

655. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of the Post Office Department pursuant to the provisions of section 2304 of title 39, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

656. A letter from the Chairman, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

657. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of 31 projects selected for funding through grants, contracts, and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, and with private firms, pursuant to the provisions of 80 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

658. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to raise the maximum age limit of schoolchildren entitled to transportation in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

659. A letter from the President, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the Council for the year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–259; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 3, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Tilghman Island Harbor, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 15, 1961; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 13, 1967, the following bill was reported on April 14, 1967:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 8363. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes (Rept. No. 192). 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. BARING:

H.R. 8599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 8600. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide for a secret ballot vote after an emergency board report to determine the wishes of the employees with respect to acceptance of the carrier's last offer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 8601. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction, based on a 36-month period, for air pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8603. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 8604. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 8605. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8606. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8607. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to $30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8608. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to authorize financial assistance for the provision of street lighting facilities in aid of the prevention or reduction of crime; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8609. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 8610. A bill to prohibit the payment by the Internal Revenue Service of informers' fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8611. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 8613. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 8614. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for extension of terms of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 8615. A bill to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8616. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 8617. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation into the United States of certain noxious aquatic plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8618. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 8619. A bill to regulate imports of

milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8620. A bill to amend section 114(b) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8621. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8622. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8623. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8624. A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 8625. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 8626. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 8627. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 8628. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8629. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1966 (Public Law 89-491); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8630. A bill to extend the authority for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8631. A bill to amend, consolidate, and clarify certain criminal contempt statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8632. A bill to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8633. A bill to repeal the provisions of section 41 of the act of March 2, 1917, as amended, relating to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8634. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Council on International Exchange to give open support to the overseas activities of private American voluntary associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 8635. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8636. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for public safety programs in blighted urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8637. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for fire control and prevention programs in blighted urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8638. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for sanitation and garbage collection programs in blighted urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8639. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for the control of rodents in urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8640. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8641. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 8642. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide an alternate method of making loans for acquisition and improvements of the farm, needed by farm families, including young farmers, and to provide the borrower family with adequate standards of living and the consumer with reasonable prices for dairy and other agricultural products, as well as to maintain and improve national health; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8643. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for milk and butterfat, to assure the Nation of adequate milk supplies and to improve dairy farm income by payments to producers of manufacturing milk and cream, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8644. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Council on International Exchange to give open support to the overseas activities of private American voluntary associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8645. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 8646. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 8647. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize annual grants to reduce the cost of private borrowing by educational institutions as an alternative form of assistance to the direct college housing loans presently provided for; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8648. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1958, to authorize payment of moving expenses in case of land acquired for inclusion in the national park system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8649. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Federal Power Act which exempt from Federal Power Commission regulation the issuance of securities by public utilities subject to certain State regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8650. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8651. A bill to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 8652. A bill to amend section 3109 of title 18, United States Code, to permit an officer to execute certain search warrants without giving notice of his authority or purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8653. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the issuance of a search warrant to search for and seize any property that may constitute evidence of the offense in connection with which the warrant is issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8654. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, to permit an appeal by the United States in certain instances from an order made before trial granting a motion for return of seized property and to suppress evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8655. A bill to amend section 2312 of title 18, United States Code, to permit a person enforcing that section to stop a motor vehicle to inspect the serial number of its body and motor if he has reason to suspect that the motor vehicle has been stolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 8656. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the city of Glendale, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8657. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Council on International Exchange to give open support to the overseas activities of private American voluntary associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 8658. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 506. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 507. Joint resolution to provide for the annual observance of National Civil Service Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the nuclear ship *Savannah*, including its ultimate disposition; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 315. Concurrent resolution to declare the week of June 18 National Coal Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Con. Res. 316. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 435. Resolution to create a committee for small unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:
H. Res. 436. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to promotion of certain members of the Reserves at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. MARTIN:
H. Res. 437. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the consideration of bills making appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER:
141. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to a study of the marketing of meat by chain food stores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
142. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to legislation to provide that voting polls close simultaneously across the Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.
143. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to the restoration of New Mexico highway fund allocations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
144. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to certain provisions in the cropland adjustments program; to the Committee on Agriculture.
145. Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
146. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the entry of the United States into World War I; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN:
H.R. 8659. A bill for the incorporation of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee; to the Commitee on District of Columbia.
By Mr. HARRISON:
H.R. 8660. A bill for the relief of Mary Knezovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCORMACK:
H.R. 8661. A bill for the relief of Chin Bak Koon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MATSUNAGA:
H.R. 8662. A bill for the relief of Tony S. Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MOORHEAD:
H.R. 8663. A bill for the relief of Anthony Francis Mannion; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MULTER:
H.R. 8664. A bill for the relief of Sandor Rothman (also known as Sandor Rotman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROSENTHAL:
H.R. 8665. A bill for the relief of Abraham Nassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. UTT:
H.R. 8666. A bill for the relief of Bassilio (Juan) Martinez (alias Mark Bradley); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

66. By Mr. CASEY: Petition of K. W. Zehfuss and other citizens of Harris County, Tex., that our Federal income tax law be amended to raise the amount of exemption on each dependent from $600 per year to $1,000 per year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
67. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to social security amendments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Jay Kaufman, executive vice president, B'nai B'rith, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Oh Lord, God of men, God of the strong and of the weak, from this august Chamber guerdoned with our Nation's power wherein labor the architects of fate, rearing the walls of our day's destiny, we pray for deeds to match our dire dilemmas. We pray for enactments to stay the unraveling of our Nation's unity, for statutes and ordinances designed to raise the lowly, the scorned seething to break the man-forged manacles binding them to despair, to lowly recompense, crumbling dwellings, deficient preparation to self-sufficient maturity, yet forced to live in their penury, face to face with fellow citizens granted in abundance all the fruits of the bounties of our most prosperous of lands.

From the hearts of all gathered here there rises unto Thee, oh Lord, the earnest beseechment for peace, the prayer for the wisdom to find our way out of the toils of war; a peace brought not by the coward's flight but through the brave man's concord. Our Heavenly Father, may the means be found to stay the carnage where brave men slay their brothers also brave, where the enemy we fight to Thee, oh Lord, is also dear.

Ma navoo al he-harim raglay m'vasayr mashmaya shalom.

How beautiful upon the hilltops are the feet of the messenger of the good tiding that announce Thy most precious gift of peace.—Isaiah 52: 7.

Oh God, may these legislators of our land follow the instructions of Hillel the Sage:

Hevay mee talmidov shel Aharon. Ohev shalom, ohev et ha-breeyot, oo m'korvay la Torah.

Be of the disciples of Aaron, lovers of peace, lovers of all men and may be ye ever nigh unto God's law—Talmud Avet 1: 12. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 14, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 12, 1967, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) to extend the period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 1966 Annual Report of the National Capital Housing Authority.

Impressive progress has been made by the Authority. More than 3,200 dwelling units are now being built or planned to provide better homes for low-income families in the District of Columbia.

Imaginative new approaches to provide decent housing are being tested—and with good results.

The first turnkey project in the Nation has recently been completed in Washington—a 343-unit building for low-income elderly families. This technique marshals the full resources of private enterprise—

To plan a low-cost public housing project.

To finance its construction.

To build the project.

After the housing has been completed, it is purchased and maintained by the local housing authority. Washington's turnkey project has shown that this technique can speed housing availability, reduce administrative costs, and improve the quality of housing through the genius of private enterprise.

In addition, the Authority has begun to lease units in privately owned dwellings to meet the immediate housing needs of low-income families in the District.

Another new program of the Authority is rehabilitating older homes for use by low-income families. A 10-unit pilot program successfully completed in 1966 forms the basis for a major effort to rehabilitate 240 units in 1967.

The National Capital Housing Authority maintains over 9,000 units of public housing. Still, the need for low-cost housing far exceeds the supply. Many needy applicants face years of waiting before decent housing can be made available. This shortage is complicated by rising construction costs and scarcity of land, making the need for new approaches more urgent.

The complexity of the task which lies ahead must not be allowed to diminish our resolve to make the Nation's Capital a city of which all Americans can be proud. For, as I said last year in my message to the Congress on American cities—

The prize—cities of spacious beauty and lively promise, where men are truly free to